

BS"D



To: parsha@parsha.net
From: cshulman@gmail.com

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET ON **TERUMAH** - 5767

In our 12th cycle. To receive this parsha sheet, go to <http://www.parsha.net> and click Subscribe or send a blank e-mail to subscribe@parsha.net Please also copy me at cshulman@gmail.com A complete archive of previous issues is now available at <http://www.parsha.net> It is also fully searchable.

This week's Internet Parsha Sheet is sponsored by:

Bob & Goldie Kikin robert.kikin@smithbarney.com in memory of Goldie's father 20th yearzeit. Yoel ben Yosef Aryeh HaLevi, Niftar 10th Adar

To sponsor an issue (proceeds to Tzedaka) email cshulman@gmail.com

<http://613.org/rav/ravnotes2.html>

Rav Soloveitchik ZT"L Notes (Volume 3)

Notice These are unapproved unedited notes [of R.Y.?] of classes given by Rav Soloveitchik. ...[Thanks to David Isaac for typing these notes]

Lecture delivered by Rabbi Soloveitchik on Saturday night, March 3, 1979

"Parsha Terumah" Should the sedra of Teruman be worded "V'yikchu Li" (And they shall take to Me) or should it say "V'yitnu Li Terumah" (and they shall give to Me the offering). The problem is resolved by the next few words. "From every man whose heart is willing shall you take the offering." "Don't use force or any method of coercion to take my Teruman if he refuses to give even if he is able to do so!" All other mitzvos were given to all people alike. For instance, 'Machazis Hashekel,' giving of the half shekel was a command to all alike. The rich shall not give more, the poor less. This Terumah, however, is voluntary, not coercive. The question is regarding Tzdukah. T'zdukah is not an act of charity but an act of justice. We must supply persons who are starving. The mishkan (Tabernacle) is a part of T'zdukah. It is like a Yeshiva or a Bas Hakneses, individual and institutional T'zdukah. Why has the Torah eliminated the Mishkan from that class, that which must be given to and "come to collect only from those who are ready to offer." Those whose haert and spirit was kind, whose spirit was elevated, came and brought money. The answer lies in certain problem which rises as soon as you start to read the parsha. Why is the "Mishkan" necessary right after leaving Mitzraim? This was raised by "Shlomo Hamelech" in his famous prayer. "If the heavens cannot contain Thee, how will the 20 cubits do so? Whenever you come across "Bas Hashem" (G-d's house) it should not be the House of G-d but the House of Man. G-d contracts Himself. He limits Himself from infinity to a small house "between the two 'Kruvim' on top of the 'Kaporet' the cover of the Ark." "I'll communicate with you from between the "Kruvim". From here He engaged Moshe. Why did Hakodosh Boruch Hu do it? Because man basically is a homeless being. No matter how his home is fortified he is exposed to the vicissitudes of life. The animal is also exposed but the animal has no concept of time. Concept of time is a wonderful gift but also the source of endless suffering. To anticipate the future, rain, snow, cold, heat - is very difficult. The purpose of man's home is to shelter him. But until Messianic times such a home has not been built -- a home to afford man total security. Only one home can give him security; it is G-d's home. "Hashkifo Mim'on Kodshecho Min Hashamayim" (Devarim, chpater 26, line 15). "Look down from Your holy habitation from heaven." G-d is

greater than the universe. Thus, the only home where man can find security is G-d. Thus, when G-d told Moshe to build a "Mishkan" it is a home not for G-d but for man. Man who feels G-d, is close to Him. G-d feigns loneliness but it is not for Him; it is for man. Everyone who cam to the Bais Hamikdosh (or to the Tabernacle) saw the Divine Shechina greater than from the outside. Outside we see G-d's nature -- the flower bush in the backyard is merely a reflection of hte Divine Glory. When I see the rising sun, the beauty of nature, the stars of the cosmos, I experience G-d. All the "Brochos," as simple as a "brocho" over a glass of water, reflects the glory of G-d. This is the cosmic experience of G-d. This we find expressly described in Psalm 104 - "Borchi Nafshi" (the earth is full of the fruit of Thy works, who causes the grass to spring up for cattle - to bring forth bread from earth and wine that maketh glad the heart of man, etc.) - there, there is no supernatural but the beauty of nature in its primitive form. When one sees the beauty such as David, he sings a hymn of beauty.l

Gemora says that if one recites the Hallel every day, it is blasphemous. This is reserved only for the special holidays - Pesach, Shvuoth, Succos. And yet one should and does say "Hallel" every day. The Hallel we do say is the "P'sukei D'Zimrei" (the psalms of praise - the "Hallelukahs" in prayers each morning). Why was one strictly forbidden and the other one allowed each day? Because the two differ in their nature. One describes the cosmic order in every blossom, in every drop of water. This should be said daily. The Hallel of suspending natural order, should only be recited on special occasions. So there are two ways to approach G-d, through nature and through supra-natural. We see G-d on this world and in the distant planets. The miracle, the supra-cosmic is not every day. This, however, was seen at the Bais Hamikdosh. That's exactly why G-d told them to build the Tabernacle. "It will be your home but will be calle dthe home of G-d. How did He describe it. "It will be the Tabernacle of Appointment - Ohel Moed -- the tent of meeting - of appointments. That is why Rambam says that the mitzvah of Bais Hamikdosh becomes binding if the people want it. That is why G-d warned, "No force. No constraint." If the people want it, they cannot be forced for the appointment from time to time through their agent, Moshe. "From whoever will bring it, accept it." That is why it doesn't say Vayitnu (give) but Vayikchu (take). "If you want G-d as your next door neighbor, to say hello to in the morning, give. If not, don't give."

Rambam ways that there are two mitzvas only which are binding on the people: Choosing a king and making the Bais Hamikdosh. These mitzvos become binding only at the request of people. If they are lonely and want a house where to meet G-d, it is binding on them but only if they desire.

What does the Bais Hamikdosh symbolize as a home? It symbolizes the universe in miniature. The "Ramah" makes a parallel between "Bereishis" (creating of the world) and the bais Hamikdosh. G-d created the world to reside in this world -- not to be far in a transcendental world -- to abide in the midst of humans. But the "Chet Akadmah" (the orginal sin) drove Him - forced Him to retreat. "And they heard the sound of the G-rd G-d walking in the garden and the man and his wife hid from before G-d amongst the trees of the garden (Bereishis, chapter 3, line 8). The "footsteps" were those of G-d - leaving the garden and departing into infinity. Hadn't they sinned, G-d always would have been close. There would be no need for T'shuvah. Everyone would have been able to communicate, not only the prophet, the "navi" and then only when the occasion was meet. By the fear of Adam's communication, G-d removed His "Schechina". Man could have seen the beauty of G-d instead of trying to interpret it scientifically. Had they when confronted said, "Chotosi" - "I have sinned", nothing would have happened. They would have lived together. But by their procrastination they "heard the steps," leaving the garden.

The purpose of the "Mishkan" was to restore the relationship. "V'Shochanti Besochom" - And I will dwell amongst them. Thus, the purpose was to perceive the closeness of G-d, but again it failed due to the "Aygeh" the golden calf. It must await moschiach! The remainder of the entire sedra is devoted to symbolism.

I'd like to investigate something else! What actually is important in the Bais Hamikdosh? What is the springwell from which "Kedushah" - holiness, flows? What does man have to do to acquire the attribute of Kedusha? What is unique about the Mishkan and Bais Hamikdosh? How can a man lead a holy sacred life? Where was the first Bais Hamikdosh?

It was not the "Mishkan" but Mt. Sinai. How do we know! It was the first place that had boundaries, dividing the line into different areas. The Torah emphasizes that the boundaries must be respected. "V'Higbalto Es Haom" (Yisro, chapter 19, line 12) - And you shall set bounds for the people. The second time Moshe was warned again. "Rayd Hoayd B'om" (sentence 21), "Go down and charge the people." Moshe answered, "The people cannot come close." G-d answered, "Go down to them! You come up with Aaron." What is the most important principle of Yehadus? What is the price that Torah demands of a Jew? It is respect for a boundary line! The animal, the beast, if you want to contain it, can only be done if you surround your land with a fence. The human if he is a decent person does not need a fence; a sign suffices. What does the Torah require? It requires that we be capable of respecting certain boundary lines which the Torah introduced.

We respect the law in two ways - B'ahava (love) and V'yira (fear). Basically, if you observe laws because of sanctions, it is not Kedusha - holy. I do not achieve moral personality if I am afraid of punishment. I only achieve it if I love doing it. Emperor Andreas said to Rabbi Yehoshuah Ben Chananya, "Your scriptures declare that a living dog is superior to a dead lion. You call me a dog so I who am alive am superior to Moshe who is dead!" The Rabbi said to the Emperor, "Are you ready for a test? Give instructions to all of Rome not to light any fires for a period of 24 hours on the threat of execution." These instructions were issued and the two ascended a hill overlooking Rome. From there, they saw smoke arising in various localities indicating that some had lit fires. Then Rabbi Yehoshuah declared, "Moshe told the Jewish people not to light fires on the Sabbath. Go and see the Jewish community. You will not find a single one lighting a fire on Sabbath. So I ask you, who is stronger?" There was another example in history. The Bereditchiver Rebbe asked two groups of Jews to do different things. One group was asked to gather Turkish shawls. (Apparently a forbidden thing in his time for although it could bring money, it could also cause arrest by the authorities.) The other group was told to bring bread just before Pesach. Despite the risk, one group brought shawls. Of the second group, not one handled bread before Pesach. The Jewish people respected the law of the boundary with merely a word or two of G-d. Perek says, "Make a fence around the Torah." The Jew is not afraid of a real fence. We are not afraid of that which is not a principle of Judaism. The other one (from Perek) is an imaginary fence. A Jew cannot step on a bed of roses. It arouses a feeling of ugliness. He does not abstain from violating Shabbos merely on account of the threat of stoning. With the exception cited in the Torah, no Jew was ever stoned for violating Shabbos. But it is our feeling of happiness, enthusiasm to observe Shabbos. G-d says, "There is one virtue indispensable to the Jews - that of watching, observing, and not violating the boundary." The "Goal" the boundary is not visible. There is no need for sanctions. This is how the Jew survives! Interestingly, before "Matan Torah", before He began, He said to Moshe, "Warn the people!" Moshe answered, "They cannot; once is enough." The Jew cannot do an "Avarah". The Jew simply couldn't kill people even when he was in the Holocaust. To make it forbidden is to make it so that people find it impossible to do so. Their physical capacity to climb the mountain or "Matan Torah" was taken from them. This is the survival of the Torah. "I simply cannot eat breakfast before I put on Tefilin in the morning. The same law applies to eating before "Mincha". This has not become a disability -- a part and parcel of us. Tefila Shacharis is so engraved that it is an impossibility. Violation of Shabbos is similar. I have an intuitive feeling of what is forbidden without having to look it up in the "Shulchan Aruch". There is no serpent or reptile to kill us, no sanction - but we have the inner feeling that makes it impossible. Thus, Moshe says, "It is impossible for them to come up to the Mount." The line, the imaginary one

is stronger than a fence. Thus, G-d told him twice. The ability to respect the imaginary line is the basis of Yehadus. Thus, the "Kedushas Hamikdosh" - the holiness of the Temple are the "Mechitzas" the dividing lines. Thus, Rmambam says that the Kedusha is still there (after 1900 years). Not to climb the Temple Mount despite the desolation. It is because we were warned not to trespass. The Kohan went so far, the Levi so far. We had the separation of "Tomah" - uncleanness.

The same applies with the mechitza of the Erub. It consists of 4 poles with a string on top. It is not a fence but an abstract boundary. Yet we respect these boundaries. It is the principle of Yehodus.

Reading today's sedra, I found an answer to a problem long bothersome. When G-d met Moshe for the first time and charged him with the mission to Mitzraim, "Go take them out of Egypt." He didn't even tell him how to do it. One detail, however, He did tell Moshe to relay to the people. "When you leave you will not leave empty. The women will borrow beautiful clothing from their neighbors and put them on their children. Why is this necessary to tell them right away? He gave Moshe no details of the plagues, "Dom", "Tzfadaya", but when you leave, you will leave loaded. Then later again, "You will take gold, silver, etc." A third time, "The people listened and borrowed clothing, etc." Why is this so important before Matan Torah to be told three times? I believe the posek, "The people found favor in the eyes of the Egyptians," has great importance. First, there is the procrastination on the part of Pharaoh, his lying -- the entire story -- what impression do you get? What did G-d want? G-d could have taken them out of Egypt in one hour! But G-d wanted that Pharaoh should liberate them! Of course, some times you must stimulate Pharaoh! But He wanted that Pharaoh should send them -- that the Jews shouldn't liberate themselves. Also, G-d shouldn't liberate them immediately.

There is a law concerning "Eved Ivri" (the Jewish slave). "Do not send him away empty handed. Why is this necessary to send the "Eved" away laden with gifts? Because basically you give gifts to one who is your equal. Heads of state give presents to the White House because it is an expression of being satisfied, mutual respect, sense of equality. G-d wanted Pharaoh not merely to liberate the Jews but to liberate them because he felt they were his equal. The "Shaloh" is not borrowing. It is merely a request. At the beginning, Moshe was not respected. "N'rpim Atem, N'rpim" (Pharaoh said to Moshe and Aaron - you are lazy). At the end, he was highly respected. Now the people were eager to give gifts. At least, for a while Pharaoh recognized them as equals, to leave as free men -- equal to the Egyptians.

There is another answer. A slave has no property. Whatever he has passes on to the master. In Egypt, they had absolutely nothing - not utensils or anything. Clothes tell the plight of the people. In Egypt, while they wore rags, the Egyptians wore the finest silks, linens and raiments. Suddenly, they were liberated with so much beautiful clothing and wealth. They suddenly could put on the same clothes as their mistresses. So, they could become greedy. However, at once there is a new request, "Vayikchu Li Terumah" -- take to me an offering. What were they asked for? The very same things which they just got. He let them fondle it for a while and then asked them to give it. But the way it was taken from them had a tremendous impact!

<http://www.chief Rabbi.org/>

Covenant & Conversation

Thoughts on the Weekly Parsha from

Sir Jonathan Sacks

Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Commonwealth

[From 2 years ago - currently 5765]

<http://www.chief Rabbi.org/tt-index.html>

Terumah A Portable Home

The sedra of Terumah describes the construction of the tabernacle, the first collective house of worship in the history of Israel. The first but not the

last. It was eventually succeeded by the Temple in Jerusalem. I want to focus on one moment in Jewish history which represents Jewish spirituality at its very highest: the moment the Temple was destroyed.

It is hard to understand the depth of the crisis into which the destruction of the First Temple plunged the Jewish people. Their very existence was predicated on a relationship with G-d symbolised by the worship that took place daily in Jerusalem. With the Babylonian conquest, Jews lost not only their land and sovereignty. In losing the Temple it was as if they had lost hope itself. For their hope lay in G-d, and how could they turn to G-d if the very place where they served Him was in ruins? One document has left a vivid record of the mood of Jews at that time: Psalm 137, 'By the waters of Babylon we sat and wept as we remembered Zion . . . How can we sing the songs of the Lord in a strange land?'

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

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

The synagogue is one of the most remarkable examples of an *itaruta delatata*, 'an awakening from below'. It came into being not through words spoken by G-d to Israel but by words spoken by Israel to G-d. There is no synagogue in Tenakh, no command to build local houses of prayer. To the contrary, insofar as the Torah speaks of a 'house of G-d' it refers to a central sanctuary, a collective focus for the worship of the people as a whole.

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

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

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

Where can I go from Your Spirit? Where can I flee from Your presence? If I go up to the heavens, You are there; if I make my bed in the depths, You are there. Hence the question asked by Israel's wisest King, Solomon:

But will G-d really dwell on earth? The heavens, even the highest heaven, cannot contain you. How much less this temple I have built! (I Kings 8: 27) The same question is posed in the name of G-d by one of Israel's greatest prophets, Isaiah:

Heaven is My throne, and the earth is My footstool. Where is the house you will build for Me? Where will My resting place be? (Is. 66: 1) The very concept of making a home in finite space for an infinite presence seems a contradiction in terms.

The answer, still astonishing in its profundity, is contained at the beginning of this week's sedra:

They shall make a sanctuary for Me, and I will dwell in them [betocham]". The Jewish mystics pointed out the linguistic strangeness of this sentence. It should have said, 'I will dwell in it', not 'I will dwell in them'. The answer is that the Divine presence lives not in a building but in its builders; not in a physical place but in the human heart. The sanctuary was not a place in which the objective existence of G-d was somehow more concentrated than elsewhere. Rather, it was a place whose holiness had the effect of opening the hearts of those who stood there to the One worshipped there. G-d exists everywhere, but not everywhere do we feel the presence of G-d in the same way. The essence of 'the holy' is that it is a place where we set aside all human 'devices and desires' and enter a domain wholly set aside to G-d.

If the concept of the *mishkan*, the Tabernacle, is that G-d lives in the human heart whenever it opens itself unreservedly to heaven, then its physical location is irrelevant. Thus the way was open, seven centuries later, to the synagogue: the supreme statement of the idea that if G-d is everywhere, He can be reached anywhere. I find it moving that the frail structure described in this week's sedra became the inspiration of an institution that, more than any other, kept the Jewish people alive through almost 2000 years of dispersion - the longest of all journeys through the wilderness.

Rabbi Yissocher Frand <ryfrand@torah.org>

To sponsor an edition of the Rabbi Frand e-mail list, go to <https://www.capalon.com/secure/torah/listDedicate.php?class1=35>.

"RavFrاند" List - Rabbi Frand on Parshas Teruma -

Contradictory Descriptions As To How The Menorah Was Made

The Torah's narration of the construction of the Menorah includes: "You shall make a Menorah of pure gold, beaten out, shall the Menorah be made (tei-a-seh haMenora), its base, its branch, its goblets, its knobs, and its flowers shall be hammered from it." [Shmos 25:31]. Rashi comments on the passive conjugation (niph'al) of the word "tei-a-seh". By other Mishkan utensils, the Torah uses the more expected conjugation "t-a-she" (you shall make). Why in the case of the Menorah does the Torah use the passive form, "tei-a-seh"?

Rashi says this teaches that the Menorah was made "by itself" (i.e. - not by human hand). Moshe had difficulty envisioning exactly how it was to be constructed. Therefore, Hashem instructed him to throw the block of gold into the fire and the Menorah would emerge miraculously by itself.

Several *pasukim* [verses] later, at the conclusion of the instructions regarding the Menorah the *pasuk* [verse] says: "See, and construct, according to their form that you are shown on the mountain." [Shmos 25:40] Rashi comments: "Moshe was perplexed by the construction of the Menorah until the Holy One, Blessed is He, showed him a Menorah of fire."

These two Rashis seem to contradict one another. What in fact happened? How was the Menorah made? Did Moshe see it, get the blueprint and make it himself, as the latter Rashi says -- or did it miraculously emerge from the fire by itself? Was it "ta'a-seh" or was it "tei-a-seh"?

The Sefas Emes resolves the apparent contradiction. Both teachings are correct. Moshe Rabbeinu could not figure out how to make the Menorah.

The Ribono shel Olam said to him “This is what it looks like. Here is the diagram. Go do it.” (Shmos 25:40), However, after Moshe tried to construct the Menorah from the diagram, he returned to the Almighty and said: “I can’t do it.” At that point Hashem said, “Okay, fine. Take the gold, throw it in the fire, and out will come the Menorah.”

But that raises the question, why didn’t Hashem just help Moshe complete the task the first time? When He saw that Moshe Rabbeinu was having difficulty with the concept of how to construct the Menorah, why didn’t HaShem immediately have him throw the gold in the fire? Why did HaShem frustrate him further going through a process that proved in the end to be futile?

The Sefas Emes explains that this is the paradigm for spirituality and acquisition of all Torah knowledge. Torah and ruchniyus [spirituality] is all about the process of acquisition. The process of trying at first and perhaps not succeeding is an essential part of the end result of acquiring Torah and ruchniyus. Success — when it comes at the end — is always “miraculous”.

The Menorah is the symbol of Torah. Sometimes it seems overwhelming. How does a person master it? A person has no idea how he will ever accomplish what he has set out to accomplish. The answer is that we must try to put it all together. After we make the effort, the end result often “emerges by itself”. About this it is stated: “If you make the effort and achieve, believe it!” After working, and sweating, and making the maximum effort then what comes is a “find” (metziah).

Regarding Torah learning and matters of the spirit, we first need to engage in the “ta-a-seh”. We need to make the effort. After showing sincere effort, as Moshe did with the Menorah, it will be achieved, as it were, via a “tei-a-seh” process.

If a person fails to make the effort, there will never be an end result — miraculous or otherwise.

I believe I once heard the following parable from Rav Gifter. A King promised great reward to anyone who would climb a ladder and reach the top of a certain tower. The problem was that the ladder was at a 90 degree angle, and the top of the ladder was still several feet away from the top floor to which the climber had to ascend. There was no way that a person could climb the ladder, get to the top rung and then get up to the floor at the top of the tower.

The King insisted that people wear a certain helmet while climbing the ladder. The climb was difficult. People would get a third of the way up the ladder, half way up, look up and ask themselves “What am I doing even trying? It is hopeless.” One after another, they would give up trying.

One determined fellow decided that he was going to give it a shot. He climbed higher and higher and higher. He sweated and toiled endlessly until he got to the top rung of the ladder. When he got there, he realized why everyone had to wear the helmet. The top of the helmet was magnetized. On the top floor was a powerful magnet. As soon as he reached the top rung, the magnet pulled him up “magically” the rest of the way.

Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, WA DavidATwersky@aol.com
Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Baltimore, MD dhoffman@torah.org
These divrei Torah were adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissocher Frand’s Commuter Chavrusah Tapes on the weekly portion: Tape #494: Bima in the Center of the Shul.

Rabbi Goldwicht <rgoldwicht@yutorah.org>

WEEKLY INSIGHT BY RAV MEIR GOLDWICHT Parashat Terumah

This Shabbat we read Parashat Terumah, which begins the second half of sefer Shemot and its discussion of the Mishkan, its vessels, and the bigdei kehunah. Our parasha begins by describing the materials donated by B’nei Yisrael for the Mishkan – gold, silver, etc. Among these materials is the skin of an animal called the “tachash.” This skin was used, the Torah tells us, for the outermost covering of the Mishkan: “orot techashim milmalah.”

These techashim existed only “I’fi sha’ah,” as the gemara tells us in Shabbat 28b. The gemara goes on to describe the tachash halachically as a

safeq chayah safeq b’heimah, and physically as having one horn protruding from its forehead as well as having beautiful, multi-colored skin, of which it was very proud. This somewhat lengthy description of the tachash by Chazal leads us to our first question: Why do Chazal set aside so much space to explain exactly what kind of animal the tachash was? After all, this is no longer relevant, since Hashem created it only temporarily. Why is it so important for us to know today exactly how the tachash looked?

The midrash (Bereishit Rabbah) teaches that when Hashem evicted Adam and Chava from Gan Eden, He fashioned clothing for them. The midrash explains that these clothes also came from the skin of the tachash. Our second question: What is the connection between the covering Hashem fashioned for Adam and Chava and the covering we are commanded to fashion for the Mishkan?

A third, final question: we find ourselves at the beginning of Adar. Chazal teach us that when Adar comes in, we increase our joy. Certainly they don’t intend that we pump up the volume or that we dance longer. Certainly they mean a simcha of substance. How do we do this?

To answer these questions, we must start by explaining the essence of simcha. The Torah mentions simcha by the shalosh regalim—“v’samachta b’chagecha.” True simcha occurs when a person feels connected to that which is above him—HaKadosh Baruch Hu. Every regel—Pesach, Shavuot, Sukkot—a little bit of the light that once was comes back to us, and we feel our connection with HaKadosh Baruch Hu. For this reason as well, when we don’t feel this connection with HaKadosh Baruch Hu, and we don’t have this simcha, all the curses of the tochechah befall us, as the Torah says, “tachat asher lo avad’ta et Hashem Elokecha b’simcha uvtuv levav.”

We find true simcha for the first time by Adam and Chava in Gan Eden, as we say in sheva berachot, “same’ach t’samach re’im ahuvim k’samechacha yetzircha b’Gan Eden mikedem” – Hashem should bring joy to the young couple as He brought to Adam and Chava. This simcha was closeness to Hashem. However, as a result of their sin, Adam and Chava forfeited their direct connection with Him and necessarily their simcha as well, as well as being thrown out of Gan Eden, the location of their connection.

Along with the punishment of eviction from Gan Eden, Hashem gave Adam and Chava the key to returning to their original stature. He did this by dressing them in the multi-colored tachash-skin, sending the following message: As you begin your lives in an unfamiliar world, a world of many colors in which you will play many roles and wear many outfits, your task is to make sure you control your situation and not vice versa. If you allow your pnimiut to guide you through every situation, you will be able to return to your former home.

Klal Yisrael received an opportunity to return to the state of Adam HaRishon before the sin at the time of Mattan Torah. But with the sin of the Golden Calf we forfeited this opportunity. Nevertheless, HaKadosh Baruch Hu advised us how to return to this state in exactly the same way: He instructed Moshe to use the skin of the tachash for the outermost covering of the Mishkan. Every morning as we left our tents we would see the tachash-skin spread over the mishkan, which would remind us that our pnimiut must shine through as we take on a world of diverse colors and situations.

This is why the same covering was used for Adam and Chava and for the Mishkan, and this is the depth of the words of R’ Meir, who says that Hashem fashioned for them cloaks of “light” (ohr with an alef) rather than cloaks of “hide” (ohr with an ayin). Despite the change in situation, the change in colors, what must stand out is one’s pnimiut.

This is the simcha of chodesh Adar, a chodesh in which we have the unique ability to reveal our true selves even as we change our clothing and dress up in costumes, in order to express the notion that the pnimiut must guide the chitzoniut and not the other way around. This is why clothes play such a significant role – for example, Mordechai tears his clothing, the people don sackcloth, Mordechai leaves the palace in royal clothing – in the

Megillah. Even though the clothes change, the characters' pnimiut does not. Rather, in every uniform, the character carries out his mission.

Therefore, if in everything we do, we ensure that it is our penimiut that guides us, we will merit to go forth from before the King of Kings in royal clothing.

Shabbat Shalom! Meir Goldwicht The weekly sichah is compiled by a student. Please feel free to forward the weekly sichah to friends and family. If you aren't yet subscribed, you can subscribe here. A PDF version of this week's sichah can be found here. We would be delighted to hear your thoughts and suggestions at talliskattan@sbcglobal.net. Weekly Insights on the Parsha and Moadim by Rabbi Meir Goldwicht is a service of YUTORah, the online source of the Torah of Yeshiva University. Get more parsha shiurim and thousands of other shiurim, by visiting www.yutorah.org. To unsubscribe from this list, please click here.

Peninim on the Torah by Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum

- Parshas Terumah

Shema Yisrael Torah Network <shemalist@shemaisrael.com> to Peninim

PARSHAS TERUMAH

And let them take for Me a portion, from every man whose heart motivates him. (25:2) Rashi explains that the term, "for Me," tells us that the people should give for the Mishkan purely for Hashem's Name, not in response to outside pressure or as an opportunity to seek glory. What does it mean to give for the sake of Hashem's Name? Perhaps the following incident will shed light on this. The Torah in Sefer Devarim 15:10 states: "You shall surely give him (to the poor), and let your heart not feel bad when you give him." When one interprets this pasuk in its simple sense, he can understand it to mean that he should not resent the obligation to part with some of his hard-earned money when a poor man asks for charity. Horav Bunim, zl, m'Peshicha gives this pasuk an additional interpretation.

The Rebbe once visited a home which was characterized by extreme poverty. He immediately gave the family money for their needs. He later returned with an additional sum of money. His chassidim saw this and asked, "Rebbe, why did you return with more money?"

Rav Bunim's reply should catalyze our introspection concerning our attitude towards giving charity. He said, "When I saw the hungry look on the children's faces, their drawn skin and sunken eyes, my heart ached for them. I immediately gave them money, but this money only served to relieve my personal distress. I gave to them because they were in need, not because Hashem tells us in the Torah to give tzedakah."

"In that case, however, I was simply acting to quell my own feelings of inadequacy. I was doing something for my own comfort. I returned, therefore, to give them additional money, as it is a mitzvah to give tzedakah. Because my personal anguish over their plight had been assuaged, I was now able to give for the sake of the mitzvah."

When one gives charity, it should not be only because he feels sympathy for the poor. Even after the pain has been relieved, there is another reason to give: it is a mitzvah. This is especially noteworthy when we are asked to contribute to a cause that does not evoke great feelings of compassion within us. As long as the recipient is deserving, we must give because it is a mitzvah. Neither positive nor negative emotion should dictate how and to whom we give. Our primary motivation should be Hashem's command.

This is implied by the pasuk. At the first juncture in their nationhood, when Hashem requests of Klal Yisrael that they contribute, He instructed them to give Li, "for Me," for Hashem's sake. They were to give because of the mitzvah, not because of the emotion or the attention they would receive as a result. Give because it is Li, "for Me."

This is the portion that you shall take from them. (25:3)

One who peruses the text will notice an ambiguity in the choice of words used to describe "them," the people who were to contribute towards the Mishkan. The Torah uses the word itam, which usually is translated as

"with them," rather than the word meihem, which literally means, "from them." The commentators address this question. Horav Aizik Ausband, Shlita, offers a noteworthy explanation for this change in wording. Itam is a reference to the funds and possessions that are with them, those items with which they pride themselves and which are integral to their daily lives.

He explains this concept by citing an incident that occurred with the Maggid, zl, of Bialistock, who once came to a city to deliver one of his fiery drashos, inspirational lectures. Prior to speaking, he queried the community's leadership as to what they felt needed to be rectified. He desired to focus his address on those issues that were most vexing to the community's spiritual development. They responded that their greatest issue was in the area of malbish arumim, providing clothing for the needy. As in all communities in Europe, earning a livelihood was difficult, and for this reason, many Jewish families barely had enough food for their own subsistence.

Decent clothing was a rarity. People walked around in out-dated, worn-out clothes. The community's leadership, try as hard as they could, had a difficult time in providing them with proper attire. This was not due to a lack of clothing. The same well-to-do people, who shared their wealth with the poor, would also give their used clothing, but here was where the problem was prevalent. Often, when the tzedakah collectors came to ask for clothes, the contributors would look through their closets and select the most threadbare, used garments they could find. In most cases, the items were torn and dirty. When the collector would patiently ask, "Is it possible that you might have something else, perhaps a bit more presentable?" the usual response was, "What is wrong with these garments? True, the poor man would feel awkward walking down to the chupah in these clothes, but there is really nothing wrong with them. They are wearable."

Upon hearing this, the Maggid proceeded to castigate the members of the community concerning their deplorable attitude towards the poor. At the time, it happened to be Parashas Netzavim. The Maggid cited the words of Yeshayah Ha'Navi in 61:10, as he speaks to the people, "I will rejoice intensely with Hashem, my soul shall exalt with my G-d, for He has dressed me in the raiment of salvation, in a robe of righteousness has He cloaked me, like a bridegroom who dons priestly glory." When one gives clothing as tzedakah, it should be such that the poor man can wear it as a bridegroom to his wedding.

This is the concept to which the pasuk is alluding. When one contributes, it should be mei'itam, from (with) them, something that he himself would wear, when he goes out to his own simchah, joyous occasion.

How true are these words. It has become a common ailment that many who possess sufficient means are complacent regarding the needs of those who do not possess such means. For instance, have you ever entered a shul or bais ha'medrash and noticed that the furniture is mismatched, or that the cloth items are threadbare, or clearly obsolete? Are mechanchim and kolleleit supposed to dress like immigrants? Must they drive old taxi cabs, or is there dispensation for them to own a car that is not in vintage condition? Regrettably, we want to come home to a comfortable nicely-furnished home, but do not feel the same need when it comes to Hashem's home. We dress, and expect our families to dress, as in an ad for a popular clothing manufacturer, but have no problem when those less fortunate wear clothes that we would not wear on Tisha B'Av. The list goes on. There is something, however, that is even more repugnant. I refer to those who cannot tolerate - or to use the popular Yiddish vernacular, fargin - an individual who devotes himself to meleches Hakodesh, holy endeavor, dressing and driving and living on an acceptable middle-class level. It is one thing not to give, but it is completely another not to tolerate. Let us take the lesson of itam to our hearts and wallets.

The poles shall remain in the rings of the Ark; they may not be removed from it. (25:15)

While a number of Klei ha'Mishkan, holy vessels that were used in the Mishkan, were to have rings affixed so that they could be transported, it was only the Aron that was to have the carrying poles that fit into these

rings actually in the rings at all times. While this is understandable at a time when the Aron is being transported, why should the poles always remain in the rings? The Sefer HaChinuch states that the simple reason is to allow for the contingency in which Klal Yisrael would have to move on quickly. In that scenario, the poles could be put hurriedly into the rings, to prevent the situation that, in all of the rush, they would not be firmly placed in the rings, causing the Aron to fall. To avoid such a mishap, the poles were never removed. There are commentators who supplement this idea with the concept that the Aron symbolizes the makom hashroas haShechinah, place where the Shechinah reposes. The mere fact that the poles remain in the rings in case of any sudden movement suggests that the Shechinah is not a stationary presence, which is relegated to one specific place. The Shechinah is everywhere.

Horav Eliyahu Schlesinger, Shlita, comments that the poles remain in the rings, not as a means for carrying the Aron, but rather as an indication of the means by which one holds onto the Aron. The message is: hold on always; never let go. Therefore, the poles are always connected to the Aron, delivering a message that must impact us at all times.

He also cites an inspirational analogy from the Baal Shem Tov HaKadosh. A leaf on a tree bemoaned the fact that it was “stuck” to the tree and was not free to fly like a bird, so that it could explore the world around it. Finally, summer was over, and the wind and cold air of autumn emerged. The winds became stronger, and the temperature began to drop. Suddenly, a blast from a strong wind freed the leaf. Oh, how excited the leaf was to fly from its place. It went high and low and far and wide. It had freedom. The wind does not last forever, however, and when the wind stopped, the leaf fell to the ground, only to be trampled by pedestrians. The leaf began to weep. If only it could still be clinging to the tree, it would still be whole and undamaged.

A parallel applies to the Jew. As long as he clings to the tree of life, symbolized by the Torah, then the winds of the world, the free thinking winds, the winds of change, the winds of an immoral hedonistic society, cannot sway and destroy him. He is firmly anchored to the Torah, which is the only stable thing in life.

Eitz chaim hi la'machazikim bah, v'somche'ah me'ushar. “It is a tree of life to those who hold on to it, and its supporters are fortunate” (Mishlei 3:18). As long as one holds on to the Torah, he is fortunate. When he lets go, he will end up like the unfortunate leaf, spiritually broken, disheveled and tread upon by the passerby.

You shall make the planks of the Mishkan of atzei shittim, acacia wood, standing erect. (26:15)

Acacia wood is a form of cedar wood that does not grow in the wilderness. Obviously, the Jewish People must have had access to this remarkably lightweight - but strong - wood prior to their coming to the wilderness. Rashi explains that Yaakov Avinu, perceiving that Klal Yisrael would one day be commanded to erect a Mishkan, provided for its construction. When he came to Egypt, he brought with him cedar trees that he had originally planted in Eretz Yisrael for this purpose. These unique trees had a long odyssey, from Eretz Yisrael to Egypt to the wilderness; they traveled with Klal Yisrael until they assumed their designated place in the Mishkan.

Another version found in the Midrash offers an earlier source for the atzei shittim. According to this version, Avraham Avinu had an eishal, a sort of rest area, where people could stop to rest, grab a bite to eat, and even spend the night. In order to provide a full-service eishal for the wayfarers, Avraham went so far as to plant an orchard of trees in which his guests could rest in the cool shade from their difficult trip. It was this orchard that provided the cedar trees for the Mishkan.

We have two sources for the wood that comprised the Mishkan - Avraham and Yaakov. Can we derive a lesson from the Mishkan's origins? My good friend, Reb Mordechai Krieger, presents an interesting perspective on this in his latest volume of commentary on the Torah. Avraham personified the middah of chesed, and this was his primary focus in his service to the

Almighty. The cedars were a component of his chesed which he performed with wayfarers. Thus, there was a valid reason that Chazal included Avraham's atzei shittim in the Mishkan. They were planted for the purpose of chesed. What more appropriate use than to apply the middah of chesed to the Mishkan? After all, it was a place of chesed where people from all over came to receive spiritual sustenance.

Yaakov exemplified the attribute of emes, truth. Indeed, Yaakov's virtue was imbued in the trees. It was a period when paganism was rampant. Virtually every tree was transformed into an asheirah, idolatrous tree, as it became the focus of the people's worship. Yaakov guaranteed that the wood used for the Mishkan was kosher, b'tachlis ha'kashrus, absolute, without any embellishments. The middos of chesed and emes were integrated into the building of the Mishkan.

We may interpret this idea into the pasuk in Mishlei 16:6, “With truth and kindness, sin is forgiven.” In the merit of kindness and truth, both working together, defining each other, sin can be erased.

We might, perhaps, take this a bit further to the point that in order to build an enduring Mishkan for Hashem, we need the middah that Yaakov represents. It is not emes upon which we should focus, but rather on Torah. Let me explain. We find in our parsha an incident that occurred during the darkness of night, when our Patriarch Yaakov was alone. The angel of Eisav, representing Eisav and everything for which he stood, attacked Yaakov. Why? Why did the Satan wait for Yaakov before he attacked? Why did he ignore Avraham and Yitzchak? His goal was to uproot and destroy Jewry. He could have fought with Avraham or Yitzchak, and he would have accomplished the same goal. Why did he wait?

Horav Elchanan Wasserman, zl, gives an intriguing answer, which not only defines our mission in the world, but also emphasizes our strength inherent in the only institution by which we as Jews will survive. Avraham sat at his tent, waiting to reach out to others in need. Surely, this was a noble and charitable character trait. Is it, however, the heart and soul of the Jewish People? As Hashem's chosen People, we have a role to fulfill in this world. While chesed is undoubtedly a magnificent middah, will it guarantee Jewish survival? Let us peruse history. The Jewish record concerning philanthropy is incredible: hospitals, shelters, homes for the aged, education. Jews are at the forefront of every philanthropic endeavor, both Jewish and secular, but has that ensured our future? Have the children of those who have initiated all of the wonderful and meaningful Jewish institutions remained true to their heritage? No, chesed does not scare Satan, because it is not a threat to him. He is opposed to Jewish continuity, and chesed does not necessarily promote this ideal.

Yitzchak personified avodah, service to Hashem, through prayer and worship. This was his primary approach to serving the Almighty. Prayer is a wonderful and necessary endeavor. Since time immemorial, devout Jews have attended the synagogue, prayed three times a day and recited Tehillim in between. All this was personified by Yitzchak and transmitted to us. It is his legacy. There have been those, however, who have repeated the age-old words by rote, out of habit, not bothering to explore the meaning of these words. They did not discover the comfort and strength in these words that their parents found and to which they clung. How often have we witnessed an aged father wrapped in his Tallis, tears falling from his eyes as he prays in rapt devotion, while his son has not even bothered to attend the service? The son was neither tied to his father's Tallis nor to his way of life. The father prayed, while the son strayed. The Satan does not see a threat coming at him from Yitzchak. Avodah will not sustain the Jewish people throughout the generations. They need more.

The Satan observed Avraham and Yitzchak, and, while he was not overjoyed with their work on behalf of the Jewish people, their ways of life did not guarantee an eternal people, a Jewry that could withstand the vicissitudes that would challenge the future generations. Along came Yaakov Avinu with his devotion to Torah study. The Torah describes him as, “A simple, wholehearted man, dwelling in tents.” Wherever he was, he found a tent of study, or he made one. Torah study was his life; Torah

coursed through his veins like blood. He lived in the *bais ha'medrash*. Yaakov served Hashem through Torah - the concrete teaching of specific belief and defined laws. He studied what we must do, what we may do and what we may not do. Avraham's *chesed* was great, but one can either accept kindness and respond to it - or not. Yitzchak accepted his father's belief; Yishmael eschewed it. Yaakov, on the other hand, incorporated *chesed* into Torah. The Torah teaches kindness, but it also goes further. Besides teaching us how and when to perform kindness, it addresses every aspect of our internal and external lives.

Yitzchak focused on prayer. One is either moved by prayer, or he is not. Yaakov accepted it, and he integrated it into his Torah way of life. Eisav had no time for prayer. He did not relate to it. Yaakov knew that prayer alone is not sufficient. The channel of communication between man and Hashem cannot be a one way street, where we ask and ask and hear only what we want to hear. We must also do and obey. This approach comes through Torah. Prayer is man's word to Hashem. Torah is Hashem's word to man.

Yaakov raised twelve sons, all of whom followed in his footsteps. Not one left the faith, because each had the Torah to which he adhered. It guided them and gave them the strength to continue their commitment, regardless of life's challenges. The Satan feared Yaakov, because Torah represented continuity. He attacked him when he was alone in the middle of the night. He felt that this was when he was most vulnerable. He inflicted his wound, but he did not succeed in besting the Patriarch. Throughout the dark exile, Eisav's descendants have attempted to destroy us. Our devotion to the Torah has always given us the ability to prevail. He might wound us, but he will not win - ever.

Let us return to the Mishkan, the focal point for our *avodah* to Hashem. It is not enough to have *Kerashim*, wooden planks, from the *chesed* of Avraham, because they do not ensure our future. It is only when they are integrated with the Torah of Yaakov that the *avodah* in the Mishkan will endure.

L'zechar nishmas Yenta bas R' Nachum Tzvi a"h By the Schulhof, Winter & Feigenbaum Families

<http://www.anshe.org/parsha.htm#parsha> Parsha Page
by **Fred Toczek** - A Service of Anshe Emes Synagogue (Los Angeles)
A survey of parsha thoughts from Gedolei Yisroel compiled by Fred Toczek. Perfect for printing and use at your Shabbos tisch.

TERUMAH 5757

I. Summary

Building The Mishkon. Hashem commanded Moshe to build a Mishkon (Sanctuary), symbolizing His presence among the Jewish people and constructed per His Divine pattern. (With the exception of the Golden Calf, the balance of Shemos is devoted to the preparations for, and the construction of, the Mishkon.) The Jews were asked to voluntarily give offerings of precious metals, fabrics, skins, wool, oil, spices, incense and precious stones. The Mishkon consisted of the *Chotzeir* (Outer Court) containing the altar for burnt offerings and the laver used by the Kohanim (Priests), and the Tabernacle which was divided into two chambers -- (a) the Outer Chamber (the *Kodesh*) to which only Priests who performed sacred duties had access and which contained the *Shulchan* (Table of Showbread), *Menorah* and *Mizbeiach HaKatoress* (Alter of Incense); and (b) the Inner Chamber (the *Kodesh Kadoshim* ["Holy of Holies"]), which only the *Kohen Gadol* (High Priest) entered on *Yom Kippur* and which contained the sacred *Oron* (the Ark holding the 10 Commandments). The instructions respecting the construction of the utensils and the actual building needed in the Mishkon are detailed in this Parsha.

II. Divrei Torah

A. Lil'Mode U'Lilamed (Rabbi Mordechai Katz)

1. Hashem In Our Midst. Why was it necessary for the Jews to be accompanied during their wandering in the desert by the Mishkon? Doesn't Hashem's presence permeate the entire universe? And, why does the Torah use the words "And let them make Me a Sanctuary, and I will dwell in them" (i.e., and not "in it")? While we may learn that Hashem's presence is everywhere, our intellect can't readily conceive of

this; thus, Hashem provided for a specific concrete place for His presence (i.e., the Mishkon, and later the Temple). But what do we have now? The *Schechinah* (Divine Presence) isn't reserved for the Mishkon and Temple -- every home, synagogue and house of Jewish assembly which exhibits a Jewish manifestation through prayer, learning, mitzvos (such as family purity, *kashrus*, *mezuzah*, etc.) is itself a haven of holiness in which Hashem dwells.

2. Two Types of Charity. The Jews were asked to make 2 kinds of contributions: (a) anything the individual desired to give; and (b) a set amount which everyone -- rich or poor -- was obligated to give on an equal basis. This gives us insights into charity. The first contribution teaches that those who are blessed with wealth should give charity. The second contribution underscores the fact that all of us should give charity, even if our worldly possessions are few. By so doing, we recognize that all of our possessions come from Hashem and that there are always others who are more needy than we are.

3. Avoiding Hypocrisies. In constructing the *Oron*, Hashem commanded that there be three arks -- each larger than the other, with the middle one wooden and the inner and outer ones gold. The gold both inside and outside reminds us that we must strive not to be hypocritical; that is, we must strive to be righteous both inwardly and outwardly. (Rabbi Perry Netter commented that there is one area where we should not be stopped by fear of appearing "hypocritical" -- in our growth in mitzvos. One should not shy away from taking steps toward fulfilling mitzvos, such as *kashrus*, *Shabbos*, family purity because one feels hypocritical that one isn't then ready to "go all the way". It is certainly better to begin to take steps, even small ones, towards mitzvos observance than to not begin at all.)

B. Majesty of Man (Rabbi A. Henach Leibowitz)

1. Pure intentions/ulterior motives. "Speak to the Children of Israel, and they should take an offering for Me [Hashem]". Why did Hashem need to emphasize "for Me"? After all, who would pass up the chance to contribute towards the Mishkon, and to seek forgiveness for the Golden Calf (according to Rashi, the Torah doesn't follow chronological order in this instance -- the Mishkon was actually assigned by Hashem as atonement for the Golden Calf)? The Torah is revealing a problem we must deal with daily -- even when it can't prevent us from performing mitzvos, our "yetzer hara" (evil inclination) can corrupt and attack even the purest intentions by creating ulterior motives for our actions; it persuades us to do mitzvos for honor and prestige, rather than wholeheartedly out of service for Hashem. If we view everything we do (e.g., our careers, money, etc.) as a means of serving Hashem, we can infuse the mundane with holiness. As Rabbi David Feinstein noted, this is why we recite in our blessing "Who has made us holy with His mitzvos" before performing a mitzvot; Hashem made us holy by giving us His mitzvos -- this is our honor.

2. Economic security. The Talmud teaches that the process of making the Showbread and incense were secrets held by the families responsible for their manufacture; the Rabbis were unable to figure out their secrets or duplicate their efforts. This teaches us that whatever Hashem decrees for us as a livelihood will always be ours -- no matter the state of the economy or how fierce our competition.

C. Kol Dodi on the Torah (Rabbi David Feinstein)

A wooden ark. Why was the middle ark wooden (and not gold)? Since wood is a living substance, which grows and reproduces itself (unlike gold which, while beautiful, is inert and lifeless) and is thus a more appropriate container to house the Torah. The Torah is not meant to be a display piece and sit lifelessly on a shelf; it is meant to be used and lived. A library of Jewish books which still looks new and shiny after 20 years in someone's home has no where near the beauty of a well-used library.

D. Love Thy Neighbor (Rabbi Zelig Pliskin)

We must always try to lighten others' burdens. Chizkuni writes that the *Oron* (Ark) wasn't made entirely of gold so as to lighten the burden of the Levites who had to carry it; this reminds us that we always try to alleviate the burden of our fellow man.

E. In the Garden of the Torah (the Lubavitcher Rebbe, Rabbi Menachem M. Schneerson, z'tl)

Spreading the light of the Torah. The Temple was not intended to be an isolated corner of holiness; rather, its windows were designed to spread light outward, for the holiness of the Temple was intended to illuminate the world. Like the Temple, the

radiance of the Torah is intended to be spread. We must do all we can towards this end, by opening our hearts and homes to others and showing them the beauty of Judaism.

Rabbi Yaakov Haber - The Divine Presence: The Hidden and The Revealed
"TorahWeb.org" <torahweb@torahweb.org>

http://www.torahweb.org/torah/2007/parsha/rhab_terumah.html

Rabbi Yaakov Haber The Divine Presence: the Hidden and the Revealed

The detailed description of the materials, dimensions, and structure of the utensils and kohanic vestments associated with the Mishkan in the desert -- mostly to be applied as well to the construction of the permanent Mikdash in Jerusalem -- leads the Midrashim and the commentaries to seek out and elaborate upon an enormous amount of symbolism inherent within the Mishkan/Mikdash which instructs and informs us concerning multi-faceted aspects of Divine service. This is not surprising in light of the comment of many that the true sanctuary is the individual Jew; the Mikdash serves as a model and live analogy for this concept. (See "The Ultimate Mikdash" at http://www.torahweb.org/torah/2003/parsha/rhab_teruma.html for further elaboration on this last point.) Here, we focus on one aspect of the construction and placement of the Aron.

The Talmud (Yoma 54a) relates that the badim (poles) were slightly pulled from their position on the sides of the Aron to protrude into the Paroches which divided between the Kodesh HaKadashim (Innermost Chamber) -- where the Aron rested -- and the Heichal (Outer Chamber). However, neither the Aron nor even the badim were visible as the Paroches prevented their being seen. (See Ha'amek Davar who infers this concept from the Torah's description of the placement of the badim (Parshas VaYakheil 40:20).) To quote Rav S. R. Hirsch (commentary to our Parsha (25:12-15)): "To anyone in the sanctuary, they (the badim) were the sole visible evidence of the existence of the Ark of the Covenant behind the curtain."

Perhaps we can explain the symbolic meaning of this partial revelation of the Aron as follows. (See Gemara Yoma ibid. for its explanation. The themes elaborated upon here can be taken as elaborations on that same explanation.) The prophets of old have already noted the inherent paradox concerning G-d's relationship with His world. On the one hand, G-d is apparent everywhere: "m'lo chol ha'aretz k'vodo", "the Earth is filled with His Glory!" (Yeshaya 6:3). On the other hand, G-d is hidden and remote: "achein atta keil mistatier", "Indeed, you are a G-d who hides" (ibid. 45:15). In the language of Rav Y. D. Soloveitchik zt"l in his classic work, *The Lonely Man of Faith* (p. 48):

...man is faced with an exasperating paradox. On the one hand, he beholds G-d in every nook and corner of creation, in the flowering of the plant, in the rushing of the tide, and in the movement of his own muscle, as if G-d were at hand close to and beside man, engaging him in a friendly dialogue. And yet the very moment man turns his face to G-d, he finds Him remote, unapproachable, enveloped in transcendence and mystery.

This duality was expressed dramatically by the placement of the badei ha'aron. At the same time it was known that the Aron, upon whose k'ruvim G-d rested his Divine Presence, was just behind the curtain, but yet, no individual could actually witness this splendid sight. The Gemara in Yoma expresses this by comparing the shape of the badim jutting into the Paroches to the contours of a human body -- seen but yet not seen through clothing.

In our lives, we often catch glimpses of Hashem's hand. We see His majestic Hand in His Creation ("the heavens bespeak the Glory of G-d!"). We observe His hand in History as the Tzur Yisrael, ensuring Israel's protection. We are often awed by His hashgacha p'ratis, individual Divine Providence, in our lives ("shivt'cha umish'ant'cha heima y'nachamuni", "your rod and support comfort me"). But yet, even with all of this, G-d remains mysterious, transcendent, unseeable and unreachable. Sometimes, this duality leads to doubt or crises in religious faith. The only individual who actually saw the Aron in its full splendor was the Kohein Gadol on Yom Kippur. Perhaps the symbolism behind this is twofold. First, our spiritual giants, prophets and great Torah sages, with their intense connection to the Almighty, constantly serve as our guides reminding us of Hashem's Omnipresence even in times when His Hand is hidden from our eyes. Thus, the Kohein Gadol testifies to us: "Yes, the Divine Presence rests in the Kodesh HaKadashim the whole year round, and I am a living witness to this fact!" Second, Yom Kippur, with its intense all-day 'avoda, is an opportunity for the individual also to experience the sense of the Divine presence.

There are times, though, in our individual and communal lives and history, during which G-d's Hand is unmistakably present. This concept is perhaps symbolized by those times during the year that the entire nation was privileged to actually see the Aron. The above-cited Gemara in Yoma records that during the festivals, the Kohanim would roll up the curtain so that the people could see the Aron and the K'ruvim embracing one another and would tell them, "See your dearness before Hashem!" The Mo'adim not only commemorate historical periods of intense Divine

connection and revelation in the past but serve as time periods when those same aspects of Hashem's revelation to us occur in the present albeit on a smaller scale. It is no surprise that precisely at those points, the Aron, symbolizing as it did the Sh'china's presence within K'lal Yisrael, was revealed in its full glory.

The entire period from the month of Adar through the month of Nissan, traversing through the joyous holidays of Purim and Pesach and the miraculous redemptions they commemorate -- one more hidden, one more revealed -- serves as an eternal reminder of the times when Hashem's intervention on the world-scene is obvious and apparent. This season of the year and the festivals celebrated within it serve as eternal sources of spiritual confidence and rejuvenation to vaccinate us for those times in our lives when G-d's hand is less than apparent. We are instructed: "Mishenichnas Adar marbin b'simcha", "When Adar enters, we increase our joy!" As Rav Soloveitchik often noted, true joy occurs only when one is in the presence of HaKadosh Baruch Hu. This entire period of miraculous redemption serves to remind us of the fact that although the intensity of the Divine Presence changes based on our actions, Hashem is always with us. "Lo ira ra ki atta imadi", "I will not fear evil because You are always with me!" May we merit speedily the full revelation and return of the Sh'china in our days!

Copyright © 2007 by The TorahWeb Foundation. All rights reserved.