



BS"D

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

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON **TERUMAH** - 5778

In our 23rd year! To receive this parsha sheet, go to <http://www.parsha.net> and click Subscribe or send a blank e-mail to parsha-subscribe@yahoo.com Please also copy me at cshulman@gmail.com A complete archive of previous issues is now available at <http://www.parsha.net> It is also fully searchable.

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

Sponsored by
Heshie and Nechie Schulhof
L'zecher Nishmas
Yenta bas Nachum Tzvi a"h, Heshie's mother.

Sponsored by
Dr. Phil & Leah Kazlow
in memory of Leah's mother
Mrs. Moshe Stern Matil bas Dovid
who's Yartzeit is the 6th of Adar

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

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com
from: Shabbat Shalom shabbatshalom@ounetwork.org
subject: Shabbat Shalom from the OU
www.ou.org/torah/parsha/rabbi-sacks-on-parsha
Covenant & Conversation 5778
Rabbi Lord Jonathan Sacks
Why We Value What We Make
Terumah 5778

The behavioural economist Dan Ariely did a series of experiments on what is known as the IKEA effect, or "why we overvalue what we make." The name comes, of course, from the store that sells self-assembly furniture. For practically-challenged people like me, putting an item of furniture together is usually like doing a giant jigsaw puzzle in which various pieces are missing, and others are in the wrong place. But in the end, even if the item is amateurish, we tend to feel a certain pride in it. We can say, "I made this," even if someone else designed it, produced the pieces, and wrote the instructions. There is, about something in which we have invested our labour, a feeling like that expressed in Psalm 128: "When you eat the fruit of the labour of your hands, you will be happy, and it will go well with you." [1] Ariely wanted to test the reality and extent of this added value. So he got volunteers to make origami models by elaborate folding of paper. He then asked them how much they were prepared to pay to keep their own model. The average answer was 25 cents. He asked other people in the vicinity what

they would be prepared to pay. The average answer was five cents. In other words, people were prepared to pay five times as much for something they had made themselves. His conclusions were: the effort that we put into something does not just change the object. It changes us and the way we evaluate that object. And the greater the labour, the greater the love for what we have made. [2]

This is part of what is happening in the long sequence about the building of the Sanctuary that begins in our parsha and continues, with few interruptions, to the end of the book. There is no comparison whatsoever between the Mishkan – the holy and the Holy of Holies – and something as secular as self-assembly furniture. But at a human level, there are psychological parallels.

The Mishkan was the first thing the Israelites made in the wilderness, and it marks a turning point in the Exodus narrative. Until now God had done all the work. He had struck Egypt with plagues. He had taken the people out to freedom. He had divided the sea and brought them across on dry land. He had given them food from heaven and water from a rock. And, with the exception of the Song at the Sea, the people had not appreciated it. They were ungrateful. They complained.

Now God instructed Moses to take the people through a role reversal. Instead of His doing things for them, He commanded them to make something for Him. This was not about God. God does not need a Sanctuary, a home on earth, for God is at home everywhere. As Isaiah said in His name: "Heaven is My throne and the earth My footstool. What house, then, can you will build for Me?" (Is. 66:1). This was about humans and their dignity, their self-respect.

With an extraordinary act of tzimtzum, self-limitation, God gave the Israelites the chance to make something with their own hands, something they would value because, collectively, they had made it. Everyone who was willing could contribute, from whatever they had: "gold, silver or bronze, blue, purple or crimson yarns, fine linen, goat hair, red-dyed ram skins, fine leather, acacia wood, oil for the lamp, balsam oils for the anointing oil and for the fragrant incense," jewels for the breastplate and so on. Some gave their labour and skills. Everyone had the opportunity to take part: women as well as men, the people as a whole, not just an elite.

For the first time God was asking them not just to follow His pillar of cloud and fire through the wilderness, or obey His laws, but to be active: to become builders and creators. And because it involved their work, energy and time, they invested something of themselves, individually and collectively, in it. To repeat Ariely's point: We value what we create. The effort that we put into something does not just change the object. It changes us.

Few places in the Torah more powerfully embody Rabbi Yohanan saying that "Wherever you find God's greatness, there you find His humility." [3] God was giving the Israelites the dignity of being able to say, "I helped build a house for God." The Creator of the universe was giving His people the chance to become creators also – not just of something physical and secular, but of something profoundly spiritual and sacred.

Hence the unusual Hebrew word for contribution, Terumah, which means not just something we give but something we lift up. The builders of the sanctuary lifted up their gift to God, and in the process of lifting, discovered that they themselves were lifted. God was giving them the chance to become "His partners in the work of creation," [4] the highest characterisation ever given of the human condition.

This is a life-changing idea. The greatest gift we can give people is to give them the chance to create. This is the one gift that turns the recipient into a giver. It gives them dignity. It shows that we trust them, have faith in them, and believe they are capable of great things.

We no longer have a Sanctuary in space, but we do have Shabbat, the "sanctuary in time." [5] Recently, a senior figure in the Church of England spent Shabbat with us in the Marble Arch Synagogue. He was with us for the full 25 hours, from Kabbalat Shabbat to Havdallah. He prayed with us,

learned with us, ate with us, and sang with us.[6] “Why are you doing this?” I asked him. He replied, “One of the greatest gifts you Jews gave us Christians was the Sabbath. We are losing it. You are keeping it. I want to learn from you how you do it.”

The answer is simple. To be sure, it was God who at the dawn of time made the seventh day holy.[7] But it was the sages who, making “a fence around the law,” added many laws, customs and regulations to protect and preserve its spirit.[8] Almost every generation contributed something to the heritage of Shabbat, if only a new song, or even a new tune for old words. Not by accident do we speak of “making Shabbat.” The Jewish people did not create the day’s holiness but they did co-create its hadrat kodosh, its sacred beauty. Ariely’s point applies here as well: the greater the effort we put into something, the greater the love for what we have made.

Hence the life-changing lesson: if you want people to value something, get them to participate in creating it. Give them a challenge and give them responsibility. The effort we put into something does not just change the object: it changes us. The greater the labour, the greater the love for what we have made.

Shabbat Shalom

[1] On the pleasures of physical work generally, especially craftsmanship, see Matthew Crawford, *The Case for Working with your Hands*, Viking, 2010; published in America as *Shop Class as Soul Craft*. Among the early Zionists there was a strong sense, best expressed by A. D. Gordon, that working on the land was itself a spiritual experience. Gordon was influenced here not only by Tanakh but also by the writings of Leo Tolstoy. [2] Dan Ariely, *The Upside of Irrationality*, Harper, 2011, 83-106. His TED lecture on this subject can be seen at: https://www.ted.com/talks/dan_ariely_what_makes_us_feel_good_about_our_work [3] Megilla 31a. [4] Shabbat 10a, 119b. [5] Abraham Joshua Heschel, *The Sabbath: Its Meaning for Modern Man*, Farrer, Straus and Giroux, 2005. [6] He was not, of course, obeying all the Shabbat laws: both Jews and Christians agree that these are imperatives for Jews alone. [7] As opposed to the festivals, whose date is dependent on the calendar, that was determined by the Sanhedrin. This difference is reflected in the liturgy. [8] Halakhically, this is the concept of Shevut, that Ramban saw as essentially biblical in origin. Copyright © 2018 The Office of Rabbi Sacks, All rights reserved.

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com from: Destiny Foundation/Rabbi Berel Wein <info@jewishdestiny.com> reply-to: info@jewishdestiny.com subject: Weekly Parsha from Rabbi Berel Wein

Home Weekly Parsha TERUMAH Rabbi Wein’s Weekly Blog

It seems that building campaigns are built into the DNA of the Jewish people from time immemorial. Beginning with this week’s Torah reading and continuing for the next number of weeks we will be informed of the contributions of the Jewish people to the construction of the Mishkan/Tabernacle and to the exquisite details regarding the construction of that building and of its holy artifacts.

Throughout Jewish history a central building of prayer, worship and devotion has always been at the center of Jewish society and thought. Both the first and second Temples were the center of Jewish life during their centuries of existence. And throughout the long exile of the Jewish people, after the destruction of the Second Temple, the longing to restore the temple and have it built once again has never wavered. Yet, it must be admitted and recognized that most of Jewish history, over the past millennia, has taken place without such a Temple and its physical representations present in the actuality of Jewish living. The Jewish people substituted synagogues and houses of worship large and small, study of Torah and community organizations for the lack of the central building of the Temple in Jerusalem.

We created miniature sanctuaries that carried us through very dark times and enormous challenges. This remarkable accomplishment of substitution for what seemed to be the central base of Judaism and the Jewish people is a prime example of the resiliency of the Jewish people and of the benevolent hand of God, so to speak, to help guide and preserve us against all odds. The landscape of the world will reveal that in almost every corner of the globe there were or still are active synagogues built by the Jewish people.

Their styles of architecture certainly differ as do the materials from which they were or are built. Nevertheless, they are all bound together in facing Jerusalem and preserving the holy traditions of prayer and services to God and humans. All attempts to change the form and nature of these synagogues were only temporary and fleeting. The rhythm of centuries and of the mysterious but omnipresent ethos of holiness that these synagogues still contain, have remained the rock of the civilization of Judaism and the Jewish people. All of these buildings were built by love and sacrifice, vision and hope, sweat and tears. The commandment that appears in this week’s Torah reading to “make for Me a dedicated sanctuary” was not limited to the generation of Moshe and those who wandered in the wilderness of the desert of Sinai. That call has echoed throughout Jewish history in every time and place where Jews settled or even visited. From the grandeur of the synagogues of Amsterdam to the small huts of the Ukraine and Lithuania, even to the basements of homes in the suburbs of the major cities of the United States, Jews have always constructed and dedicated their houses of worship and made them centerpieces of their personal and communal life. This is one of the many miraculous events that mark the Jewish story throughout history. Shabbat shalom Rabbi Berel Wein

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com from: Rabbi Chanan Morrison <chanan@ravkooktorah.org> to: rav-kook-list@googlegroups.com subject: [Rav Kook Torah]

Terumah: "Take for Me an Offering" Rav Kook Torah In preparation for building the Tabernacle, God commanded Moses to collect the necessary materials: “Speak to the Israelites and have them take for Me an offering. From every person whose heart inspires him to donate, you shall take My offering.” (Ex. 25:2) Why did God command Moses to take the donations? The verse should read that they must give an offering! The language of “taking” might lead one to conclude that the materials could have been taken from the people by force. But this was not the case, for the Torah stresses that the offerings were donated freely - “from every person whose heart inspires him to donate.” Why, in fact, did this collection need to be voluntary? The Talmud in Baba Batra 8b teaches that a community may force members of the community to support the poor and the needy. Using our money to help others is a trait that needs to be trained and developed. So why did God command that these gifts for the Tabernacle, the first act of tzedakah (charity) on a national level, be donated solely out of sincere generosity? Two Goals of Tzedakah The mitzvah of tzedakah is meant to accomplish two objectives. The first concerns the person receiving the charity. Through this mitzvah, the poor are provided with what they lack. The second objective concerns the one giving. By donating our time and money, we express our inner qualities of chessed and kindness in a concrete and tangible manner. The act of tzedakah actualizes our traits of generosity and contributes toward our own spiritual growth. We can distinguish between these two objectives within the act itself. The first goal stresses the aspect of giving to the needy. The important factor here is that the poor person receives the assistance he needs. The second goal, on the other hand, stresses the aspect of taking from the benefactor. This is a special benefit of the mitzvah of tzedakah: by relinquishing our material possessions for the sake of others, we refine our character traits and elevate the soul. Which of these two goals is the principal objective of tzedakah? ת ך The Gimmel’s Chase The Sages in Shabbat 104a noted that the Hebrew letter Gimmel appears to be facing the next letter in the alphabet, the Dalet, with its left ‘leg’ stretched out toward the Dalet. Why is the Gimmel running toward the Dalet? The Sages explained that the Gimmel is the benefactor (from the word gommeil, meaning one who gives or supports). The Gimmel is chasing after the impoverished Dalet (from the word dal, meaning ‘poor’ or ‘needy’) in order to help him. Why is the benefactor running after the poor? Should it not be the other way around? The Sages wanted to teach us that the principal aim of tzedakah is connected to the very foundations of the universe. The

true goal of tzedakah is to elevate the soul of the giver. After all, if the purpose was to help the poor, God could have provided other means for their support without having to rely on the generosity of society. The shapes of the Hebrew letters - letters which God used to create the universe - hint at this fundamental truth. The Gimmels, the benefactors, need to pursue the Dalets, the poor, in order to grow and develop spiritually. Thus the Jewish people's very first philanthropic project emphasized that the central aspect of tzedakah is not giving to the needy, but taking from the donor. "Have them take for Me an offering." God commanded that the contributions to the Tabernacle be given freely - "every person whose heart inspires him to donate" - since the soul and its traits are only refined when one donates willingly. (Sapphire from the Land of Israel. Adapted from Otzarot HaRe'iyah vol. II, pp. 189-190) See also: Terumah: Betzalel's Wisdom

from: **Rabbi Yissocher Frand** <ryfrand@torah.org>
to: ravfrand@torah.org
date: Wed, Feb 14, 2018 at 12:53 PM
subject: Rav Frand - Four "Takes" on the Strange Expression, "V'Yikchu Li Terumah"

Parshas Terumah

Four "Takes" on the Strange Expression, "V'Yikchu Li Terumah"

These divrei Torah were adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissocher Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Tapes on the weekly portion: #1021 - Should a Yahrzeit Make His Own Minyan in Shul to Get the Amud? Good Shabbos!

The Chumash commentaries are bothered by a word in this week's parsha. The second pasuk of Parshas Terumah says, "Speak to the Children of Israel, and they shall take to Me (v'yikchu Li) a portion, from every man whose heart will motivate him shall you take My portion." [Shemos 25:2] The question is that, given the fact that people are being asked to give a portion rather than take a portion, the pasuk should say "v'yitnu Li terumah" rather than "v'yikchu Li terumah."

There are many different answers given to this question. Some commentators base their answer on the Rabbinic advice regarding the mitzvah of tithing, about which the Torah commands "aser, t'aser..." [Devorim 12:22]. The Rabbis homiletically expound on this "double language," and interpret "aser" [give 10 percent] "bishvil she'tisasher" [in order that you should become wealthy] [Shabbos 119a]. The idea is that if a person gives charity — in particular "ma'aser" [a tithe] — he will not become poor from that; on the contrary he will become wealthy as a result. So too, here, when a person contributes to the mishkan fund, he will not be on the short end of matters (as if he had "given"), but he will profit from the matter (as if he had "taken").

Other commentaries explain that when a person gives to a poor person, he is giving him something physical and material (gashmiyus). However, by giving the poor person money, the donor performs a mitzvah, which is spiritual (ruchniyus). In the "real world," ruchniyus is eternal; material things are transient. Thus, the donor receives a better deal than the recipient.

He took the mitzvah, while the poor person only received a few dollars, which will be quickly spent. Therefore, every time a person gives tzedaka, it is not a matter of giving, it is a matter of taking.

Rav Simcha Scheps, in his sefer Simchas HaTorah, suggests a third interpretation. Rav Scheps also explains that when one gives tzedaka, he is actually taking, but he explains it as follows: By giving tzedaka a person is elevating himself. As a result of giving money to a poor person or to a charity fund, a person becomes a "Giver". There is no greater goal in life than to become a "Giver." When a person becomes a Giver, he resembles the Shechina [Divine Presence of G-d]. This is the life mission of every person in this world. We enter this world as "takers", but when we learn to give, we become G-d-like, and the more we give, the more G-d-like we become. The pasuk in Mishlei says, "Charity elevates the nation..." [14:34]. Therefore, someone who gives is, in fact, taking something much greater.

The Simchas HaTorah references the Rambam in his Mishna commentary to Tractate Avos. The Rambam writes that if a person has \$1,000 to distribute to charitable causes, it is preferable to give one thousand people \$1 each, than to give \$1,000 to a single person. Although in accounting terms the outlay is identical, the Rambam writes that when someone gives a single large donation to just one person, he does not thereby become a Giver. He may well remain the same "stingy person" he always was, just a "stingy person" who happened to give one large donation. However, if someone gives and gives, over and over again, his personality changes. Someone who has given one thousand times becomes a different type of person. He is now a "Giver."

I would just like to add a fourth interpretation of my own. This is perhaps a particularly appropriate interpretation, given the situation we find ourselves in, in the year 2009 (when this shiur was delivered), in which we are in the midst of what everyone is calling "the worst economic crises" since the depression.

There was once a very wealthy major real estate owner named Mr. Schiff. He lived in New York City in the 1920s. At that time, Rav Moshe Mordechai Epstein, the Chevron Rosh Yeshiva, came to the United States and solicited funds from this wealthy American Jew. Mr. Schiff gave the Rosh Yeshiva \$25,000 for the Slabodaka-Chevron Yeshiva. \$25,000 in the 1920s was a very generous donation. Then this Mr. Schiff lost everything during the financial crisis of 1929, to the extent that he was living in the basement of one of his New York City buildings.

The next year, there was another parlor meeting in New York City on behalf of the Slabodka-Chevron Yeshiva, and Mr. Schiff came to the parlor meeting. The emissary for the Yeshiva (who was not Rav Moshe Mordechai Epstein this time) heard what happened to Mr. Schiff, and offered him that the Slabodka-Chevron Yeshiva would loan him \$5,000. Mr. Schiff got up at the meeting and said, "I am not going to take it, and I cannot understand how you can offer it to me. I lost everything. I lost my entire portfolio; my entire fortune. The only thing that I still have left is the merit of the \$25,000 that I gave to the Slabodka Yeshiva. And now you want to take part of that merit away from me? Under no circumstances will I agree to that."

Perhaps this is also an interpretation of our expression "v'yikchu Li terumah". My friends, people unfortunately lost their jobs; we have seen our 401Ks reduced to 201Ks, and people are suffering. People have literally lost their fortunes. But, there is one thing that can never be taken away. People can never lose the charity they have given. When a person "gives," he is in fact giving something that he can "take with him."

Transcribed by David Twersky; Jerusalem DavidATwersky@gmail.com

Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Baltimore, MD dhoffman@torah.org This week's write-up is adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissochar Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Series on the weekly Torah portion. A complete catalogue can be ordered from the Yad Yechiel Institute, PO Box 511, Owings Mills MD 21117-0511. Call (410) 358-0416 or e-mail tapes@yadyechiel.org or visit <http://www.yadyechiel.org/> for further information. Rav Frand © 2017 by Torah.org. Donate to Project Genesis - Torah.org Do you have a question or comment? Feel free to contact us on our website. Join the Jewish Learning Revolution! Torah.org: The Judaism Site brings this and a host of other classes to you every week. Visit <http://torah.org> to get your own free copy of this mailing or subscribe to the series of your choice. Permission is granted to redistribute, but please give proper attribution and copyright to the author and Torah.org. Both the author and Torah.org reserve certain rights. Email copyrights@torah.org for full information. Torah.org: The Judaism Site Project Genesis, Inc. 2833 Smith Ave., Suite 225 Baltimore, MD 21209 <http://www.torah.org/> learn@torah.org 410-602-1350

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com www.matzav.com or
www.torah.org/learning/drasha **Parsha Parables By Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky**
Parshas Terumah Ark of Inclusion

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

by a command stated in the singular form: "And you shall make" "And you shall make a show bread table." "And you shall make a Menorah." "And you shall make an Altar." The command is directed toward Moshe to delegate the construction. The Aron Kodesh, the Holy Ark is different. Its command is not stated in the singular form, rather in the plural. The Torah does not say and you shall make a Holy Ark, it states, "And they shall make a Holy Ark." The commentaries ask, why was the command to build the Ark the only one that was given to a group? In a small shul in Yerushalayim, a daily Daf HaYomi shiur (Talmudic folio class) was held each morning before Shacharis. An elderly Russian immigrant attended the shiur. Quiet as he was, his behavior in the shiur intrigued the lecturer. He would never ask a thing. Often he would nod off. Sometimes, when the Rabbi quoted a particular Talmudic sage, the old man's face would light up – especially when the Rabbi mentioned an opinion from a obscure Talmudic personality. This behavior continued throughout the summer. Always quiet, the man would sometimes nod off, and at other times he would perk up. Then winter came. The group of men would gather around the table in the frigid mornings huddled close as they would warm to the strains of the Talmud and the straining heater in the old synagogue. The old man never missed a class. One morning a rare snow blanketed Jerusalem. No one showed up to the shiur except the Rabbi and the elderly Russian Jew. Instead of giving his usual lecture, the Rabbi decided he would ask the old Jew a little bit about himself. "Tell me," he inquired, "I watch you as I say my shiur. Sometimes you look intrigued but at other times you seem totally disinterested. The trouble is I would like to make the shiur more interesting for you during its entirety, but I can't seem to make out what perks you up and makes you doze?" The old man smiled. "I never had a Jewish education. I can barely read Hebrew. I do not come to the shiur for the same reasons that the other men come." He paused as his eyes pondered his past. "You see, I was a soldier in the Red Army during World War II. Every day our commander would herd us into a room and put a gun to our heads. He commanded us to recite the names of every member of the Politburo. And we did. We learned those names backwards and forward. I come to this class to hear the names of every rabbi in the Talmud. If I cannot learn at least I will know the names of all the great sages! "That." he smiled "is my Daf HaYomi!" Although the show bread table, the Menorah, and the Altar can be constructed by individuals — the Ark that holds the Torah is different. One man cannot make it alone. It must be a communal effort. Just as the Torah cannot be learned by one man alone, its Ark cannot be built by an individual either. The Torah is given for everyone to learn and to experience – each one according to his or her own level and ability. Lighting a Menorah is a clear-cut ritual delegated to the Kohain. The Altar is used for the sacrifices brought by the kohanim. The Torah is for everybody. And each individual has his own Shas and Daf HaYomi. Each person has his share in Toras Yisrael. Everyone extracts something holy from the Torah. To some it may be extrapolative halachic theory, while for others it may be the refinement of character. And still for others it may be the names of Abayai and Rava. Good Shabbos! In memory of Ruth Gleicher by Ben Lipschitz (Chaya) Rivka Bas haRav Yoel Copyright © 2002 by Rabbi M. Kamenetzky and Project Genesis, Inc.

from: Naaleh Torah Online <contact@naaleh.com>
date: Thu, Feb 15, 2018 at 9:15 PM
subject: Chodesh Adar and Parsha Terumah Newsletter
Parshat Terumah: Tribute to Tachash
Based on a Naaleh.com shiur by Mrs. Shira Smiles
Summary by Channie Kopolowitz Stein

While most of the materials Hashem asked Bnei Yisroel to contribute to the building of the mishkan are familiar, there is one that is unknown to us. This is the skin of the tachash which was used as a covering above the mishkan. The Gemara Shabbos explains that this was a beautiful, multi colored animal

that existed only at that time, neither before from creation nor after. Onkelos writes that the tachash sos gavna, rejoices and prides itself in its colors. Shenayim Mikra explains the words differently. Sos can be read as six (shesh) colors. Ohel Yosef writes that this represent the six emanations through which God is manifest in the world. The seventh sefirah is malchut, the sovereignty of God Himself, above all the others and above the mishkan. The Shvilei Pinchas questions, haughtiness is antithetical to God's presence. How could the tachash who was prideful be used for the mishkan? The Tal Hashamayim answers that the tachash took pride for the short time that it was in the service of Hashem. Even a Torah scholar can have a small bit of measured pride for doing Hashem's will, writes Hashir Vehashevach. Therefore the tachash must be other worldly, created from outside this world to exist for only a short time to help us feel Hashem's presence, for only in the mishkan where Hashem's presence is manifest can we find pride (haughtiness) and greatness (ga'avah u'gedulah) together. The Shvilei Pinchas notes that each side of the mishkan represented one of our forefathers. The right side represented Avraham and his attribute of chesed (kindness); the left side represented Yitzchak and his attribute of gevurah (strength). But there was a center bar that went from one side to the other, bridging the gap and joining the two. This represents Yaakov whose attribute was tiferet, glory and splendor which is the point at which chesed and gevurah meet in balance. The Shvilei Pinchas cites the Alshich in noting that the first beit hamikdosh was in the merit of Avraham but was destroyed because of Yishmael. The second beit hamikdosh was in the merit of Yitzchak but was destroyed because of Esav. The third beit hamikdosh will be built in the merit of Yaakov and will incorporate the hidden elements of the mishkan within it. Likewise, as the middle link in attributes, Yaakov incorporates within himself the attributes of Avraham and Yitzchak. This idea brings us back to the tachash. Avraham is the white of kindness and Yitzchak is the red of strength. Yaakov is represented by green. (Green is the middle color of the rainbow, bridging the opposite extremes.) The tachash was important because its skin had the ability to incorporate many colors and create a beautiful synthesis to create tiferet, splendor. Tachash is an anagram for Torah, chaim (life) and shalom (peace). Yaakov represented each of these elements. He sat in the tents of Shem and Ever and studied Torah. The Gemara says Yaakov never died, (chaim), and he was able to create the balance and peace between the gentle chesed of Avraham and the harsh strength of Yitzchak, hence shalom. However, when the forces of evil corrupt this balance, we get the reverse anagram, shachat, destruction. Like the tachash, Yaakov takes pride in synthesizing these elements and creating a new and beautiful "color." It is this synthesis that covers the entire Mishkan and is the source of shalom. The Chasam Sofer adds that unity of purpose creates this peace.

Rabbi B. Z. Firer explains that the just as the tachash contained many different, beautiful hues so too although Bnei Yisroel are centered around one unchanging body of law, each group brings their individual beauty and perspective in the form of custom and tradition. The mishkan itself is exact, but the tachash that surrounds it represents our diversity and individuality. Therefore there were twelve distinct tribes. Each of us is a unique combination of nature and nurture with a unique path and goal to serve God. In the same manner, the tachash was also created to fulfill a unique purpose in a specific moment of time, notes Rabbi Frand. Like the tachash, continues Rabbi Brazil, we can each be happy and proud when we realize that there is none other like me who can fulfill my specific purpose on earth. The tachash teaches us that our diversity and multiple hues present a beautiful and textured setting for Hashem's presence to rest among us, for although each of us is unique, together we represent the glorious multiplicity of the universe and our unique placement within it.

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com from: Mordechai Tzion
toratravaviner@yahoo.com to: ravaviner@yahoogroups.com

<http://www.ravaviner.com/> Yeshivat Ateret Yerushalayim From the teachings of the Rosh Yeshiva Ha-Rav Shlomo Aviner Shlit"a
www.ravaviner.com Yeshivat Ateret Yerushalayim From the teachings of the Rosh Yeshiva Ha-Rav Shlomo Aviner Shlit"a - Short & Sweet

Ha-Rav answers hundreds of text message questions a day. Here's a sample:

Map of Eretz Yisrael in the Bathroom Q: Is it permissible to hang a map of Eretz Yisrael in the bathroom? A: Yes, as long as one does not think about Torah when looking at it. Q: But Eretz Yisrael is holy?! A: Correct. But it is even permissible to have bathrooms in Eretz Yisrael, and it is holier than a map. Time of Wedding Q: Is it permissible to delay the time written on the wedding invitation in order to have a longer Kabbalat Panim, pictures, etc.? A: Certainly not. One is obligated to have the wedding at the time written on the invitation. One should not begin their marriage with a lie! (It once happened that Ha-Rav Shmuel Ha-Levi Vosner, the author of Shut Shevet Ha-Levi, traveled from Bnai Brak to Yerushalayim to serve as Sandak at a Brit Milah. They had agreed on a time for the Brit Milah, and Rav Vosner, as he usually did, was particular to arrive early. The Mohel, however, did not arrive on time. After waiting a while, Rav Vosner told the father of the baby: "There is no choice, I am returning to Bnai Brak now. Please take someone else as the Sandak. My time is precious, and this is the first day of the Zman and I want to be in the Yeshiva". The father said that the Mohel is an expert and has many Britot, and called to say that he was delayed but is already on his way. Rav Vosner replied: "Tell the Mohel that not coming on time involves the transgression of 'Do not lie' and if the time of the Brit Milah is set after discussing it with the Mohel, he must arrange his schedule so that he arrives on time, does not deceive others and does not violate the transgression of lying!" And he added: "Regardless, I am hurrying back to Bnai Brak." In the meanwhile, the mother's father, who was a grandson of the Yismach Moshe, approached and showed Rav Vosner the Kiddush cup of the Yismach Moshe. Rav Vosner's face glowed and he asked how he inherited it, checked the size and asked if his grandfather used it for Kiddush, etc. The Mohel then arrived and apologized to Rav Vosner, but Rav Vosner said to him: "Time is time! Time is something very precious to me!", and he served as Sandak. Rav Rabbanan, pp. 229-230). Chevra Kadisha in Every Community Q: Should there be a Chevra Kadisha in every community, or is it enough for there to be one in larger communities? A: The custom in every generation and every location is for there to be a Chevra Kadisha in every community. See Neta'ei Gavriel (Avelut Volume 1 42:1). Changing Name Order Q: My name is Leah Iris. A Rav told me to change the order to Iris Leah. Do I need to do so only on my Teudat Zehut (Israeli I.D. card) or should my father mention it in a Mi She-Berach in Shul when he receives an Aliyah? A: 1. Ask the Rav who said so. 2. There is absolutely no need to change the order. There is no difference. Respecting Politicians Q: How should we relate to politicians who do both good and bad things? A: The Rambam writes that if the majority of one's actions are Mitzvot, a person is righteous, if the majority of one's actions are transgressions, he is wicked (Hilchot Teshuvah Chapter 3). Either way, one obviously receives reward for the Mitzvot and is punished for the transgressions.. Doctor who Does Not Succeed Q: Our Sages say that Hashem causes good to be brought about through the agency of righteous people and bad to be brought about through the agency of evil people (Shabbat 32a). If a doctor's patient dies, isn't this a sign that he is evil? A: No! He did not perform a transgression, but rather the great Mitzvah of trying to heal another person. It is not dependent on him if he will succeed. It is Hashem's decision. See Ramban, Torat Ha-Adam, Sha'ar Ha-Sakanah. Kitzur Shulchan Aruch Saves Questions Q: Does it bother Ha-Rav that I send him so many questions? A: No. But almost all of your questions are found in basic Halachah books like the Kitzur Shulchan Aruch. There are also pocket versions. It is better to look there. Once on Erev Pesach when a myriad of people came to ask questions of Ha-Rav Shmuel Ha-Levi Vosner, author of Shut Shevet Ha-Levi, he said: "If the questioners would learn even the Kitzur Shulchan Aruch, 80% of the

questions here would not need to be asked" (Rav Rabanan, p. 402). Child Bothering During Shemoneh Esrei Q: If a young child is making noise in the middle of the Shemoneh Esrei, and he cannot be calmed down, what should one do? A: His father should take him outside in the middle of the Shemoneh Esrei (Ha-Rav Yosef Shalom Elyashiv, Aliba De-Hilchata #12, p. 3. And see the exchange of letters between Rav Aviner and Ha-Rav Avraham Dov Auerbach, Rav of Tiveriah, about this issue in Shut She'eilat Shlomo 1:53 and Shut Hagrad"a p. 26). Special thank you to Orly Tzion for editing the Ateret Yerushalayim Parashah Sheet

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com

http://www.ou.org/torah/author/Rabbi_Dr_Tzvi_Hersh_Weinreb from: Shabbat Shalom <shabbatshalom@ounetwork.org> reply-to: shabbatshalom@ounetwork.org Rabbi Dr. Tzvi Hersh Weinreb ***OU Torah The Missing Tzedakah Box Rabbi Dr. Tzvi Hersh Weinreb***

It was a cold winter, all over the world. It was the year 1991, and it was the time of the great Gulf War. Scud missiles were falling upon towns and cities throughout the State of Israel. To say that times were tense would indeed be an understatement. The city of Baltimore had a sister city relationship with Odessa, in the former Soviet Union. The communist regime had just fallen, and travel to places like Odessa was becoming more practical. The Jewish community of Baltimore had begun to send representatives to assist the Jews of Odessa in various ways. Every six months or so, they would assign a different rabbi to travel to Odessa to ascertain the needs of the Jewish community there. That winter, it was my turn as a local Baltimore congregational rabbi to visit Odessa. It was a tense time for such a visit, and my family and friends urged me not to go.

However, I did go and had one of the most adventurous experiences in my life. My companion and I were stranded in the Moscow airport and could not continue on to Odessa, because the Russian Navy was on maneuvers in anticipation of the spreading of the Gulf War – and we were considered potential spies. We spent a frigid Shabbat in Moscow, eventually obtained the credentials to gain access to Odessa, and spent about ten days there. I had a busy and rewarding time there, especially because of my visit to the one synagogue that was permitted to function throughout the communist era. I remember the synagogue well, and I recall the fact that the prayer services were held in a basement room and not in the still beautiful and quite a large sanctuary, because the community could not afford to heat the larger facility. About twenty men and three or four women gathered in that basement shul every morning. They had Torah scrolls and read from them. Many individuals came by for a moment or two to light memorial candles. There were even siddurim and chumashim. But something was missing, and for a while I couldn't quite put my finger on what it was. Suddenly, it dawned upon me that there were no pushkas (tzedakah boxes) and no collection of tzedakah (charity) whatsoever. Tzedakah is an integral part of the Jewish prayer service, and no synagogue that I am familiar with, whatever its orientation, lacks a tzedekah box in which to at least put in a few pennies. It was at that moment that I began to fully comprehend the effects of seventy years of communist domination upon the religious psyche of the Jews who lived under Soviet regime and tyranny. The deep-rooted custom of giving charity daily had been uprooted. The profound compassion, which has characterized the Jewish people throughout the ages, had been purged from the very souls of the victims of Communism. I reflect on this important personal observation when this week's Torah portion, Parshat Terumah, comes around. For although we have examples of charity and benevolence earlier in the Torah, this week we read for the first time about the entire Jewish community and its response to a call, an appeal, for contributions. In Terumah, the Jewish people begin to construct the Mishkan, the Sanctuary. In a sense, it is the first synagogue in our history. It is certainly the first time that we are summoned to contribute, each and every one of us, to a community-wide project. The Jewish people do respond, and respond

generously, with all their hearts, and with whatever they have available, to the call for contributions to the Sanctuary. There is no record of anyone shirking this responsibility. Our Torah portion begins with the command of the Almighty to Moses that he speak to the Jewish people and “have them take for Me a gift from every person whose heart moves him to give.” (Exodus 25:2). Commentaries throughout the ages find it remarkable that we are asked to take, not give, a gift, establishing the basic teaching that he who gives takes a great deal in the process, that giving is a reward and not a deprivation. That fundamental lesson was expunged from the minds and hearts of the Jews of Odessa under the duress of a mere seventy years of communist oppression. I have been reading a great deal about the science of genetics and its fascinating recent discoveries. Among these discoveries is the finding that many traits that we ordinarily think are products of our education and experience are ultimately rooted in heredity, in our genes. One of those traits is altruism, the tendency to care about others and to act benevolently toward them. This scientific finding is, in a sense, consistent with the Talmudic teaching that three personality traits are part of the definition of the Jew, hardwired into our very nature: compassion, the capacity to feel shame, and generosity. The Jews I met during those wintry days on the shores of the Black Sea have the same genetic composition as the alms-giving Jews I see every morning in New York, Baltimore, and Jerusalem. They share a common heritage and heredity with all other Jews. They, too, possessed the gene for altruism, if in fact such a gene exists. But I am convinced that the power of our social experiences is sufficient enough to overwhelm the innate power of our inherited traits. The indoctrination of seventy years of a culture which taught that one has no private property, no ownership, no say over giving or taking, but that everything belongs to the commune, was sufficient to undermine centuries of teachings and practices of an entirely different ethic. For the Jewish ethic of charity teaches that we are entitled to private property that we come by through honest effort and legitimate toil. The Jewish ethic of charity teaches, however, that we are accountable to take some of that legitimately earned private property and give it on to those less fortunate than we are or to ward the needs of the larger collective, the tzibbur. There are many ways to understand Jewish history, many perspectives from which to view our origins and our ability to have survived the vicissitudes we have encountered over hundreds of years. We can understand our history in terms of our persecutions, in terms of our heroic leaders, in terms of our migrations to every part of the globe. But I maintain that the way to understand Jewish history is through the recognition of the power of the mitzvah of tzedakah, a mitzvah that we have all faithfully kept whether we observed other mitzvot or not. We have had the amazing ability to recognize our obligation as individuals to the greater community. We have always demonstrated our compassion for the welfare of the poor, of the sick, of the elderly. Jewish history can be understood in terms of our successes in the area of charity. The old synagogue of Odessa, as I am told by those who have visited there more recently, now has a tzedakah box. Indeed, it has more than one. The Jews there are more than generous in their giving. The lessons of Communism have been undone. The Jewish tradition of “taking gifts” has been restored. That is the way I choose to understand the major theme of Jewish history; compassion for each other, generosity, charity, and altruism. Sometimes, for brief periods, we may lose our focus. But we are quick to regain it.

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com from: Ohr Torah Stone
 <ohrtorahstone@otsny.org> reply-to: yishai@ots.org.il subject: Rabbi Riskin on the Weekly Torah Portion **Parshat Terumah (Exodus 25:1 – 27:19) Rabbi Shlomo Riskin**

Efrat, Israel — “And the cherubs shall spread their wings on high, spreading over the kapporet, as they face one another; towards the Kapporet shall they face” [Ex. 25:20].

Concerning the construction of the Holy Ark and the cherubs, two technical textual questions are raised by the Midrash and many Biblical commentaries. First of all, throughout our Torah portion, Terumah, the various parts of the Sanctuary are commanded to be built by Moses: “You [second person singular, ve-asita] shall make.” The one glaring exception is the Holy Ark, “And they shall make an ark out of shittim wood...,” which is written in the third-person plural (ve-asu), referring to the entire nation of Israel [ibid., v. 10]. Why the distinction?

Second, there appears to be a superfluous wording in the verse. In the first instance, the Torah records: “And you shall place in the Ark the Testimony that I shall give you” [ibid., v. 16]. And then, after the command of the construction of the cherubs and only five verses after the verse just cited, we find once again: “And into the Ark shall you place the Testimony that I shall give you”. Why repeat the instruction to place the tablets of Testimony into the Holy Ark?

Siftei Hakhamim (Rabbi Shabtai ben Yosef Bass, 17th-18th Century Poland and Prague) draws our attention to a detailed grammatical difference that answers our question. The form of the verb used the first time is past tense (natata), albeit changed to the future in meaning by the prefix vav but nevertheless a past-tense form: literally, “and you have placed the tablets” [ibid., v. 16]. The form used the second time is pure future tense (titein), literally, “you shall place the tablets” [ibid., v. 21].

Thus, the second verse is alluding to the second tablets that will be placed in the Holy Ark after the first tablets will be broken by Moses when he sees the Israelite worship of the Golden Calf. The midrash [Shemot Rabbah] explains that the Second Tablets will be hewn out by Moses (not by God Himself), and that the Second Tables contained the Oral Law of all the generations, the “Halakhot, midrashim and Aggadot,” the human input of the great rabbis of all the Jewish periods who interpreted Torah for all times.

Along these lines there is another apparent difference of opinion, concerning the gender of the cherubs, which certainly impacts on the particular symbolism they are meant to convey. Our Sages cite a tradition that the cherubs were in the form of two winged children, one male and the other female, locked in an embrace. The imagery of this tradition is one of familial purity, innocent love, physical and emotional attachment devoid of erotic lust and defilement [BT Yoma 54], explaining that Torah may best be conveyed within the familial context.

But Rashi and Ibn Ezra [ad loc.] seem to have another tradition: while they accept the representation of winged children, they do not include the male-female aspect of the description. For Rashi, there are two faces of young children; for Ibn Ezra, there are two male youths (“ne’arim”). Here the symbolism is not at all familial or sexual in nature, it is rather the protection and continuity of Torah through the commitment of succeeding generations, human angels taking responsibility for the eternal Torah.

And the Oral Torah is the development of those seeds into the magnificent fruit that will provide the necessary spiritual sustenance and divine nourishment for every generation. Indeed, “every spiritual truth and religious decision that a devoted student will ultimately expound in a novel fashion was originally given at Sinai” [JT, Megillah 4:1] – if not directly at least in potential.

Hence, Rabbenu Yaakov Ba’al Haturim (13th-14th Century Germany and Spain) explains that the individual called to the Torah recites one blessing over the Written Torah and a second blessing over the Oral Torah, the force of the Oral Torah being expressed in the words, “and an eternal Torah has He planted in our midst.”

It is the task of the Torah scholars of every generation – symbolized by the two winged youths, reminiscent of a dedicated havruta (Torah study partnership) or by the wholehearted Torah leaders who retain a youthful purity – to nurture the seeds of the Written Torah into a dynamic and ever-increasing fount of Torah nourishment for every period and its perplexities, every era and its exigencies.

Now our original questions can all be answered. The Holy Ark that houses the sacred Torah must be constructed not by Moses alone, but rather by the entire nation of Israel, indeed, by the most committed Israelites of every future generation. The Torah is protected by those who study it, interpret it and expound its message for all subsequent times.

The cherubs symbolize the human partners in the expansion of Torah, largely to be found in the Oral Law, primarily developed by the great Torah interpreters of each generation, individuals who soar Heavenward by virtue of their ability to extract from the Divinely-planted seeds the fruit in order to make the Torah meaningful and accessible to every Jew for every place and every time. Shabbat Shalom

<http://www.kosherveyosher.com/hamotzi-vs-mezonos.html>

Hamotzei vs Mezonos

From the series, Halachically Speaking; Authored by

Rabbi Moishe Dovid Lebovits,

Reviewed by Rabbi Ben-zion Schiffenbauer Shlita, Piskei Harav Yisrael Belsky Shlita, reviewed by Harav Yisrael Belsky Shlita

The halachos regarding whether a product is a mezonos or hamotzei is complicated.[1] However, one can become knowledgeable in this critical and common area by learning the Shulchan Aruch (with poskim) until the halachos are crystal clear.[2]

In this issue we will clarify which beracha to make on bread and dough products.

The Beracha on Matzah

There are three definitions advanced regarding "pas habab'kisinin"[3] food which is not bread but in the bread family, and one who is kove'ah seuda on these foods, must wash and bench.[4] The third definition has the most relevance to what we will be discussing in this issue. Therefore, we will discuss only that definition.

The opinion of Rav Hai Goan in the name of the Aruch is that pas haba b'kisinin is a dough that has been baked in a manner which becomes very hard.[5] Crackers, bread sticks[6] and flat breads fall into this category.[7] Although they are made from the same ingredients as bread, due to their appearance and texture they are not eaten as bread during a meal,[8] and thus the beracha is mezonos.[9]

According to Rav Hai Goan matzah is pas haba b'kisinin since it is crispy, and therefore the correct beracha would be a mezonos. The custom among Sefardim is indeed to recite a mezonos on matzah all year round with the exception of Pesach.[10] The reason why matzah is a hamotzei on Pesach according to the Sefardim is because during Pesach everyone considers matzah as bread.[11] The custom among the Ashkenazim is to recite a hamotzei on matzah all year round.[12] The reason is because matzah is used year-round for a meal, and not considered a snack item.[13] Some Sefardim have a custom to recite hamotzei on matzah all year.[14] Some poskim say the reason why the custom of Ashkenazim is to recite hamotzei on matzah is because matzah is not what Rav Hai Goan said pas haba b'kisinin is classified as.[15]

The question arises according to the opinion of the Sefardim as to which beracha to make on leftover matzah after Pesach. Many poskim maintain that the beracha is indeed a mezonos,[16] while others say since this matzah was a hamotzei during Yom Tov the din of hamotzei remains on them as long as those matzahs remain.[17] On Motzei Pesach if one is kove'ah seuda on matzah, even a Sefardi would recite a hamotzei on the matzah.[18] The Gr'a did not eat matzah all year (except for Pesach) because he was unsure of the correct beracha to recite on matzah.[19]

Matzah Crackers

Some say matzah crackers one does not have a meal from them; therefore, the beracha would be a mezonos.[20]

Pretzels

A pretzel is a baked snack that is twisted into a unique knot-like shape. A pretzel is regular bread dough. Since they are hard and not eaten as a meal according to Rav Hai Goan the beracha is mezonos.[21]

Soft pretzels are made from bread dough and the beracha should therefore be hamotzei. Therefore one who wants to eat this pretzel must wash and bench. If the pretzel tastes like cake then a mezonos would be made, but such pretzels are not manufactured.[22]

Pita Bread

The beracha for this pita is hamotzei since it is regular bread.[23]

Toast

Toast is regular bread put into a toaster. Once bread attained the status of bread, the bread cannot be transformed into a cracker by toasting it. Therefore, the beracha is hamotzei.[24]

Melba toast

Melba toast is a very dry, crisp, thinly toasted piece of bread. Melba toast is made by lightly toasting bread in a normal manner. Once the outside of the bread is slightly firm, it is removed from the toaster and then each slice is cut in half longitudinally with a knife to make two slices, each half the thickness of the original. These two slices are then toasted again to make Melba toast. As one can see, this product is 100% bread. Therefore, the beracha is hamotzei and not mezonos.[25]

Bagel Chips

Bagel chips are made from long loaves of bagel dough that are extruded and cut into uniformly sized bagel chips that are seasoned, baked and toasted. These companies manufacture this product as a snack food. Accordingly, some poskim are of the opinion that the beracha is a mezonos.[26] However, as a matter of halacha l'maseh the beracha on this product is hamotzei,[27] since the intent of the company does not play a role in deciding which beracha should be made on a specific food.[28] If they would be made with leftover bagels then all would agree they are hamotzei.[29]

Bagel

A piece of dough which is boiled and then baked requires hamotzei.[30] This is the process in which bagels are made. Therefore, the beracha for a bagel is hamotzei.[31]

Kneidlach- Matzah Balls

If one takes pieces of bread which are a k'zayis (each piece individually) and cooks them, the beracha remains hamotzei. If the individual pieces are less than a k'zayis, even if they retain the appearance of the bread the beracha is mezonos. If the bread pieces are not cooked, but are rather stuck together with honey or soup, and the conglomerate is a k'zayis the beracha is hamotzei. This is true even if it does not have the appearance of bread (appearance of bread means it has to look like a baked item as opposed to a different way of making the food).[32] If it is not a k'zayis then it is only hamotzei if the conglomerate retains the appearance of bread, otherwise it is mezonos.[33] If one was kove'ah seuda on the above mezonos items that are less than a k'zayis no washing or benching would be required because there is no appearance of bread.[34]

The beracha on kneidlach when one uses matzah meal, a little amount of water, and cooks it, is mezonos.[35] If something is less than a k'zayis but cooked even with an appearance of bread it is mezonos because it is a dish not a bread product.[36] Some say it may be soaked as well.[37] In order for the bread to be considered cooked it has to either be placed in a utensil on the fire[38] and hot anywhere from 113-175 degrees[39] or in a utensil which was just removed from the fire after cooking.[40] Placing food in a kli sheini does not render the bread a cooked item.[41] Pouring from a kli rishon does not cook the food either.[42] Some were careful to make the kneidlach less than a k'zayis in size to avoid questions of the beracha since if it is less than a k'zayis it would be mezonos even if it looked like bread.[43]

There is a discussion in the poskim if frying is considered cooking.[44] Relevant to us is if bread is fried in a pan. All would agree that if one merely placed enough oil in the pan so that the bread should not burn, the food is not considered tignon (fried) orbishul (cooked) and the beracha is hamotzei.[45] The uncertainty is when the amount of oil used is more than is needed to prevent burning but less than deep fried.[46] Bread which is deep fried (this means the entire food is covered with oil)[47] definitely has the status of being cooked, and the beracha would be mezonos, if it is less than a k'zayis.[48] The ramifications of this halacha will be discussed below as they apply to French toast, matzei brei, and to croutons.

One who wants to change the status of bread from hamotzei to mezonos should cook the bread in water for about a minute and then prepare the dish the way he would like.[49]

French toast

French toast is generally made with bread, eggs, and some milk which is fried in a frying pan. If one uses pieces of bread which are larger than a k'zayis then the beracha is hamotzei since when frying pieces of bread larger than a k'zayis the appearance of bread does not change, and the beracha is hamotzei. One who makes French toast by using pieces of bread less than a k'zayis would recite a mezonos on it.[50]

Challah Kugel

There are many different ways of making challah kugel. The challah is usually broken into pieces and soaked in water. If the pieces are larger than a k'zayis the beracha is hamotzei. If the pieces are less than a k'zayis the beracha is mezonos since it loses its appearance of bread.[51] However, usually the challah kugel is baked afterwards which would be problematic because this baking may turn it into a bread item.[52] If the challah kugel is made with little flavoring other than the bread and water one should recite a hamotzei.[53] However, most challah kugels are made to taste very sweet made with raisins, eggs etc. Therefore, in this situation the beracha would be a mezonos even if the challah kugel is placed in the oven after the initial soaking.[54]

Some say that the challah or (matzah look below) should be soaked for a half-hour in order for it to lose the appearance of bread (if it is less than a k'zayis and not cooked).[55]

Matzah Brie

Matzah brie is made by breaking up matzah into small pieces and soaking the matzah in eggs. After the matzah is soaked one fries it in a frying pan with oil which is just enough to prevent burning. If the pieces are larger than a k'zayis the beracha is undoubtedly hamotzei. If the pieces are smaller than a k'zayis the beracha is questionable.[56] Therefore, one should wash on real bread prior to eating this food.[57] If one deep fries the matzah brie and the pieces are smaller than a k'zayis, a mezonos is recited on it. [58]

The bnei Sefard who year-round recite a mezonos on matzah, would recite a mezonos on matzah brie regardless of how it is made.[59]

Croutons

There are many different types of croutons sold on the market.[60] The yellow Osem® croutons are not pieces of bread and are deep fried, their beracha is mezonos.[61]

If a piece of bread less than a k'zayis is deep fried it is mezonoseven if it retains its appearance of bread. If it would be baked or fried, but not immersed in oil it remains hamotzei. There are two types of croutons made from small square pieces of bread that are manufactured. The flavored types of croutons (white or dark) are made from very small pieces of bread and are generally deep fried. The beracha for these are mezonos.[62] The larger ones (but still less than a k'zayis) are baked. Accordingly, the berachais hamotzei.[63] If croutons were fried in oil but not enough to consider them deep fried then one should wash and bentsh and then he may eat these croutons without a problem.[64]

If one would take croutons (or any piece of bread) that are less than a k'zayis and place them in a kli rishon for enough time that it loses its bread appearance the beracha would be mezonos. Placing them in a kli sheini would not help. However, if one soaks them in a kli sheini for a minute or two then a mezonos may be made on them since they are less than a k'zayis.[65] One who places the larger kind of croutons in a salad would recite ahamotzei on them.[66] Many people make mezonos on the large croutons even when placed in salad, and this is not correct.

There is an opinion in the poskim which says that if one has intention for the product to be pas haba b'kisinin, when making the dough and bread, the beracha is a mezonos. According to this opinion, some want to say if croutons are not made from standard bread, but from dough specifically for this product, then the beracha would be a mezonos.[67] However, this is not to be relied upon for halacha l'maseh.[68]

Bread Crumbs

Bread crumbs and matzah meal are made by crumbling bread into tiny pieces. It would seem that the beracha on this should behamotzei because it is bread (or matzah).[69] However, in most cases the beracha would be mezonos as will be explained. One reason is because the pieces are less than a k'zayis, and it is placed with a liquid when fried, and it loses its appearance of bread, which changes its status from hamotzei to mezonos.[70] Furthermore, bread crumbs are usually used to fry fish or chicken cutlets and the bread crumbs are deep fried even though the oil used is not enough to consider the chicken cutlets deep fried. Some say the reason is because in any dish it is placed in, and the bread crumbs are butel.[71]

Doughnuts

One who has thick dough and cooks or fries it recites a mezonoson it even if it looks like bread since the beracha only goes according to the time it was cooked. Others say the beracha ishamotzei.[72] The custom is to be lenient.[73] however, a person who fears Hashem should only eat such foods during a bread meal.[74] Technically one may eat doughnuts even an amount of a kvias seuda but the custom is not like this.[75] If the dough was made with ingredients like oil or honey the beracha is amezonos.[76]

Doughnuts are made by deep frying dough in oil.[77] Accordingly they should only be eaten during a bread meal.[78] However, the custom is not like this, and in fact the beracha is mezonos.[79] Why is this so, since it seems to be against the opinion of theposkim. The reasons are the following: There is an opinion in theposkim who maintains if it is deep fried it is considered as if the dough is made with oil and not flour and water.[80] Furthermore, the dough is made with sweet ingredients, and not made with only flour and water.[81] Some say since one is not kove'ah seuda on such items the beracha is mezonos.[82] This applies to doughnuts without a filling. Doughnuts with a filling will be discusses at a different time.

One should still avoid eating doughnuts to the amount that one is kove'ah seuda on.[83]

Some say one who wants to eat a doughnut in middle of a meal does not require its own beracha and is exempt with the berachaon the bread in the beginning of the meal.[84] Others say one should have in mind at the beginning of the meal when he washes to exempt the doughnuts from a beracha.[85]

Lukshin

A dough that is cooked (not baked) and the finished product does not have an appearance pf bread is mezonos according to all opinions.[86] Many people make lokshon kugel by putting noodles with eggs and other ingredients and then bake it in an oven. Some say this may be considered a food that has an appearance of bread since it is baked and therefore, if one would eat an amount of kvias seuda he would have to

wash and bentsh.[87]The minhag however is to be lenient,[88] and most poskim hold even in this situation it is not considered a bread product and theberacha is a mezonos.[89] Some say for this reason lokshon kugel is given out by a kiddush (as opposed to cake) is in order for one to be able to eat a lot of kugel without running into a problem of kvias seuda.[90] Couscous and farfel are considered non-bread products and the beracha on them is mezonos even if one eats it as a meal.[91]

Spagheti/Macaroni/Baked Ziti/Lasagna

Based on the above paragraph one may recite a mezonos on spaghetti, macaroni[92] and noodles since they do not have a bread appearance.[93] One may recite a mezonos on baked ziti even though it is baked after the noodles are cooked. The reason is because the baking is done for a small period of time in order to melt the cheese. Therefore, it is not considered a baked item.[94]

The beracha on lasagna is questionable since lasagna is wide pieces of dehydrated dough. The noodles are cooked and then the sauce and cheese is baked in an oven altogether. TheShulchan Aruch[95] says the beracha for such a food is hamotzei. Lasagna is not comparable to regular noodles which are thin and not as tough. It would make sense that if the lasagna has a dry look to it then one should wash beforehand, and if the lasagna has a wet look to it then a mezonos is made, since it may not look like bread.[96] Most lasagna today have a wet consistency and therefore a mezonos is required.[97]

Kreplach

Kreplach are dough pockets containing meat inside which are cooked. One recites a mezonos on this food.[98]

Blintzes/Pancakes/Waffles

A thick batter that has been poured into a mold causing the finished product to be thick would be hamotzei.[99] If the batter was poured onto a flat surface and spread out completely and it becomes very thin, the beracha would be a mezonos.[100]

The wrapper of many blintzes are made from a thin batter which is spread out in the frying pan. Based on this, the poskim say that a blintz is a mezonos because it is very thin and does not have an appearance of bread. Even if one eats the amount of aseuda he would not be required to wash or bentsh.[101] If the wrapper was fried and is very thick then the beracha would behamotzei.[102] but this is usually not the case.

Pancakes are made in a frying pan and they are thicker than blintzes. If one places enough oil only that they should not burn, the beracha would be hamotzei, if one eats the amount of aseuda.[103] Others say even if one is kove'ah seuda on pancakes they are mezonos.[104] Pancakes that are deep fried are not subject to the above halacha and a mezonos will always be required. A thin pancake would have the same halachos as a blintz mentioned above.[105]

Some say waffles should be considered like blintzes because they are thin.[106] However, today this is not the case as our waffles are thick, but since they do not have an appearance of bread even if one eats the shiur of a seuda one would recite amezonos.[107]

Wraps

It has become very common for one to eat a wrap with tuna etc. A wrap is made with bread ingredients but is very flat. If the wrap has a very chewy consistency and can't be eaten alone, then the beracha is mezonos.[108] If the wrap looks like bread and can be eaten alone then hamotzeiis recited.[109] Most wraps today fall into the latter category and the correct beracha is hamotzei.[110] One should not assume theberacha is mezonos because in fact it may not be.

[1] Pri Megadim introduction to Hilchos Berochos. [2] Horav Yisroel Belsky Shlita. [3] Refer to Shulchan Aruch 168:7. [4] Shulchan Aruch ibid:6. [5] Refer to Vezos HaBeracha birurim 39. [6] V'sein Beracha page 468, The Laws of Brachos page 238. [7] Refer to Kashrus Kurrents from the Star-K. [8] Magen Avraham 17, Machtzis HaShekel 17, Be'er Heitiv 13, Pri Megadim M.Z. 8, Eishel Avraham 17, Elya Rabbah 15, Mishnah Berurah 36, Kaf Ha'chaim 62. [9] Bais Yosef 168, Darchei Moshe 2, Shulchan Aruch 168:7, Levush 6, Aruch HaShulchan 25. [10] Divrei Chachumim page 70:174, Ohr L'tzyon 2:12:3, Yalkut Yosef 3:pages 126-127:3, Teshuvos V'hanugos 3:73. [11] Ginas Viradim (Gan Hamelech) 64, Maharsham 2:12, Binyan Sholom pages 230-232, Shevet HaLevi 1:205:page 270. [12] Chelek Levi 152, Da'as Torah 168:10, Pischei Halacha 8:12, Birchos Haneinin pages 100-101, V'haish Mordechai pages 235-236, Yechaveh Da'as 3:12, Teshuvos V'hanugos 3:73, Avnei Yushfei 1:39:5, Binyan Sholom pages 230-231, Shevet HaLevi 7:27, Birchos Hashem O.C. 1:61, Rivevos Ephraim 6:234, Shalmei Moed page 344, Chazon Ovadia (Berochos) page 61. [13] Bais Dovid 70, Oz Nedberu 14:29:2, Teshuvos V'hanugos 3:73, V'sein Beracha page 466. [14] Sharei HaBeracha 16:footnote 114. [15] Eishel Avraham Butchatch 168, Tzitz Eliezer 11:19, Minchas Yitzchok 1:71, Binyan Sholom pages 230-232. [16] Machzik Beracha 158:5, Yechaveh Da'as 3:12, Ohr L'tzyon ibid:footnote 3, Halichos Shlomo Moadim 2:10:20, Da'as Torah 168:7, Chazon Yeshaya (Berochos) page 61. [17] Bais Dovid 70, 83, Kaf Ha'chaim 158:43. [18] Ohr L'tzyon ibid, see Sharei HaBeracha page 605. [19] Bais Avi 5:12. The beracha for egg matzah (when one is notkove'ah seuda) is mezonos, since it is made with only fruit juice and eggs (Sharei HaBeracha page 606:footnote 377, The Laws of Brachos page 239). [20] Har Tzvi O.C. 91, Vezos HaBeracha page 21, Birchos Haneinin pages 102-103, Sharei HaBeracha page 606:footnote 378, V'sein Beracha pages 466-467 quoting the opinion of Horav Shlomo Zalman Aurbach zt"l. Opinion of the Chazon Ish quoted by Horav Chaim Kanievesky Shlita in Pischei Halacha 8:footnote 28, Orchos Rabbeinu 1:pages 79-80. [21] Chelkas Yaakov 3:173, Pischei Halachos 8:11, Vezos HaBeracha page 22. Some say the beracha is hamotzei but these are not referring to our pretzels (Refer to Pri Megadim Eishel Avraham 168:39, Kitzur Shulchan Aruch 48:6, Birchos Habayis 9:32, Kaf Ha'chaim 168:119). [22] Horav Yisroel Belsky Shlita, see Vezos HaBeracha page 468 who maintains it is mezonos. [23] Ohr L'tzyon 2:12:3:footnote 3:page 97, The Laws of Brachos page 376. [24] Kaf Ha'chaim 168:66, Binyan Sholom page 229, V'sein Beracha page 467:footnote 17 quoting the opinion of Horav Shlomo Zalman Aurbach zt"l, see V'haish Mordechai page 265. [25] Horav Yisroel Belsky Shlita, see Mesora 1:pages 39-40, Vezos HaBeracha pages 307-308, Sharei HaBeracha page 600:footnote 356, Pischei Halacha pages 29, 278-280, also see page 276:41 who says the ones which are not

round are like bread because they are eaten as a meal and the round ones are eaten as a snack. [26] *Vezev Ha'beracha* page 308, *Shevet Ha'Levi* 8:33, *Sharei Ha'beracha* page 525:footnote 75, see *Pnei Ha'shulchan* page 37. [27] *Horav Yisroel Belsky Shlita*. [28] *Horav Yisroel Belsky Shlita* as expressed in *Mesorah* 1, and *Shulchan Ha'Levi* pages 10-12. [29] *V'sein Beracha* page 486:footnote 19-1. [30] *Shulchan Aruch* 168:14. Refer to *Mishnah Berurah* 85-86. Cooking would have the same din in this regard (*Pri Megadim Eishel Avraham* 39). [31] *Kaf Ha'chaim* 168:119, *Shulchan Hatohar* 169:19, *Birchos Habayis* 9:32, *Chazzon Ish* O.C. 26:9, *Bais Avi* 5:7, *Pischei Halacha* 8:38, *V'sein Beracha* page 467, *Sharei Ha'beracha* 16:footnote 62. [32] Refer to *Prisha* 168:4. [33] Refer to *Mesechtas Berochos* 37b, *Rosh* 6:10, *Tur* 168, *Bais Yosef*, *Bach*, *Shulchan Aruch* 168:10, *Levush* 10. Cooking removes the appearance of bread (*Magen Avraham* 168:27, *Mishnah Berurah* 56). [34] *Mishnah Berurah* 168:57. [35] Refer to *Taz* 168:8, *Shulchan Aruch Harav* 12, *Birchos Haneinen* 2:15, *Chai Adom* 54:12, *Kitzur Shulchan Aruch* 48:9, *Mishnah Berurah* 94, *Aruch Ha'shulchan* 24, *Ketzos Ha'shulchan* 48:10:bad 30, *Birchos Habayis* 8:13, *Vezev Ha'beracha* page 26, *V'haish Mordechai* pages 258-259, see *Magen Avraham* 28. Some say since today the ingredients call for other things like oil and eggs the beracha is mezonos (*Sharei Ha'beracha* 16:footnote 90). One who recites a hamotzei on kneidlach was yotzei b'dieved (*Pri Megadim* M.Z. 176:1). [36] *Mishnah Berurah* 168:49. [37] *Magen Avraham* 168:24, *Levush* 11, *Mishnah Berurah* 51. [38] *Magen Avraham* 168:25, *Mishnah Berurah* 52. [39] *Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchoso* 1:1. [40] *Ketzos Ha'shulchan* 48:28. [41] *Magen Avraham* ibid, *Be'er Heitiv* 22, *Mishnah Berurah* 51, see *Pri Megadim Eishel Avraham* 25. [42] *Birchos Habayis* 8:4. [43] *Chasam Sofer* quoted in the new edition of the *Shulchan Aruch*, *Maharam Shik* O.C. 16, see *Misgeres Ha'shulchan* 48:14:page 125. [44] Refer to *Mishnah Berurah* 168:56, *Shar Ha'tzyion* 168:52, *Shoneh Halachos* 168:32. [45] *Rama* 168:14, *Mishnah Berurah* 69. [46] *Horav Elyashiv Shlita* holds this is called frying (*V'sein Beracha* page 470:footnote 27). Refer to *Teshuvos V'hanugos* 3:143:5. [47] *Opinion of Horav Shlomo Zalman Aurbach zt"l* quoted in *V'sein Beracha* page 469:footnote 25. [48] Refer to *Birchos Haneinen Shulchan Aruch Harav* 2:12, *Vezev Ha'beracha* page 25. [49] *V'sein Beracha* page 473:footnote 39. [50] *V'sein Beracha* page 471, *Vezev Ha'beracha* page 25. [51] *V'sein Beracha* page 474, *Laws of Brachos* page 265, see *Sharei Ha'beracha* page 351. [52] Refer to *Minchas Osher* pages 48-51 in depth. [53] Refer to *Divrei Chachumim* page 72:21, see *Vezev Ha'beracha* page 329. [54] *Horav Yisroel Belsky Shlita*, *Opinion of Horav Shlomo Zalman Aurbach zt"l* (*V'sein Beracha* page 475:footnote 44, *Teshuvos* page 10:10), see *Pnei Ha'shulchan* page 53. [55] *Horav Yisroel Belsky Shlita*. [56] Refer to *Kitzur Shulchan Aruch* 48:9, *Vezev Ha'beracha* page 25, *Rivevos Ephraim* 6:234. [57] *Horav Yisroel Belsky Shlita*, see *Chazzon Ish* 26:9, *Shevet Ha'Levi* 7:27, *Minchas Osher* pages 44-46, *Vezev Ha'beracha* page 25, *V'haish Mordechai* pages 259-261, *Shalmei Moed* page 344, *Refer to Avnei Yushfei* 1:39:2. [58] Refer to *Aruch Ha'shulchan* 168:37, *Birchos Haneinen* pages 179-181, *Avnei Yushfei* 1:39:1, *Shalmei Moed* page 345. [59] *Vezev Ha'beracha* page 25. [60] Refer to *Pnei Ha'shulchan* page 50. [61] *Ha'beracha V'hilchosuv* page 152:footnote 13. [62] Based on a discussion with a Rabbinical Coordinator in the OU who explained the metziot, see *Sharei Ha'beracha* page 684:footnote 669. [63] *Laws of Brachos* page 366, *Sharei Ha'beracha* page 355:44, *Vezev Ha'beracha* page 122. Based on a discussion with a Rabbinical Coordinator in the OU. Old London and Savion arehamotzei. One must find out how the croutons are made before eating them in order to determine what beracha to recite on them. [64] *Vezev Ha'beracha* page 122, *Sharei Ha'beracha* ibid. [65] *Horav Yisroel Belsky Shlita*. [66] *Horav Yisroel Belsky Shlita*. [67] Refer to *Sharei Ha'beracha* page 364. See *Mekor Beracha* 9. [68] *Horav Yisroel Belsky Shlita*, see *Sharei Ha'beracha* page 684:footnote 668 quoting this as the opinion of *Horav Elyashiv Shlita*. [69] Refer to *Tur* 168, *Shulchan Aruch* 168:10, *Taz* 13, *Mishnah Berurah* 49, 60, *Biur Halacha* 461 "yotzei," *Da'as Torah* 10. [70] *Kinyan Torah* 2:19, *Vezev Ha'beracha* page 26, *Sharei Ha'beracha* 16:43, *V'haish Mordechai* pages 231-237, see *Yaskil Avdi* 8:hashmutos to O.C. 5:4. [71] *Kinyan Torah* ibid. [72] *Shulchan Aruch* 168:13, *Aruch Ha'shulchan* 42. See *Mishnah Berurah* 67-73 who explains the opinions. Refer to *Pnei Ha'shulchan* pages 55-57. [73] *Rama* 168:13, *Mishnah Berurah* 74. [74] *Shulchan Aruch* 168:13, *Mishnah Berurah* 76. [75] *V'sein Beracha* pages 496-497:footnote 3. [76] *Rama* ibid. The reason is since this would be like a pas hab b'kissin product discussed in *Shulchan Aruch* 168:7. [77] In order for it to be halachically considered deep fired it has to be that the doughnut has a taste of it being deep fried (*Mishnah Berurah* 85). [78] *Mishnah Berurah* 77, *Biur Halacha* "yerei shomyaim." [79] *Kitzur Shulchan Aruch* 48:8, *Kaf Ha'chaim* 168:107, *Halichos Shlomo Moadim* 1:17:10:footnote 11, *Sharei Ha'beracha* page 629:footnote 465, *Vezev Ha'beracha* pages 208, 368:footnote 101, *Yabea Omer* O.C. 8:21. If one recited a hamotzei on doughnuts he was yotzei b'dieved (*Yabea Omer* ibid). [80] Refer to *Mishnah Berurah* 82, *Biur Halacha* "kol ze," *Pischei Halachos* 8:37, *Vezev Ha'beracha* pages 28-29, page 378, *Sharei Ha'beracha* 16:31. [81] *V'sein Beracha* pages 496-497, *Sharei Ha'beracha* 16:footnote 61, *Halichos Shlomo Moadim* 17:10:footnote 12. He says the reason why we eat doughnuts on Chanukah is because the Mizbe'ach was not able to be purified after the Yevonim invaded the Bais Hamikdash. Therefore, we eat doughnuts in order to mention in the Al Hamichya about the Mizbe'ach. Refer to *Minchas Osher* 24:pages 55-58. [82] *Pnei Ha'shulchan* page 57:footnote 7. [83] *Pnei Ha'shulchan* page 57. [84] Refer to *Biur Halacha* 168:8 "te'unim." *Halichos Shlomo Moadim* 1:17:10. See *Vezev Ha'beracha* birurim 12:4:page 228 quoting the opinion of *Horav Shlomo Zalman Aurbach zt"l*. [85] *V'sein Beracha* page 497:footnote 413. [86] *Rama* 168:13, *Shulchan Aruch Harav* 168:17, *Yabea Omer* O.C. 8:21, *Yaskil Avdi* 8:page 184:8. [87] Refer to *Pnei Ha'shulchan* pages 59-60, *Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchoso* 54:footnote 65, [88] *Ketzos Ha'shulchan* 48:bad 24, *Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchoso* 3:page 73, *Meor Ha'Shabbos* 2:pages 573, 655, *Ohr L'tzyion* 2:12:10, *Birchos Haneinen* pages 134-135, *Oz Neduber* 8:31:4, *Vezev Ha'beracha* page 218, *Sharei Ha'beracha* 16:footnote 125. Raisins placed in lukshin kugel do not require their own beracha (*Sharei Ha'beracha* page 663:footnote 589). [89] *Horav Yisroel Belsky Shlita*, see *Rivevos Ephraim* 6:82:1, 8:292, *Yalkut Yosef* 3:page 134. [90] *Pnei Ha'shulchan* pages 59-60 quoting the opinion of *Horav Elyashiv Shlita*. See *Aruch Ha'shulchan* 168:18 who has a limud zechus on why people eat so much mezonos and other food at akiddush without washing for bread. [91] *Vezev Ha'beracha* page 28. [92] *Birchei Yosef* 168:3. [93] *Avnei Yushfei* 1:31:1, *Vezev Ha'beracha* page 368. [94] *Horav Yisroel Belsky Shlita*. [95] 168:17. Refer to *Chazzon Yeshaya* (*Berachos*) page 67. [96] *Horav Yisroel Belsky Shlita*, see *Vezev Ha'beracha* pages 218-219 in depth who says lasagna does not have an appearance of bread (*Opinion of Horav Sheinberg Shlita*). Refer to *Laws of Brachos* page 371. The *Pischei Halacha* page 382 says it is not a bread item. [97] *Horav Yisroel Belsky Shlita*. [98] Refer to *Mishnah Berurah* 80, *Ketzos Ha'shulchan* 48:10, *Pischei Halachos* 8:36, *V'sein Beracha* pages 496-497:footnote 41:4, *Piskei Teshuvos* page 471, *Vezev Ha'beracha* page 370, *The Laws of Brachos* page 471. The reason for eating Kreplach on Erev Yom Kippur is because it is a Yom Tov, but one is permitted to do mealach, therefore the Yom Tov is in a sense hidden. On Yom Tov we are supposed to have simcha and this is done with meat. Therefore, we hide the meat in a pocket to represent this idea. This is why it is eaten on Hoshana Rabbah and on Purim as well (*Matamim* page 81 (new), *Lekutei Maharich* (seder dini minhagei erev Yom Kippur) 3:page 649 (new), *Natei Gavriel Purim* 71:10. [99] *Mishnah Berurah* 168:36. [100] *Shulchan Aruch* 168:15, *Be'er Heitiv* 18, *Magen Avraham* 19-20, *Pri Megadim Eishel Avraham* 19. [101] *Horav Yisroel Belsky Shlita*, see *Mishnah Berurah* 168:37, *Birchos Haneinen* page 99, *Binyan Sholom* page 286. Refer to *Sharei Ha'beracha* page 526:footnote 82 who says one should not eat an amount that would make up a shiur seuda. [102] *Kaf Ha'chaim* 168:65, *Vezev Ha'beracha* page 219 quoting the opinion of *Horav Elyashiv Shlita*. [103] *Vezev Ha'beracha* pages 219, 367, see page 28 quoting the opinion of *Horav Shlomo Zalman Aurbach zt"l* and *Horav Elyashiv Shlita*, *V'sein Beracha* page 493. [104] Refer to *V'sein Beracha* page 494. [105] *Vezev Ha'beracha* page 219 quoting the opinion of *Horav Shlomo Zalman Aurbach zt"l*. [106] *Mishnah Berurah* 168:38, *Shar Ha'tzyion* 30. [107] *Yaskil Avdi* 8:page 184:8, *Rivevos Ephraim* 6:80:5, *Pnei Ha'shulchan* pages 45-46, *Pischei Halacha* 8:33, *Pischei Halacha* (michtavim) 38:page 290, *Vezev Ha'beracha* page 22:footnote 22 quoting the opinion of *Horav Sheinberg Shlita*, *Sharei Ha'beracha* page 345. [108] *Horav Yisroel Belsky Shlita*. Refer to *Shulchan Aruch* 168:15, *Magen Avraham* 40, see *Mishnah Berurah* 88-89, *Biur Halacha* "kemach." [109] *Horav Yisroel Belsky Shlita*. [110] Based on a discussion with a Rabbinical Coordinator in the OU.

Salting on Shabbos By Rabbi Yirmiyohu Kaganoff

Question #1: Is this a Bubba Meisah? "When I was a child, my bubby, a"n, told me that the rav of the shtetl in which she was raised once permitted them to have a gentile kasher meat on Shabbos. Could that possibly be true?"

Question #2: Salting on Yom Tov? "May one salt vegetables on Yom Tov?"

Question #3: Saltwater at the Seder "If we forgot to prepare saltwater for the Seder, may we make it on Yom Tov? Does it make any difference this year, when the first night of Pesach falls on Shabbos?"

Question #4: Salting Snow "May one spread salt outside on Shabbos so that people do not slip?"

Introduction: *Parshas Terumah* mentions the construction of the mishkan, which provides the laws of what work may not be performed on Shabbos. We learn from this the 39 melachos involved in building the mishkan that are also the 39 melachos that we may not do on Shabbos.

One of the 39 melachos is me'abeid, tanning. This melachah was performed as part of the construction of the mishkan, because of the need to preserve the hides of the rams and the techashim, whose skins were used for the covering of the ohel mo'ed. The purpose of tanning is to preserve and strengthen hide, and to manufacture leather from it. One of the steps performed while tanning is salting the rawhide, which draws out its moisture. One of the questions that we will be discussing is whether, and to what extent, one may salt food items on Shabbos and Yom Tov. Is this considered similar enough to the melachah of tanning that it is also prohibited?

As always, the intent of this article is not to provide a definitive psak regarding these issues – every person should ask his own rav or posek. Our goal is to give people a better understanding of the issues involved and an appreciation of their rav's ruling, whatever it may be.

The Gemara's discussion Prior to the invention of the freezer, the most practical method of preserving meat for long term use was to pack it heavily in salt. The Gemara (*Shabbos* 75b) records a dispute between the amora'im, Rabbah bar Rav Huna and Rava, whether salting meat on Shabbos to preserve it is prohibited min haTorah. The dispute between the amora'im was whether this salting, whose purpose is to make the meat last, is comparable to salting hides and therefore included in the Torah's prohibition. Rabbah bar Rav Huna held that since one's goal is to preserve the meat, this salting is indeed prohibited min haTorah, whereas Rava held that the melachah of tanning does not apply to food, presumably because this process is considered dissimilar from salting hides to make leather. The goal of tanning a hide is to create strong and permanent leather that will last, perhaps, even for years. Although salting meat to preserve it is for the purpose of making it last, the goals of the two processes are not similar enough to make them comparable – when tanning, one is trying to make leather very tough, which is not the goal of salting meat (see the continuation of the Gemara there).

How do we rule? Do we paskin according to Rabbah bar Rav Huna, that it is prohibited min haTorah to salt meat in order to preserve it, or according to Rava, that no Torah violation is involved when salting meat? We find that the rishonim dispute how we rule. Whereas the Rambam (*Hilchos Shabbos* 11:5) concludes that ein ibud ba'ochalin, the melachah of me'abeid does not apply when salting food, other rishonim rule that one can violate Shabbos min haTorah when salting meat to preserve it (*Rashba*, *Toras Habayis* 3:3; *Piskei Rid*, *Shabbos* 75b; *Me'iri*, *Beitzah* 11a). Among the acharonim, we find this dispute repeated, with the Magen Avraham (321:7) siding with the Rambam and contending that ein ibud ba'ochalin, whereas the Elyah Rabbah (321:9) and the Chasam Sofer (*Shabbos* 75a) rule that packing meat in salt to preserve it is indeed prohibited min haTorah.

There is an interesting difference in practical halachah that results from this dispute. Accepted halachah prohibits asking a gentile to perform an act on Shabbos that a Jew is prohibited to do min haTorah. (An exception to this rule is to accommodate the needs of someone who is ill, a topic that is beyond the scope of this article [*Shulchan Aruch*, *Orach Chayim* 328:17].) However, under certain extenuating situations, such as major financial loss, one may ask a gentile to perform an activity that, were a Jew to do it, would violate only a rabbinic injunction (*Shulchan Aruch*, *Orach Chayim* 307:5).

According to the position of the Rambam and the Magen Avraham that packing meat in salt to preserve it does not violate a Torah prohibition, one is permitted to have a gentile preserve the meat, in a situation of major financial loss. However, according to the opinion of the other authorities, one would not be permitted to do so.

Salting korbanos Prior to placing offerings on the mizbei'ach (the altar), there is a requirement to salt them (*Vayikra* 2:13). The authorities dispute whether this activity would be considered a melachah on Shabbos. The *Rashba** (*Menachos* 21a) and the *Me'iri* (*Beitzah* 11a) rule that this salting qualifies as a melachah, whereas several other commentaries contend that it does not. All agree that since offering the regular daily korbanos and the special Shabbos korbanos supersedes Shabbos, salting these korbanos supersedes Shabbos, similar to the law that a bris milah is sometimes performed on

Shabbos. The dispute between the authorities would be applicable to someone who, in error, salted an offering that was not to be offered on Shabbos – did he desecrate Shabbos min haTorah when he salted it?

Kosher salting of meat Now that we have some background to the laws of salting meat on Shabbos, we can discuss the first question that was raised above:

“When I was a child, my bubby, a”h, told me that the rav of the shtetl in which she was raised once permitted people to have a gentile kosher meat on Shabbos. Could that possibly be true?”

Allow me to provide an introduction: Prior to preparing meat for the table, halachah requires that one salt it to remove the blood. We now need to understand: Would performing this salting on Shabbos be prohibited min haTorah as an extension of the prohibition of salting or tanning leather? In the above-quoted Gemara, Rava rules that it is not. The Gemara subsequently concluded with a comment from a later amora, Rav Ashi, who said that Rabbah bar Rav Huna contended that one violates Shabbos min haTorah only when one is salting meat for the purpose of preserving it, such as when he intends to pack for a lengthy trip. Only this type of salting can possibly be included in the Torah violation of me’abeid. However, salting meat to make it kosher for the Jewish table is certainly not a Torah violation of me’abeid. The Aruch Hashulchan (321:29) explains that salting hides is prohibited min haTorah, because this is one stage in the process of making leather last for a very long time. When kashering meat, one is not trying to have the meat last long; therefore, this is not included in the Torah’s prohibition.

Thus, we see that all opinions in the Gemara conclude that there is no Torah prohibition when salting meat for kashrus purposes. Not being omniscient, I have no idea what were the circumstances at the time that the rav in “bubby’s” shtetl paskined. But the background to the question makes it sound as if that reasonably could actually have happened. Gentiles in the shtetl who assisted in Jewish homes were very familiar with Jewish practices, including how to kasher meat, and they often helped the housewife do so. It is certainly possible that there was an extenuating situation, whereby the local rav permitted instructing a gentile to kasher meat on Shabbos, presumably with someone Jewish overseeing to guarantee that the process was performed correctly. Since kashering meat on Shabbos involves only a rabbinic prohibition, and one may ask a gentile to perform a rabbinic prohibition on Shabbos to avoid a major financial loss, circumstances may have been such that the local rav permitted this.

We should note that there is an opinion that holds that kashering meat on Shabbos might be prohibited min HaTorah for a different reason. This approach contends that kashering meat, which is in order to remove the blood, is similar to squeezing juice out of fruit or milking a cow, both of which are prohibited because they are extracting one substance from a different substance (Rosh Yosef, Shabbos 75b, based on Rambam, Hilchos Shabbos 8:7, 10). It would appear that the rav in “bubby’s” shtetl was not concerned about this opinion, at least not under the circumstances and the fact that a gentile was performing the kashering.

Salting on Yom Tov? Let us now examine a different question that we mentioned above:

“May one salt vegetables on Yom Tov?” First, let us analyze the Gemara’s discussion about salting vegetables on Shabbos. The Gemara (Shabbos 108b, as explained by Rashi) prohibits salting a few slices of radish at a time on Shabbos, but permits dipping them in salt, one at a time, as one eats them.

Among rishonim, there are different opinions why it is prohibited to salt several radish slices at one time. Rashi explains that this is a rabbinic injunction, because when the slices are placed in salt they begin to undergo a process that is somewhat similar to what salting does to preserve hides. However, dipping a radish in salt as you eat it is not comparable to that injunction.

A second approach to explain why we may not salt radishes on Shabbos is because it looks like you are pickling foods on Shabbos. This is prohibited, because it is considered miderabbanan as a type of cooking on Shabbos (Rambam, Hilchos Shabbos 23:10).

A third approach We find yet a third approach among the rishonim why it is prohibited to salt foods heavily on Shabbos. The Semag and the Hagahos Semak prohibit salting food on Shabbos because this is considered maaseh chol, an activity that is not in the spirit of Shabbos.

The Rambam, who understands that salting vegetables is prohibited as a type of cooking miderabbanan, needs to explain why pickling is more stringent than cooking directly in the sun, which is permitted on Shabbos (see Shabbos 39a; Shu”t Noda Biyehudah 2: Orach Chayim #23; Shaarei Teshuvah 318:3). It would seem that the difference is that pickling and salting are common food preparation procedures, and were therefore treated more strictly than cooking in the sun, which is not normally done (Nimla Tal, Me’abeid, note 16).

Other veggies The halachic authorities rule that, although the Gemara mentions specifically that it is prohibited to salt radishes, the law applies to any other vegetable

that would commonly be processed or prepared by salting (Taz, Orach Chayim 321:2). Thus, the same prohibition would certainly apply to onions or cucumbers (see Shu”t Shevus Yaakov 2:12).

Ramifications of a dispute There are several applications in which the dispute among the rishonim as to why one may not salt vegetables on Shabbos results in differences in practical halachah. According to the Rambam, one may not submerge vegetables in vinegar on Shabbos; this would also violate, miderabbanan, the prohibition of cooking on Shabbos (Pri Megadim, Mishbetzos Zahav 321:3). However, according to Rashi, this should be permitted, since placing vegetables into vinegar is not comparable to salting leather (Nimla Tal, Melechtes Me’abeid, note 16).

Wine and vinegar blend? May one mix wine and vinegar on Shabbos? According to Rashi, this is certainly permitted. The Taz (321:3) prohibits it, based on the Rambam, but the Aruch Hashulchan (321:34) disagrees, ruling that pickling is considered comparable to cooking only when pickling a solid item like meat, fish or vegetables, but not when mixing together two liquids.

Not worth its salt Here is another case that might be dependent on the dispute among rishonim why one may not salt radishes on Shabbos. One has a vegetable that is not usually salted, and one wants to put it in salt on Shabbos and leave it there in order to preserve it. According to the Semag and Rashi, this should be prohibited, either because it is comparable to me’abeid miderabbanan or because it is uvda de’chol. However, according to the Rambam, this might be permitted, because it is not considered a type of cooking, and the rule of ein me’abeid ba’ochalin has no exceptions. In halachic conclusion on this question, the Graz (321:2) prohibits preserving a vegetable in salt on Shabbos, even when it is not usually eaten or preserved this way.

Salting veggies on Yom Tov One of our opening questions was whether the rabbinic prohibition not to salt radishes and other vegetables applies on Yom Tov, just as it applies on Shabbos. This question is dependent on the dispute between the rishonim that we just raised. According to Rashi, that the prohibition is because it is comparable to tanning, since the melachah of me’abeid is prohibited on Yom Tov, it should similarly be prohibited to salt vegetables on Yom Tov. However, according to the Rambam that the prohibition of salting vegetables on Shabbos is because it is a form of cooking, it should be permitted on Yom Tov, just as cooking is. (The dispute among authorities in this matter is recorded in the Rema, Orach Chayim 510:7).

How do we rule? Within this dispute among rishonim concerning why one may not salt radishes on Shabbos, what is the halachic conclusion? The Shulchan Aruch, in Orach Chayim 321:2, quotes Rashi’s reason, and yet, in 321:3, he quotes the Rambam’s opinion prohibiting salting radishes, because it is like cooking. It appears that he ruled to be strict and follow the chumros of both opinions. Thus, it would appear that one should follow the stringent approach in the different cases that we have mentioned. This conclusion is consistent with the various rulings of the different acharonim (Pri Megadim, Mishbetzos Zahav 321:3; Mishnah Berurah 321:15; Gra”z 321:2).

Saltwater at the Seder Let us now examine a different question that we mentioned above:

“If we forgot to prepare saltwater for the Seder, may we make it on Yom Tov? Does it make any difference this year, when the first night of Pesach falls on Shabbos?”

To answer this question, we first need to examine the appropriate passage of Gemara. The Mishnah (Shabbos 108a), as explained by the Gemara (108b), says as follows: One may not make a large quantity of saltwater on Shabbos, but one may make a small quantity of saltwater, dip your bread into it or add it to your cooked food. Rabbi Yosi disagrees, prohibiting making even a small amount of saltwater on Shabbos.

To answer the question whether one may make saltwater for the Seder on Shabbos, we need to answer two questions:

Do we rule according to Rabbi Yosi or according to the first tanna?

What is considered a “small quantity” of saltwater that the first tanna permits?

How do we rule? The Gemara in Eiruvin (14b) rules according to the first tanna, and this is the halachic conclusion of virtually all authorities (Rif, Rabbeinu Chananel, Tosafos, Rambam, Semag, Rosh, Tur and Shulchan Aruch. However, the Semak quotes some authorities who ruled according to Rabbi Yosi.)

What is considered a “small quantity” of saltwater that the first tanna permits?

The Ran explains that the amount of saltwater one needs for the dipping of the coming meal. Thus, according to his conclusion, one may make saltwater on Shabbos prior to the start of the Seder, but only as much as one thinks one will need for the one Seder. After Shabbos, one will have to make more saltwater for the second Seder.

Salting snow And now, time for our last opening question: “May one spread salt outside on Shabbos so that people do not slip?”

Assuming that there is an eruv that permits carrying outside, I see no evidence that there is anything prohibited about spreading salt on the ground to melt the ice. It is therefore permitted. I subsequently discovered that several contemporary authors concur with this conclusion (Shemiras Shabbos Kehilchasah; Orchos Shabbos).

In conclusion All of the 39 melachos are derived from what was done when building the mishkan. In this case, tanning hides was a necessary step in building the mishkan, and our question is to what extent is salting food comparable to salting and tanning hides.

Rav Samson Raphael Hirsch (Shemos 20:10) notes that people mistakenly think that work is prohibited on Shabbos in order to provide a day of rest. This is incorrect, he points out, because the Torah does not prohibit doing avodah, which connotes hard work, but melachah, which implies purpose and accomplishment. The goal of Shabbos is to emphasize Hashem's rule as the focus of creation by refraining from our own creative acts (Hirsch Commentary, Shemos 20:11). By refraining from melachah for one day a week, we acknowledge the true Builder of the world and all that it contains.

* It is generally accepted that the author of this commentary to Menachos is not the Rashba, as once thought, but a different rishon.

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com

from: Torah in Action /Shema Yisrael <parsha@torahinaction.com>

subject:Peninim on the Torah by Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum

Shema Yisrael Torah Network

Peninim on the Torah - פרשת תרומה השע"ז

Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum

דבר אל בני ישראל ויקחו לי תרומה מאת כל איש אשר ידבנו לבו

Speak to Bnei Yisrael and let them take for Me a terumah/tithing/portion, from every man whose heart motivates him. (25:2)

Nedivas ha'lev, a donation from the sincerity of one's heart, is the loftiest level of generosity. It is easy to write a check – if one has the money to back it. Easy come – easy go. Generosity of the heart demands sincerity; it is not about the amount of money that one gives. It is how much of himself he gives with that money. The purity of money is based upon the sincerity behind it. When one seeks to establish an abode for Hashem, a place where the Divine Presence will repose, it must be the result of funds that are spiritually and ethically pure, that emanate from an individual whose desire to participate in this davar she'bikedushah, holy endeavor, is sincere. The following story underscores this idea.

Horav Avraham Yaakov, zl, m'Sadiger, was one of the nineteenth centuries' chassidic Rebbes. Chassidim flocked to him from all over Europe. His shul was a majestic edifice which looked like the palace of a king. Its entrance way was flanked by two large pillars. Its windows were colorful works of art in stained glass. One ascended wide marble steps on the outside of the shul prior to entering the cavernous sanctuary in which 3,000 people were able to sit. Its walls were hand - painted with artwork that was surrounded by the finest wood. Hundreds of candelabras, which illuminated the shul, provided a well-lit and relaxed backdrop for prayer.

The Sadigerer Rebbe was the son of the Rizhiner Rebbe, who felt that his son possessed the neshamah, soul, of the Baal Shem Tov HaKadosh. The Rebbe was challenged by much adversity, emerging each time stronger and holier. Indeed, following each challenge, his chassidic following would increase and expand. Tzaddikim would comment that the very holiness of the Rebbe was contagious.

Now, for the story behind the magnificent shul of Sadiger. Amongst the Rebbe's thousands of chassidim was a poverty - stricken melamed, Torah teacher. He lived in a tiny village far from the beaten path of mainstream chassidim. He had heard so much about the Rebbe that it became his dream, his obsession, that he must travel there to give the Rebbe a kvitel, written petition, accompanied by his pidyon, donation. Unfortunately, it was easier said than done. Since the man was so poor, it took an entire year until he had saved up one ruble (a small, almost insignificant sum) to bring to the Rebbe. The man left for his trip, which took quite some time, considering that his two legs were his only means of conveyance. After he finally arrived at the Rebbe's house, the gabbai, Rebbe's secretary, told him that the earliest possible time to meet with the Rebbe was Friday night following davening, when the Rebbe greeted all the guests who had come for Shabbos. The melamed was grief-stricken. After saving and scrounging for a year, he finally had a pidyon, money. This was followed by a long, difficult and tiring journey. All of that for what? To be told that he should wait in line Friday night with all the guests.

Our melamed had reached his breaking point. He felt that had he had money or had been dressed in more impressive attire, he might have been welcomed by the gabbai in a more embracing manner. This is life, and the movers and the shakers are treated differently. The melamed, however, just could not

wait any longer. He had a meltdown. Tears streamed down his cheeks, as he began to relate his tale of woe to the gabbai. Sadly, the gabbai heard such stories a few times each day. People came from all over to petition the Rebbe's blessing. Everyone was experiencing some form of adversity; everyone was in need of a yeshuah, some form of salvation.

The melamed would not be stilled, to the point that his incessant weeping reached the Rebbe's ears. After inquiring of his gabbai concerning the source of commotion, he instructed the gabbai to show the melamed into his study. When the melamed entered the room and gazed upon the Rebbe's holy countenance, he almost passed out. Finally, he gathered up his courage and related to the Rebbe that he had saved all year to bring his one ruble pidyon to the Rebbe. He then asked the Rebbe for his blessing: The Rebbe accepted the man's coin, held it for a moment, then said, "You may have this coin back. Use it however you want. It will bring blessing and success to anyone who will use it." The melamed graciously thanked the Rebbe and left. When word got out that the Rebbe had blessed the man's coin, everyone wanted to purchase it. Soon, a public auction was held during which the one - ruble coin blessed by the Rebbe sold for 10,000 ruble! The Rebbe's blessing had achieved fruition. That is not, however, the end of the story.

The melamed immediately returned to the Rebbe's home. This time he was not asked to wait. He was now a member of the elite. Although still attired in his beggar's garb, the money jingling in his pocket more than made up for his lack of impressive attire. The gabbai ushered him in as soon as the Rebbe was available.

"Rebbe!" the melamed said excitedly. "The Rebbe's brachah materialized! I immediately was able to sell my ruble for more money than I ever dreamed of. Now, I would like to give the Rebbe maaser, one tenth (tithe) of my earnings. I am overjoyed to do this!"

The Rebbe looked at the melamed and was silent for a moment. Finally, he spoke, "For a while now I have been thinking of building a new, large bais hamedrash to glorify Hashem. This should be a bais hamedrash that would inspire prayer, where people would feel comfortable to spend time. I wanted the money that would pay for this edifice to be the result of ahavas Hashem, love of the Almighty, and from the generosity of one's heart. The money that you have given me serves as the perfect donation for this cause." This is how the magnificent shul came into being.

ועשית את הקרשים למשכן עצי שטים עמידים

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

The Midrash observes that atzei shittim refers to wood derived from a tree that does not bear fruit. Chazal explain that, if in the future, a person would want to build a house of wood from a fruit-bearing tree, he would be prevented from doing so by applying a simple logic. If the King of Kings, Hashem, to Whom everything in this world belongs, said that His Mishkan should only be built from wood from a type that does not bear fruit, how can a human being make a different decision? We derive from here that whatever we do, regardless of its simplicity or mundane nature, we may not ever do anything, whether it is person or communal, in such a manner that it might adversely affect another person – financially, emotionally, socially. Going forward by stepping on the shoulders of our fellow is not the Torah's idea of progress.

No one will disagree that mundane endeavors may not infringe on the sensitivities of our fellow man, but does it apply as well with regard to devarim she'b'kedushah, endeavors of a consecrated, spiritual nature? There really is nothing holier than the Mishkan/Bais Hamikdash. Yet, we may not use wood from a fruit-bearing tree. Every step of the way, we must be certain that our sensitivity toward our fellow is not diminished.

One who takes it upon himself to establish a makom Torah that will educate, inspire, and change the lives of many might feel that his goals take precedence over the needs and feelings of the few individuals who stand in the way of progress. He may feel that all tzedakos, communal charity funds, should be refocused toward his endeavor. If, as a result, a few people might have it rough – well, everybody has to sacrifice for the betterment of the klal. Horav Chaim Zaitchik, zl, presents a scenario which we cannot dispute. Imagine that our generation has been handed the unparalleled mission to build the Bais Hamikdash. Certainly, we would all throw ourselves into the work: from the planning stages until the moment of fruition. By the way, what will happen to the "lesser" mitzvos, such as gemillas chasadim, acts of lovingkindness, charity, visiting the sick and elderly, looking out for the orphaned children – both physically and spiritually? We all know the answer to that question, and we surely have a rational excuse to validate our

indifference. It is not that we do not care. It is just that we have to address something of “greater” importance.

The next scenario: We have just been informed (over our cell phones, of course) that Moshiach Tziddkeinu is about to arrive shortly. How would we react? We would run! We would push our way forward, each one vying for the first look, to be seen and blessed. What about the old man whose cane can take him only so fast? Or the fellow in the wheelchair whose pusher leaves him, so that he can run and greet Moshiach? Will any of the younger generation, the stronger generation, notice that they are lagging behind, or will they be too busy stepping over them?

This is why Hashem told us not to use wood from a fruit-bearing tree. When doing a mitzvah, take everything and everyone into consideration. A mitzvah that is carried out in such a manner that it ignores the welfare and emotions of others is missing a vital ingredient that renders it spiritually flawed.

What is the cause of such spiritual discrepancy? Why do some people perform chesed successfully, earning the accolades not only of the beneficiaries of their good work, but also of the entire community? Others, however, try and simply do not realize the fruition of their wonderful work. It all depends on the acceptance and integration of a pasuk in our parshah. V’asu li Mikdash v’shochanti b’socham, “And they shall make for Me a Sanctuary, and I shall repose among them” (Shemos 25:15). What is the true purpose of my endeavor? Am I doing it for Hashem, or to garner attention for myself? When I seek the limelight, I have no reason, no desire, to share my time with anyone else. I am too busy promoting myself. If, however, I am acting Li, “for Me”/Hashem, then I act no differently than He would act. When Hashem provides chesed, or asks for us to do something for Him, He always takes into consideration the emotions and sensitivities of the little “guy.” Someone who is all filled with himself has no room for Hashem. An American Jew decided to take a “spiritual” vacation together with his wife. What better and more inspirational place is there than Eretz Yisrael? He figured that if he were to imbibe all the ruchiniyos, spirituality, that the Holy Land has to offer, he should first arrange to have all of his materialistic needs addressed. He wanted to remain focused on spirituality and sanctity – nothing else.

He called a real estate broker and gave him his “order”: a five-room apartment, with air conditioning; religious neighbors – but not too frum, observant; a parking garage; a shul nearby; and, of course, a supermarket that carries all of the American products. The real estate agent immediately went to work and located the perfect apartment in the perfect neighborhood with all the necessary accrements. Everything seemed perfect – until the day of arrival.

Mr. & Mrs. Ploni landed in Ben Gurion Airport and immediately took a monit, taxi, to their destination. They walked into their apartment and were surprised that it was “lived” in. There were people there – specifically, a young mother and her three children, who had just finished lunch. “Why are you here?” the man asked the young mother. “I live here,” she replied. “Why are you here?” she asked. “I rented this apartment for two months! That is why I am here!” he responded somewhat emphatically.

The American tourist called the real estate agent, and, before he could issue a word of complaint, the agent asked, “So, how is the apartment? Is it not exactly what you asked for? Five rooms, great view, wonderful neighborhood. What more can a person want?”

The American was dumbfounded, but he was able to blurt out, “But there is a family living here!” The agent was taken aback. “One second, you never mentioned that the apartment had to be empty!”

V’asu Li Mikdash v’shochanti b’socham: Anyone can build a Sanctuary for Hashem – and he sincerely thinks that he has prepared a wonderful abode for the Almighty. The problem is that the sanctuary that he has created within himself is not empty. It is filled with his Ani, “I,” “me”. He is filled with himself – his anger, arrogance, unwarranted hatred for others, all of the flawed character traits that represent him. If we want Hashem to repose in our Mishkan, we must clear “ourselves” from it, to make room for Him.

In memory of our parents, grandparents and great-grandparents

ר' נפתלי מכלאל בן נתנאל ז"ל

מרת שרה ריבע בת ר' יעקב מאיר הכהן ז"ל

The Rothner Family Hebrew Academy of Cleveland, ©All rights reserved

prepared and edited by Rabbi L. Scheinbaum