



BS"D

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

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET ON TETZAVE - 5772

In our 17th year! To receive this parsha sheet, go to <http://www.parsha.net> and click Subscribe or send a blank e-mail to subscribe@parsha.net. Please also copy me at cshulman@gmail.com. A complete archive of previous issues is now available at <http://www.parsha.net>. It is also fully searchable.

This week's Internet Parsha Sheet is sponsored anonymously for a Refuah Shleimah for **Yitzchak Yaakov ben Basia Sarah Chaim Yissachor Ben Chaye Mushkit Henna Sara bat Fayga Malya** b'soch sha'ar cholei yisroel

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

<http://www.chief Rabbi.org/> Covenant & Conversation
Thoughts on the Weekly Parsha from **Lord Jonathan Sacks**
Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British
Commonwealth

<http://www.chief Rabbi.org/>
Covenant & Conversation

Tetzaveh As I have mentioned before in these studies, Tetzaveh is the only sedra from the beginning of Exodus to the end of Deuteronomy, that does not contain the word "Moses". For once Moses, the hero, the leader, the liberator, the lawgiver, is offstage. Instead our focus is on his elder brother Aaron who, elsewhere, is often in the background. Indeed virtually the whole sedra is devoted to the role Moses did not occupy, except briefly - that of priest in general, high priest in particular.

Why so? Is there any larger significance to the absence of Moses from this passage? The commentators offered many suggestions. One of two offered by R. Jacob ben Asher (c1270-1340, author of the code known as the Tur), relates this week's sedra to an event at the beginning of Moses' leadership: his encounter with G-d at the burning bush (Ex. 3-4). Moses repeatedly expressed reluctance to undertake the mission of leading the people out of Egypt. Finally we read:

But Moses said, "O Lord, please send someone else to do it." Then the Lord's anger burned against Moses and he said, "What about your brother, Aaron the Levite? I know he can speak well. He is already on his way to meet you, and his heart will be glad when he sees you. You shall speak to him and put words in his mouth; I will help both of you speak and will teach you what to do." (Ex. 4: 13-15) The sages say that it was this hesitation on the part of Moses that caused part of his role

- as potential high priest - to be taken from him and given to his brother. R. Jacob ben Asher concludes that Moses' name is missing from Tetzaveh "to spare him distress" on seeing Aaron acquire the insignia of priesthood that might have been Moses' own.

Without negating this or other explanations, there may be a more fundamental message. As I have mentioned before, one of the recurring themes of Genesis is sibling rivalry, hostility between brothers. This story is told, at ever-increasing length, four times: between Cain and Abel, Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau, and Joseph and his brothers.

There is an identifiable pattern to this set of narratives, best seen in the way each ends. The story of Cain and Abel ends with murder, fratricide. Isaac and Ishmael - though they grow up apart - are seen together at Abraham's funeral. Evidently there had been a reconciliation, though this is told between the lines (and spelled out in midrash), not directly in the text. Jacob and Esau meet, embrace and go their separate ways. Joseph and his brothers are reconciled and live together in peace, Joseph providing them with food, land, and protection. Genesis is telling us a story of great consequence. Fraternity - one of the key words of the French revolution - is not simple or straightforward. It is often fraught with conflict and contention. Yet slowly, brothers can learn that there is another way. On this note Genesis ends.

But it is not the end of the story. There is a fifth chapter: the relationship between Moses and Aaron. Here, for the first time, there is no hint of sibling rivalry (some developed later - Bamidbar ch. 12 - but was resolved by Moses' humility). The brothers work together from the very outset of the mission to lead the Israelites to freedom. They address the people together. They stand together when confronting Pharaoh. They perform signs and wonders together. They share leadership of the people in the wilderness together. For the first time, brothers function as a team, with different gifts, different talents, different roles, but without hostility, each complementing the other.

This is conveyed by the Torah in two striking phrases. The first is in the passage already cited above. G-d says to Moses: Aaron "is already on his way to meet you, and his heart will be glad when he sees you." How different this is from the tense encounters between brothers in Genesis. Aaron, we may have thought, might have many reasons not to rejoice on seeing Moses return. The brothers had not grown up together. Moses had been adopted by Pharaoh's daughter and raised in an Egyptian palace. Nor had they been together during the Israelites' sufferings. Moses, fearing for his life after his assault on an Egyptian taskmaster, had fled to Midian. Besides this, Moses was Aaron's younger brother, and it was he who was about to become leader of the people. Always in the past, when the younger had taken something the elder might have believed belonged naturally to him, there was jealousy, animosity. Yet G-d assures Moses: "when Aaron sees you, he will rejoice". And so he did (Ex. 4: 27).

The second intimation is contained in a strange text, tracing the descent of Moses and Aaron:

Amram married his father's sister Jochebed, who bore him Aaron and Moses. Amram lived 137 years . . . It was this same Aaron and Moses to whom the Lord said, "Bring the Israelites out of Egypt by their divisions." They were the ones who spoke to Pharaoh king of Egypt about bringing the Israelites out of Egypt. It was the same Moses and Aaron. (Ex. 6: 20, 26-27). The repeated phrase, "It was this same", is emphatic even in translation. It is all the more so when we note two peculiarities of the text. The first is that the phrases, though at first they sound identical, in fact place the names of the brothers in a different order: the first phrase says "Aaron and Moses", the second, "Moses and Aaron". Even more striking is the grammatical oddity of the phrase. Both times, the third person singular is used. Literally, they read: "He was Aaron and Moses", "He was Moses and Aaron". The text should have said, "They" - all the more so since the pronoun "they" is used in the middle of the passage: "They were the ones who spoke to Pharaoh".

The unmistakable implication is that they were like a single individual. They were as one. There was no hierarchy between them: sometimes Aaron's name appears first, sometimes Moses'. On this there is a wonderful midrash, based on the verse in Psalms (85: 11) "Loving-kindness and truth meet together; righteousness and peace kiss each other."

Loving-kindness - this refers to Aaron. Truth - this refers to Moses. Righteousness - this refers to Moses. Peace - this refers to Aaron. (Shemot Rabbah 5: 10) The midrash brings prooftexts for each of these identifications, but we understand them immediately. Moses and Aaron were quite different in temperament and role. Moses was the man of truth, Aaron of peace. Without truth, there can be no vision to inspire a nation. But without internal peace, there is no nation to inspire. Aaron and Moses were both necessary. Their roles were in creative tension. Yet they worked side by side, each respecting the distinctive gift of the other. As the midrash goes on to say:

"And he kissed him" [the brothers kissed when they met] - This means: each rejoiced at the other's greatness. (Shemot Rabbah ad loc) A final midrash completes the picture by referring to this week's sedra and the vestments of the high priest, especially the breastplate with its Urim and Tumim:

"His heart will be glad when he sees you" - Let the heart that rejoiced in the greatness of his brother be vested with the Urim and Tumim. (Shemot Rabbah 3: 17) It was precisely the fact that Aaron did not envy his younger brother but instead rejoiced in his greatness that made him worthy to be High Priest. So it came to pass - measure for measure - that just as Aaron made space for his younger brother to lead, so the Torah makes space for Aaron to lead. That is why Aaron is the hero of Tetzaveh: for once, not overshadowed by Moses.

"Who is honoured?" asked ben Zoma (Avot 4: 1). "One who honours others." Aaron honoured his younger brother. That is why Moses (not mentioned by name but by implication) is told in this week's sedra, "Make sacred garments for your brother Aaron, to give him honour and splendour" (Ex. 28: 2). To this day a Cohen is honoured by being first to be called up to the Torah - the Torah that Aaron's younger brother Moses gave to the Jewish people.

The story of Aaron and Moses, the fifth chapter in the biblical story of brotherhood, is where, finally, fraternity reaches the heights. And that surely is the meaning of Psalm 133, with its explicit reference to Aaron and his sacred garments: "How good and pleasant it is when brothers live together in unity! It is like precious oil poured on the head, running down on the beard, running down on Aaron's beard, down upon the collar of his robes." It was thanks to Aaron, and the honour he showed Moses, that at last brothers learned to live together in unity.

A Good Sense Of Humour is Simply Divine The Times – Credo – July 1998 The poet WH Auden used to quote the following as one of his favourite examples of Jewish humour. "Maybe," sighed the sage after a lifetime of contemplating human suffering, "it would have been better not to have been born. But how many are so lucky? Not one in a thousand!" From the earliest days, humour seems to have been part of the Jewish personality. The great third-century teacher Rav would always begin his classes in Jewish law with a joke. The Book of Esther, with its terrifying theme of attempted genocide, is nonetheless shot through with as many reversals and misunderstandings as a Whitehall farce. Even the Genesis story of the Tower of Babel contains wonderful touches of Divine humour. Men have decided to build a "tower whose top will reach the heavens". But God has to "come down" to see it, so minute is it from the perspective of heaven. Thus is man's hubris mocked. A sense of humour is not something we normally associate with the realm of faith. The religious personality is more likely to be linked in our mind with images of austere puritans or stern, unbending Victorians such as Gladstone, than with storytellers who have a twinkle in their eye.

If religion is a capacity to invest life with ultimate seriousness, then humour is precisely the opposite, an ability to say, "nothing is so serious that we cannot laugh". Jews though, and not only Jews, would disagree. It was Peter Berger, the American sociologist, who put it best when he spoke of the sense of humour as one of the "signals of transcendence" that break through into the human situation and remind us of something beyond. We are part of nature, but there is a dimension of human consciousness that lies beyond nature. We are physical beings, but there are aspects of the human spirit that cannot be reduced to physics - and the ability to understand a joke is one of them. Could a computer have a sense of humour? Probably not. The reason, I would guess, is that humour has to do with our ability to see things differently, to escape from the cage of tragedy, to affirm the freedom of the mind.

COVENANT & CONVERSATION is now available in book form!
Vol. I: Genesis, The Book of Beginnings VolIII: Exodus, The Book of Redemption: Available Autumn 2010

<http://www.kof-k.org/dvar%20torah/Tzaveh%2007.pdf>

Parshas Tetzave
[RABBI ZECHARIAH SENTER]

You shall command: (27:20)

Many commentators remind us that from the time Moshe Rabbainu was born, mentioned in Parshas Shmos, his name appears in every Parsha in the Torah except Tetzave and Nitzavim. Nitzavim does not include any commands that Hashem gave to Moshe, and there is no need for his name to be mentioned. But for our Parsha they give another reason. The text teaches 'The Tzadik decrees and Hashem carries it out'. This is the reason given for Rachel dying before entering into Eretz Yisroel, because unwittingly, Yaacov declared to Lavan 'whoever stole your gods shall die' without realizing that Rachel stole them. There are many other instances, which prove the strength of a Beracha, or curse, uttered by a Tzadik. When Hashem threatened to punish the Bnay Yisroel for worshipping the golden calf, Moshe countered with an offer to instead, have his name erased from the Torah. Hashem accepted this offer and Moshe Rabbinu's name does not appear in this Parsha. This presents a bit of a problem, since Moshe, in offering to have his name erased in place of the Bnay Yisroel, acted as the devoted shepherd he was. He should have been recognized for his selfless deed, rather than be punished for it by having his name erased. Therefore, we might suggest another reason for his name not being mentioned.

When Hashem told Avraham Avinu that his children will be slaves and strangers for 400 years, he didn't ask for a pardon or at least for a reduction in time or work. When Hashem showed Yaacov in the dream that his children will be sent into a number of exiles, he didn't ask for mercy for them. How does this compare to Moshe, who put his spiritual life on the line, and was willing to have his name erased from the Torah in place of the Bnay Yisroel? Therefore, Hashem showed Moshe how much this gesture was appreciated. Until now, in every Parsha, Hashem told Moshe what to do or say. In this Parsha, Moshe will do and say without being told by Hashem what to do. That is why each paragraph begins with the words "And you" referring to Moshe who will do, take or command Aharon and his children, without being told what to do. This is his Parsha, and is the reward he received for his devotion to his people.

They shall take to you pressed olive oil: (ibid)

This oil was used for lighting the lamps in the Menora, which is described in great detail in Parshiyos Emor and Behaaloscha. Why is it mentioned here and only in passing? What was the significance of the olives being pressed, before producing the oil for the lamps? We are

taught that one of the reasons for lighting the Menora was to prove that Hashem had His Shechina dwell in the Mishkan and later in the Bais Hamikdash. The same amount of oil was placed in each cup, but the Ner Maaravi, was never extinguished. The fire in this lamp represented Hashem, and His presence, was always felt by the Bnay Yisroel. This was true only as long as the Menora was lit in the Mishkan and in the Bais Hamikdash. How do we know that Hashem dwells among the Bnay Yisroel even when they are in Golus? The answer might be alluded to from another text. We are taught, 'The mitzvah is a Ner and the Torah is light'. As long as the Bnay Yisroel study the Torah, they will merit to have Hashem visit them, as we are told in Pirkei Avos, 'The Shechina of Hashem is present among people who study Torah.'

In the very last verse of the Neviim, we are commanded 'remember the Torah of My servant Moshe', which credits Moshe with giving the Torah to the Bnay Yisroel. He is known as Moshe Rabbainu, our teacher, because we still study the Torah he brought us. In this Parsha, which as mentioned earlier, is devoted to Moshe, Hashem wanted to associate the study of Torah in all generations, to Moshe, in whose merit the Shechina will dwell among us. By telling Moshe to have the Bnay Yisroel bring pure olive oil to be placed in the Menora, even though this is not the Parsha where the Menora is being discussed, Hashem reminds us, that the light really is represented by the Torah each of us learns. This is based on the verse quoted above, the Torah being likened to a Ner, a light. But, for us to deserve that Hashem should recognize our studies and dwell among us we have to expend the same effort that was involved in deriving the oil that was lit in the Menorah. One who reads the text of the Torah as he reads another book, is reading but not learning. The true Talmid Chacham has to toil in the Torah called Amailim BaTorah, and only then will he be considered to represent the Menora. Just as the olive had to be pressed before deriving oil from it, likewise, the student has to spend time and energy as he delves into the intricacies of the Talmud and Shulchan Aruch. Only then, will he be rewarded by feeling the spirit of Hashem emanating from his studies. This is represented by the oil in today's Parsha.

To bring up a light always: (ibid 21)

How are the Bnay Yisroel to perform lighting the Menora for all generations, since we do not have the Menora today? Why did Hashem add these words, for all generations, only by the Menora and not by the other vessels or clothing? The answer is that the Ner Maaravi, by burning constantly, was the sign that the Shechina of Hashem is dwelling among the Bnay Yisroel. Since only the Kohanim performed all the services with the Menora, one might think that it is in their merit that the Ner Maaravi burned, or that all the lights turned towards the Ner Maaravi instead of straight up. Hashem wanted to impress upon them that all the miracles were caused by the merit of the Bnay Yisroel. This merit could be effective in all generations and in all lands, as long as the Bnay Yisroel will indulge in the study of Torah and keep Hashem holy.

Today, the Menora is represented by the Shabbos candles, the candles lit in Shul before the Chazan, the Chanukiya, and the candles lit during every Seudah Shel Mitzvah. As long as the Bnay Yisroel continue the tradition of lighting candles for the honor of Hashem, His Shechina will dwell among them.

Perhaps there is another reason that Hashem chose to impress upon this particular Mitzvah everlasting importance. The flame of the Ner is very much like Hashem. One can light many fires from a single flame without diminishing the original; it can cook food or heat a house; flames can light up a dark room and can burn using many fuels. Likewise, Hashem gives life to all living creatures without being diminished; He can warm a person's heart by comforting him in times of distress; Hashem is in constant communication with every living thing, even a blade of grass. By keeping the flame of the Ner burning at all times and on all occasions, we are being reminded of the presence of

Hashem around us. This is as true today as it was during the times of the Mishkan and the two Battei Mikdash.

Many commentators try to answer the question, why the Mizbayach Haketores, was placed at the very end of today's Parsha, which dealt almost entirely with the Bigday Kehuna, the Kohanim clothing, rather in last week's Parsha where all the vessels of the Mishkan are described?

Also, assuming the Baal Haturim was right in saying that Moshe's name was omitted from this Parsha because, during the sin of the golden calf, he suggested to Hashem that his name should be omitted from the Torah, why did Hashem choose to omit his name from this particular Parsha?

The answer to both questions is as follows:

When Hashem told Moshe at the burning bush to go take the Bnay Yisroel out of Mitzrayim, he argued with Hashem for a week until Hashem relented. He told Moshe that his brother Aharon, the Levi, who until then was only a Levi and Moshe was supposed to be both the king and Kohain, will now become the Kohain and Moshe will remain only as the king or leader. Why was the Kehuna removed from Moshe?

We can understand this from a story told about a great Tzadik. When he came to heaven, since he was a great Tzadik, and also a Possaik, he was placed on the Bes Din Shel Maaloh. The next day he was asked to leave his bench. As soon as someone came up to be tried for his sins, he would throw a fit at him. "You had the nerve to do an avairo? Don't you realize that Hashem keeps you alive etc. etc. etc." He couldn't understand how a person sins against Hashem, and was too strict for this court. There, a judge has to have compassion, realizing that maybe he didn't learn, had bad friends, or any other valid reason not to be so careful. The same was meant with the Bigday Kehuna. Each of the clothing the Kohain wore, was supposed to forgive a different sin committed by someone from Adam until that generation and further. The Kohain was supposed to help the person do Teshuva and receive forgiveness and not harass him for sinning.

At the burning bush, Moshe wanted to know in what Zechus the Bnay Yisroel will merit to be redeemed. Why take them out, when there are speakers of Lashon Hara among them? He couldn't find a good reason to have them freed from their slavery. Hashem told him, that he can not be the Kohain, but could remain the leader, speaking to them in the name of Hashem. That is why his name was omitted from this particular Parsha, which deals with the clothing worn by the Kohain, and no other Parsha,

As for the Mizbayach Haketores, it follows along the same lines. When Moshe was on Har Sinai and beat the angels at their argument, about keeping the Torah in heaven, every Malach gave him a present. The Malach Hamaves told him the secret that Ketores could stop a plague. That is why, when there was a plague, Moshe told Aharon to go among the people with Ketores and the plague stopped. While the other vessels in the Mishkan were important for what they represented, they were not really involved with every individual as the Ketores was. Just a pinch would make the cloud go straight up and not be bent by the wind. That showed that Hashem accepted their services, more than anything else. The Mizbayach Haketores served the same purpose that the Bigday Kehuna did, and that is why the Mizbayach Haketores is mentioned in this Parsha and not among the other vessels in the last Parsha.

Thanks to hamelaket@gmail.com for collecting the following items:

From Destiny Foundation/Rabbi Berel Wein
<info@jewishdestiny.com>

Jerusalem Post Sunday, February 26, 2012

AMERICAN JEWRY :: Rabbi Berel Wein

Having just returned from a three week trip and lecture tour in the United States I undoubtedly qualify as an expert on the state of affairs of the Jewish society there. I was in a number of cities on both the West Coast and East Coast of that vast country. I visited different communities with different shades of observant practices and Jewish and world outlooks.

There is a great deal of concern in the established and religious Jewish communities about the fate of the State of Israel. Iran looms as a much more dangerous threat in the eyes of Jews in Los Angeles and Brooklyn than it does in the daily lives of we Israelis living in Jerusalem. Everyone (well, almost everyone) asked me "Aren't you afraid to be living in Israel now?" They looked at me incredulously when my response was in effect "I don't know what you are talking about!"

The subliminal truth is that this section of American Jewry cannot imagine how it would survive and prosper if, God forbid, anything happened to the State of Israel. They are afraid for us but they are equally afraid for themselves. They have a subconscious fear that the Golden Land may not be so golden to them if Israel is no longer a factor in American and Jewish life. Therefore their anxiety about Israel is two-fold. It is about us here in the Holy Land but it is also about themselves and their future in American life. Apparently in their view the two are deeply intertwined.

The vast majority of American Jews are liberals first and Jews second or third or not at all. American Jews paradoxically were originally disturbed when, for its first thirty years, Israel was governed by the left and was a socialistic society and economy. When Israel finally abandoned socialism, paradoxically, again American Jewry in the main became predominantly leftist, doctrinally liberal and married to the Democratic Party no matter what.

Now that Israel is cast as a villain by the left for various reasons American Jews are very uncomfortable with Israel. It is too Jewish, too traditional, too observant, too stubborn, too strong, too inflexible, too Orthodox and it is insufficiently liberal. Therefore it has to change to meet these demands of American Jewish liberals.

In their frustration with Israel and in a spectacular exhibition of complete assimilation that borders on self-hate, Israel has become an object of scorn and shame to many of them. Alienated from any observance of Judaism, devoid of Jewish values and ignorant of Torah and tradition, it has bought into the Arab propaganda line that Israel is an illegitimate state and an "occupier" of the land of others.

The Jews on college campuses all over America are deluged with this propaganda and since they themselves have no background or meaningful Jewish education they succumb very easily to this chimera, especially since it fits in nicely into the present view of the liberals in the United States. And make no mistake, this insidious liberalism is the new Jewish religion for a very large section of American Jewry.

There are however bright spots in this picture. AIPAC has triumphed mightily over J Street and congressional support for Israel remains strong in spite of the policies and pronouncements of the current administration on the Middle East. There is still a great deal of sympathy for Israel amongst the American general public, though the efforts of Israeli "hasbara" in the United States have proven to be really feeble. Even such forcible spokesmen as Dore Gold and Alan Dershowitz have not been able to stem the tide of Arab propaganda that daily inundates the American media and college campuses.

The New York Times is especially vicious in its anti-Israel bias and in the type of articles that its Jerusalem correspondent writes for publication. As the flagship of the liberal media in the United States it shapes the liberal view of Israel and it is a very unflattering one. The New York Times no longer has an opinion writer such as William Safire writing in defense of Israel. And since, as I pointed out previously,

liberalism is the religion of much of American Jewry, the New York Times is its bible.

The fact that the most vocal defenders of Israel are the rabidly conservative radio talk show hosts has a counter productive effect upon the liberal American Jew. He now associates Israel with Rush Limbaugh - the archenemy of liberalism in America. If you hate Rush you won't like Israel either, the apparent result of all of this. Well, times and ideas change so the final verdict on American Jewry vis a vis Israel is yet to be written.

Shabat shalom.

From Destiny Foundation/Rabbi Berel Wein

<info@jewishdestiny.com>

Subject Weekly Parsha from Rabbi Berel Wein

Weekly Parsha :: TETZAVEH :: Rabbi Berel Wein

The breastplate/choshen of the High Priest was ordained to be securely attached to the ceremonial apron/ephod that covered the body of the High Priest. The Torah specifically mentions that the breastplate/choshen should not be allowed to slide away from that apron/ephod. The commentators to Torah discuss the significance of this rule. Why is it so important that the breastplate/choshen should remain attached to the apron/ephod while the High Priest is wearing the priestly garments? What is the moral message that the Torah wishes to impart to us by this requirement?

Again, the answers to these questions and the observations of the great sages of Israel over the ages are varied and many. I have always felt that the Torah is imparting a message to us, that the spiritual side of humans - the breastplate/choshen that rests upon the heart, the seat of human emotion and spirit - is inextricably bound up with the bodily and physical needs and demands of the human body itself as represented by the apron/ephod.

The two garments, the breastplate/choshen and the apron/ephod, like our souls and bodies during our lifetimes are inseparable. The two opposites - of spirit and physicality are meant to balance and influence each other. A human being cannot, in this world, be wholly physical, for, if so, one is little more than an animal. Nor can humans achieve a fully spiritual state of existence, for God said to Moses that "no humans can see me and live." It is the integration of these two human traits that creates the main challenge in our lives and eventually defines us as a Jew and as a human being.

The Torah abhors schizophrenic behavior. The old slogan of the Haskala: "Be a Jew at home and a regular person/citizen in the street" proved to be an unattainable goal. Either the Jew at home had to give way, which is what most often happened, or the man in the street had to defer to the homegrown Jew.

The Torah therefore wished to create a whole person who would be comfortable with one's Jewishness and mission both at home and in the street. All Jews, not only the High Priest, have to wear the breastplate/choshen attached to the apron/ephod; to combine within one and the same person a physical existence and a spiritual one as well. The numerous commandments that the Torah ordains for our performance in all facets of our lives are meant to help us create a whole unified person for ourselves. We are to sanctify the mundane and create spirit where apparently only physicality exists. And, at the same time, the fact is that in our lifetime we are of this world with all of the physical limitations that this fact of human existence imposes upon us.

This duality of purpose and existence is itself the secret of human society and points to the eternal necessity for God's guidance and Torah blessings. In following His tenets we find our whole - inner and outer -

self. In this way we are all entitled to wear the garments of the High Priest both at home and in the street all the days of our lives.
Shabat shalom, Happy Purim

From Rabbi Yissocher Frand ryfrand@torah.org & genesis@torah.org
To ravfrand@torah.org
Subject Rabbi Frand on Parsha

Rabbi Yissocher Frand - Parshas Tetzaveh
When Someone Says "Don't Worry About It" It Is Time To Start Worrying

This week's Parsha contains the mitzvah of lighting the Menorah in the Mishkan: "Now you shall command the Children of Israel that they shall take for you pure, pressed olive oil for illumination, to kindle the lamp continually..." [Shmos 27:20]

The Gemara [Shabbos 22] raises an obvious question: Why does the Almighty command us to have a Menorah in the Mishkan/Mikdash? Does He need its light? After all, throughout the 40 years of wandering in the Wilderness, the Jews were led by His Light. He certainly does not need our light. Rather, the Light of the Menorah is symbolic of the fact that G-d's Presence dwells in the midst of the Jewish people. This is how the Gemaara deals with this question.

However, the Medrash Rabbah has a different take on the matter. The Medrash is bothered by the same question. The Medrash, putting words, as it were, into the mouth of the Almighty, states: "I don't need the light, but let them provide a light for Me just as I provided a light for them. As it is written 'And Hashem walked before them in the day.'" The Medrash explains that when the Jewish people were given this mitzvah (to light the Menorah), they asked Moshe Rabbeinu -- 'Why does haKadosh Baruch Hu need our light?' Moshe responded that it was to give them the opportunity to "pay back" Hashem, so to speak. "Let them provide light for Me like I provided light for them."

This Chazal teaches an insight into how people act. When Reuven does Shimmon a favor, Shimmon will say "Thank you so much." Reuven's response will be "Think nothing of it. It was nothing. You don't have to even say thank you. Don't worry about it!" How do we view Reuven? We think, "He's a great guy! A Tzadik!

Rav Yeruchem Levovitz zt"l, the Mirrer Mashgiach, says that Reuven is not such a tzadik. He has an ulterior motive. As long as Shimmon feels he is unable to pay Reuven back for the favor he's performed, as the expression goes "You owe me -- big time!" People like it when others owe them "big time". Deep down, Reuven does not want Shimmon to feel he is able to pay back the favor, regardless of what Shimmon says to or does for Reuven.

The fact that the Ribono Shel Olam -- who in fact Klal Yisrael did owe "big time" -- allows them to do a favor for Him, as "payback," as it were, for the favor He did for them shows that Hashem does not want us to feel helpless in this relationship. It was a tremendous Chesed [Divine Kindness] that after having provided them with Light for 40 years in the Wilderness, the Almighty was now giving them an opportunity to pay Him back.

This is the difference between the Master of the World and a flesh and blood person. He did us a favor and He lets us pay Him back. He does not want us to feel in His debt.

Shoftim Chapter 13 contains the story of the future parents of Shimshon, who were barren for many years. One fine day, an Angel came and told Manoach's wife that she would conceive and have a child. The Angel instructed the mother not to drink wine during her pregnancy and likewise commanded her that the child should be a Nazir his entire life.

Manoach's wife told her husband about the prophecy. He asked to meet the Angel. The Angel reappeared in the presence of both of them. They offered a sacrifice and then the Angel disappeared never to return again.

The pasuk states that when the Angel failed to ever reappear again, "Then Manoach knew that it was an Angel of G-d." [Shoftim 13:21] In other words, they had a child as the angel foretold, but the angel was never seen again. Then Manoach knew it was truly an Angel of G-d. > From the flow of the pasuk, it sounds like the reason Manoach realized it was truly an Angel of G-d was specifically because he never returned. The reason this is so is because if this was a regular person, one could bet his bottom dollar that on the child's birthday, the person would return and say "Nu, how's my little child doing?" Then Manoach and his wife would have to say "Oh, we can't thank you enough. What can we ever do for you do show our appreciation?" And the person would say "Oh, think nothing of it" (but he would in fact want them to feel indebted to him.) However, the one who delivered the message of a child to Manoach and his wife was indeed an Angel... because he never came back to implicitly demand thanks and indebtedness.

The Brisker Rav zt"l had many children. He married them all off in the same Jerusalem wedding hall call Vagshal. The owner of the establishment was honored to have the Brisker Rav choose his wedding hall for the weddings and offered the hall at no charge. The Brisker Rav refused to accept the offer. He said something to the effect: "The highest price I ever pay for something is when it is free."

When someone gives you something for free, do not think that you are not paying anything. When it is free, you are in someone's debt. That is what this pasuk is teaching us. G-d gave us the opportunity to pay Him back by lighting a light for Him, as He did for us for so many years, in order that we not feel indebted to Him.

Transcribed by David Twersky Seattle, WA; Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman, Baltimore, MD

RavFrand, Copyright © 2007 by Rabbi Yissocher Frand and Torah.org.

From Shema Yisrael Torah Network <shemalist@shemayisrael.com>
To Peninim <peninim@shemayisrael.com>
Subject Peninim on the Torah by Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum

Peninim on the Torah by Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum
Parshas Tetzave
They shall take for you pure oil...to kindle the lamp continually. (27:2)

Chazal teach that Hashem gave us the mitzvah of lighting the Menorah in the Bais Hamikdash, "not because I need the light." After all, Hashem is the light of the world. "Rather, I command you to light for Me just as I provided illumination for you in the wilderness. This will give you the opportunity to return the favor." Horav Yeruchem Levovitz, zl, derives an important lesson from Chazal: A beneficiary may somehow want to return the favor - let him do it. Chazal teach us a lesson in Torah etiquette. When someone does a favor for another person, the beneficiary may want to repay the kindness. The benefactor has it all. He needs absolutely nothing. What should he do?

The Mashgiach notes that most of us would say, "Forget about it. No problem; Don't worry about it. I'm actually good." Chazal are teaching us that this is wrong. We must permit the beneficiary to repay the favor. Someone who is truly sensitive to the feelings of the beneficiary will say, "Yes, I will be happy to receive a favor in return." He will not want his friend to feel indebted to him.

A relationship between two people should be one of unity and harmony. Allow the fellow to maintain his dignity by paying back the favor. The main objective is that his dignity will have been preserved.

Rav Yeruchem cites the Rosh in Sefer Orchos Chaim L'Ha'Rosh, who asserts that the ramifications of sensitivity apply even under such circumstances in which someone offends us. He now stands before us with pleading eyes, asking forgiveness. What should we do? The Rosh

writes: "Do not consider it a sin if a person wishes to excuse himself in front of you." The Rosh is addressing a situation whereby Reuven offended Shimon. Reuven now wants to explain his behavior and somehow achieve forgiveness. Most of us would simply say, "Forget about it. It is over, don't worry. I am not upset." What, however, if he wants to explain? The Rosh says that a baal middos, one who possesses refined character traits, will listen to what the individual has to say. This is probably against our basic instinctive reaction. No one wants to hear someone's excuse concerning why he insulted him, why he hurt him, why he caused him a monetary loss. The usual reaction is: "Forget about it. I will not weep over spilled milk. What is done is done!" In truth, the reason the victim does not want to listen to the offender's excuse is that he wants him to suffer. Thus, whenever he meets him, he will be able to subtly rub it in. "You hurt me, and I never really forgave you. I never listened to your justification."

The Rosh is teaching us to let a person have his say - even if, as an excuse, it is not worth much. At least, he has the satisfaction that he was allowed to have his say, and, in his mind, this means that he was forgiven.

The Mashgiach cites the episode with Yosef and his brothers as an indication of how a Torah Jew should act. The ten brothers felt terrible. They had gone through life justifying their hatred, and eventual sale, of Yosef. While this was a step up from their original intention to kill him, they still acted badly toward him. Now they were confronting him after all these years. They are without words. Indeed, words cannot soothe Yosef's pain or their share of the blame. They did what they did, and he suffered terribly. What excuse could they render to gloss over two decades of suffering? Apologies are insufficient at a time such as this. Yosef gave them the excuse: "It was not your fault. Hashem wanted this to occur. Thus, He manipulated the events. You were mere pawns in Hashem's hands." By saying this, Yosef was removing from them the burden of guilt, allowing them to preserve their dignity and face him after all these years.

Aharon and his sons shall arrange it... an eternal decree for their generations, from the Bnei Yisrael. (27:21)

There is an inspiring Midrash whose commentary on the pasuk "illuminates" for us the significance of and proper attitude toward the middah, character trait, of hakoras hatov, gratitude. Hashem says, "I ask you to light the Menorah for Me not because I need the light. I want you to light it for Me as I illuminated for you (in the wilderness). Thus, I will elevate your esteem in the eyes of the nations of the world, for they will then say, 'Yisrael is lighting for the One Who lights for all.'" The Midrash continues by offering an analogy to a blind man who was walking together with a pikeach, healthy man, whose vision is unimpaired. The pikeach said to the blind man, "Come, and I will support you and lead the way." When they arrived at their destination and were about to enter the house, the pikeach said to the blind man, "Go and light for me a candle, so that you should not remain in my debt." In other words, the healthy person, sensing that the blind man would feel indebted to him, realized that there was a way to allow him his independence. A blind man's ability to move around in a dark house is greater than one who can see. Thus, the pikeach came up with an idea to preserve the blind man's esteem.

Horav Moshe Shternbuch, Shlita, observes the incredible foresight and mentchlichkeit, human decency, of this pikeach. Not only did he make a point of caring for the physical needs of his blind friend, he went out of his way to look out for the man's self-esteem, allowing him the opportunity to feel "needed," to be a benefactor to someone, rather than a constant beneficiary. This parallels Hashem's Divine ways. Does Hashem have needs? Does he require anything of us? No! Indeed, everything that we possess, everything that we do, is from Him. Hashem illuminates the world, bringing light to each and every individual member of the world

community. Yet, Hashem moves into the background by allowing the Jewish People to light for Him, thereby raising their value in the world. Rav Shternbuch cites the Baal Shem Tov who offers an insightful interpretation to David HaMelech's statement in Tehillim 62:13, "And Yours, my Lord, is kindness, for You reward each man in accordance with his needs." What does the Psalmist mean with this statement? The fact that Hashem rewards one for his positive actions is not an act of kindness; it is just; it is the correct thing to do. The Besht explains that we forget that the ability to carry out the most simple activity originates from Hashem. We do nothing on our own. It is all Him. Without Hashem we are unable to act - period. Therefore, the fact that we receive reward for the actions that we execute, by employing the power and ability that He grants us, is a chesed, kindness, from Hashem. We are not really acting. He is acting. Yet, He grants us reward. This is His kindness to us. Veritably, when one makes the first effort to give some thought to how the world runs, he realizes that, indeed, every aspect of human life is much like the pikeach and the blind man. Hashem sustains the entire world. Those who toil relentlessly to earn that elusive "buck" do not grasp the fact that their effort neither plays a role, nor is it necessary in order to enable one's particular portion of the proverbial "pie." Does he not understand that what he gathers in his specific field of endeavor is due to Hashem's altruism? This is how the intelligent, observant Jew should think and perceive life. Regrettably, this form of intelligence eludes many.

Rav Shternbuch quotes Horav Moshe Yitzchak, zl, the Kelmer Maggid, who said that people think that by adding the often quoted, and not as often contemplated, b'ezras Hashem, with Hashem's help, one has fulfilled his obligation to Hashem. On the contrary, attributing one's success to Hashem's "assistance," is basically saying, "I did it, and Hashem helped." It is nothing more than kochi v'otzem yadi asah li es ha'chayil ha'zeh, "My strength and the might of my hand wrought for me all this wealth." The b'ezras Hashem is a little tidbit in which he includes Hashem together with his kochi v'otzem yadi. One must never forget that Hashem does not "assist", He is everything - He does it all!

V'zocharta es Hashem Elokecha ki Hu Ha'nosein lecha koach laasos chayil, "Then you shall remember Hashem, Your G-d, for it is He Who gave you strength to make wealth" (Devarim 8:18). Targum Onkelos interprets this pasuk in an intriguing manner. Arei Hu yaheiv lecha eitzah l'miknei nichsin, "For it is He Who gave you the advice to purchase property." In other words, not only is Hashem responsible for your success in business, but even the original idea of what to buy and when to buy it came from Hashem. We are not much more than innocent bystanders.

Bring near to yourself Aharon your brother...from amongst Bnei Yisrael to minister to Me. (28:1)

We wonder why the position of Kohen Gadol, High Priest, went to Aharon, as opposed to Moshe Rabbeinu, who was clearly the greatest Jew at the time. The Maggid, zl, m'Dubno gives a practical reason for this selection. The purpose of the Kohen Gadol is kaparah. He is the one who atones for the sins of the people and who must execute that service. Such a person must be from among the people, someone who understands them, whose appreciation of the average Jew is profound. One who understands their many foibles and misgivings is able to make sense of their errant behavior and shortcomings. Moshe was a great man, a Himmel mentch, a man whose head was in the clouds. He was not as close with the ha'mon am, average Jew, like his brother, Aharon. The Kohen Gadol was the one who personified oheiv shalom v'rodef shalom, "loves peace and pursues peace," loves people and brings them closer to Torah.

Not all peace is good! The Tanna in Pirkei Avos 1:12 emphasizes Hillel's dictum, "Be like the disciples of Aharon, love peace and pursue peace, love people and bring them closer to Torah." The Slonimer Rebbe, zl, Horav Avraham, commented, "Only such peace that ultimately brings

Jews closer to Torah may be considered the shalom of Aharon. A peace that does not serve as a catalyst for bringing one closer to Torah is a false peace."

Bringing a Jew closer to a Torah way of life often requires an astute mind, while at other times, a practical, common sense approach will do the trick. Deep down within every Jew's psyche there exists a gravitational pull toward Torah. The problem is that it is covered with layers and layers of fear, indifference, and even resentment. If we can succeed in penetrating this covering, we can draw the individual to his origins, to the Torah.

Horav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach, zl, was the posek ha'dor, Halachic decisor, of his generation. He was Rosh Hayeshivah of Kol Torah, where his lectures throughout the years molded and shaped the minds of thousands of students. He was also paradigmatic of Aharon HaKohen, soft and sensitive, caring and loving, empathizing with each and every Jew, always looking for a way to bring Jews closer to Torah.

The Rosh Yeshivah would arrive daily at the Yeshivah via taxi. A number of times, the taxi would pull up to the curb, but Rav Shlomo Zalman would not alight. He remained in the cab, conversing with the driver for a few minutes, often for as long as ten minutes. What could they be talking about? Rav Shlomo Zalman was an individual who valued every moment. This was totally out of character.

One of the students was overcome by curiosity, to the point that after the Rosh Yeshivah went inside, he flagged over the taxi and asked the driver, "What gives? What were you talking about with the Rosh Yeshivah?"

"What?" asked the driver. "What did you call that elderly man? Are you saying that wonderful old man is your Rosh Yeshivah? He is learned? I never knew!" After some prodding, the driver shared his story, "We were once traveling to the yeshivah, and the gentleman asked me concerning my background. I replied that I was born near Yerushalayim, and I even remember attending an Orthodox school. The gentleman asked me what I had learned in school. I told him that I did not remember much, but I would share with him what I remember from my Chumash class. It began with Bereishis, Adam and Chavah. Next, I covered Avraham and Sarah, and I continued on. It was clear that the older man was deriving much pleasure from the stories. Regrettably, I remembered just so much. In order to keep up our conversation and make the man feel good, I would 'prepare' on Shabbos by taking my son's stories of the Torah and reading them. What can I say? He was actually enjoying these stories!"

What a brilliant way to bring a Jew closer to Torah. This could only have been achieved by an individual who felt another Jew's pain as his own, who loved each and every Jew as family.

Since the Kohen Gadol is to spread good will, reaching out to all Jews with love and care, he must be respected by the people. One listens to whom one respects. This is why the Kohen Gadol's vestments were outstanding in their beauty. When the Kohen Gadol stepped out bedecked in his Priestly vestments, he represented spiritual monarchy. He oozed royalty which, by its very nature, demanded respect. For this reason, the people readily accepted his word, allowing for him to atone for them.

Clothes do not necessarily make the person, but they do give one an idea about the nature of the individual. When a person dresses royally, he catches the eye of people. They look up to him and are willing to accept his guidance. This is especially true of an inner sanctity that glows within, as his countenance illuminates without.

It is related that once one of the premier Lithuanian Torah scholars came with a complaint to the Netziv, zl, at the time the Volozhiner Rosh HaYeshivah and that generation's pre-eminent Torah leader, with a complaint. Why is it that a number of the Admorim, Rebbes, who had large chassidic courts, lived a life of affluence, wearing beautiful, rich garments that reflected glory and royalty, while so many Roshei Yeshivah lived in squalor, suffering from abject poverty? The Netziv

explained that this has been going on for quite some time. One can say that it dated back to the days of Moshe and Aharon's leadership of the Jewish People. There are two pursuits, missions or purposes in life. There are two ways to serve Hashem. Each and every generation has those who are better suited for one, while others seem to gravitate and revel in the other. Indeed, there are two ways/approaches toward reaching out to the Jewish People.

One derech, approach, is Aharon's way, whereby one reaches out with love, caring and sensitivity. This approach is best suited if one seeks to reach the common man, the one who is neither necessarily erudite, nor looking for scholarship. He seeks warmth, love, a shoulder to lean on, and a heart that will open up to him. To reach out to the ha'mon am, greater community, one must be impressive in dress, speech, and manner. This was Aharon's way.

Moshe's approach was the one that required pure Torah dissemination without embellishment: pristine Torah, lomdus, logical analysis, brilliant lecture and dialog. This approach does not hinge on impressive externals. One has only to look at the photographs of some of our greatest Torah scholars to notice that clothes did not play a role in their lives. Whether it was a simple hat, or a hat, which served its owner for years in all sorts of climates, or it was a kapote that was more mirror than cloth; to them it was all the same.

On the other hand, when Horav Chaim Soloveitchik, zl, who did not normally dress in specific rabbinic attire, travelled to Germany to meet with its rabbinic leadership, he was very particular in selecting his wardrobe. He commissioned a tailor to prepare for him a new kapote, carefully selecting the material himself. It had to be "stylish" and fit properly. Rav Chaim explained that his fastidiousness was due to the German Jews' discriminatory nature and demand concerning resplendent attire. Their idea of how a Rabbiner should present himself was quite different than what was the perspective in Eastern Europe. If, in their eyes, a Rav should dress a certain way, it would be a chillul kavod haTorah, desecration of the honor due the Torah, to act adversely.

Va'ani Tefillah

B'raash gadol misnasim... v'omrim: Baruch kavod Hashem mimkomo.

With great noise raise themselves saying, Blessed is the glory of Hashem from His place.

The subjects revolving around the Heavenly spheres, as revealed to the Neviim, remain in an area far beyond human conception. Horav Shimon Schwab, zl, comments that such a discussion is analogous to a man born sightless, discussing the workings of a traffic light - red meaning stop; and green meaning go. Since he has never seen colors, the entire subject is theoretical. We do have some idea of the meaning of the pesukim. The first kadosh, kadosh, which comprises Kiddushah d'yeshivah, the Kedushah recited sitting, is followed by the pasuk, Baruch kavod Hashem mimkomo. As a precursor to this Heavenly response to Kedushah, we describe that uttering this pasuk initiates a "loud noise," almost a shattering of the senses. Why?

Kadosh, Kadosh, Kadosh intimates that Hashem's level of kedushah is so totally removed even from the fiery, Heavenly angels and creatures, that He remains in complete separation from all. The message of Baruch kavod Hashem mimkomo teaches the very opposite. L'umasam - means that Hashem is as close as possible to His creatures. This causes a great Heavenly furor. The message of Baruch teaches that, despite Hashem's awesome separation and His distance beyond our comprehension, the angels sense that He is coming closer and closer to them. This catalyzes their excited response, "Baruch kavod Hashem mimkomo."

In honor of Ilana Ratner from The Jacobs Family

From Rabbi Chanan Morrison <ravkooklist@gmail.com>

reply-To rav-kook-list+owners@googlegroups.com
To Rav Kook List <Rav-Kook-List@googlegroups.com>
Subject [Rav Kook List]

Rav Kook List

Rav Kook on the Torah Portion

Tetzaveh: The High Priest's Golden Crown

Perhaps most striking of the special garments of the Kohen Gadol (High Priest) was the Tzitz. This was a gold plate worn over the forehead, engraved with the words, "Holy to God." What was the significance of this priestly crown?

Rav Kook wrote that the Tzitz, fashioned out of pure gold, reflected the highest spiritual riches. The crown's placement on the forehead - the location of the ratzon, our inner will for good and holiness - symbolized the Kohen's aspirations for the most elevated good, as revealed within his inner soul.

The Talmud teaches that the Tzitz encircled the forehead from one ear to the other. What do the ears have to do with the Tzitz?

Two Types of Listening

The ear is, of course, an organ to hear and listen. One ear is directed above - a receptivity to the shining light of elevated thought. The Tzitz extended from the ear to the forehead, indicating that it transmitted this receptivity to his inner will. In short, it symbolized the Kohen's aspirations to actualize the highest goals, implementing them in life, traits and deeds.

The other ear is for a different type of listening - an awareness of the physical world below. This sensitivity allowed the physical world to acquire a new inner content, a content which cannot be attained in the spiritual realm alone. Here the spiritual is enriched by insight into the material world, its actions and emotions.

The Tzitz thus connected both types of listening - elevated thoughts from above, as well as understanding the physical world below. It provided a channel that linked these two realms, uniting a world with all of its disparate parts.

In this way, the Kohen Gadol became whole and integrated, aware how the physical can extend and enrich the spiritual realm. He could then serve as a unifying force for the people, who share this yearning for complete unity.

This ability corresponds to the essence of the mission of the kohanim. They are a conduit, connecting the Jewish people to God, and God to the Jewish people. The Talmud describes them as sheluchei dedan - our representatives, as they bring Israel's offerings to God. Yet they are also sheluchei deRachamana - God's emissaries, bringing God's blessings and Torah to Israel.

The placement of the Tzitz, encompassing both ears, indicated that the Kohen Gadol was not troubled by a disconnect between his spiritual and physical sides. A conduit between man and God, he needed to be attuned to the spiritual, while still in touch with the material world.

(Adapted from Ein Eyah vol. IV, Shabbat 6:72, p. 113)

Comments and inquiries may be sent to: <mailto:RavKookList@gmail.com>

From Yeshiva.org.il <subscribe@yeshiva.org.il>

reply-To subscribe@yeshiva.org.il

By Rabbi Yirmiyohu Kaganoff

Do Clothes Make the Kohen? -- Identifying the materials from which the Bigdei Kehunah are made.

By Rabbi Yirmiyohu Kaganoff

In the year 5017 (1257), several hundred Baalei Tosafos, led by Rav Yechiel of Paris, left Northern France on a journey to Eretz Yisrael. Rav Eshtori HaParchi, who lived two generations later, records a fascinating story he heard when he went

to Yerushalayim to have his sefer, the Kaftor VaFarech, reviewed by a talmid chacham, named Rav Baruch. Rav Baruch told him that Rav Yechiel had planned to offer korbanos upon arriving in Yerushalayim! Rav Eshtori writes that he was too preoccupied with his sefer at the time to realize that there were several halachic problems with Rav Yechiel's plan.¹ In Kaftor VaFarech, he mentions some of his own concerns; in addition, later poskim discuss many other potential difficulties. Among the concerns raised is identifying several of the materials necessary for the kohanim's vestments.

Vestments of the kohen

The Torah describes the garments worn by the kohanim in the Beis HaMikdash as follows: "Aharon and his sons shall don their belt and their hat, and they (the garments) shall be for them as kehunah, as a statute forever."² The Gemara³ deduces, "When they wear their special vestments, they have the status of kehunah. When they are not wearing these vestments, they do not have this status." This means that korbanos are valid only if the kohen offering them attires himself correctly.

The regular kohen (kohen hedyot) wears four garments when performing service in the Beis HaMikdash; three of them, his undergarment, his robe, and his turban are woven exclusively from white linen. The Torah never describes how one makes the fourth garment of the regular kohen, the avneit, or belt, but it does mention the material of the belts worn by the kohen gadol - on Yom Kippur he wears a pure linen belt, whereas his regular belt also contains techeiles, argaman, and tola'as shani, different colored materials that I will describe shortly. The Gemara cites a dispute whether the kohen hedyot's belt also includes these special threads, or whether he wears one of pure linen.⁴ The Rambam concludes that the regular kohen's avneit includes threads of techeiles, argaman, and tola'as shani.⁵ Assuming that Rav Yechiel concluded that the regular kohen's avneit also includes techeiles, argaman, and tola'as shani, his proposal to offer korbanos required proper identification of these materials, a necessary prerequisite to offering korbanos. This article will be devoted to the fascinating questions that we must resolve to accomplish this task.

What is argaman?

The Midrash Rabbah reports that argaman is the most valuable of these four threads and is the color of royal garments.⁶ The Rishonim dispute its color, the Rambam ruling that it is red, whereas the Raavad understands that it is multicolored cloth, woven either from different species or of different colored threads.⁷ The Raavad explains that the word argaman is a composite of arug min, meaning woven of different types. This approach appears to be supported by a pasuk in Divrei HaYamim⁸ that lists argavan, rather than argaman, as the material used in building the Beis HaMikdash.⁹ The word argavan seems to be a composite of two words, arug gavna, meaning woven from several colors, an approach that fits the Raavad's description much better than it fits the Rambam's.¹⁰

The Raavad's approach that argaman is multicolored is further supported by a comment in the Zohar¹¹ that describes argaman as multicolored. However, the Radak¹² understands the word argavan according to Rambam's approach, and Kesef Mishneh, similarly, states that the primary commentaries followed Rambam's interpretation. The Rekanti¹³ quotes both approaches, but implies that he considers the Raavad's approach to be primary.

By the way, the Ibn Ezra¹⁴ implies that argaman might have been dyed silk rather than wool, whereas most opinions assume that it is wool.¹⁵ Rabbeinu Bachyei¹⁶ contends that silk could not have been used for the mishkan or the Beis HaMikdash, since it is manufactured from non-kosher species. This is based on the Gemara's¹⁷ statement that non-kosher items may not be used for mitzvos. I will discuss this point further below.

Is argaman a color or a source?

It is unclear if the requirement to use argaman thread means that the thread used for the Kohen's belt must be a certain shade of color, or whether it must be dyed with a specific dye. Rambam implies that the source for the argaman color is irrelevant.

These are his words:

"Argaman is wool dyed red, and tola'as shani is wool dyed with a worm."¹⁸ (The Rambam explains elsewhere what he means when he says "dyed with a worm." It should also be noted that the Hebrew word tola'as, which is usually translated worm, may include insects and other small invertebrates.) The Rambam's wording implies that the source of the argaman dye is immaterial, as long as the thread is red. Thus, there may be no halachically required source for the dye, provided one knows the correct appearance of its shade.

Tola'as shani

One of the dye colors mentioned above is tola'as shani. In addition to its use for dyeing the kohen's belt and some of the kohen gadol's vestments, tola'as shani was also used for some of the curtains in the mishkan and in the Beis HaMikdash, in the manufacture of the purifying ashes of the parah adumah¹⁹ and for the purifying procedure both of a metzora and of a house that became tamei because of tzaraas.²⁰

Tola'as shani is a red color.²¹ This presents us with a question: According to the Rambam that argaman is red, the source of which is irrelevant, what is the difference between the shade of argaman and that of tola'as shani? The Radak explains that they are different shades of red, although he provides us with no details of this difference.²²

Must tola'as shani be derived from a specific source, or is it sufficient for it to be a distinctive shade of red, just as I suggested above that argaman is a color and not necessarily of a specific dye source?

The words of the Rambam that I quoted above answer this question: "Argaman is wool dyed red, and tola'as shani is wool dyed with a worm." These words imply that although argaman can be used from any source that produces this particular color, tola'as shani must be from a very specific source.

A worm-based dye

Can the pesukim help us identify what is tola'as shani? The description of tola'as, which means worm, implies that the source of this dye is an invertebrate of some type. For this reason, some authorities seem to identify tola'as shani as "kermes," a shade of scarlet derived from scale insects or some similar animal-derived red color.²³ Support for this approach could be rallied from a pasuk in Divrei HaYamim,²⁴ which describes the paroches (curtain) that served as the entrance to the kodoshhei hakodoshim, the Holy of Holies of the Beis HaMikdash, as woven from the following four types of thread: techeiles, argaman, karmil, and butz, which is linen. The Torah, in describing the same paroches, refers to it as made of techeiles, argaman, tolaas shani, and linen. Obviously, karmil is another way of describing tola'as shani.²⁵ Similarly, in Divrei HaYamim II,²⁶ when describing the artisans sent by the Tyrian King, Hiram, to help his friend King Shelomoh, the pasuk mentions karmil as one of the materials in place of tola'as shani. Thus, karmil, a word cognate to kermes, seems to be a synonym for tola'as shani.²⁷ However, as I mentioned above, Rabbeinu Bachyei takes issue with this approach, insisting that only kosher species may be used for building the mishkan and the garments of the kohanim. He bases his opinion on the Gemara²⁸ that states that "only items that one may eat may be used for the work of heaven," which teaches that only kosher items may be used in the manufacture of tefillin. How does this fit with the description of tola'as shani as a worm derivative?

The Rambam states that the dye called tola'as shani does not originate from the worm itself, but from a berry that the worm consumes.²⁹ Thus, according to the opinion of Rambam, Rabbeinu Bachyei and others, although tola'as shani and karmil are the same, they are not from non-kosher sources, but from kosher vegetable sources.

Although this is probably the primary approach we would follow in a halachic decision, we cannot summarily dismiss those who identify tola'as shani as kermes or a different invertebrate-based dye. Although Rabbeinu Bachyei objects to a non-kosher source for tola'as shani, those who accept that its source is kermes have several ways to resolve this issue. One possibility is that this halacha applies only to a substance used as the primary item to fulfill the mitzvah, but not if it serves only as a dye.³⁰

Others resolve the objection raised by Rabbeinu Bachyei by contending that the color derived from these non-kosher creatures may indeed be kosher. Several different reasons have been advanced to explain this approach. Some contend that this coloring is kosher, since the creatures are first dried until they are inedible, or, because a dead insect dried for twelve months is considered an innocuous powder and no longer non-kosher.³¹ (The halachic debate on this issue actually concerns a colorant called carmine red that is derived from a South American insect called cochineal. This color, which is derived from the powdered bodies of this insect, is used extensively as a "natural red coloring" in food production. To the best of my knowledge, all major contemporary kashrus organizations and hechsherim treat carmine as non-kosher, although I have read teshuvos contending that it is kosher and know that some rabbonim of the previous generation considered it to be kosher.)

A similar approach asserts that kermes dye is kosher, since it is no longer recognizable as coming from its original source.³² This approach is based on a dispute among early poskim as to whether a prohibited substance remains non-kosher after its appearance has been completely transformed. The Rosh³³ cites Rabbeinu Yonah, who permitted using musk, a fragrance derived from the glands of several different animals, as a flavor, because it has been transformed into a new

substance that is permitted. The Rosh disputes Rabbeinu Yonah's conclusion, although in a responsum³⁴ he quotes Rabbeinu Yonah's approach approvingly.³⁵ It is noteworthy that this dispute between the Rosh and Rabbeinu Yonah appears to be identical to a disagreement between the Rambam and the Raavad³⁶ in determining the source of the mor, one of the ingredients burnt as part of the fragrant ketores offering in the Beis HaMikdash.³⁷ The Rambam rules that mor is musk, which he describes as "the blood of a well-known undomesticated (in Hebrew, chayah)³⁸ Indian species of animal." (Although the Rambam calls it blood, he probably means a body fluid.) The Raavad disagrees, objecting that the blood of a chayah would not be used in the construction of the Beis HaMikdash, even if it were to be derived from a kosher species, certainly from a non-kosher one. In explaining the Rambam's position, Kesef Mishneh contends that once musk is reduced to a powder that bears no resemblance to its origin, it is kosher. Thus, the disagreement between the Rambam and the Raavad as to whether a major change of physical appearance changes the halachos of a substance may be identical to the dispute between Rabbeinu Yonah and the Rosh. It turns out that the Radak, who implies that tola'as shani derives from non-kosher invertebrates, may also accept the approach of Rabbeinu Yonah.

Some authorities have a different approach that would explain how tola'as shani may be acceptable for Beis HaMikdash use, even if it derives from a non-kosher source. They contend that the rule prohibiting the use of non-kosher items applies only to tefillin and other mitzvos that utilize kisvei hakodesh, holy writings, but does not apply to most mitzvos or to items used in the Beis HaMikdash.³⁹ This approach requires some explanation.

The Gemara states that tefillin may be manufactured only from kosher substances, deriving this halacha from the following verse: Lema'an tihyeh toras Hashem b'ficha, in order that the law of Hashem should always be in your mouth;⁴⁰ i.e., whatever is used for the Torah of Hashem must be from kosher items that one may place into one's mouth. In order to resolve a certain question that results from the Gemara's discussion, some authorities explain that this halacha refers only to items that have words of the Torah or Hashem's name in them, such as tefillin, mezuzos or a sefer torah, but does not include the garments worn by the kohen hedyot in the Beis HaMikdash, which do not contain Hashem's name.⁴¹ (The halacha requiring kosher substances would still apply to the tzitz and the choshen, garments of the kohen gadol, both of which carry Hashem's name.)

Techeiles

The next material or shade we need to identify, the techeiles, is also a factor in the wearing of our daily tzitzis. Indeed, the Torah requires us to wear techeiles threads as part of this mitzvah. Nevertheless, Jews stopped wearing techeiles about 1300 to 1500 years ago, and with time, its source has been forgotten. Although the Gemara⁴² mentions a creature called chilazon, whose blood is the source of techeiles, and even discusses how to manufacture the dye, the use of techeiles ended some time after the period of the Gemara. The Midrash states that "now we have only white tzitzis, since the techeiles was concealed,"⁴³ which implies that Hashem hid the source for the techeiles. Indeed some poskim interpret the writings of the Arizal as saying that techeiles should not be worn until moshiach comes.⁴⁴

Attempts to identify the techeiles

In 5647 (1887), the Radziner Rebbe, Rav Gershon Henech Leiner, zt"l, published a small sefer, Sefunei Temunei Chol, which concluded that the mitzvah of wearing techeiles applies even today. In his opinion, the Midrash quoted above means that techeiles will become unavailable, but we are both permitted and required to wear it. Based on his analysis of every place the Gemara mentions the word chilazon, the Radziner drew up a list of eleven requirements whereby one could identify the chilazon, and concluded that if one locates a marine animal that meets all these requirements, one may assume that it is the chilazon. He then traveled to Naples, Italy, to study marine animals that might fit all the descriptions of techeiles, and concluded that a squid-like creature called the cuttlefish, which in many languages is called the inkfish, is indeed the chilazon from which one produces techeiles. The Radziner then published his second volume on the subject, Pesil Techeiles, in which he announced his discovery of the chilazon and his proofs as to how the cuttlefish can be identified as the chilazon. Subsequently, the Radziner published a third volume, Ayn HaTecheiles, to refute those who disagreed with him. The Radziner attempted to convince the great poskim of his generation to accept his thesis, particularly Rav Yitzchok Elchonon Spector (the Rav of Kovno and the posek hador at the time), the Beis HaLevi (then the Rav of Brisk), Rav Yehoshua Kutno (author of Yeshuos Malko, the Rav of Kutno), the Maharil Diskin (who had been Rav of Brisk and was living in Yerushalayim), and Rav Shmuel Salant (the Rav of Yerushalayim). None of these rabbonim accepted the Radziner's proposal, although the Maharsham, the posek hador of the time in Galicia, felt that the

Radziner's approach had merit and wore a talis with the Radziner's techeiles, although apparently only in private. Nowadays, only Radziner Hasidim and some Breslevar Hasidim wear the techeiles that the Radziner introduced.

Some later authorities have attempted to identify the techeiles as being one of several varieties of sea snail, although the objections raised by the generation of poskim of the Radziner's own time apply to these species as well. Many today feel that *Murex trunculus* is the source of the techeiles. Several years ago, I discussed their position and the position of their opponents.⁴⁵ We should also note that Rashi's understanding of the chilazon that is the source of the techeiles cannot possibly describe any variety of sea snail since Rashi describes the process of extracting the techeiles as involving squeezing out its blood by hand.⁴⁶ One cannot squeeze the shell of a sea snail to extract its dye component – one must smash or drill through the shell to reach it.

Among the many objections to both of these identifications of the chilazon is the contention that neither the cuttlefish nor a snail could possibly be the source of the techeiles, since they are not kosher. In addition to the reasons I mentioned above, the Radziner presents a novel approach to explain why techeiles may derive from a non-kosher source. He contends that although the flesh of a non-kosher fish is forbidden *min haTorah*, the blood of non-kosher fish is forbidden only *miderabbanan*. Since *min haTorah* one may eat this blood, it is permitted as a source for a kosher dye.

It is noteworthy that a prominent nineteenth century posek, Rav Tzvi Hirsch Kalisher, contended that the garments of the kohen do not require chilazon as the dye source, only the color of techeiles. In his opinion, chilazon dye is only necessary for tzitzis.⁴⁷ In Rav Kalisher's opinion, it is sufficient to dye the threads of the *avneit* the correct techeiles color in order to perform the service in the Beis HaMikdash. However, not all poskim accept this interpretation, but require the specific dye source of chilazon to dye the vestments.⁴⁸

In review, what we know for certain is that the regular kohen (*kohen hedyot*) wears four garments when performing service in the Beis HaMikdash, including the *avneit*, or belt, which the Rambam rules includes threads of techeiles, *argaman*, and *tola'as shani*. In identifying these materials, however, we have several disputes: the first, as to whether the techeiles must be derived from chilazon for offering *korbanos*, or if merely dyeing clothes the appropriate color is sufficient; a second dispute, whether the chilazon has been hidden until *moshiach* comes, and a third dispute whether the chilazon must be kosher or not. In identifying the *argaman*, we are faced with a dispute between *rishonim* whether its color is red or a mix of different colors. And in identifying the *tola'as shani*, we face a dispute as to whether its source is a berry that "worms" eat or a worm of some type. All these questions will need to be resolved before we can again manufacture kosher *bigdei kehunah*, either by having *Eliyahu Hanavi* teach us how the *bigdei kehunah* were made, or by having the poskim of *klal Yisrael* determine what the halacha is.

Several earlier poskim devoted much time and energy to clarifying the correct procedures for offering *korbanos*, because of their intense desire to bring sacrificial offerings. Do we, too, have such a burning desire to see the Beis HaMikdash rebuilt speedily in our days? May we soon merit seeing the *kohanim* offering the *korbanos* in the Beis HaMikdash in purity and sanctity. Amen.

1 Vol. 1, page 101 in the 5757 edition 2 Shemos 29:9 3 Zevachim 17b 4 Yoma 6a, 12a, 69a 5 Hilchos Klei HaMikdash 8:2; cf. Rashi, Pesachim 26a s.v. Kesheirim 6 Naso 12:4 7 Hilchos Klei HaMikdash 8:13 8 II, 2:6 9 See also Daniel 5:7; Rashi on Divrei HaYamim II, 2:6 10 See Ibn Ezra on Shemos 25:4 11 Parshas Naso 12 Divrei HaYamim II, 2:6 13 Shemos 25:3 14 Shemos 25:4 15 Rambam, Hilchos Klei HaMikdash 8:13; Rashi, Shemos 25:4; 26:1; Rashbam, Shemos 25:4 16 Shemos 25:3 17 Shabbos 28a 18 Hilchos Klei HaMikdash 8:13 19 Bamidbar 19:6 20 Vayikra 14:4, 49 21 See Yeshaya 1:18 22 Divrei HaYamim II 2:6 23 See Radak on Divrei HaYamim II 2:6 24 II 3:14 25 Rashi ad loc. 26 2:13 27 See Radak on Divrei HaYamim II 2:6 28 Shabbos 28a 29 Hilchos Parah Adumah 3:2; see Rashi on Yeshaya 1:18 who explains it in a similar way. 30 Shu't Noda Bi'Yehudah II, Orach Chayim #3 31 See Shu't Minchas Yitzchak 3:96:2 32 Pesil Techeiles, pg. 48 in the 1990 edition 33 Berachos 6:35 34 Shu't HaRosh 24:6 35 We should note that the Rosh's descendents contend that their father wrote the Halachos after he wrote his Teshuvos, and that therefore the Halachos should be considered most authoritative. See Tur, Choshen Mishpat, at the end of Chapter 72, and the Beis Yosef, Yoreh Deah Chapter 341, quoting *Rabbeinu Yehudah*, the son of the Tur. However, the *Perisha*, Choshen Mishpat 72:35, notes that this rule is not absolute, and that some of the Rosh's responsa were written after he wrote the Halachos. 36 Hilchos Klei HaMikdash 1:3 37 See Shemos 30:23 38 As I explained in a different article, on identifying what is a *beheimah* and what is a *chayah*, translating the word *chayah* as an "undomesticated species" is not really accurate. The halachic difference between *chayah* and *beheimah* is highly complicated and also obscure, and is certainly not dependent

whether the species can be domesticated. For example, the reindeer qualifies as a *chayah* notwithstanding its ability to be domesticated. In the above quoted article, I discussed whether the American bison is halachically a *chayah* or a *beheimah*. For simplicity's sake, I used the more common and inaccurate translation here. 39 Shu't Noda Bi'Yehudah 2, Orach Chayim #3; cf. Magen Avraham 586:13 40 Shemos 13:9 41 Shu't Noda Bi'Yehudah II, Orach Chayim #3 42 See Menachos 42b 43 Midrash Tanchuma, Shelach 15; Midrash Rabbah, Shelach 17:5 44 Shu't Yeshuos Malko #1-3 45 This article can be read at RabbiKaganoff.com 46 Rashi, Shabbos 75a s.v. HaPotzo 47 He based this approach on the wording of the Rambam in Hilchos Tzitzis 2:1-2. 48 Likutei Halachos, Zevachim Chapter 13, pg. 67a in the original edition