

BS"D

To: Parsha@YahooGroups.com
From: crshulman@aol.com

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON VAYAKHEL SHEKALIM - 5763

To receive this parsha sheet in Word and/or Text format, send a blank e-mail to parsha-subscribe@yahogroups.com or go to <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/parsha/join> Please also copy me at crshulman@aol.com For old parsha sheets see <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/parsha/messages> For Torah links see <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/parsha/links>

From: RABBI YISSOCHER FRAND [ryfrand@torah.org To: ravfrand@torah.org Subject: Rabbi Frand on Parshas Vayakhel "RavFrand" List - Rabbi Frand on Parshas Vayakhel

A Good Name Is Better Than Good Oil
There is an interesting Medrash on the pasuk [verse] "See G-d has called by name Betzalel son of Uri son of Chur of the tribe of Yehudah" [Shmos 35:30]. The Medrash references the pasuk in Koheles "A good name is better than good oil" [Koheles 7:1]. The Medrash elaborates that the scent of good oil may precede the oil by a mile or two at most, even if the oil has a very powerful aroma. However, a good name can proceed a person even across continents.

The Medrash then asks how far a person must remove himself from contact with the prohibition of Shatnez [the forbidden mixture of wool and linen]. The Medrash answers that even if a person is wearing 99 layers of clothing and none of them are Shatnez, he still may not wear a garment containing Shatnez as the one hundredth layer of clothing.

What is the connection between distancing oneself from Shatnez and the pasuk that says, "A good name is better than good oil"? Rav Nissan Alpert gives the following interpretation of this Medrash (in his sefer Limudei Nissan):

Every time the Torah introduces Betzalel, it uses the following unique expression: "Look, I've called him by this name..." Why does the Torah give Betzalel such an introduction? The Medrash explains that the reason why Betzalel merited to be the master builder of the Mishkan [Tabernacle] was not because he had master architectural talents or special artistic ability. Betzalel's uniqueness was that he -- for some reason -- merited having a 'good name'. The Medrash then emphasizes how wonderful it is to have a good reputation (shem tov). G-d, in choosing someone to construct his dwelling place on earth (the Mishkan), did not want to be associated with anyone who had anything less than an impeccable reputation.

How does one obtain a good reputation? The Medrash answers this question by introducing the matter of Shatnez. The Medrash is teaching that the way a person acquires a good name is not by merely avoiding evil or sin, but by avoiding even the slightest hint of impropriety. It is not sufficient to merely 'play it by the book'. A person must distance himself to the ultimate extent from anything that even smacks of impropriety.

Shatnez is a peculiar prohibition, in that the two substances involved (wool and linen) are completely permitted when taken individually. Only a combination of the two is prohibited. The Torah is teaching us that a person merits a good name by staying away from Shatnez. Avoiding Shatnez represents staying away from anything that has even a minute mixture of something improper.

Those people in our communities who have achieved a good name are people who are above reproach. They have removed themselves from any taint of scandal or impropriety. Impeccable reputations are not achieved by playing it on the edge or bending the rules. We all know that certain people's handshakes are more reliable than other people's signed contracts. The reason why is because the first group of people stay away from 'forbidden mixtures'. They stay away from the slightest hint of 'non-Kosher' business practices. Ultimately, this is what pays off for them in the long run. When G-d builds a Mishkan, He does not want it built by a person regarding whom people may have suspicions. He wants a Betzalel -- a person above reproach, who possesses a good name, which is superior to good oil.

Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, WA
DavidATwersky@aol.com Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Baltimore, MD dhoffman@torah.org This dvar Torah was adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissocher Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Tapes on the weekly portion: Tape # 366, The Melacha of Tearing. Tapes or a complete catalogue can be ordered from the Yad Yechiel Institute, PO Box 511, Owings Mills MD 21117-0511. Call (41) 358-0416 or e-mail tapes@yadyechiel.org or visit <http://www.yadyechiel.org/> for further information. RavFrand, Copyright © 2003 by Rabbi Yissocher Frand and Torah.org. Torah.org: The Judaism Site <http://www.torah.org/> Project Genesis, Inc. [learn@torah.org](http://www.torah.org/)

From: Shlomo Katz [skatz@torah.org] To: hamaayan@torah.org
Subject: HaMaayan / The Torah Spring - Parashat Vayakhel
Hamaayan / The Torah Spring
Edited by SHLOMO KATZ
Vayakhel: The Light of Shabbat
Dedicated "I'ilui nishmat" Ilan ben Eliezer a"n, on his Shloshim

Sponsored by Eli, Rachel Adina and Daniel Avraham Rutstein, in honor of the birthday of wife and mother Galit Rutstein Elaine and Jerry Taragin, in memory of Asriel Taragin a"n

Last week's parashah ends: "When Bnei Yisrael saw Moshe's face, that the 'ohr' / skin of Moshe's face had become radiant, Moshe put the mask back on his face until he came to speak with Him." This week's parashah then opens with the laws of Shabbat. R' Shlomo Halberstam z"l (1907-2000; the Bobover Rav) explains the connection between these two sections as follows:

Following Adam's sin of eating from the Tree of Knowledge, the Torah states (Bereishit 3:21): "Hashem G-d made for Adam and his wife garments of 'ohr' / skin." Chazal say that in the Sefer Torah of the sage Rabbi Meir, this verse said -- instead of "garments of 'ohr' [with an 'ayin', meaning 'skin']" -- "garments of 'ohr' [with an 'aleph', meaning 'light']". Commentaries explain that this midrash refers to Rabbi Meir's ability to look beneath the coarse "garments" that hide the spirituality inherent in the world and to extract the "light." Thus, for example, the Gemara (Chagigah 15a) relates that Rabbi Meir continued to study Torah from the sage Elisha ben Avuyah after the latter became a heretic. The Gemara says of Rabbi Meir's relationship with his teacher: "He (Rabbi Meir) found a pomegranate - he ate the fruit and discarded the rind."

When Bnei Yisrael committed the sin of the Golden Calf, they fell from their lofty spiritual level, exactly as Adam had through his sin. All of the "light" that Bnei Yisrael forfeited thereby was given to Moshe, and it was that light that created the radiance seen on the skin of Moshe's face. However, we say in the Shabbat

morning prayers: "Moshe rejoices in the gift of his portion, that You have called him a faithful servant." The gift in which Moshe rejoices is that radiance, but like a faithful servant, Moshe shares that radiance with his people. When? On Shabbat. This is alluded to in the opening verse of our parashah: "Moshe assembled the entire `eidah' / assembly of Bnei Yisrael." The word "eidah" reminds us of the "eid" / "jewelry" of which Bnei Yisrael were stripped after the sin of the Golden Calf (see Shmot 33:6). For Shabbat, Moshe gave that "jewelry" back to the people. (Quoted in Otzrot Tzaddikei U'geonei Ha'dorot)

"He made the parochet of turquoise, purple and scarlet wool, and linen, twisted; he made it with a woven design of cherubs." (36:35)

R' Yitzchok Isaac Halevi Herzog z"l (1889-1959; Ashkenazic Chief Rabbi of Israel) wrote the following on 10 Kislev 5708 / November 23, 1947 to a synagogue designing a parochet / covering for an aron kodesh:

"If you heed my advice, you will not place a picture of any living thing in the shul, and certainly not on the aron kodesh. Your intentions - to beautify the holy sanctuary - are good. However, the designs you propose are not permitted according to some authorities, and some of our great masters of halachah, as well as masters of kabbalah (may their merit protect us), object strenuously to such designs. Our brethren the Sephardim (may G-d protect them) are very strict about this. There is another reason for their strictness, i.e., that their Moslem neighbors view such images as absolutely prohibited. Considering that the Moslem aversion to images derived from our own, it would constitute a chillul Hashem / desecration of G-d's Name to place such decorations in our houses of prayer. If you wish to include artwork in your shul, there are many other options, including plants, the Temple implements (except the cherubs), such as a menorah, musical instruments, or images from Temple-era coins.

"[That is my advice.] However, if you want to know the letter of the law, since most early authorities, and at their head, the Rambam, permit even the form of a lion - even though this is one of the four faces on the Divine Chariot - there is no halachic concern about what you proposed. This is especially true because in this part of the world, no one worships lions. Moreover, the sketch you sent me shows only the profile of a lion. Since we have seen such images in synagogues in the diaspora, even in the most halachically meticulous congregations, I cannot say it is prohibited.

"Nevertheless, the image you sent me of a lion with wings -- that I absolutely prohibit because its roots are in ancient pagan mythology. Blessed is He who uprooted paganism from these lands. G-d forbid that we should create a memory of that paganism in our shuls. Perish even the thought! If you wish to include an image of a lion to remind yourselves to be strong like lions to do the will of your Father in Heaven, make it like the sketch you sent me - in profile, and absolutely without wings. I am too busy now to clarify the law as much as I would wish. If you desire a more developed discussion of the halachah, let me know, and I will attempt to do your desire.

"May it be His Will that the One Who chooses Torah and Zion will be with you. May it be His Will that your miniature Temple [i.e., shul] will be built speedily, and we will dedicate it gloriously amidst the joy of the atchalta de'geulah / initial stages of the redemption.

"With blessings of the Torah, Zion and Yerushalayim, Your friend, who loves you immensely, Yitzchak Isaac Halevi Herzog, Chief Rabbi of Eretz Yisrael." (Pesakim U'ktavim, O.C. Vol. I, No. 23)

Shabbat "Moshe assembled the entire assembly of Bnei Yisrael and said to them: `These are the things that Hashem commanded to do them: On six days work shall be done, but the seventh day shall be holy for you, a day of complete rest for Hashem; whoever does work on it shall be put to death. You shall not kindle fire in any of your dwellings on the Sabbath day'." (From our parashah - 35:1-2) R' Yosef Eliyahu Henkin z"l (1891-1973) asks: Considering what follows, should not the Torah have said, "These are the things that Hashem commanded _not_ to do them"? Also, why does the Torah use a phrase - "On six days work shall be done" - which implies that one is _obligated_ to work? He explains: Shabbat represents two competing concepts that man is charged with balancing: bitachon / the recognition that everything that happens is in G-d's control, and hishtadlut / man's obligation to help himself. In the Aseret Ha'dibrot in Parashat Yitro (20:11) we read that Shabbat commemorates Creation. This alludes to man's obligation of hishtadlut, for we read at the end of the Creation section (Bereishit 2:3), "G-d blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because on it He abstained from all His work, which G-d had created _to do_." This verse teaches that the first Shabbat was the end of G-d's regular overt involvement with the world. From that point on, man would appear to be in charge. And, this verse conveys G-d's blessing that man will succeed when he uses G-d's creation "to do" for himself.

However, man can be led astray if he thinks that he alone is in control. Man must temper his hishtadlut with bitachon. Therefore, the Aseret Ha'dibrot in Parashat Va'etchanan (5:15) remind us that Shabbat also commemorates the Exodus. We were helpless slaves in Egypt, and only because G-d redeemed us did we become free. (This, explains R' Henkin, is why Shabbat is not one of the universal Noachide laws. Creation was an event that affected all of mankind, not only the Jews. However, without the Exodus, the message of Shabbat would be incomplete and even misleading.)

In this light, we can understand our verses. The Torah uses a phrase - "On six days work shall be done" - that implies that one is obligated to work because man is obligated to engage in some form of hishtadlut. "These are the things that Hashem commanded to do them," for if man relied on miracles alone, he would not even perform mitzvot. Instead, he would believe mistakenly that G-d's Will will be done whether he (man) lifts a finger or not.

Chazal teach that just as Shabbat is a sign of our covenant with Hashem, so are tefilin. [This is why we do not wear tefilin on Shabbat.] R' Henkin observes: The tefilin on the arm alludes to hishtadlut, for the arm is the instrument of action. The tefilin on the head alludes to bitachon, for the head is the seat of the mind, where trust in G-d develops. (Perushei Ivra, Part II, Ma'amar No. 1)

HaMaayan, Copyright © 2003 by Shlomo Katz and Torah.org. Posted by Alan Broder, ajb@torah.org. The editors hope these brief 'snippets' will engender further study and discussion of Torah topics ("lehagdil Torah u'leha'adirah"), and your letters are appreciated. Web archives are available starting with Rosh HaShanah 5758 (1997) at <http://www.torah.org/learning/hamaayan/>. Text archives from 1990 through the present are available at <http://www.acoast.com/~sehc/hamaayan/>. Donations to HaMaayan are tax-deductible. Torah.org: The Judaism Site <http://www.torah.org/> Project Genesis, Inc. learn@torah.org 122

From: Shema Yisrael Torah Network
[shemalists@shemayisrael.com] To: Peninim Parsha Subject:
PENINIM ON THE TORAH BY RABBI A. LEIB SCHEINBAUM -
Parshas Vayakhel

PARSHAS VAYAKHEL And Moshe assembled the entire assembly of Bnei Yisrael. (35:1) Rashi tells us that the word Vayakhel, "and (Moshe) [he] assembled", is written in the hifil, causative, to teach us that Moshe Rabbeinu did not gather the people directly. Rather, he caused them to gather themselves. What is Rashi teaching us? Certainly, he did not gather them by hand. The Satmar Rebbe, zl, explains that the objective of this assembly was unique in that Moshe sought to assemble only those who were Jews, not members of the eirev rav, mixed multitude, the creators of the eigel, Golden Calf. Moshe was not assembling people "by hand," for no specific purpose other than to make an assembly. No! Moshe sought to gather together the Jews of the same weltanschau'ung, perspective on life.

One can gather a group of people together for the purpose of having a group - or one can gather a group of people together in a manner that suggests that he is the one in charge of the group, such that his perspective guides the entire group. Moshe wanted the group to be as one: one G-d; one Torah; one leader - Moshe Rabbeinu. Moshe's words were the koach hame'achad, force/glue that was the mutual bond between them. Every assembly must have a goal in order for it to succeed. Their goal was realized, as they severed their relationship with the eirav rav and became one harmonious group.

Horav Yaakov Kaminetzky, zl, takes a somewhat similar approach. He explains that when the Torah was given to Klal Yisrael, the Jewish people had achieved an unprecedented level of achdus, unity. They were k'ish echad b'lev echad, "as one person with one heart". All their hearts beat as one. When the eigel was made, this unity was shattered. Indeed, the Talmud Yerushalmi, Sanhedrin 10:2 contends that each Shevet, tribe, had its own little eigel. Even then, they could not see eye to eye! Each one had his own individual perspective on how to rebel against Hashem! What a sad commentary on the Jewish People, suggesting that we have not changed much today. Every group that is not Torah-oriented has its own little eigel. Moshe Rabbeinu had to bring the people together first, under one banner with one outlook. He first had to make a vayakahel, and assemble the people together to give them one goal and one purpose. Then he could instruct them in the next step: building a Sanctuary.

But the seventh day... shall be holy for you, a day of complete rest for Hashem. (35:2)

The various commands and admonishments concerning Shabbos Kodesh are reiterated in the Torah a number of times. This clearly indicates the overriding significance of Shabbos to Klal Yisrael. In the beginning of our parsha, as Moshe Rabbeinu assembles Klal Yisrael to instruct them about the building of the Mishkan, he prefaces his talk with a reminder about Kedushas Shabbos, the sanctity of the seventh day. Chazal derive from here that the building of the Mishkan does not supercede the mitzvah of Shabbos. Interestingly, the avodas ha'korban, sacrificial service, was performed on Shabbos. The holy day was "set aside" for the holy sacrifices. Apparently, the building of the Mishkan, which was only a hechsher - preparation, - for the actual mitzvah of offering korbanos, does not override the mitzvah.

The fact that the Torah found it necessary to imply that the building of the Mishkan does not countermand Shabbos, indicates that there is a logical assumption for building the Mishkan, even on Shabbos. After all, we have a halachic axiom, Aseih docheh Lo Saaseh, "a positive commandment prevails over a negative commandment". To build the Mishkan is a positive dictate which should dominate over the negative canon of Shabbos.

The Abarbanel explains that by giving precedence to the positive/active mitzvah of building the Mishkan over the negative commandment, one might be led to believe that enterprise, positive activity, is a greater indication of one's belief in Hashem than passively withholding oneself from transgression. This is not true. While it was crucial that Klal Yisrael build the Mishkan, it did not give them license to eliminate Shabbos. While this demonstrates the significance of Shabbos, it still does not explain why the building of the Mishkan did not eclipse Shabbos.

Furthermore, why should positive activity not surpass the restraint that is part and parcel of a negative command?

Horav Moshe Reis, Shlita, suggests that a deeper aspect to Shabbos is often ignored. The Torah in Parashas Ki Sisa (31:14) sums up its characterization of Shabbos with the words, Kodesh he lechem, "For it is holy to you." To the one who views Shabbos superficially, it is nothing more than an inert mitzvah which demands of us that we desist from labor on Shabbos. This does not, however, accurately characterize Shabbos. Perhaps its body is the various constraints placed upon the Jews, but its soul is something much more profound. The essence of Shabbos is its kedushah, sanctity. Thus, the various prohibitions that are involved in the mitzvah of Shabbos reflect kedushas Shabbos, its hallowedness. This idea is reiterated in our parsha when the Torah tells us that Shabbos "shall be holy for you, a day of complete rest for Hashem." Sanctity demands the prohibition of mundane activity, because the day belongs to Hashem, Who has consecrated it. Just as there is a sanctuary which is erected in the holiest place, so too, is there a sanctuary for time. Shabbos is our sanctuary of time - the seventh day, designated by Hashem as the holiest day for Him. The kedushah of the Sanctuary obligates one to maintain a high personal level of holiness and purity. Likewise, the sanctuary of time requires one to act appropriately. Shabbos attests to the creation of the world. It is a positive reinforcement that on the Seventh Day Hashem rested from Creation. It is a mitzvah that serves as testimony to Hashem's creation of the world, and, as such, it is a sanctuary of time, which cannot be overridden by the mitzvah of building the Mishkan. The command to erect a sanctuary in space does not take precedence over the observance of the sanctuary in time.

We suggest another aspect of Shabbos that precludes it from being superceded by the building of the Mishkan. We think of Shabbos as a body of laws which prohibit various forms of labor on the seventh day. While it is true that these labors are prohibited, it is not a negative aspect of Shabbos. On the contrary, it is specifically these prohibited labors that indicate to us the actual character of the mitzvah of Shabbos. Shabbos is an experience which is spiritual in nature. It is elevated above what the human being can physically perceive and absorb. Thus, he must elevate himself above the physical dimension which holds him captive - and cling to Hashem. Shabbos is a day when the Jew transcends the physical and enters into the spiritual realm. It is regarding this concept that the Zohar HaKadosh writes that "Shabbos is the day of the neshamah, soul." One, therefore, prepares himself prior to Shabbos, divesting himself of the shackles of the physical dimension as he anticipates entering into the spiritual realm. The prohibitions of Shabbos are more than

merely a passive form of observance. They are actually a positive aspect of Shabbos, for they help divest the person of his physical encumbrances.

We now understand why one may not construct the Mishkan on Shabbos. By transgressing the "negative" commandments that enhance the Shabbos, one destroys the character of the mitzvah and undermines its spiritual aspect. Without the spiritual qualities of Shabbos, it becomes just another day of the week.

Everyone whose heart motivates him shall bring it. (35:5)
Sincerity is the key word when it comes to contributing to a Torah cause. The amount that one gives is not important. Rather, it is the manner in which one gives: with what attitude, with what sensitivity, with what feeling. Hashem does not need our contributions. What is important to Him is the contributor's inner desire to elevate and coalesce himself with the Almighty. There are people with small hearts who give big checks. The manner in which - and to whom - they give attests to this. There are also those whose checks are much less significant, but they manage to give with a big heart. They will help the "little guy" whose only recognition will be a warm smile, a bowed head and a profound "thank you." These are the "nediv lev's," who open their hearts as well as their wallets.

I recently came across a meaningful story in Rabbi Paysach Krohn's latest publication. The story is compelling, as is Rabbi Krohn's postscript - to which I would like to supplement my own personal comment as well. Reb Reuven Mendlowitz, the brother of Rabbi Shraga Feivel Mendlowitz, zl, had a grocery store in the Williamsburg section of Brooklyn. While we may call it a grocery store, some of those little stores maintained a standard of kedushah, holiness, that would parallel some yeshivos. On the day of Reb Shraga Feivel's levayah, funeral, the streets of Williamsburg were packed, as thousands of people assembled in Mesivta Torah Vodaath to pay a last tribute to the man who shaped the map of Torah in America. On his way to his brother's funeral, Reb Reuven stopped suddenly and entered a small grocery store along the way.

The people accompanying Reb Reuven were slightly taken aback at this diversion. What could be so important that would take precedence over the levayah? Out of respect for Reb Reuven's piety no one said anything. Yet, it continued to bother them. During the shivah, seven-day mourning period, one of the people summoned the courage to ask Reb Reuven what it was that was so important that day.

Reb Reuven's answer teaches us a lesson in sensitivity and charity. It seems there was a very poor man who daily came to Reb Reuven's grocery to "purchase" bread and milk for his family. Knowing that the man had no money, Reb Reuven never charged him for those necessities. To preserve his dignity, however, he would mark the amount due in a ledger - which both of them knew would probably never be cleared. It was a silent agreement between them. He gave, and he took, and that was the end of it. "During shivah my store would be closed," Reb Reuven explained, "and this man will have to go to another grocery to get his daily bread and milk. I wanted to make sure that the grocer would not charge my friend, so I went in to assure him that I would personally cover the cost." Incredible! Thoughtfulness, sensitivity and *mentlichkeit*: all embodied in one person. Rabbi Krohn adds, "If that is what the grocers of that generation were like, can we imagine what the *gedolei Yisrael*, the Torah leaders, were like?" I would like to add that whatever the grocers were, they attained such heights because they paralleled their *gedolim*. When the Torah leaders are extraordinary, the common man follows suit.

Every man and woman whose heart motivated them to bring for any of the work... Bnei Yisrael brought a free-willed offering to Hashem. (35:29)

The pasuk begins by pointing out how every man and every woman brought his/her offerings to the Mishkan. Why, then, does it seemingly reiterate its previous statement by saying, "The Bnei Yisrael brought a free-willed offering to Hashem"? Horav Mordechai Rogov, zl, explains that those who give of themselves and their possessions possess a pure and benevolent spirit of generosity which was imbued in them by those who educated them. *Chesed*, kindness, is taught. It is infused in a person by his rebbeim, teachers, who, along with the scholarly knowledge which they impart, also inculcate their students with ethics and responsibility to reach out with loving-kindness to their fellow Jew. David Hamelech says in *Sefer Tehillim* 92:14, "Those who are planted in the house of Hashem will flower in the courtyards of our G-d." It is in the yeshivos and Torah institutions which these individuals attended that they were taught the meaning of *chesed*. When a person has developed deep roots while he is still in the yeshivah, he will flourish further when he leaves for the courtyards, when he is involved in commerce in the marketplace, when he interacts in the public arena.

Likewise, as the courtyard is a prelude house, a vestibule that accesses entry into the home, these individuals view their secular/mundane endeavors as being close extensions of the *bais hamedrash*, opportunities for applying the Torah values imparted to them in the yeshivah. It is through these endeavors that their *avodas Hashem*, service to G-d, flourishes, as they contribute "back" to support the Torah institutions. Our pasuk tells us of the men and women who came forward wholeheartedly to contribute towards the building of the Mishkan. What inspired them to seize this wonderful opportunity and participate with such enthusiasm? It was that they had been raised in an environment that taught an appreciation of *chesed*, where it was common that "Bnei Yisrael brought a free-willed offering to Hashem." The ones who had previously responded to support these institutions, in which educating their charges with a sense of responsibility and generosity for the Jewish People, provided *Klal Yisrael* with men and women of benevolence, who, in turn, then devoted themselves to the construction of the Mishkan. It has to start somewhere. The Torah recognizes the source.

From: Yeshivat Har Etzion Office [office@etzion.org.il To: Yhesichot@etzion.org.il Subject: SICHOT63 -22: Parashat Vayakhel Yeshivat Har Etzion Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash (Vbm) Student Summaries Of Sichot Of The Roshei Yeshiva Please pray for a refuah sheleimah for Shlitiel Moshe HaLevi ben Penina.

The Etzion Foundation Cordially invites you to attend its ANNUAL DINNER Honoring Rabbi Scot A. Berman '77 and Esther Meiersdorf Alumnus of the Year Award Nathan '78 and Yocheved Lindenbaum Parent Recognition Award And our Alumni of the 1981 and 1982 Machzorim 8 Adar Bet 5763 Wednesday, the 12th of March, p2003 Reception 6pm, Dinner 7pm At the Grand Hyatt Hotel Park Avenue at Grand Central, New York City For reservations, call 212-732-4874

PARASHAT VAYAKHEL
SICHA OF HARAV AHARON LICHTENSTEIN SHLIT"A
Renewing the Relationship Summarized by Zev Frimer

"And Moshe gathered the whole congregation of Bnei Yisrael and he said to them: These are the things that G-d has commanded to do..." (Shemot 35:1)

The reason for this gathering is not mentioned explicitly in the text. The commentaries, however, address this question. Ibn Ezra explains:

"The reason for gathering them is that everyone would hear directly from him about the Mishkan, and would volunteer donations."

The Rashbam offers a more detailed and specific explanation, along the same lines (and the Ramban comments likewise): "And Moshe gathered" - in order to collect from each one a half-shekel per head, and also to warn them concerning the work of the Mishkan."

Common to these interpretations is the idea that the gathering focused on a future purpose and a functional objective.

We may perhaps offer a different approach: this gathering focused on the past as well, rather than solely on a future purpose.

As a result of the sin of the golden calf, there was a sharp turn in the relationship between Moshe and Bnei Yisrael. From the point of view of the nation, what they now saw before them was a leader whose character had changed. He now acted differently and was estranged from them.

Prior to the sin, they knew Moshe as a leader who was involved, with every fiber of his being, in the affairs of the nation. He had sat "to judge the nation... from the morning until the evening," with the aim of teaching them "God's statutes and His Torah" (Shemot 18) directly, with no mediation or middlemen, despite the enormous personal effort that this entailed. Following the sin of the golden calf, in contrast, Moshe distanced himself from the nation, taking the Ohel Mo'ed and pitching it "outside the camp, at a distance from the camp" (ibid. 35:7). Now "anyone who sought God" could no longer simply approach their leader, who dwelt among them. Rather, he would have to go out to the Ohel Mo'ed "that was outside the camp" and initiate by himself the process of transmission of "God's statutes and His Torah."

Likewise, following the sin, Bnei Yisrael were no longer recipients of great and joyous tidings from their leader, such as they had previously heard: "You have seen what I did to Egypt, and how I carried you on eagles' wings, and brought you to Me... You will be a treasure to Me from among all the nations... And you will be for Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." (Shemot 19:4-6)

Instead, their leader now transmitted somber messages:

"You are a stiff-necked nation; in one moment I shall come up among you and consume you... Take off your ornaments from upon you, that I may know what I shall do to you." (ibid. 33:5-6)

Indeed, this is how the situation appears to Bnei Yisrael. They do not know about Moshe, the great leader who "entreated ... before the Lord his God," who storms the heavens on behalf of the nation and demands their forgiveness, as described by Chazal: "Moshe grasped the Holy One, as it were, like a man who grabs his friend's garment, and he said: 'Master of the Universe, I will not let You go until you forgive them'... until He agreed." (Yalkut Shimoni, Shemot 32, #392)

They do not know about Moshe, who refuses the offer of, "Now leave Me, and My anger will burn against them and I will consume them, and I will make you into a great nation" (32:10), and would sooner give up his own life on behalf of the nation:

"And now, if You will forgive their sin - and if not, please erase me from Your book that You have written." (32:32)

The above description, which is familiar to us, was hidden from Bnei Yisrael at the time. They now see only the leader who brings them water and tests them like women suspected of adultery (Avoda Zara 44a). They see the leader who commands, "Let each man place his sword on his thigh; pass over backwards and forwards from entrance to entrance in the camp and let each man kill his brother, let each kill those close to him" (Shemot 32:27). Their leader appears to have severed himself from them and to have placed himself very far from the camp.

It is no wonder that Chazal (Tanchuma, Ki Tisa, 27) interpret the verse, "And they looked after Moshe until he came to the tent" (ibid. 33:8) to imply the nation's resentment and mistrust.

As a result, Moshe - the leader who was truly great and blameless - commences (at the end of parashat Ki Tisa, 34:31) a process of rehabilitation of the relationship, in an effort to bring it back to its former state: "And Moshe called to them, and Aharon and all the princes of the congregation returned to him, and Moshe spoke to them, and thereafter all of Bnei Yisrael approached..."

The beginning of parashat Vayakhel ("And Moshe gathered the whole congregation of Bnei Yisrael and he said to them...") is simply a continuation of the same process of reconciliation between the greatest of leaders and his followers.

Hence it is clear that beyond the future, functional objective of building the Mishkan, this gathering also has a central aspect of looking backwards. It is the rehabilitation of the past and the start of a new era. In the Ramban's formulation, this shows that "they returned to their former [status] and their newlywed love" in their relationship with God, and it is not difficult to imagine that the same applied to their relationship with God's faithful shepherd, Moshe. (This sicha was delivered on leil Shabbat parashat Vayakhel 5760 [2000].)

If you have any questions, please write to office@etzion.org.il
Yeshivat Har Etzion's Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash is on the world wide web at <http://www.vbm-torah.org>

http://www.torahweb.org/torah/1999/parsha/rsch_vapi.htm

TorahWeb [from several years ago]

RAV HERSCHEL SCHACHTER

MITZVOT LE-DOROT AND HORA'OT SHA'AH

In this week's Torah-portions we learn that the Jews constructed the Mishkan and prepared the bigdei kehunah. Although in both cases the Jews followed the directions they had been given, the Torah stresses at every stage in the preparation of the bigdei kehunah that the work was done "ka'asher tzivah Hashem et Moshe" -- "just as Hashem commanded Moshe" (see Ramban 37:8, 38:22). Why would the Torah stress the fact that the Jews obeyed their orders only regarding the bigdei kehunah? Why not include the phrase by the construction of the Mishkan as well? To answer this question R. Velvel Soloveichick explained that the verb "tzivah" is a halachic term; whenever it appears in the Torah it denotes the presence of a mitzvah le-dorot (an obligation that is binding throughout the generations), as opposed to a hora'at sha'ah (an obligation that was binding only for a limited time). This distinction between perpetual mitzvot and temporary obligations was noted by tana'im in the Sifra and was quoted by Rashi (Vayikra 6:1); the Rambam also adopted this as a criterion for inclusion in his Sefer ha-Mitzvot (Shores 3). For this reason the Torah only used the phrase "ka'asher tzivah Hashem et Moshe" regarding the bigdei kehunah, whose specifications would never change. It would be inappropriate for the Torah to use the term "tzivah" when referring to the details of the Mishkan, whose

boards and curtains would later be superseded by the stones of the Beit ha-Mikdash.

The distinction between mitzvot le-dorot and hora'ot sha'ah should not be limited to the realm of biblical exegesis. It is relevant today as well, particularly in the area of "ma'aseh rav" (attempting to determine current policy based on the practices and recorded opinions of our Rabbeim). Developing a p'sak requires careful analysis of a given case's details, so that the recorded p'sak of a rav may not be applicable to other cases in which the details are different. Sometimes even the actions of a rav must be considered hora'ot sha'ah, and therefore inapplicable to the world today.

The great care that must be exercised when drawing conclusions from the actions of a rav is stressed by the Talmud itself. The Talmud (Chullin 6b) relates that when Rabbi heard that R. Meir ate fruit grown in the town of Beit She'an without taking t'rumot u-ma'asrot, Rabbi followed this "ma'aseh rav" and ruled that Beit She'an should not be considered part of the Land of Israel (produce grown outside Israel does not require tithing). But he only lent such weight to R. Meir's reported actions because they were attested to by R. Yehoshua ben Zeruz, a torah scholar in his own right, and brother-in-law of R. Meir. Rabbi was sure that R. Yehoshua ben Zeruz would have understood properly what he had seen R. Meir practice, and so he relied on R. Yehoshua's reports in determining the halachah. If R. Meir's actions had been reported by a person of lesser stature, Rabbi would have had to be concerned that important details of the situation had been overlooked, or that R. Meir's actions could only be considered a hora'at sha'ah.

The distinction between mitzvot le-dorot and hora'ot sha'ah is not the only one recognized by halachah; we must also distinguish between mitzvot possessing different levels of holiness. When a yom tov falls on a Sunday, for example, we recite the blessing "ha-mavdil bein kodesh le-kodesh," to distinguish between the higher holiness of Shabbat and the lower holiness of the arriving yom tov.

In fact, there is a hierarchy of importance which encompasses all the mitzvot and distinguishes between different levels of holiness among them. Just as we must know which mitzvot were given le-dorot and which were only intended le-sha'ah, so too we must know today which mitzvot have priority over others, which are the rule and which are the exceptions to the rule.

It is clear that words and ideas take on new meanings when set forth in different arrangements. The philosopher Blaise Pascal, for example, wrote that although each of his individual ideas may have appeared in the writings of earlier philosophers, the arrangement in which he presented them created his unique philosophy (Thoughts 1:22). Similarly, although all poets use words from the dictionary, no one would argue that therefore all poems mean the same thing. The same is true of mitzvot: to interfere with the hierarchy of mitzvot is to change the mitzvot themselves, and to depart from the established values of Judaism.

From: Jeffrey Gross [jgross@torah.org] Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2003 11:54 PM To: weekly-halacha@torah.org Subject: Weekly Halacha - Parshas Vayakhel WEEKLY-HALACHA FOR 5763

By Rabbi Doniel Neustadt Rav of Young Israel in Cleveland Heights

A discussion of Halachic topics. For final rulings, consult your Rav HONORING PARENTS: WHAT IS THE LIMIT?

There are two major categories under which the halachos of conduct towards parents are subsumed: kibud, honoring them, and mora, revering them.

KIBUD AV V'EIM - HONOR OF PARENTS

Kibud is accomplished in three different ways: 1. Through the children's thoughts - children are supposed to view their parents as being honorable and respected people - even if they are not considered as such in the eyes of others. This attitudinal aspect of the mitzvah is the main part of kibud(1); 2. Through the children's actions - this includes feeding, dressing and escorting them, and generally assisting them in all of their needs as a servant would do for his master. These actions must be done b'sever panim yafos, pleasantly and enthusiastically. The manner in which one assists parents is a crucial aspect of the mitzvah(2). Even if the child is in the midst of learning Torah, he must stop to assist his parents(3). 3. Through the children's speech - e.g., when a child is honored, he should credit his parents for the honor bestowed upon him. When a child asks others to grant his request or to do him a favor, he should not request it in his own merit, but rather, in the merit of his father or mother [when applicable](4). Parents may excuse their children from the mitzvah of kibud(5). In fact, it is advisable for them to do so. A parent who constantly exacts respect from his children will surely cause his children to be punished on his account(6). Consequently, although according to the halachah(7) a child should stand up when a parent enters(8) the room(9), in practice this halachah is not widely observed. It is safe to assume that most parents excuse their children from demonstrating this honor towards them(10), and since they do, the children are not obligated(11). It is recommended, though, that children ask their parents explicitly if they excuse them from demonstrating this kibud(12). Reciting Kaddish after a parent's death falls into the category of kibud(13). Consequently, a parent may excuse his child from saying Kaddish after his passing(14).

MORA AV V'EIM - REVERENCE OF PARENTS

The second category of the halachos governing the conduct of children to parents is mora, reverence, or fear. It means that one should act towards his parents as he would towards a sovereign with the power to punish those who treat him disrespectfully(15). Specifically, this commandment prohibits a child from sitting in his parents' set places at home or in shul, interrupting them, contradicting them [in an abrupt or disrespectful manner] and calling them by their first names(16). Most poskim maintain that parents may also excuse their children from the mitzvah of mora(17). Consequently, it has become customary that children sit in their father's place in shul, since parents are not particular about this show of respect(18). Parents may not, however, allow themselves to be degraded, hit or cursed by their children. Those actions are not excusable(19). Even if a parent is, G-d forbid, insane and has embarrassed the child in public, it is nevertheless forbidden for the child to shame or degrade the parent(20). One may, however, take steps to ensure that his parents are not publicly embarrassed [e.g., one may arrange to have others bar the parents from a public gathering, etc.(21)]. When an elderly father lives with his son, the son is not required to give up his seat at the head of the table(22), although the custom in many homes is to do so(23). In any case, the son must allow his father to wash his hands first and to be served first(24), etc.

A son should preferably not daven Shemoneh Esrei within four amos [approximately eight feet] of his father(25). If her husband objects, a married woman is not required to honor her parents. She is, however, obligated to revere them and to avoid demeaning them(26).

FOOTNOTES: 1 Chayei Adam 67:3. See explanation in Sichos Mussar (5731, Ma'amar 22). 2 Y.D. 240:4. 3 Pischei Teshuvah 240:8; Harav S.Z. Auerbach (oral ruling quoted in Kibud v'Yiras Horim K'hilchasam, pg. 25). 4 Y.D. 240:5; Chayei Adam 67:5. 5 The parents may change their mind and revoke their exemption - Maharam Shick Y.D. 218. 6 Y.D. 240:19. See Alei Shur pg. 261 for elaboration. 7 This is a Biblical obligation - Rosh Kiddushin 1:57. There are various views in the poskim as to how many times per day this obligation applies - see Chayei Adam 67:7; Aruch ha-Shulchan 24; Shevet ha-Levi 1:111-4; Avnei Yashfei 1:185. 8 According to some poskim, the obligation to stand up for a parent begins when the child hears their footsteps - see Gilyon Maharsha Y.D. 240:7 and Aruch ha-Shulchan 240:24. Other poskim rule that the obligation begins only when seeing them - see Chayei Adam 67:7; Chazon Ish Y.D. 149:10. 9 Y.D. 240:7. This is an obligation of kibud - Aruch ha-Shulchan 240:24; Chazon Ish Y.D. 149:4; Geshet ha-Chayim 20:9. 10 See Sefer Chasidim 152 and 339. 11 Even when parents have exempted their children from honoring them, if the children honor them they are fulfilling a mitzvah - R' Akiva Eiger and Pischei Teshuvah Y.D. 240:16. 12 Harav Y.S. Elyashiv, quoted in Avnei Yashfei 1:185 and in Mora ha-Horim v'Kibudam pg. 49. 13 Chayei Adam 67:6. 14 Pischei Teshuvah Y.D. 344:1. 15 Rambam, Sefer ha-Mitzvos 211. 16 Y.D. 240:2. 17 Birkei Yosef 240:13. See also Igros Moshe Y.D. 1:133. 18 Aruch ha-Shulchan 240:9. 19 Teshuvos Rivash 220; Meishiv Davar 2:50. See Minchas Shelomo 32. 20 Y.D. 240:8-10. 21 Aruch ha-Shulchan 240:32. See Tzitz Eliezer 12:59. 22 Aruch ha-Shulchan 240:11. 23 She'arim ha-Metzuyanim B'halachah 143:2. Harav S.Z. Auerbach, Harav Y.S. Elyashiv and Harav C.P. Scheinberg are quoted (Mora ha-Horim v'Kibudam, pg. 19; Kibud v'Yiras Horim K'hilchasam, pg. 62) as ruling that it is proper for the son to offer his seat to his father. If the father declines, then the son may sit there. 24 Aruch ha-Shulchan 240:11; Harav Y.S. Elyashiv and Harav B.Z. Abba Shaul (oral ruling quoted in Mora ha-Horim v'Kibudam, pg. 19). 25 O.C. 90:24 and Mishnah Berurah 73, 77, 78. See Beir Halachah there. 26 Y.D. 240:17, Shach 19 and Aruch ha-Shulchan 38. See, however, Tzitz Eliezer 16:28.

Weekly-Halacha, Copyright © 2003 by Rabbi Neustadt, Dr. Jeffrey Gross and Torah.org. The author, Rabbi Neustadt, is the principal of Yavne Teachers' College in Cleveland, Ohio. He is also the Magid Shiur of a daily Mishna Berurah class at Congregation Shomre Shabbos. The Weekly-Halacha Series is distributed L'zchus Doniel Meir ben Hinda. Weekly sponsorships are available - please mail to jgross+@torah.org . Torah.org: The Judaism Site <http://www.torah.org/> Project Genesis, Inc. learn@torah.org

From: Ohr Somayach [ohr@ohr.edu] To: weekly@ohr.edu
 Subject: Torah Weekly - Parshat Vayakhel
 * TORAH WEEKLY * For the week ending 1 March 2003 / 27
 Adar I 5763 from Ohr Somayach | www.ohr.edu

If you think you're complete - you're finished. "The cherubim...their faces toward one another." (37:9)
 Do you know where the word "Cherub" comes from?
 Cherub comes from the Hebrew kruv. The kruvim were solid gold statues extruded from the cover of the Aron Hakodesh (the Holy Ark) which contained the Torah and the Tablets of the Covenant. Kruv comes from the Aramaic -k'rvava - which means "like a child." They were called kruvim because they both had the face of child.

Why?

A child is like a new immigrant. He learns with great rapidity the language of his new host country. Youth's greatest asset is the ability to change, to be flexible, to be open-minded. The essence of Torah is to remain as flexible and adaptable as we were as children.

If you ask someone to define a talmid chacham, he'll probably tell you it's someone who has a large and deep knowledge of the Torah.

True. However, literally, a talmid chacham translates as "a student of a sage."

In Judaism, the essence of being a sage is to always be a student. A talmid chacham, by definition, is someone who never stops learning, who never feels himself complete but is constantly growing in Torah, in character, and in his awareness of G-d. A person who does this makes himself a vehicle through which holiness descends to the world.

The biggest insult in the vocabulary of a great sage of the previous generation was that someone was a "fartige" - literally "a finished one."

If you think you're complete - you're really finished.

Sources: Chochma U'Mussar 190

Written and compiled by RABBI YAAKOV ASHER SINCLAIR

At Ohr Somayach/Tanenbaum College in Jerusalem, students explore their heritage under the guidance of today's top Jewish educators. For information, please write to info@ohr.edu or visit <http://www.ohr.edu>

From: Menachem Leibtag [tsc@bezeqint.net] Subject: [par-new]Parshat Vayakhel - shiur
 RABBI MENACHEM LEIBTAG
 THE TANACH STUDY CENTER [http://www.tanach.org] In
 Memory of Rabbi Abraham Leibtag
 Shiurim in Chumash & Navi by Menachem Leibtag

Parshat Vayakhel - The Mishkan: A Perpetuation of Ma'amad Har Sinai

Is parshat Vayakhel simply a repeat of parshat Teruma? Indeed, the details of the mishkan are practically identical in both parshiot - however, their manner of presentation is quite different. To explain why, this week's shiur first considers the different purpose of each Parsha. Afterward, we will attempt to tackle the more difficult question concerning the necessity of this 'repetition'.
 INTRODUCTION Before we discuss the similarities between Teruma and Vayakhel, we should note the obvious difference between these two parshiot. In parshat Teruma / Tetzaveh, the Torah records God's commandment to Moshe to build the mishkan - what we refer to as 'tzivui ha-mishkan', while parshat Vayakhel / Pekudei describes how Moshe conveys these instructions to Bnei Yisrael. Let's explain how this affects their order:

THE ORDER IN PARSHAT TERUMA As the primary focus of the tzivui ha-mishkan unit (i.e. chapters 25-29) is the function of the mishkan, this unit opens with its 'statement of purpose': "And you shall build for Me a mikdash in order that I shall dwell among you" (see 25:1-8). and closes with an almost identical statement: "And I shall dwell among Bnei Yisrael, and I will be for them a God, and they shall know..." (see 29:45-46).

In our shiur on parshat Tetzaveh, we explained how these opening and closing psukim serve as 'matching bookends' that highlight the Shchina unit. This observation explains the logic behind its order.

First and foremost, the Torah describes the aron [ark of the covenant], which will house the luchot - the symbol of brit Sinai - and hence the focal point of the mishkan. This same parsha also describes the kaporet, the protective cover of the aron, from where G-d will speak to Moshe. The next parshiot describe the various 'keilim' (vessels) that are situated in the ohel mo'ed, such as the menorah and shulchan (25:23-40). Immediately afterward, we find the description of the portable structure that will house them, i.e. the canvas for the tent ['yeriot ha-mishkan'] and its support poles ['kerashim'] etc. (see 26:1-37). The description of the ohel mo'ed [=tent of meeting] follows the laws of the keilim since this structure serves only a secondary function, i.e. a housing for those vessels. These instructions are followed by the commandment to build an altar ['mizbach ha-nechoshet'], which will be placed in front of this ohel mo'ed (see 27:1-8), and a courtyard ['chatzer'] constructed from curtains and poles that would encompass it (see 27:9-19).

This Shchina unit concludes with the laws concerning the kohanim who are to officiate in the mishkan (chapter 28), and the seven day dedication ceremony (chapter 29). In chapters 30 and 31 we find additional mitzvot relating to the mishkan, including the 'mizbach ketoret' and the 'kiyor'. At the very conclusion of the tzivui ha-mishkan we find the instruction to appoint Betzalel to build the mishkan, and the reminder not to undertake any construction on Shabbat.

The following table summarizes this order in parshat Teruma according to its most general categories:

Intro - Shchina Keilim - the vessels (chapter 25) * The aron - which will house the luchot The kaporet - from where G-d will speak to Moshe * The shulchan - on which the lechem will be placed * The menorah - which will provide light Structure - the ohel mo'ed (the tent - chapter 26) * The yeriot * The krashim * The "parochet" Chatzer - The courtyard (chapter 27) * The mizbeiach - the altar in front of the ohel mo'ed * The courtyard - "amudei ve-kelei ha-chatzer" Kohanim (chapters 28 & 29) * The bigdei kehuna * The dedication ceremony (milu'im) Misc.

Topics (chapter 30) The Builder - Betzalel (chapter 31) Shabbat (not to build the mishkan on Shabbat/ 31:11-17)

THE ORDER IN PARSHAT VAYAKHEL In contrast, the order in parshat Vayakhel is quite different, for now Moshe must explain to Bnei Yisrael how to build the mishkan. Therefore, the sequence will follow a more practical order, i.e. from the perspective of its construction. The following table summarizes this 'practical' order, as presented in parshat Vayakhel:

Shabbat * Guidelines re: when construction work is permitted (35:1-3); Teruma * The collection of the building materials (35:4-29);

The Builder * The appointment of the chief architect - Betzalel - and his fellow artisans (35:30-36:7);

Structure - the ohel mo'ed - the tent (36:8-38): * the yeriot * the kerashim * the parochet

Keilim (chapter 37) * the aron * shulchan * menorah * mizbach ktoret (from misc. above)

Chatzer (chapter 38) * the mizbeiach * the kiyor (from misc. above) * the courtyard

Kohanim (chapter 39) * their garments

Construction * assembly of the mishkan on the 1st of Nissan (40:1-33) Shchina * God's glory dwells on the mishkan (40:34-38)

Simply, review (and compare) these two tables. Doing so will help you understand how and why the order in Vayakhel / Pekudei differs from the order in Teruma / Tetzaveh. [Note as well that the mizbach ha-ktoret and the kiyor that were omitted (for thematic reasons) from the Shchina unit in Teruma / Tetzaveh are now included (for practical reasons) in parshat Vayakhel -

right where they belong! [See also TSC shiur on parshat Tetzaveh.]

WHY THE REPETITION? With this distinction in mind, let's consider now a more basic question, i.e. the very need to repeat anything! After all, the building of the mishkan was only a 'one-time' mitzva. Would it not have been sufficient for the Torah to simply tell us in one pasuk that Bnei Yisrael constructed the mishkan 'as G-d commanded Moshe on Har Sinai'? To answer this question, we return to our study of the overall theme of Sefer Shmot.

THE MISHKAN EXCLUSIVE In Sefer Shmot, from the time that Moshe ascended Har Sinai to receive the first luchot (see 24:12), the mishkan emerged as its primary focus. Even though Moshe received numerous other laws during these forty days, in chapters 25 thru 31 Sefer Shmot records only those mitzvot relating to the mishkan. Likewise, when Moshe descends from Har Sinai (after the last forty days), even though the Torah informs us that he conveyed all the mitzvot to Bnei Yisrael at that time (see 34:32), nevertheless Sefer Shmot chooses to record only Moshe's transmission of the mitzvot concerning the mishkan (i.e. chapters 35->40). All the other mitzvot appear only later, in the books of Vayikra, Bamidbar and Devarim (see Chizkuni 34:32)! So the question is not only - why the 'repeat'; but also why the exclusivity of the mishkan?

Ramban, in his explanation of the overall theme of Sefer Shmot, suggests an answer: "... Sefer Shmot discusses the exile [i.e. the slavery in Egypt]... and Bnei Yisrael's redemption from that exile... for the descent of the children of Yaakov to Egypt marked the beginning of that exile... and that exile does not end until they return to the spiritual level of their forefathers... Even though Bnei Yisrael had left Egypt [i.e. physical redemption], they are not yet considered redeemed... [However,] when they reach Har Sinai and build the mishkan, and G-d returns His Shchina to dwell among them, then they have returned to the spiritual level of their forefathers [spiritual redemption]... Therefore, Sefer Shmot concludes with the topic of the mishkan and the constant dwelling of God's Glory upon it [for this marks the completion of the Redemption process]." (see Ramban, introduction to Sefer Shmot)

According to Ramban, Sefer Shmot concludes with the story of the mishkan because its construction marks the completion of Bnei Yisrael's redemption. His explanation can help us understand the manner in which the Torah repeats the details of the mishkan in parshiot Vayakhel / Pekudei.

SPIRITUAL REHABILITATION As Ramban explained, the 'spiritual level' that Bnei Yisrael had achieved at Ma'amad Har Sinai was lost as a result of chet ha-egel. Consequently, G-d had removed His Shchina from Bnei Yisrael (see Shmot 33:1-7), effectively thwarting the redemption process that began with Yetziat Mitzrayim. Moshe Rabeinu's intervention on Bnei Yisrael's behalf (see 32:11-14) certainly saved them from immediate punishment and secured their atonement (see 32:30, 34:9). However, that prayer alone could not restore Bnei Yisrael to the spiritual level achieved at Har Sinai. The Shchina, which was to have resided in their midst, remained outside the camp (see 33:7, read carefully!). Moshe interceded once again (see 33:12-16), whereupon G-d declared his thirteen 'attributes of mercy' (33:17-34:8), thus allowing Bnei Yisrael a 'second chance'.

Nonetheless, the Shchina did not return automatically. To bring the Shchina back, it would be necessary for Bnei Yisrael to do something - they must actively and collectively involve themselves in the process of building the mishkan. In other words, Bnei Yisrael required what we might call 'spiritual rehabilitation'. Their collective participation in the construction of

the mishkan helped repair the strain in their relationship with G-d brought about by chet ha-egel. Or, using more 'kabalistic' terminology, the construction of the mishkan functioned as a 'tikkun' for chet ha-egel. A closer examination of parshiot Vayakhel / Pekudei supports this interpretation and can explain why Sefer Shmot repeats the details of the mishkan in Vayakhel / Pekudei.

TEXTUAL PARALLELS Let's take for example the Torah's use of the word 'vayakhel' at the beginning of the parsha. This immediately brings to mind the opening line of the chet ha-egel narrative: "Va-yikahel ha-am al Aharon - and the nation gathered against Aharon..." (32:1).

This new 'gathering' of the people, for the purpose of building the mishkan, serves as a tikkun for that original gathering to build the egel. As opposed to their assembly to fashion the golden calf, Bnei Yisrael now gather to build a more 'proper' symbol of God's presence. Similarly, the commandment for the people to 'donate their gold' and other belongings for this project (see 35:5) can also be understood as a tikkun for Aharon's solicitation of the people's gold for the egel (32:2-3). However, the strongest proof is the Torah's glaring repetition of the phrase: "ka'asher tziva Hashem et Moshe" ["as G-d commanded Moshe"]. This phrase not only appears in both the opening commandment (35:1 & 35:4) and the finale (39:32 & 39:43), but it is repeated like a chorus over twenty times throughout Vayakhel-Pekudei, at every key point of the construction process. [I recommend that you note this using a Tanach Koren. See 35:29; 36:1; 36:5; 39:1,5,7,21,26,29,31,32,42,43; and especially in 40:16,19,21,23,25,27,29,32, as each part of the mishkan is put into its proper place.] Clearly, the Torah's repetition of this phrase is intentional, and may very well point to the mishkan's function as a tikkun for chet ha-egel. Let's explain why: Recall from our shiur on parshat Ki Tisa that the people's initial intention at chet ha-egel was to make a physical representation of their perception of God. Despite the innocence of such aspirations per se, a man-made representation, no matter how pure its intention, may lead to idol worship (see Shmot 20:20). This does not mean, however, that G-d cannot ever be represented by a physical symbol. When G-d Himself chooses the symbol, it is not only permitted, but it becomes a mitzva. That is basically what the mishkan / mikdash is all about. [See 23:17,19; 34:24, Devarim 12:5,11 & 16:16.] The Torah therefore stresses that Bnei Yisrael have now 'learned their lesson'. They construct the mishkan precisely 'as G-d commanded Moshe,' down to the very last detail, understanding that there is no room for human innovation when choosing a symbol for His Divine Presence.

AN APPROPRIATE FINALE This concept of tikkun for chet ha-egel finds further support in the very conclusion of Sefer Shmot.

Although the aspect of Shchina (a central feature in Teruma / Tetzaveh) is mentioned nowhere throughout the detail of the mishkan's construction in Vayakhel / Pekudei, it makes a sudden reappearance at the very end of the sefer. After each component of the mishkan is put into place on the first of Nissan (see 40:1 - 33), this entire process reaches its dramatic climax: "When Moshe had finished his work, the anan (cloud) covered the ohel mo'ed and God's kavod ('glory') filled the mishkan" (40:34).

This pasuk describes the dwelling of the Shchina on the mishkan in the exact same terms used to depict the dwelling of the Shchina on Har Sinai: "When Moshe ascended the har [Mount Sinai, to receive the first luchot], the anan covered the har, and kvod Hashem (God's glory) dwelled upon Har Sinai..." (24:15- 16).

Clearly, the Torah intentionally parallels, thereby associating, the descent of the Shchina onto Har Sinai with the dwelling of the

Shchina on the mishkan. Only after Bnei Yisrael meticulously complete the construction of the mishkan - precisely 'as G-d commanded Moshe' - does the Shchina return to Bnei Yisrael and dwell therein (40:34), just as it had dwelled on Har Sinai. Thus, the end of Sefer Shmot marks the completion of the tikkun for chet ha-egel. Accordingly, as Ramban posits, the entire 'redemption process' - the theme of Sefer Shmot - has also reached its culmination. The Shchina's return to the camp also signifies Bnei Yisrael's return to the stature they had lost after the golden calf. Recall that in the aftermath of that incident: "Moshe took his tent and set it up outside the camp, far away from the camp, and called it the ohel mo'ed [tent of meeting (with God)], such that anyone who would search for G-d was required to go out to this ohel mo'ed, outside the camp" [see 33:7 and its context in 33:1-11].

This ohel mo'ed, located outside the camp, symbolized the distancing of the Shchina. Once the mishkan is built, G-d will bring His Shchina back inside the camp. [See 25:8 and 29:45.] **BACK TO BREISHIT** Thus far, we have shown that the manner by which Bnei Yisrael construct the mishkan serves as a tikkun for chet ha-egel and relates to the overall theme of Sefer Shmot.

One could suggest that the very concept of a mishkan - irrespective of its mode of construction - may constitute a more general tikkun, beyond the specific context of the golden calf. In this sense, the mishkan relates to a more general biblical theme developed in Sefer Breishit. As explained in our shiurim on Sefer Breishit, the Garden of Eden reflects the ideal spiritual environment in which Man cultivates his relationship with God. After Adam sinned and was consequently banished from the Garden, G-d placed keruvim to guard the path of return to the Tree of Life (see Breishit 3:24). It may not be coincidental that the mishkan is the only other context throughout the entire Chumash where the concept of keruvim appears. Recall how the mishkan features keruvim: 1) on the kaporet as protectors of the aron, which contains the luchot (Shmot 25:22), and 2) woven into the parochet, the curtain which guards the entrance into the kodesh ha-kodashim - the Holy of Holies (where the aron and kaporet are located).

This parallel suggests a conceptual relationship between Gan Eden and the mishkan. The symbolic function of the keruvim as guardians of the kodesh kodashim may correspond to the mishkan's function as an environment similar to Gan Eden, where man can strive to come closer to God:

1) The keruvim of the kaporet, protecting the aron, indicate that the 'Tree of Life' of Gan Eden has been replaced by the Torah, represented by the luchot inside the aron. ["Etz chayim hi la-machazikim bah" - see Mishlei 3:1-18.]

2) The keruvim woven into the parochet remind man that his entry into the kodesh kodashim, although desired, remains limited and requires spiritual readiness. [Note that keruvim are also woven into the innermost covering of the mishkan (see Shmot 26:1-2).]

In this sense, we may view the mishkan as a tikkun for Adam's sin in the Garden of Eden. Should man wish to return to the Tree of Life, he must keep God's covenant - the laws of the Torah - as symbolized by the luchot ha-eidut in the aron, protected by the keruvim. If so, then the Torah's repetition of the laws of the mishkan, as well as there exclusivity, may be alluding to one of the most important themes of Chumash - man's never ending quest to develop a relationship with his Creator.

shabbat shalom, menachem

Copyright (c) 2002 by Menachem Leibtag

<http://mail.tanach.org/mailman/listinfo/par-new>