

DIVREI TORAH FROM INTERNET
ON PARSHAS TERUMAH - 5756

B'S'D'

which is dry-steamed - but not cooked - is Hoadama(7). If, however the granola flakes adhere to one another, many Poskim rule that the proper Bracha is Mezonos, Al Hamichya(8). The Bracha Achrona for steamed grain is Borei Nefashos, although preferably(9), steamed grain should be eaten only during a meal to avoid making a Bracha which does not satisfy all opinions.

Grape Nuts - baked as heavy/dense bread that is then pulverized into cereal; Mezonos, Al Hamichya(10).

Honeycombs - made from a combination of oat and corn flour; Mezonos, Al Hamichya(11).

Kix, Trix - contain primarily corn flour plus some oat flour (and wheat starch as a binder). Contemporary authorities are in doubt as to whether the taste of the oat flour is actually distinguishable. If it is, then the Bracha is Mezonos, Al Hamichya(12). If it is not, then the correct Bracha is Shehakol, Borei Nefashos(13). See Additional Notes #1.

Oatmeal - cooked oats, Farina, cooked wheat; Mezonos, Al Hamichya.

Oatmeal Crisp - made out of oats and wheat; Mezonos, Al Hamichya.

Rice Krispies - made from rice by a process called oven puffing; Mezonos, Borei Nefashos(14). Included in this category are Cocoa Pebbles, Fruity Pebbles and Rice Chex.

Raisin Bran, Clusters - made from bran and other parts of the wheat kernel; Mezonos, Al Hamichya. The raisins do not require their own Bracha since they are secondary to the bran(15).

Sugar Crisp - made from puffed - not cooked or baked - wheat, which remains whole throughout the process(16). Most Poskim(17) rule that Hoadama is said. See Additional Notes #1. (See 'Granola' for Bracha Achrona.)

Wheat Chex, Wheaties - Mezonos, Al Hamichya.

Additional Notes Note 1. The Brachos for several of the cereals discussed (e.g. Kix, Crispix, Sugar Crisp) remain problematic. As with many Halachic issue, there are sometimes different opinions. In addition, incomplete or conflicting information is often given by manufacturers which further complicates matters. It is therefore recommended that those cereals whose Bracha Rishona or Achrona is in doubt should be eaten only during a meal, or with other cereals whose Bracha is not subject to debate. Alternatively, a competent Halachic authority should be consulted for final rulings.

Note 2: Al Hamichya is said only if one eats at least a Kzayis (1.1 fl. oz.) of grain within a time span of 3-4 minutes. Certain cereals (e.g. Honeycombs, Kix) contain only a small amount of oat flour, which makes it difficult to gauge if a Shiur was consumed. For less than a K'zayis of grain, a Borei Nefashos is said(18).

Note 3: Milk mixed with cereal does not require its own Shehakol, since most people add milk to their cereal to make it more palatable and easier to eat(19). [The small amount of milk that may remain in the bowl after the cereal has been eaten does not require a Shehakol(20).] In the atypical case where the milk is not secondary to the cereal but is consumed for its own value, it would require a Shehakol(21).

Note 4: When various cereals are eaten together in one bowl and one of the cereals requires a Mezonos, then a Mezonos, Al Hamichya should be said over the entire mixture (provided a K'zayis of grain was eaten). No further Brachos are required(22).

FOOTNOTES: 1 Kvius Seuda over Cheerios would require Hamotzi and Birchas Hamazon - Harav S.Z. Auerbach (V'sain Bracha by Harav P. Bodner pg. 527). 2 The Laws of Brachos by Harav b. Forst (pg. 364); V'sain Bracha (pg. 528). 3 Kellogg's and Post currently use this process. 4 General Mills (Country, Total) and Kemach currently use this process. If accurate information is not available, Hoadama should be said (Harav S.Y. Elyashiv quoted in V'zos Habracha pg. 255). 5 See The Laws of Brachos, pg. 386. 6 Baltimore Vaad Hakashruth - Harav M. Heinemann. 7 Harav S.Z. Auerbach (V'sain Bracha pg. 505). If the granola is cooked in water, then its Bracha is Mezonos, Al Hamichya. 8 V'zos Habracha (pg. 103) quoting Harav S.Z. Auerbach and Harav S.Y. Elyashiv. 9 Interpretation of Harav S.Z. Auerbach (quoted in Birchas Hanehenin pg. 147) of OC 208:4 and Mishna Berurah 18. 10 Research and Psak of The Laws of Brachos, pg. 386. 11 The Laws of Brachos (pg. 371); Baltimore Vaad Hakashruth. 12 The Laws of Brachos (pg. 371); Baltimore Vaad Hakashruth. 13 Research and ruling of V'sain Bracha (pg. 528). 14 As is true with all rice products - see OC 208:5 15 Biur Halacha 212:1 Harav S.Z. Auerbach, Harav S.Y. Elyashiv (V'zos Habracha pg. 94). Note, however, Igros Moshe OC 4:43 who requires a separate Bracha for bananas which are found in cereal. See also Chayei Adam 51:11. 16 Even if part of the kernel is removed during the process, still many Poskim hold that the Bracha remains Hoadama, since the wheat is not cooked but only steamed for a few seconds. See The Laws of Brachos (pg. 272). 17 Igros Moshe OC 4:44; Harav S.Z. Auerbach (V'sain Bracha pg. 527), Harav S. Y. Elyashiv (V'zos Habracha pg. 101). Igros Moshe OC 4:45 adds that Mezonos is also acceptable, but Al Hamichya may not be said. Mekor Habracha (54) ruled that the proper Bracha is Mezonos. 18 OC 208:9; Igros Moshe OC 1:71. 19 Igros Moshe OC 4:43. 20 Mishnah Berurah 168:46. 21 Igros Moshe, ibid. If

For back issues and questions E-mail me at cshulman@paulweiss.com

Some Internet Dvar Torah Lists

Jerl Lists: E-mail to: listproc@jerl.co.il In msg type: subscribe <listname> Your_Name" Some of lists: DafYomi: Weekly From Ohr Somayach; Halacha: Weekly; Parasha-Page: Parashat Shavua from Yeshivat Ohr Yerushalayim; Parasha-QA; Torah-Talk: Parasha w/ Rabbi Steinberg; Weekly: Highlights of Torah Portion ; yhe-metho by Rabbi Moshe Taragin; yhe-RKook - by Rav Hillel Rachmani; yhe-sichot - of Rav Lichtenstein and Rav Amital; yhe-parsha: by Rav Menachem Leibtag. Send command "lists" for complete lists.

Chabad E-mail to listserv@chabad.org. In subject write: subscribe me. In text write: "Subscribe <code> (e.g.: code = W-2)" Some of Codes: D-3) Rambam Daily; W-2) Likutei Sichos On Parsha; W-3) Week in Review on Weekly Portion; W-4) Once Upon A Chasid; W-7) Wellsprings - Insight into Torah Portion; G-3) Explanations on Hagadah. Send command "lists" for complete list.

Shamash: E-mail to listserv@israel.nysnet.org In message write " sub 'listname'<your name>" Bytetorah: from Zev Itzkowitz; Enayim: YU Divrei Torah; daf-hashavua: Weekly Sedra London. Send "lists" for complete list.

Project Genesis E-mail to majordomo@torah.org with "subscribe listname" in message. Lists include: Torah-Forum-digest / DvarTorah / Halacha-Yomi / Maharal / Rambam / Ramchal / RavFrant / Tefila / YomTov / Drasha. Send "lists" for complete list.

Israel News To: Listserv@vm.tau.ac.il Subject: Subscribe Listname <your name> Type "Subscribe <listname> <your name>". Lists include "Israline" and "Israel-mideast". Also Jerl (listproc@jerl.co.il) has Arutz-7 (West Bank news).

Some www sites Shamash Home pg - http://shamash.nysnet.org; Jerusalem 1 Home Page - http://www.jerl.co.il, YU - http://yu1.yu.edu; Chabad - http://www.chabad.org; YHE - http://www.etzion.org.il; Jewish Comm. Ntwk - http://www.jcn18.com; Project Genesis http://www.torah.org; Israel internet - http://www.ac.il

From: Jeffrey Gross<75310.3454@compuserve.com> **To:** CSHULMAN

Date: 2/14/96 8:56am **By** Rabbi Doniel Neustadt

Parshas Mishpatim He shall bless your bread and your water (23:25). Do not read He wil l bless, read you will bless. From here we derive that a Bracha is required before eating... (Brachos 48b)

Brachos Over Breakfast Cereals

QUESTION: What are the correct Brachos to recite over the various breakfast cereals?

DISCUSSION: Cereal manufacturers may change their ingredients and/or manufacturing processes. Manufacturing may also vary from country to country. This discussion is based on U.S. manufacturing. One should be aware of the possibility of changes that may affect the Kashruth or Bracha of a product. Following is a list of some of the popular breakfast cereals and their proper Brachos:

All Bran, Fiber One - made from the outer shell of the grain which is not considered as part of the grain. May also contain some corn flour; Shehakol, Borei Nefashos.

Alpha Bits, Captain Crunch - made from a combination of oats and corn; Mezonos, Al Hamichya.

Cheerios - made from of oat flour; Mezonos, Al Hamichya(1). Includes sugar-coated and flavored varieties.

Cocoa Puffs, Reese's Puffs - made from of corn meal (with a small amount of wheat starch as a binder); Shehakol, Borei Nefashos(2).

Corn Chex, Corn Total - made from a batter of corn flour; Shehakol, Borei Nefashos.

Corn Pops - corn kernel is still intact - it is merely formed into a new shape; Hoadama, Borei Nefashos.

Corn Flakes, Frosted Flakes - when processed by pressing pieces of cooked corn kernels into flakes, its Bracha is Hoadama, Borei Nefashos(3). When produced from corn flour, its Bracha is Shehakol, Borei Nefashos(4).

Crispix - made from equal amounts of milled rice and corn. The correct Bracha is problematic(5). Some Poskim rule that both Mezonos and Hoadama be recited(6). See Additional Notes # 1.

Granola - usually made from steamed rolled oats. The Bracha on grain

the cereal serves as a method to get a child to drink milk, then the milk requires its own Bracha (oral ruling by Harav M. Feinstein quoted in Brochos Study Guide pg. 43). 22 OC 212:1, Mishna Berurah and Biur Halacha ibid.

From: "Seth Ness <ness@aecom.yu.edu>"
To: CSHULMAN, " Yeshiva University s weekly devar
Date: 2/23/96 1:51pm
Subject: enayim l'torah -- teruma

teruma

Enayim L'Torah Parshat T'rumah
Publication of Student Organization of Yeshiva University

candle lighting: 5:21 pm
shma (morning) (Magen Avraham): 8:48 am
shma (morning) (GR"A): 9:24 am
zman tfila: 10:19 am
chatzot: 12:09 pm
mincha gedola: 12:39 pm
motzei shabbat: 6:21 pm
motzei shabbat (Rabbeinu Tam): 6:52 pm

Ad Matai Ehyeh BaChutz
by Rav Moshe Dovid Tendler

"And they will take unto me a donation" - "Open to me, my sister, my love," until when will I be without a house: "that my head fills with dew," but make for me a sanctuary, so that I won't be outside.

The Mishkan - tabernacle - was ordained by Hashem to be a physical sign of His presence - so he may dwell in our midst (VeShachanti BeTocham) actively influencing our life decisions and daily behavior. It was not the intent of Hashem in commanding His Mamlechet Kohanim VeGoy Kadosh to build the Mishkan and institute the sacrifices only to receive the homage of a grateful nation and to enthuse them with the attending pomp and ceremony.

Today, like then, the plaint of Hashem is "SheLo Eheyeh BaChutz" - "Don't leave me out; I want to dwell within you. This is where I belong." If there is any area of our lives to which Hashem is not admitted, we violate our covenant with Him. Hashem speaks to us today in the language of halacha. We must not silence the voice of halacha in any of our life pursuits - from the most vital to the least significant. Halacha is the absolute decisor of what is ethical and moral in medicine, law, business, politics, and family relations. To fail to apply the yardstick of halacha in these areas is to "push" Hashem out of our house, repeating the mistake of our ancestors; Hashem wonders Ad Matai Ethalech BeLo Bayit!

Inviting Hashem into our homes means that he is present in every room. It is not only in the kitchen that his impact is noted by kashrut and symbols on food items. He is also in the computer room asking you to evaluate what you wrote, what you read, and how you acquired your software. He is even in the gym, monitoring the

shouts from the stands, the behavior on the court, and the dress of our talmidim.

Our generation is blessed to live in an age when Torah values can be our guide. Religious freedom permits us to invite Hashem into every aspect of our lives. We must understand that our lives are enriched and ennobled when our minds and hearts become a Mishkan Hashem.

Subscriptions, Sponsorship, Comments, or Suggestions:
call - Uriel Lubetski at 212-923-9627
e-mail - lubetu@yu1.yu.edu
fax - SOY fax
mail - Enayim LaTorah
c/o Student Organization of Yeshiva
2525 Amsterdam Ave.

Seth L. Ness Ness Gadol Hayah Sham
ness@aecom.yu.edu

From: "Ohr Somayach <ohr@jer1.co.il>"
To: CSHULMAN, " " Highlights of the Torah weekly port...
Date: 2/20/96 11:03am
Subject: Torah Weekly - Terumah

* TORAH WEEKLY * Highlights of the Weekly Torah Portion with "Sing, My Soul!" thoughts on Shabbos Zemiros Parshas Terumah
For the week ending 4 Adar 5756 23 & 24 February 1996

Dedicated in Memory of Shmuel Yaakov ben Aleksander Ziskind on his third Yahrzeit, Aleph D'Rosh Chodesh Adar, by his wife, Faye Simon, and his family, Susan & Jerry Kaufman & Alice & Kalman Scheinwald.

Summary

Hashem commands Moshe to build a Mishkan (Sanctuary) and supplies him with detailed instructions. The Bnei Yisrael are asked to contribute precious metals and stones, fabrics, skins, oil and spices. In the Mishkan's outer courtyard is an Altar for the burnt offerings and a laver for washing. The Tent of Meeting is divided by a curtain into two chambers. The outer chamber is accessible only to the Kohanim, the descendants of Aaron. This contains the Table of showbreads, the Menorah, and the Golden Altar for incense. The innermost chamber, the Holy of Holies, may be entered only by the Kohen Gadol, and only once a year, on Yom Kippur. Here is the Ark that held the Ten Commandments inscribed on the two tablets of stone which Hashem gave to the Jewish nation on Mt. Sinai. All of the utensils and vessels, as well as the construction of the Mishkan, are described in extraordinary detail.

Commentaries

A SWELL PARTY

"Let them (the children of Israel) take for Me a portion." (25:1)

"What a great wedding this is! The food! The flowers! The bridesmaids' dresses! (Was that real silk?!)"

"Ah - this is nothing. You should have come to the wedding I went to last week. This guy wanted to make some impression I'll tell ya! He rented the Space Shuttle and the ceremony was performed while the bride and groom were floating in outer space wearing spacesuits!

"Wow! That must have been great."

"Yeah - it was okay, but somehow there was no atmosphere..."

All the preparations for a wedding are for one purpose only - to bring simcha to the chassan (groom) and kallah (bride). But there are those who focus on the trappings and miss the essence, those who come only to eat and drink, and ignore the essential point. Similarly this world is no more than a wedding-hall bedecked with food and flowers and streamers and musicians. All for one purpose. To bring the chassan and kallah together. That the soul of Man be wedded to the Creator. But there are those who wander through life like guests at a wedding banquet, picking up a chicken drumstick here and an egg-roll there, and completely miss the point. "Let them (the children of Israel) take for Me a portion." Let them separate themselves from what is superficial and superfluous in life and connect themselves constantly to the essence. To wed themselves constantly to the Divine Presence.

(Adapted from Degel Machane Efraim)

GIVE AND TAKE - 1

"Let them (the children of Israel) take for Me a portion." (25:1)

Giving can sometimes be taking. When a man marries a woman, he must give

her something of value. We usually use a ring for this purpose. If, however, she were to give him something, the marriage would not be valid. An exception to this rule is the case where the groom is someone of importance, who normally would not receive gifts. If his bride-to-be gave him the ring, then the marriage would be valid, because she receives the pleasure of him accepting her gift, and so it's like he was really giving and she taking.

"Let them take for Me a portion." Really, it seems that the Torah should have written here "Let them give Me a portion". However, the fact that Hashem accepts our offerings gives us more pleasure than the value of what we give to Hashem, and so it is we who are really doing the taking...

(Adapted from the Alshich in Kehillas Yitzchak)

GIVE AND TAKE - 2

"And they shall make for Me a sanctuary, and I will dwell within them." (25:8) An entity and its parts have a symbiotic relationship. They both must give and take from each other. Take the body of a man. Without limbs there can be no body. The limbs comprise the body. But when the limbs are all connected and the current of life flows within them, the body itself now takes on an existence which is greater than the sum of its parts. And then it gives back to the limbs the power of life.

It's the same way with Torah and mitzvos. The Torah is the body which comprises the limbs - the mitzvos. Without the Torah, the mitzvos have no value, no point, for we would have no idea how to do even one mitzvah without the Torah to teach us. But, on the other hand, without mitzvos, the Torah itself loses its value, for without action, the grandeur of learning loses its greatness.

"And they shall make for Me a sanctuary, and I will dwell within them." Sometimes, the Torah mentions the construction of the Mishkan before its vessels and implements, sometimes the reverse. This is to teach us that Torah and mitzvos are an indivisible team. The flow of influence is in both directions. One cannot function without the other.

(Adapted from Rabbi S. Y. Zevin, L'Torah U'LMoadim)

Haftorah: 1 Melachim 5:26-6:13

BUILT TO LAST

"This Temple that you build - if you follow My decrees, perform My statutes, and observe all My commandments." (6:12)

Just as the week's Parsha deals with the Mishkan, so the Haftorah describes the construction of the first Beis Hamikdash by Shlomo Hamelech. In this

verse Hashem says to Shlomo: Don't think that the construction of My house is by mere material means; by the lavishing of silver and gold. All these are mere illusions -- not the real Beis Hamikdash. Rather, "if you follow My decrees, and perform My statutes" -- this is how the Beis Hamikdash is really built. And since the materials of its construction are really spiritual, so too the Beis Hamikdash, even after its physical destruction, even after its material components have disintegrated, continues to exist, "I will dwell within the Bnei Yisrael, and I will not forsake my people Yisrael..."

(Kochav MiYaakov)

Sing, My Soul! Insights into the Zemiroh sung at the Shabbos table throughout the generations.

Ribbon Kol Haolamim - "Master of all the Worlds..."

(Many Jews have a custom of saying this song of praise and prayer on the Sabbath eve between Shalom Aleichem and Eishes Chayil.)

"Blessed be Your sacred and pure angels who do Your will."

Are there angels who do not do the will of Hashem and are any angels in need of our blessing?

An angel, say our Sages, is created from every mitzvah which we fulfill. Our prayer is to be worthy of fulfilling many mitzvos so that the number of angels will be blessed with increase. The intention of our words then is that there be a "blessed" increase of Hashem's "sacred and pure angels" as a result of we "who do Your will."

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair

General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Lev Seltzer

(C) 1996 Ohr Somayach International - All rights reserved.

From: "Rav Yissocher Frand <ravfrand@torah.org>"
To: CSHULMAN, "ravfrand@torah.org"
Date: 2/23/96 1:29am
Subject: Rabbi Frand on Parshas Trumah

When Not "Tocho c'Baro", Bring In More Benches

The pasuk [Shmos 25:11] in Parshas Trumah says, concerning the building of the Aron (Ark), "You shall cover it with pure gold, from the inside and from the outside shall you cover it...". We have spoken in past years of that which many commentaries on Chumash say - the Aron is symbolic of the Talmid Chochom (Torah scholar). Just like the Aron contains in it the Tablets of the Testimony, so too, the Talmid Chochom is analogous to the Aron. The Talmid Chochom also contains within himself the Tablets of Testimony.

Based on this, Rava says in Tractate Yoma [72b], "Any Talmid Chochom who is not sterling on the inside as well as on the outside (tocho c'baro), is not a Talmid Chochom". One who is two-faced and hypocritical, as scholarly as he may be, may not be given the special title and accolade -- 'Talmid Chochom'.

This statement of Rava (Kol Talmid Chochom sh'ayn tocho c'baro...) is used in a different connection elsewhere in Talmud. The Gemara in Tractate Brochos [28a] says that when Rabban Gamliel was the Rosh Yeshiva, his policy was that any Talmid Chochom who was not "tocho c'baro" could not enter the Beis HaMedrash (study hall). He did not accept just anybody into his Yeshiva. Rabban Gamliel only accepted students who were honest and sincere, through and through, without fakery and without hypocrisy.

The Gemara says that there later was a change in leadership. Rav

Elazar ben Azariah became Rosh Yeshiva and implemented a new policy -- even someone who was not "tocho c'baro" could still come into the Beis HaMedrash. Even a student who was not 100% could come into the study hall and learn Torah. Affirmative action -- anybody could come in. As a result of that, the Talmud says (using a strange expression), "many benches were added to the study hall".

I saw a beautiful insight on this unique expression from Rav Gedalya Eismann, shlit"a. Why doesn't the Gemara say simply that there were many new students? If a Yeshiva wants to advertise that for a new z'man (semester), there are many new students, would the Yeshiva say "we've added thirty beds"?

Rav Gedalya Eismann says that the Gemara is emphasizing the distinction between students who are "tocham c'baram" (identical on the inside and outside) and students who are not "tocham c'baram". When all the students who they accepted into the Yeshiva were sincere, the presence of benches in the study hall was insignificant. The students were not concerned with where they would sit, or whether they would have comfortable learning conditions. As long as there was a place to learn, that was sufficient for them.

But when Rav Elazar ben Azariah lowered the standards and accepted students who were not "tocham c'baram," there were suddenly complaints: "Where am I going to sit?" "Where am I going to sleep?" Therefore, the first thing they had to do was add benches. That is what the Gemara is trying to emphasize.

Word of G-d Comes from Between the Youth-like Cherubs

The parsha goes on to describe [25:18] that on top of the Aron rested two Keruvim (Cherubs). The Ba'al HaTurim comments on this word that it is actually spelled defective (without the pronounced vov) as if it were written Keravim. This denotes that which we learn in the Gemara (Succah 5b): They were called Keruvim because they had the face of children. "... because in Babylonia they call a child `ravva'." Thus, the Keruvim were k'ravva (like children). The Ba'al HaTurim continues by quoting the verse [Hoshea 11:1] "For Israel is like a lad, and I loved him".

Rav Simcha Zissel, the Alter from Kelm, speaking in the name of his Rebbe, Rav Yisroel Salanter, explained the Ba'al HaTurim's comment. The Ba'al HaTurim is not saying that G-d worships youth, discounting the value of a person after he has reached a certain age. The Ba'al HaTurim is saying that G-d likes the Jewish people because they have the attribute of youth. A young person is willing to learn. He is open to learning new things and does not have a "know it all already" attitude. He is open to be trained.

G-d is saying, "I love my Klal Yisroel because no matter how old they are, they have the tremendous attribute of being youthful -- because they are ready to and want to learn". They are prepared to grow and to expand.

Rav Shmuel Razovsky, z"tl, points out that the pasuk [25:22] continues "...and it is there that I will set My meetings with you and I shall speak to you from atop the Cover, from between the two Cherubim...". The only time and the only way that the Word of G-d can come to us is from between the two Cherubim. The conduit is the youth-like characters that reside atop the Aron. One can hear the Word of G-d transmitted from the Holy of Holies -- all the ingredients for teaching -- but if one is lacking that ingredient of youthful willingness to listen and to grow and to expand, then learning can not take place.

This is the symbolism of the Cherubs atop the Aron. The reason G-d loves us as a people is because we don't "know it all" but rather we possess that magnificent gift of youth that we are willing to learn and to try to grow and remain open.

Not long ago, I was in a doctor's office. On his wall he had a poem. The first lines of the poem were exactly what we are saying: Youth is not a time of life, it is a state of mind.

A person can be 25 years old and he can be "old", because he already knows it all and is not willing to continue growing intellectually. Someone like Rav Breur, on the other hand, can come to America -- a foreign country with a foreign language -- at age 60 and say, "I want to start over; I'm going to try again; I'm going to learn new things".

That is "For Israel is a lad; and I love him". That is why the Word of G-d came through the Cherubs, because as long as one thinks like a young person, one can accept and grow from the Word of G-d.

Personalities and Sources

Ba'al HaTurim -- Name of the commentary of R. Yaakov (c 1275- c 1340) son of the Rosh on Chumash. The Ba'al HaTurim is actually a brief commentary based on gematria and Masoretic interpretations and is an introduction to his longer commentary known as Peirush HaTur HaAruch.

R. Simcha Zissel of Kelm -- (1824-1898) Founder and Head of 'Talmud Torah' of Kelm, a famous Mussar Yeshiva in Lithuania.

R. Yisroel (Lipkin) Salanter -- (1809-1883), father of the Mussar (ethical behavior) Movement.

R. Shmuel Razovsky -- Rosh Yeshiva, Ponivitz Yeshiva, Israel

Rav Joseph Breur -- Born in Papa, Hungary in 1882. Son-in-law of R. Solomon Breur and grandson of S. R. Hirsch; came to U.S. in 1939 and founded K'hal Adath Jeshurun in Washington Heights, N.Y., modeled after the Frankfort Kehilla; lived well into his nineties.

Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington twerskyd@scn.org
RavFrاند, Copyright (c) 1996 by Rabbi Y. Frاند and Project Genesis, Inc.
This list is part of Project Genesis, the Jewish Learning Network.
Permission is granted to redistribute electronically or on paper, provided that this notice is included intact.

From: "Mordechai Kamenetzky <ateres@pppmail.nyser.net>"
To: CSHULMAN, " drasha@torah.org"
Date: 2/21/96 10:43am **Subject:** Drasha Terumah -- Give or Take

DRASHA PARSHAS TERUMAH GIVE OR TAKE 2/23/96
Volume 2 Issue 19

After an entire portion filled with commandments regarding man's obligation toward his fellow man, the Torah focuses on a very spiritual aspect of our existence. Hashem commands His nation to build a Tabernacle in which He would figuratively dwell. Thus the Torah begins this week's portion with a mainstay of Jewish life -- the appeal.

The Torah instructs the Jewish nation to contribute gold, silver, and an array of other materials to the great cause of erecting and furnishing a Mishkan (Tabernacle). However the appeal is worded very strangely. Hashem does not ask the people to give; he asks them to take. Exodus 25:2: "Speak to the children of Israel and let them take a portion for me." The question is obvious. Why does the Torah tell the people to take a portion when in

essence they are giving a portion? What is the message behind the semantic anomaly?

Max and Irving went fishing on an overcast afternoon. About two hours into their expedition a fierce storm developed. Their small rowboat tossed and tossed and finally flipped over into the middle of the lake. Max, a strong swimmer, called to save Irving, but to no avail. Irving did not respond to any plea and unfortunately drowned. Max swam to shore to break the terrible news to Irving's poor wife.

"What happened?" she screamed. "Tell me the whole story!"

Max recounted the entire episode in full detail.

"But what did you do to try to save my Irving?" she shrieked.

Max explained once again. "I kept screaming to your husband, 'Irving, give

me your hand -- give me your hand -- GIVE ME YOUR HAND!!' But Irving just gave me a blank stare and drifted away."

"You fool!" shouted the widow. "You said the wrong thing. You should have yelled, 'TAKE MY HAND.' Irving never gave anything to anybody!"

We often make the same mistake that Irving made. When we hear the word

"give" we recoil. In its first solicitation, the Torah is teaching us a lesson. When you give with true heart, you are not giving anything away. You are taking a share for yourself. Materialistic pleasures in which many people indulge are eventually digested and forgotten. The new cars become old ones, the glorious homes fall to disrepair, and the newest gizmos become outdated. The only items that remain are those that we give. They remain in a storehouse of merits and eventually will repay us and our descendants. The Montefiores and the Rothschilds are not forever cherished for opulence and indulgence. They are remembered for their great benevolence and charity. They not only gave for eternity. They received for eternity as well.

Good Shabbos!

(c) 1996 Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky Yeshiva of South Shore
516-328-2490 Fax 516-328-2553

This issue is dedicated in loving memory of Edith Gluck Chana bas Yitzchok Eizik O"H -- 4 Adar by the Gluck Family
FAXHOMILY IS A PROJECT OF THE HENRY & MYRTLE HIRSCH FOUNDATION

Mordechai Kamenetzky Ateres@pppmail.nyser.net

Drasha, Copyright (c) 1996 by Rabbi M. Kamenetzky and Project Genesis, Inc.

Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky is the Rosh Mesivta at Mesivta Ateres Yaakov, the High School Division of Yeshiva of South Shore.

This list is part of Project Genesis, the Jewish Learning Network. Permission is granted to redistribute electronically or on paper, provided that this notice is included intact.

From: ""Yeshivat Har Etzion" <yhe@jer1.co.il>
To: DHUEBNER, CSHULMAN, " " Chumash shiur focusing o...
Date: 2/22/96 12:21pm
Subject: PARSHAT TRUMAH

PARSHAT HASHAVUA
by Menachem Leibtag

Note: Thank you for your 'filot' this week. I am writing this shiur from the hospital in Akron, Ohio. My father's condition has improved, but he remains

in intensive care and still needs a lot of "rachmei shamayim". Please continue to add a "mi sh'berach" for Ha'rav Avraham ben Shayna Motel HaCohen. Thank you.

PARSHAT TRUMAH

This shiur is donated by hillel and rosie bick in honor of the marriage of their daughter adina miriam bick to simon rabinowitz.

The Mishkan receives a disproportionate amount of 'press coverage' in Sefer Shmot. Four and a half Parshiot explain and repeat its laws and the details of its construction. This week's shiur explains the reason for this 'favoritism' by analyzing the overall structure of the second half of Sefer Shmot.

THE CENTRALITY OF THE MISHKAN

In last week's shiur we examined the overall structure of Parshiot Yitro and Mishpatim, and showed how those chapters (19-24) form a distinct unit known as "Ma'amad Har Sinai". >From the beginning of Parshat Trumah until the end of Sefer Shmot, we discern three additional units. The following table clarifies this point.

PERAKIM TOPIC

- | PERAKIM | TOPIC |
|----------|--|
| A) 19-24 | YITRO / MISHPATIM
MA'AMAD HAR SINAI (last week's shiur)
[24:12/ Moshe ascends to receive Luchot & Mitzvot..] |
| B) 25-31 | TRUMAH / T'ZAVEH (+ first part of KiTisah)
THE COMMANDMENT to build the MISHKAN
[31:12-17 concludes with laws of Shabbat!] |
| C) 32-34 | KI-TISAH
CHET HA'EGEL & the Second Luchot
[35:1-3 Construction begins with laws of Shabbat!] |
| D) 35-40 | VA'YAKHEL / P'KUDEI
THE CONSTRUCTION of the MISHKAN
[concludes with the Shchina returning to Am Yisrael]
This table will help us appreciate the centrality of the Mishkan in the second half of Sefer Shmot. But in order to do so, we must first review the SEQUENCE of events that takeS place. |

At the conclusion of the story of Ma'amad Har Sinai (A), Moshe ascends Har Sinai for forty days to receive the "Luchot, Torah, & Mitzvah" (24:12-18). One would expect that the subsequent 'parshiot' of Mitzvot (B) would contain ALL the mitzvot that Moshe received during those forty days. Instead, the Torah records ONLY the mitzvot relating to the commandment to build the Mishkan! [The only exception being a commandment regarding Shabbat in 31:12-17 / See Further Iyun.]

The narrative of Sefer Shmot continues from (A) with the story of Chet Ha'egel (C) and concludes with Moshe ascending Har Sinai for an additional forty days to receive the Second Luchot. Immediately afterward, Moshe gathers the people together to relay to them the mitzvot he received on Har Sinai (D). Again, one would expect ALL the mitzvot conveyed at that time (35:1) to be recorded in the ensuing parshiot. Instead, excluding a few opening psukim regarding Shabbat (35:2-3), only the mitzvot regarding the construction of the Mishkan are recorded!

This 'exclusive coverage' of the Mishkan points to its

thematic importance in Sefer Shmot. Now, we must uncover its significance.

A MORE LOGICAL ORDER

Let's summarize: The narrative of "Ma'amad Har Sinai" (A) (chapter 24) continues with the story of "chet ha'egel" (C) in chapter 32, i.e. from (A) to (C)!

[I suggest reading from the end of (A) to the beginning of (C) in a continuous manner to verify this point.]

In a similar fashion, the unit that describes the commandment to build the Mishkan (B) seems to flow directly into the unit that describes its actual construction (D).

Therefore, the order A->C, B->D seems more logical. Nevertheless, the Torah prefers to weave these parshiot together, i.e. A->B->C->D. Why?

The reason, one could suggest, is that the 'parshiot' are recorded in the chronological order in which they occurred. Therefore, since Moshe receives the commandment to build the Mishkan when he ascends Har Sinai and receives the "Luchot, Torah, & Mitzvah" (24:12), the Torah records this unit (B) at the conclusion of the story of Ma'amad Har Sinai (A).

If this is so, then the Torah should have recorded ALL the mitzvot which God gave Moshe during those forty days before continuing with the "chet ha'egel" narrative. Instead ONLY the mitzvah to build the Mishkan is recorded in this location, while all the other mitzvot are not! Therefore, we must still explain why the Torah chooses to record here ONLY the mitzvot regarding the Mishkan.

THE RAMBAN'S SHITA

The Ramban, following this reasoning, explains that the commandment to build the Mishkan was actually the FIRST and PRIMARY mitzvah that God gave Moshe during the forty days on Har Sinai. The Mishkan, Ramban explains (see 25:1), serves as a vehicle to PERPETUATE the Sinai experience. Therefore, it is the first mitzvah which God gives Moshe when he ascends Har Sinai.

The Ramban's "shita" explains the numerous similarities between the Mishkan and Ma'amad Har Sinai. Although many more exist, we will note just a few examples:

1) Just as God had spoken to Bnei Yisrael at Har Sinai, so too does He continue to speak to them (via Moshe) from the "Ko'desh- haKodashim", through the 'kruvim' atop the 'Aron':

"v'no'adti lcha sham, v'dibarti itcha m'al ha'Kaporet m'bein shnei haKruvim asher al Aron Ha'Eidut, et kol asher a'tzaveh ot'cha el Bnei Yisrael" (25:22)

2) The "luchot Ha'eidut" which Moshe will receive (24:12) on Har Sinai, serve as a testimony to Matan Torah and thus, will be kept in the Aron, the focal point of the Mishkan (25:21):

"v'el ha'aron ti'tein ha'Eidut asher e'tein ay'lecha"

3) The "anan" created by the Mizbach ha'ktoret symbolizes the "anan" that covered Har Sinai (19:9, 24:15-18).

4) The "aish" on the mizbayach symbolizes the "aish" that descended on Har Sinai (24:17). The laws of the Mizbayach reflect the 'Brit' ceremony that took place at the end of Parshat Mishpatim (see 24:4-5).

RASHI'S SHITA

Despite the beauty and attraction of Ramban's shita, Rashi, together with other commentators and numerous Midrashim, claims exactly the opposite: that the Commandment to build the Mishkan was given AFTER Chet Ha'egel, i.e. the

parshiot are NOT in chronological order!

At first, this interpretation seems senseless. Why should the Torah record at this specific point in Chumash the mitzvot which he DID NOT receive at this time, while omitting all the mitzvot which He DID receive at this time!

What leads Rashi to this absurd conclusion? Once again, we see the existence of textual and thematic similarities .

Just as similarities exist between the Mishkan and "Ma'amad Har Sinai", so do very striking similarities exist between the construction of the 'egel hazahav' and the Mishkan. One example is the manner in which gold was collected from the people, melted down and formed. Because of these similarities, Rashi concludes that God's commandment to build the Mishkan must have been given AFTER, and BECAUSE OF, Chet Ha'egel!

[See Rashi on Shmot 31:18, 30:16, 29:1, & Chizkuni 31:2 - highly recommended to see inside.]

This dispute between Rashi and the Ramban seems to reflect a fundamental argument with regard to their understanding of the very nature of a Mishkan. Ramban obviously understands the entire concept of a Mishkan as "l'chatchila" [de jure], for it perpetuates Har Sinai. In contrast, Rashi's basic concept of a Mishkan is "b'di'evad" [de facto], i.e. ideally man should be able to relate to God WITHOUT any physical representation. We reach this conclusion by Rashi insisting that the commandment to build the Mishkan was given only after Chet Ha'egel. According to this approach, the Mishkan only becomes necessary as a result of Bnei Yisrael's weak spiritual character.

We will show however, that even Rashi's shita CAN AND MUST concur with the Ramban's opinion that the concept of the Mishkan is "l'chatchila".

FUNDAMENTAL OR EXEGETICAL?

The Ramban's shita explaining the Mishkan as a perpetuation of Har Sinai must be correct. Practically half of chumash - the last half of sefer Shmot, most of Vayikra, and significant sections of Sefer Bamidbar and Dvarim - deal extensively with the details of the Mishkan and Korbanot. Is it thinkable that so many Mitzvot were simply an afterthought due to Chet Ha'egel?

On the other hand, Rashi's shita seems quite logical. After all, the striking similarities between the Mishkan and Chet Ha'egel cannot be overlooked.

First we will prove that Rashi's shita does not require viewing the concept of Mishkan as b'di'evad. Then we will show how Rashi's shita actually strengthens the Ramban's explanation of the Mishkan as l'chatchila. Afterward we will explain the reason for this "machloket" based on the different exegetical approaches employed by Rashi and Ramban.

TEMPLE TERMINOLOGY

Until this point we have used the words Mishkan and Mikdash interchangeably. In their general context, they both refer to a Sanctuary dedicated to the worship of God. However, in their more specific usage, the Mishkan refers to a TEMPORARY Sanctuary (Tabernacle, a tent-like structure) whereas the Mikdash (Temple, as built by Shlomo Ha'melech) refers to a more PERMANENT structure.

We posit that all commentators must agree that a PERMANENT Sanctuary, THE symbol of Am Yisrael's relationship

with God, (call it Mishkan or Mikdash) is "I'chatchila" and a basic theme in Chumash. The dispute between Rashi and Ramban relates only to a more 'technical' issue: the need for Am Yisrael to build a TEMPORARY Sanctuary, i.e. the Mishkan, prior to their conquest of Eretz Yisrael.

EARLIER REFERENCES TO THE 'MIKDASH'

Parshat Mishpatim provides proof for this assumption: All commentators concur that Parshat Mishpatim was given BEFORE Chet Ha'egel took place. That Parsha (see 23:14-19) includes the mitzvah of aliyah l'regel :

"Shalosh p'amim b'shana yay'ra'eh kol zchur'cha et pnei ha'Adon Hashem" (23:17)

[Three times a year, you must all come and see God...]

Without a Sanctuary of some sort - this mitzvah could not be fulfilled. [See Ramban Hilchot Bet Ha'bchira I:1 !! v'duk]

The final pasuk of that 'parsha' proves that a Mikdash is necessary:

"Your first fruits, must be brought to the HOUSE OF YOUR GOD" ["Reishit Bikurei admat'cha ta'vi BEIT HASHEM ELOKECHA"]

(23:19)

"Bet Elokim" in Parshat Mishpatim must be referring to a Sanctuary! Furthermore, this concept of Beit Elokim is already mentioned by Yaakov Avinu after his dream in Bet-el:

"An Yaakov woke up (at Bet El) and said: "This must be the site of (the future) BET ELOKIM', for it is the gate to the heavens." (Br.28:17)

[See also Shirat Hayam- "MIKDASH Hashem kon'nu yodechu" (Shmot 15:17)]

Clearly then, even Rashi must agree that the need for a Mikdash has nothing to do with Chet Ha'egel. However, according to Rashi, had it not been for chet ha'egel, there would have been no need to build a temporary Mikdash (=the Mishkan) before conquering the land. Once the people sinned, they were not 'spiritually ready' to conquer the Land. It was necessary to first build a temporary Mishkan, for it would take many years until the would be worthy of building a permanent structure.

The Ramban, on the other hand, maintains that even without Chet Ha'egel there would still have been a need to build a temporary Mishkan prior to the conquest of Eretz Yisrael.

WHAT COULD HAVE BEEN

To better understand this "machloket", let us conjecture what would have happened had Bnei Yisrael not sinned at chet ha'egel. According to Shmot [23:20-33] Hashem was prepared to send a 'Malach' to help them conquer the land. The distance from Har Sinai to Kadesh Barnea was no more than an eleven-day journey (Dvarim 1:2). The first wave of conquest could have been completed in a very short time (a six-day war?). They had survived six weeks in the desert since Yetziat Mitzraim without a Mikdash -- what would be so terrible if they waited another few weeks or months until 'Har Habayit' and Yerushalayim were conquered? A proper permanent structure could have been constructed immediately, and there would have been no need for a temporary Mishkan. [Note that the Mishkan itself took six months to complete -Shmot 40:1] So it could have been according to Rashi.

Enter Chet Ha'egel: the spiritual level of Bnei Yisrael plummets and the 'shchinah' leaves the camp. No longer is there a guarantee that Hashem will help fight their battles (see Shmot 33:20-24). Bnei Yisrael are no longer spiritually ready to conquer the land. The conquest could take many years, possibly generations. Therefore, a TEMPORARY Mikdash is required to help rehabilitate Am Yisrael's spiritual character. Nevertheless, the Torah INTENTIONALLY records this 'parsha' BEFORE chet ha'egel, to emphasize the thematic connection between Har Sinai and the Mikdash, in accordance with the fundamental importance of this mitzvah.

Now, Rashi's shita seems to be the most logical. Why doesn't the Ramban accept this explanation?

"YEISH" OR "EIN"

The answer to these two questions lies in the respective exegetical approaches of these two Rishonim. Ramban's approach throughout Chumash is "YEISH mukdam u'muchar b'torah (whether or not the parshiot in the Torah are presented in chronological order)." His basic assumption is that the parshiot of the Torah are written in chronological order. The Ramban makes exceptions to this rule only on the rarest of occasions where there is no other possible explanation. In his opinion, the similarities between the Mishkan and Chet Ha'egel are not strong enough to 'override' his basic assumption that the parshiot need to be in order.

Rashi, on the other hand, maintains "EIN mukdam u'muchar b'Torah." His basic assumption is that the location of parshiot of Mitzvot throughout chumash does not necessarily reflect WHEN the Mitzvot were given; rather, they are written in thematic relation to the ongoing story. Thus, according to Rashi, even though the parshiot of the Mishkan in Trumah - Tzaveh were actually given to Moshe AFTER Chet Ha'egel during the second set of forty days, the Torah places them immediately after Ma'amad Har Sinai to emphasize that the Mikdash is a perpetuation of Sinai.

Therefore, Rashi and the Ramban are in total agreement as to the fundamental importance of the Mikdash as well as to the thematic connection between Har Sinai and the Mishkan. Their disagreement arises from a dispute in their exegetical approach, i.e. the degree to which Chet Ha'egel affected the construction of the temporary Mikdash - the Mishkan.

Iy'h, next week we will continue our discussion and show how the internal structure of Parshiot Trumah and Tzaveh supports our explanation of the fundamental importance of the Mishkan in Chumash.

shabbat shalom

menachem

FOR FURTHER IYUN:

A. Note Chazal's understanding of the intrinsic connection between M'lechet Shabbat and M'lechet HaMishkan. See Shabbat perek shvii.

1. Explain this definition of the 39 melachot of shabbat based on the table presented in the beginning of the shiur, i.e. the short mention of Shabbat immediately after the Commandment and immediately before the Mishkan's construction:
note 31:12-17 and 35:1-3

2. Relate your answer to "et shabtoteti tishmoru u'mikdashhei ti'rau"! Vyk.26:2]

From: "listserv@lubavitch.chabad.org (W-2 LIST Chabad-Lubavitch)"
To: CSHULMAN
Date: 2/20/96 10:39am
Subject: Torah Studies - Terumah

B"H

Torah Studies

Adaptation of Likutei Sichos
by Rabbi Dr. Jonathan Sacks
Chief Rabbi of Great Britain

Based on the teachings and talks of the Lubavitcher Rebbe
Rabbi Menachem M. Schneerson on the weekly Torah Portion

TERUMAH

The Jew faces a paradox when he considers himself: In the eyes of G-d all Jews are equal. They each have a soul whose source is from G-d ("And he breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man became a living soul").

But the Jew is an embodied soul and in his attributes - intelligence, temperament and strength of will - each is different.

Clearly, temperament and strength of will - each is different.

Clearly the Jew is called to exercise his individuality to the full; and yet he is supposed constantly to be animated by the life of the soul through which he comes into relation with G-d and in which he stands as no more and no less than any other Jew.

How are we to reconcile these two aspects?

Where do man's sameness and his distinctness fit into the life of Torah?

These are the questions explored below.

THE THREE KINDS OF TERUMAH

Terumah means a contribution for sacred purposes, something which the Israelites gave for the building and maintenance of the Sanctuary; and our Sidra, in detailing the plans for its construction, describes the form that these contributions should take.

There were three kinds of Terumah:

- (i) Shekalim: The annual contribution of half-a-shekel that was to pay for the sacrifices;
- (ii) The once-only payment of a half-a-shekel to provide for the sockets (Adanim) of the sanctuary;
- (iii) The provision of the materials and the coverings of the Sanctuary, which again was a once-only contribution, ceasing once it was built.

The first, in other words, was a perpetual offering, persisting all the while the Sanctuary and the Temple existed, and still commemorated today, in the donation of half of the common unit of currency, before Purim.

The second and third, however, were limited in time to the actual period of construction.

What interest, then, can they have for us today?

The answer is that the Torah is eternal, meaning that its every detail has some relevant implication for all Jews at all times. And especially so for the details of the Sanctuary, for we read of it, "And they shall make Me a Sanctuary, and I shall dwell in them," whose meaning is that G-d's presence will rest not only in the Sanctuary itself but also in the heart of each Jew. So that even if the physical

building is destroyed, a Jew can construct his own sanctuary of the soul, as an inward correlate of the once-external place.

And each detail of its construction will mirror the precise practical directives contained in this and the subsequent Sidrot.

The Foundation and the Building of the Sanctuary

The terumat ha-adanim (the offering for the sockets) was obligatory, everyone had to give an equal amount (half-a-shekel), and was for the foundation of the sanctuary.

The terumat ha-mishkan (provision of materials) was voluntary, of diverse kinds, and was for the structure itself, and its coverings.

If we are to find their analogues in the inner life of the Jew, the adanim must be the original act of kabbalat ol - the gesture of submission to G-d's will, when one foregoes one's independent existence and becomes a vehicle through which the Torah flows.

For this act is one in which all are equal - it does not depend on the particularized capacities of intellect or emotion; it is not the exercise of a power but a state of receptivity.

And it is the foundation of all true service, for without it one is always distant from G-d. If his thoughts and desires form a closed circle, there is no gap through which revelation can enter.

The Mishkan, on the other hand, is that which is built on the foundation.

It is the articulation of one's faith and its suffusion through one's mind and heart.

In this each person is different, because intellectual powers and temperament are not evenly distributed, and the extent to which one can grasp in thought, or allow their emotions to be refashioned by, the awareness of G-d which has been achieved through kabbalat ol, will depend on the persons particular capacities.

INWARD FORMS

What are the forms in which these inner activities are expressed? The adanim correspond to prayer, for prayer is the foundation and initiation of the person's daily service.

The Mishkan, however, belongs to the realm of learning and action. Through learning, the molten energies aroused in prayer are shaped into thought and action, to be finally enacted in the practical world.

Learning and action are the structure and outer covering of which prayer is the support and the animating spirit.

A PARADOX

But in both the adanim and the Mishkan we can unearth a paradox, one that finds its way correspondingly into prayer on the one hand and learning and action on the other.

The fact that the terumat ha-adanim had to be brought in equal amounts by everyone suggests at a deeper level that the inner powers which it summoned forth were equal amongst us, and this is what was suggested by relating it to kabbalat ol, the gesture of submission which each person can make in the same way.

If so, why was it that it was commanded only of men; why did it exclude women and children who were no less able to make the gesture?

Similarly why is regular prayer commanded only to men, while in prayer all are equal, for each reads the same words?

On the other hand the provision for the Mishkan could be offered by anyone, women and children included. Yet the Mishkan stands for learning and action, precisely those areas where individual differences count and where, if anywhere, we would expect to find discrimination as to who may or may not participate.

And similarly, we find that learning and action themselves are demanded of all, albeit suited to the particular individual:

Some men are required to spend more time learning, some less, according to their situation; women learn those laws which are applicable to their situation; men must perform all of the Mitzvot; while women are released from positive commands which are bound up with a specific time.

The Foundation of Prayer and Action

The answer is that kabbalat ol lies even deeper than prayer. Its place is in the simple words of recognition and thanks that every Jew must say when they wake up in the morning, the Modeh Ani ("I make acknowledgment before You, living and enduring King, who has restored to me my soul in mercy great is Your faithfulness").

We say this even before washing our hands, which is necessary before all other prayer, because it comes from so deeply-embedded a recognition that however unprepared we may be for prayer in general, we are always in a position to utter these words.

When we turn later to prayer, we are transmitting this nascent awareness into something we can understand and feel. And because our intellectual and emotional capacities are finite, we must put it into a form of words.

But because we pray in the aftermath of the act of kabbalat ol, we still stand as equals in submission, so each must use the same words. We are now using our particular powers, but in the light of the equality of souls.

So likewise does the paradox resolve itself in the case of the Mishkan, which is for us the symbol of learning and action.

In action, unlike prayer, there is no limitation of finitude: We must seek to enact G-d's will everywhere. Hence it must devolve on all. But each in his own way.

The scope of any individual's involvement in the world is bounded by his capacities and his situation. So neither the offering for the Mishkan nor the parallel acts of learning and Mitzvot, have set limits, even though they are asked of everyone.

BUILDING AN INNER SANCTUARY

So we can see that an apparent anachronism - the terumot of the adanim and the Mishkan - which has no physical application today, in fact describes the precise manner in which a person must seek to build his own sanctuary within himself, and thus create a space for G-d's presence.

First, he must lay the foundation by the act of accepting G-d's will as his own, which he does in the Modeh Ani with his first waking words;

Second, he must articulate this foundation into thought and feeling, in the fixed forms of prayer (the adanim);

Third, he must realize its implication for his actions, by learning, which is the discrimination between acts which are in accord with G-d's will and those which are not;

Lastly, he must emerge into the world of action and embody there what has been transmitted to him in the prior stages of service (Mishkan).

These are the foundations, the walls and the coverings, of his personal sanctuary, ever recreated day by day, evolving as they do from what is most universal to what is most particular in his nature; and in this way he is able to admit G-d into the very depths of his being.

(Source: Likkutei Sichot, Vol. XI pp. 109-122 (adapted))

Date: 2/21/96 12:12pm

Subject: Parshas Terumah
SELECTED HALACHOS RELATING TO PARSHAS TERUMAH
By Rabbi Doniel Neustadt

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

You shall make the planks of the Mishkan (26:15). ...They used to write on the planks to indicate their correct placement... and if one was incorrectly marked, the writing was erased so that it could be corrected (Rashi Shabbos 73:1)

Eating a Decorated Cake on Shabbos

QUESTION: On Shabbos, is it permissible to cut letters or pictures which decorate a cake ?

DISCUSSION: The biblical prohibition of erasing letters on Shabbos applied to erasing for the purpose of preparing the surface for future writing. This was the nature of the "erasing" in the Mishkan, as quoted above. The Rabbis, however extended the prohibition to include any and all erasing - regardless of the purpose of the erasure and even when the erasure served no purpose at all, as in tearing the lettering of a package(1).

The Rema (OC 240:3) quotes a view that prohibits cutting or breaking off a piece of cake on which letters - or pictures(2) - are written. The fact that the person has no intention of erasing the letters and is interested only in eating the cake makes no difference: The letters are erased in the process, so cutting or breaking off a piece of decorated cake is forbidden based on the rule of inevitable consequences (Psik Reisha). It makes no difference, according to this view, if the erasure was done prior to the eating by cutting the cake with a knife, or even if the letters were erased by biting into and chewing the cake(3). Either action is considered to be erasing and is prohibited.

Other Poskim(4) differ with the Rema. They hold that the Rabbis did not forbid cutting or breaking off a piece of cake because 1) the erasing in this case is not done for the intent of future writing; 2) the erasing is destructive; 3) the erasing is done indirectly (K'lachar Yad). According to this view, then, it would be permitted to cut a decorated cake, even before eating it, although the frosted letters would definitely be erased.

Latter-day Poskim debate what the Halacha L'masse should be. Some tend to be lenient(5), while others are stringent(6). Mishna Berurah rules that one may rely on the lenient view only when the erasing is done by biting and chewing. Cutting the cake before eating it is prohibited. However, the following exceptions are discussed by the Poskim:

It is permitted to cut between the letters even if a word is destroyed(7). It is also permitted to remove a letter along with a thin sliver of cake on which it rests(8).

It is permitted to cut letters or figures that are baked into the body of the cake itself(9). It is also permitted to cut a cake or cookie that has a meaningful shape(10), such as a ginger bread man.

It is permitted to cut letters which are made from fruit juice or from honey mixed with water. Decorations fashioned from those ingredients are not considered "permanent"(11). The sugar-based frosting commonly found on cakes today which hardens when it

From: "Jeffrey Gross <75310.3454@compuserve.com>"
To: CSHULMAN, " "Halachic Topics Related to the Weekl..."

dries, is not included in this leniency(12).

Some Poskim allow a right-handed person to cut the cake with his left hand and vice versa(13). Others do not allow this leniency(14).

If the cake was cut before Shabbos, one is permitted to separate the pieces on Shabbos(15).

A cake with lettering may be placed in front of a child even though the child may erase the lettering on the cake(16). The adult may not, however, specifically instruct the child to erase the lettering(17).

HALACHA is published L'zchus Haya'el Doniel Meir ben Hinda. Sponsored by Dr. and Mrs. E. Z. Schur honor of the "upschuren" of their triplets.

* Distributed by: The Harbotzas Torah Division of Congregation Shomre Shabbos 1801 South Taylor Road Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118 HaRav Yisroel Grumer, Morah D'Asra

FOOTNOTES:

- 1 See Mishnah Berura 340:41 and Shaar Hatzion 76.
- 2 Mishnah Berurah 340:16.
- 3 Taz 340:2; Chazon Ish OC 61:1.
- 4 Dagul Mervava OC 340 quoted in Shaarei Teshuva 340:5
- 5 Aruch Hashulchan 240:23, who holds that the entire prohibition is limited to letters that are formed from ink or paint. He nevertheless advises to let a child cut the cake. See footnote 16.
- 6 S.A. Harav (343:10) and Chazon Ish OC 61:1 who prohibit erasing letters even by biting and chewing.
- 7 Harav S.Z. Auerbach (Shmiras Shabbos Khilchasa 9: fn. 48).
- 8 See "The Shabbos Home" page 50.
- 9 Mishnah Berurah 240:15. Shu"t Har Tzvi OC 214. In other places, however, the Mishna Berurah seems to contradict himself and prohibits this, see 475:47 and 500:17. Harav S.Z. Auerbach (Shmiras Shabbos Khilchasa 11: fn. 31) attempts to resolve this contradiction. See also Chazon Ish OC 61 who questions this leniency.
- 10 See footnote 8. In this case, however, even Chazon Ish seems to be lenient.
- 11 Mishnah Berura 240:15. Chazon Ish questions this leniency.
- 12 Tifers Yisrael (Kalkes Shabbos - erasing); Ktzos Hashulchan (144:3); Shu"t Be'er Moshe 6:94.
- 13 Eliyahu Rabba 240:11.
- 14 Avnei Nezer 209. Mishnah Berura, too, does not quote this option.
- 15 Harav S.Z. Auerbach (Shmiras Shabbos K'hilchasa 11 fn. 30).
- 16 Mishnah Berura 240:14. See explanation in S.A. Harav 340:4 and 343:10. See also Chanoch L'naar 17:4-5.
- 17 S.A. Harav 343:10.

From: "Mordecai Kornfeld <kornfeld@jer1.co.il>"
To: CSHULMAN, " Torah insight by Mordecai Kornfeld <p...
Date: 2/22/96 1:42pm
Subject: Parashat Terumah 5756 - "Gateways to wisdom"
The Weekly Internet
P * A * R * A * S * H * A - P * A * G * E
--- ---
by Mordecai Kornfeld
kornfeld@jer1.co.il

=====

This week's issue has been dedicated by Hillel Kagan, in memory of his grandmother, Yachana bat Avigdor Z"L. Hillel and I also extend special

Mazel Tov wishes to Abie Gutnicki, on the occasion of his "aufruf" and upcoming marriage to Ronit Magence, of Chicago!

Parashat Terumah 5756

GATEWAYS TO WISDOM

In Parashat Terumah, Hashem relates to Moshe the exact measurements of the various components of the Mishkan [= Tabernacle]. Moshe learns the length, width and height of each article that is involved in the Mishkan. Similarly, we find that when the Beit Hamikdash [=Holy Temple] was to be built, King David passed down to his son, Shlomo, a scroll containing the dimensions of the Beit Hamikdash and all of its contents (Divrei Hayamim I 28:19). According to our Sages (Succot 41b), this scroll did not contain King David's own architectural recommendations. Rather, the measurements dictated were passed down to David by the prophets Shmuel, Gad and Natan. Hashem taught these prophets the measurements of the Temple by means of Divine Inspiration. King Shlomo eventually built the Beit Hamikdash based on these divinely prescribed measurements.

Undoubtedly, these divine measurements were not chosen randomly. Every measurement certainly represents an important teaching about Torah, the world, or the fear of G-d. Happy is the person to whom Hashem reveals the secrets of His Temple. For the average reader, though, it must suffice to simply take them as measurements. I would like to present here an interesting insight into a few of these measurements as noted by a commentator some three-hundred years ago. His intriguing suggestion at the same time provides us with a beautifully original interpretation of a Gemara [= Talmudic passage] in Eruvin.

II

"The hearts of the earlier Sages were as broad as the gateway to the Ulam [= the entrance hall to the Beit Hamikdash]. The hearts of the later Sages were as broad as the gateway to the Hechal [= the main sanctuary of the Temple]. And our hearts are no broader than the opening of a seamstress's needle."

(Eruvin 53a)

The Gemara, describing the "generation gap" between the earlier Sages and the later ones, compares the successive generations to the doorway of the Ulam and the doorway of the Hechal, respectively. The ground floor of the Beit Hamikdash structure was divided into three halls. Upon entering the 100 x 100 x 100 cubit edifice, one would first encounter the Ulam, or entrance hall. The doorway that opened to this Ulam was an impressive 20 x 40 cubits. (Each cubit, or "Amah," is one arm's length -- measured from the elbow to the fingertip -- or about 1.75 feet.) The next section was the outer sanctuary, or the Hechal, which contained the Golden Candelabra, the Table of the Showbread, and the Incense Altar. The doorway that opened to it was only 10 x 20 cubits. The third section, hidden behind a thick curtain, was the inner sanctuary, or the Holy of Holies, which housed the Holy Ark. The Gemara tells us that the greater intellectual capacities of the earlier Sages in relation to the weaker minds and hearts of the later ones, could be compared to the relationship between the 20 x 40 entranceway to the Ulam and the 10 x 20 entranceway to the Hechal. Why does the Gemara choose the comparison of these two doorways in order to accent the difference between the Torah understanding of the earlier and later sages? One commentary suggests the following interpretation. The Gemara in Eruvin (21a) purports that the "length and breadth" of the Torah (the Written Law and Oral Laws combined) can be measured in cubits. (Rashi explains that these cubits are not the standard human arm's length cubits. Rather, these cubits are measured in mysterious "divine," metaphorical arm's lengths.) Based on descriptions of a length of

parchment, representing the Torah, that is seen by the prophets Zechariah and Yechezkel in a vision, the Gemara contends that the Torah is 10 x 20 cubits. Since Zechariah informs us that the parchment was doubled over on itself, the Gemara infers that unfolded, it would measure 20 x 20 cubits. Yechezkel adds that the parchment was covered with writing on both sides. The Gemara infers from this that, were all the written area of the parchment to be put side by side (the outer, visible, text and the text that was doubled over; the front of each page and its back), the entire area covered by the parchment would be equivalent to an area of 20 x 40 cubits. This, then, is the full length and breadth of the Torah.

The Maharsha (Eruvin 21a) teaches why the parchment was seen to be doubled over and had writing on both sides. All of the Torah that we learn can be extracted from the Written Law through four distinct approaches to the verses of the Torah: "Peshat," "Remez," "Drush," and "Sod" (hinted at by the acronym "PaRDeS," see Chaggigah 14b). Peshat means understanding the simple meaning of the verses of the written Torah. Drush is the exegetical methodology for extracting the Oral Law from the Written Law. These two, says the Maharsha, are suggested by the doubled up parchment. The side of the parchment that could be seen on top represents the Peshat, the most obvious and clearest meaning of the verses. By unfolding the parchment, one uncovers Drush, or the exegetical derivations of the Torah. This deeper meaning of the verses of the Written Law is not quite as apparent as the Peshat. It can only be found by peering "under" the Peshat.

The other two facets of the Torah were written on the back of the parchment and not on its face. This denotes the fact that they are harder to grasp and that they require a greater effort to find them. It is through Remez and Sod that the hidden teachings of the Torah are learned. Remez refers to a metaphorical or a deep, philosophical approach to the Torah. Sod refers to the Kabbalistic meaning of the verses. These two approaches to the Torah complete the four "faces" of Torah which were represented in the parchment of Zechariah's vision.

III

This Gemara may perhaps be used to uncover a deeper meaning in the wording of our previous passage. We learned that the hearts of the earlier Sages were compared to the gateway to the Ulam -- the entrance hall of the Beit Hamikdash -- whereas the hearts of the later Sages were likened to the gateway to the Hechal. The gateway to the Ulam was 20 x 40 cubits. This is exactly equal to the combined length and breadth of all four parts of the Torah, as represented by Zechariah's parchment. This is meant to infer that the hearts of the earlier Sages were so broad, they were able to grasp all the different aspects of the Torah fully. (As the Gemara continues, the "early Sage" in question was none other than Rabbi Akiva, the greatest of the Sages of the Mishnah.)

By contrast, the hearts of the later Sages are compared to the smaller gateway to the Hechal, which was only 10 x 20 cubits. This is meant to hint that they fully mastered only one of the four aspects of the Torah -- Peshat, or the simple meaning of the text of the Written Law. They did not grasp the rest of the Torah as fully as the earlier Sages, who were able to comprehend all four facets of the Torah. Their hearts are compared to the gateway to the Hechal, which was 10 x 20 cubits, or the exact dimensions of the top layer of the folded parchment that Zechariah saw. Our hearts, however, are no wider than the eye of a needle. We don't even fully grasp the Peshat, or simple meaning of the verses!

(This interpretation is presented by the Maharsha's son-in-law in "Mahadura Batra" -- Eruvin 21a and 53a. The same thought can be found, quoted from an unstated source, in the introductions to "Kohellet Yitzchak" and "Margoliot Hatorah.")

IV

According to what we have learned, the dimensions of the Temple

gateways represent the "dimensions" of the various parts of the Torah. The innermost gateway (the entrance to the Hechal) represented the size of the simple, Written Law. The outer gateway (the entrance to the Ulam) represented the size of all of the teachings of the Torah in their entirety. Perhaps we can understand the relationship between these two gateways in a manner similar to the Gemara's understanding of the Temple's unique windows.

The verse describes the Temple's windows as being "Shekufim Atumim" (I Kings 6:4). The Gemara (Menachot 86b, see also Vayikra Rabba 15:1) explains this to mean that these windows were built in a manner contrary to the accepted method of construction. Normally, windows are wider on the inside than on the outside, in order to let the light that enters them spread through the building. The Temple windows, however, were wider on the outside than on the inside. The reason for this, the Gemara explains, was in order to demonstrate that the Temple did not need light from the outside. It was from the *Temple* that "light" spread to the entire world -- the light of the Torah and the fear of G-d.

We may suggest a similar interpretation for the sizes of the two Temple gateways. The light of Torah-understanding can be said to have emanated from within the Temple. Its source was the Holy Ark that held Moses' two stone tablets, which rested in the Holy of Holies. The inner gateway of the Temple was narrower than the outer one, to symbolize that the light of Torah emanated from within the Temple. The gateway to the Hechal, which was 10 x 20 cubits, was built to the proportions of the Peshat, the openly visible part of the Law, as we have seen above (section III). The gateway to the Ulam, which was the outer gateway of the Temple, was 20 by 40 cubits, or the dimensions of the *entire* Torah according to Zechariah's vision. This symbolized that the four approaches to the Torah, all of which emanated from the Temple building, started with a firm understanding of the Peshat. This understanding could then be expanded to include all the other teachings of the Torah as well!

As we have seen, all the proportions of the Beit Hamikdash hint at deep secrets of Judaism, involving the Torah and the fear of G-d. The Maharsha's son-in-law adds that perhaps this is why the Torah was presented to Zechariah as a parchment of specific proportions. Where do we find that the entire collected teachings of the Torah were ever written on a parchment? And how can the Torah can be represented by a parchment of finite dimensions?

Perhaps this parchment was none other than the scroll that King David gave to his son Shlomo which described the dimensions of the various parts of the Temple. This is the parchment which represented the full extent of the Torah that Zechariah was shown! Through elaborating on the connotations of the various measurements in the Temple plans, one could infer every teaching that could possibly be inferred from the Written Torah through the various traditional approaches!

From: ""Yeshivat Har Etzion" <yhe@jer1.co.il>"
To: CSHULMAN, NDIAMENT, " " Yeshivat Har Etzion Virt...
Date: 2/20/96 10:23am
Subject: Sichat Rosh Chodesh
The real-live staff of the VIRTUAL BEIT MIDRASH invites all our students to join us in a virtual "kiddush" in honor of the victory of human intelligence over the machine and salutes Gary Kasparov's achievement.

"Mi-shenikhnas Adar marbim be-simcha"
"When the month of Adar arrives, we increase celebration"

Ezra Bick

This may be stretching the VBM's mandate a little bit, but precisely because we have entrusted our Torah to a computer network, we are especially pleased that once again it has been shown that the 'net' isn't going to replace the mind. So - after getting VBM Torah on your computer, I hope you are depositing it in your brain and not leaving it on a computer chip.

It isn't only the question of where the memory resides - in silicon or neurons. Silicon might well be better for that purpose. But the real purpose of the VBM isn't to give you a ready source of information; it is to provide an experience of learning, of analysis, of intellectual creativity that the Rambam defines as the "image of God."

Sometimes, watching my computer spill out kilobytes of Torah content, I cannot help but wonder if it is still Torah. Will the seductive tendency to rely on my hard-disk not vitiate the creative soul, the living essence of the Torah experience? Chess may be something else - but it is good to see the creative soul make the ultimate difference in a computer program.

What does this have to do with the month of Adar? Purim has been interpreted by our commentators as the celebration of Torah she-ba'al peh - the oral Torah. Not mandated by the Written law, it was instituted by the Sages, with prophetic sanction. But more profoundly, it celebrates the human effort in religious life. The Talmud (Shabbat 88a) contrasts the passivity of the Jews at the giving of the Torah, when they were overwhelmed by God's commanding presence, and the active discovery of God's providence at the time of Purim. God is not mentioned in the megilla. The miracle is disguised as a court intrigue. Mordechai and Esther have to devise a plan and carry it through alone - as Esther says, "If I am lost, I am lost." Nonetheless, "the Jews affirmed and accepted that which they had begun to do." The Sages state, "they affirmed that which they had already received" - they discovered that here too the hand of God was active and they accepted willingly the Torah as a way of life. The name Esther means "hidden." God's hand was hidden. The holiday exists because human intelligence could discover it within the folds of history and uncover it from within the cloak of darkness.

This is the message and meaning of Torah she-ba'al peh. Your mind, analyzing, trying to comprehend, to develop, discovers the divine meaning within the words. My master, Rav Yosef Dov Soloveitchik, would say that the human soul is the parchment of Torah she-ba'al peh, as the skin of a cow is the parchment of Torah she-bikhtav. Not paper, surely not a hard-disk - Torah she-ba'al peh cannot be written down in that fashion. It can only exist properly, as a living truth, when it has been wedded to a searching, active mind-questioning, analyzing, probing, and enlivening.

So, as you savor the virtual schnapps in my virtual cup, turn to your chavruta, turn to yourself, where the Torah resides and renew your commitment to learning - not to reading, definitely not to computer storage - but to "lernen," to struggling to understand, to questioning and answering, to joining 1000 generations of Torah creativity.

And enjoy Purim this year....
Be-birkat ha-Torah mi-Tzion

From: "Bircas Hatorah <bircas@jer1.co.il>"
To: CSHULMAN, " " Weekly Words of Torah from Bircas H...
Date: 2/22/96 1:16pm

Trumah

Selected, translated and arranged by Rabbi Dov Rabinowitz
"And into the Aron you shall put the testimony which I shall give you"
(25,21)

The Meshech Chochma observes that all the vessels (which are described in our parsha) were found in the Second Beis HaMikdash, except for the Aron. (Compare with Rash"i - 25,9 - that if one of the vessels would be lost, it must be replaced with one of the same form, and similarly with regard to the vessels of the future Beis HaMikdash. DR).

The reason that there was no Aron in the Second Beis HaMikdash was that the Luchos (Tablets of the Ten Statements) had been hidden away, and without the Luchos, there can be no Aron.

This is derived from the principle that whenever there is a repetition of a posuk pertaining to anything sanctified for the Beis HaMikdash, this repetition indicates that it is essential and obligatory. Thus our posuk is repeated (25,16 and 25,21) to inform us that until the Luchos are placed in it, the Aron does not fulfill its purpose. The Luchos are essential for the Aron. Thus in the Second Beis HaMikdash, since there were no Luchos, there was no Aron.

And this is in agreement with what the Ramba"n writes (in the Sefer HaMitzvos - positive mitzvah 33) that if the Aron were to be destroyed it would be obligatory to build a new one. Since, provided that we have the Luchos, the Aron is a positive mitzvah for all generations.

Rash"i (25,40) tells us that Moshe Rabeinu had difficulty comprehending the form of the Menorah so HaShem showed him replica of fire. But this was insufficient, so HaShem told him to cast the measure of gold into the fire, and the Menorah was made by itself - Rash"i (25,31).

The Sfas Emes asks in this case, why did HaShem have to display the replica of fire?

He answers that this comes to teach us that through a person's true desire, with all his heart and his soul, everything is completed. What he can not do, is done by itself. The Menorah serves as a paradigm for every mitzvah of every Jew.

For clearly no human has the ability to fulfill HaShem's desire. But to the degree that the person yearns (to fulfill HaShem's mitzvah), so it is completed "by itself". But the desire of the person also contributes to this completion.

Thus HaShem showed him the replica of fire, so that he would know what HaShem desired. And through his longing to do what HaShem wanted, although it was beyond human capability, the Menorah was made by itself.

From: "Yosef Goldstein <JOE-G@VM.VIPS.COM>"
To: CSHULMAN, " Dvar Torah <dvar Torah@torah.org>"
Date: 2/22/96 6:02am

Subject: Parshas Terumah

This Dvar Torah is dedicated to the memory of my grandmother Chaya Malka Bas Reb Yaakov Yitzchok, whose Yartzit is 2 Adar

"And G-d Spoke to Moses saying: Speak to the Israelites and have them bring me an offering. (Parshas Terumah 25:1,2)

The Medrash Tanchuma says: "And have them bring me an offering". That is what the Posuk (Passage) says: "I love you says G-d..... and I love Yaakov, (However) I hate Aisov...." (Malachi 1:2,3)

Turnus Rufus (A Roman nobleman) once asked Rabbi Akiva; "Why does your G-D hate us, as the Posuk (Passage) says, "And I hate Aisov"?"

Rabbi Akiva asked him to allow him time to answer him until the next day. In the morning Turnus Rufus snidely asked Rabbi Akiva, "What did you dream about and what did you see?" (A sarcastic remark meaning, did you dream up an answer to my question yet?) Rabbi Akiva told him he dreamed he had two dogs, one was names Rufus and the other was called Rufina. Turnus Rufus became incensed and yelled "You called your two dogs by my name and the name of my wife? You are certainly deserving to die for such insolence!" Rabbi Akiva replied; "What difference is there between you and them? You eat and drink and they eat and drink. You procreate and they procreate. You will die and they will die! Do you want to kill me just because I called them by your name! Just imagine G-d's anger with you. G-d has created the heavens and the earth and you take a stick or a stone and you call it "God" Isn't it a valid reason for him to hate you? That is why the Posuk (passage) says And Aisov I hate."

As with any Medrash we must understand what the Posuk (Passage) in Malachi has to do with our Parsha. What does the love for Yaakov versus the hate for Aisov have do with Parshas Terumah and the taking of money, jewelry etc for the building of the Mishkon/Tabernacle?

Rabbi Yehuda Aszoud (He was a Rabbi in Seredhell, Hungary, in the 1800's) explains this Medrash by quoting another Medrash that explains the Posuk (Passage) in Malachi. The Medrash says: "I Love Yaakov and I hate Aisov" Aisov said to G-d Why do you love Yaakov? He married two sisters? (Rachel and Leah were sisters and they were both married to Yaakov at the same time. This is considered a forbidden relationship) Aisov continues by saying "Do you want to say *I* am at fault? Then why do you protect him under the shade of your Succah?"

This set of questions posed by Aisov to G-D need explaining. What does Yaakov's seemingly illegal marriage have to do with anything? What did Aisov mean "Am I at fault?" and to what is he referring when he says to G-d "why protect him under the shade of your Succah". Finally what "Succah" is Aisov referring to?

There are two kinds of love, explains Reb Yehuda. One is when a person loves another for no reason other than an intrinsic love. There is no objective reason for it. He just loves him. The other kind is when a person loves someone because of some other situation. For example, when everybody else in a community lacks in Middos, good character. However one person, although not of sterling character himself is so much better than anyone else that he is befriended by a good person. However, If the former were to get worse than that, the relationship would end. This person is not loved for who he is, rather he is loved because of the comparison to everyone else around him.

The love G-d has for Yaakov is baseless, not relative. G-d just loves Yaakov and the Jews for WHO they are, *not* for WHAT they do. This is in contrast to the hate G-d has for Aisov. The explanation for this could be, G-d saw our forefathers and saw the purity of their devotion for him and to what extent they were committed to serving him. Because of the commitment shown by Avrohom, G-d made a BRIS, a "treaty" with him choosing his children as his own chosen people for eternity. This commitment was continued by Yitzchok and G-d renewed his Bris with him. Again Yaakov demonstrated his continued commitment and because of that

G-d extended the Bris of Avrohom and Yitzchok to Yaakov's family ONLY. By the power of three generations of commitment to G-d, our national character has been formed into one that is committed to serve G-d. Even when the Jews veer away from the "straight and Narrow" path it is just an aberrance, it is NOT a character fault in the Jewish character. By virtue of the Middos, the character instilled in us by our forefathers, we are good.

Aisov on the other hand had rejected the good character displayed by his parents. He abandoned the ways of his fathers and he began his OWN path and national character. That character however is one that is not intrinsically good. The "personality" of a nation as is ingrained in it by it's forefathers is also demonstrated by the different mitzvos that G-d offered Aisov, Yishmoel and Moav, and their subsequent refusal of Torah. When offering the Torah to the Jews G-d offered it to the other nations. The Medrash specifically tells us about the offer to nations of Aisov, Yishmoel and Moav. G-d asked Aisov, "Will you accept the Torah?" Aisov asked, "What does it say?" "You shall not Murder" G-d answered. Aisov said "our entire existence is based on killing" The same dialogue went on with Yishmoel, The difference being G-d Told he "You shall not steal" and to Moav "You shall not commit adultery". Their answer was the same, "We cannot accept that it goes against our very being" (Moav was born from an incestuous relationship. The angel informed Hagar about Yishmoel's future "On the face of his brothers will he dwell"). What stopped the nations from accepting the Torah was: accepting the Torah would mean a commitment to change it's personality to keep G-d's bidding. Each nation refused. The Jews, on the other hand were willing to accept ANYTHING G-d requested from them.

Getting back to the explanation of the Medrash. The love for Yaakov is baseless, That is proven by the hatred that G-d has for Aisov. Why does G-d hate Aisov? That is very clear from the story of Rabbi Akiva and Turnus Rufus, we quoted earlier, because Aisov and his children are Idol worshippers. They deny G-d's existence and his authority over everything. However, even though the Jews also had worshipped idols, as they did by the sin of the Golden Calf, G-d STILL loves them and he forgives their transgressions. (Because as we explained earlier the idol worship was just an aberration. *not* a national character) This we see from the Medrash Tanchuma later in the Parsha that says "Have them bring an offering of *gold* for me to cause forgiveness for the gold they gave towards creating the golden calf." We see G-d gave the Jews a way to attain forgiveness for idol Worship. Historically, during the times of the first Bais Hamikdosh (Holy Temple), the Jews did sin by worshipping idols. However, G-d did not destroy the Jews, he took out his wrath upon the wood and stones of the Bais Hamikdosh, The Holy Temple. That is why the Mishkon/Bais Hamikdosh (The Holy Temple) is called the Mishkon because it was taken for the debt of the Jews. (NOTE: A MASHKON is a item taken to guarantee repayment of a loan. The letters for Mishkon and Mashkon are the same)

That is what Aisov was complaining to G-d about. Why do you love Yaakov in spite of his transgressions in marrying two sisters? Is it a love ONLY in comparison to me, (Hence the words, "am I the cause?") that you love him? However, it is not an intrinsic love? If that is the case then why protect him in the shadow of your Succah, i.e. Why do you grant them forgiveness for the sins of Idol Worship by giving them the protection of the Bais Hamikdosh, the Holy Temple? Therefore it MUST be that the love that G-d has for the Jews is an intrinsic love. This love is not based on WHAT we do, rather on WHO we are.

Now we can understand the connection between the Posuk (Passage) of: "And have them bring me an offering" and the Posuk (passage) where G-d Contrasts his love for the Jews versus his hate for Aisov. His Love for

the Jews is measured by G-d's desire to forgive the Jews for the sin of Idol worship by building the Mishkon.

May we all merit to see the rebuilding of the Bais Hamikdash soon.
A Guten Shabbos Yosef

DvarTorah, Copyright (c) 1996 Project Genesis, Inc.

This list is part of Project Genesis, the Jewish Learning Network.
Permission is granted to redistribute electronically or on paper, provided that this notice is included intact.

For information on subscriptions, archives, and other Project Genesis

From: "kollel@mcs.com"

To: CSHULMAN, " haftorah@torah.org"

Date: 2/22/96 4:03pm

Subject: t'rumah

MESSAGE FROM HAFTORAH PARSHAS TERUMAH KINGS II, 5:26

This week's haftorah teaches us the proper perspective about the security of the Bais Hamikdash and of our synagogue, our miniature Bais Hamikdash. We read that Shlomo Hamelech built a magnificent edifice to serve as the Bais Hamikdash. Every stone used in the exterior walls was hewed from the quarry in perfect size and shape and did not require any cutting or planing. Numerous chambers and annexes were built around the basic walls and winding staircases were included. Shlomo even panelled the entire structure with impressive cedar wood. After completing the exterior of the Bais Hamikdash, Shlomo received words of prophecy from Hashem. The Scriptures say, "Regarding the house which you are building, if you follow My statutes and fulfill My laws and guard all of My mitzvos to walk in their direction... I will then dwell amongst the Jewish people and I will not forsake My Jewish nation." Hashem warned Shlomo Hamelech that the key factor in the Bais Hamikdash was the adherence to the mitzvos of Hashem. Even this most beautiful edifice will

be of practically no value unless the Jewish people follow closely along the path of Hashem. Shlomo was reminded that the objective of the Bais Hamikdash was to become the House of Hashem. This could only occur if the inner fiber of the Bais Hamikdash was also preserved, namely the sincere interest of the Jews to associate with Hashem.

It is interesting to note that this prophecy was delivered to the king in the midst of his labor. Shlomo Hamelech had just completed the exterior structure of the Bais Hamikdash and before even beginning the interior structure he sent a message from Hashem. The upshot of this is that Shlomo Hamelech being taught a meaningful lesson. Although this absolutely stunning edifice should rightfully enhance the glory of Hashem its external qualities would not suffice. Shlomo was told that the exterior structure was not the answer but it was the interior which truly made the difference. He was reminded that the actual interior of the Bais Hamikdash was the close adherence of the Jews to

the will of Hashem, and not magnificent interior walls. Hashem reminded Shlomo that Bais Hamikdash means House of Hashem and that this could only transpire if the Jews adhere to the mitzvos of Hashem. If they were truly

interested in the association with Hashem, then and only then could they merit the presence of Hashem.

But an additional dimension was revealed to Shlomo during the construction of the Bais Hamikdash. In the above passages we discover that Hashem attributed the construction exclusively to Shlomo Hamelech. Hashem said, "The house which you (singular) are building; if you (singular) walk in My statutes...." The Malbim (ad loc) sensitizes us to the fact that the actual workers who constructed the Bais Hamikdash were omitted and ignored. The construction was specifically attributed to Shlomo and to no one else. This reminds us of the comment of Sforno (Shmos 38:21) in noting the contrast between the Mishkan, sanctuary, and the Bais Hamikdash. He notes that the Mishkan was never destroyed or ruined and never fell into foreign hands. However, as we read in the last haftorah, the Bais Hamikdash suffered much deterioration and as we know, it was eventually destroyed by foreign hands. Sforno attributes this to the stark contrast between the builders of the Bais Hamikdash and of the Mishkan. The Mishkan was physically constructed by the most pious individuals, Betzalel and his devoted crew. They realized that the true objective was to create an environment wherein Hashem would consent to rest His Divine Presence. Spirituality, sanctity and devotion were the keys to such a result. However the Bais Hamikdash was constructed and erected by a combination of Jews and Tyreans. This construction lent itself to focusing on the physical factors and dimensions of the Bais Hamikdash, rather than its spiritual qualities. Sforno therefore explains that the Mishkan remained intact and was always appreciated for its spirituality and sanctity. It always remained the House of Hashem never to be destroyed because it was built with that focus in mind. However the construction of the Bais Hamikdash included external factors and did not possess the same spiritual qualities as did the Mishkan. The Bais Hamikdash was prone to be viewed as a physical edifice rather than the House of Hashem and could eventually forfeit its true quality and appreciation and even fall into foreign hands. This is what the prophet referred to when he attributed the construction of the Bais Hamikdash to Shlomo himself. The only dimension of the Bais Hamikdash which was meaningful and secure was Shlomo's participation in its construction, building it with the directive of spirituality and sanctity. The prophet therefore attributes the erection of the Bais Hamikdash solely to Shlomo. The inner fiber of the Bais Hamikdash was supplied solely by Shlomo and its true erection and continued existence was totally his credit.

The synagogue, our miniature Bais Hamikdash follows the same formula. Its existence also depends on it being the House of Hashem which, as we've learned can only be facilitated through our sincere interest to associate with Hashem.

By Rabbi Dovid Siegel, Rosh Kollel (Dean) Kollel Toras Chesed
3732 West Dempster Skokie, IL 60076 847-674-7959 fax:
847-674-7961 e-mail: kollel@mcs.com URL: <http://www.mcs.net/~kollel/>

From: "Project Genesis <genesis@j51.com>"

To: JHURWITZ, CSHULMAN, " Project Genesis
LifeLine

Date: 2/23/96 9:18am **Subject:** * PG LifeLine - Trumah

My grandfather, Nosson Yitzchak ben Tzvi Herschel, Isaac Golubitsky, passed away last Friday. This week's LifeLine is dedicated in his memory.

Please pray for the speedy healing of AvShalom ben Shashana, Esther Miriam bat Aliza Geula, Sarit bat Esther, Yitzchak ben Tzivia, Netanel ben Chaya, and Tzvi Yehuda ben Chaya Esther.

please consider a tax-deductable donation to support our programs. Please send email with the keyword "DONATIONS" for further information,

"G-d spoke to Moshe, saying: 'Speak to the children of Israel, that they take an offering for me; from every man whose heart desires [to give], take my offering.'" [25:1-2]

The Bais HaLevi, Rabbi Yosef Soloveitchik of Brisk, discusses why this week's reading, Terumah, follows last week's reading of Mishpatim in the Torah. As we mentioned last week, Mishpatim describes an abundance of interpersonal laws. He explains that before a person gives charity with his money, he or she must first ensure that his or her money was acquired honestly, and not through theft or dubious business practices. If not, the "charity" will be of no benefit to the giver, meaning that it will not be considered a Mitzvah at all.

In the laws of Sukkos, we learn that one cannot use a stolen Lulav, referring to the palm frond taken during the holiday. If one uses a stolen Lulav, he has not fulfilled the Mitzvah, and has recited a blessing in vain. According to the Bais HaLevi, the law here is the same.

This is why the profit Isaiah says ["So says HaShem, 'Guard judgment and do Tzedakah'" [56:1] (Tzedakah means either justice or charity), because one must first do one's business with judgment, and then give charity. Therefore, HaShem first gave His judgments, and only then commanded Israel to bring their donations to the Tabernacle.

Here we see the close ties between the interpersonal laws and those between man and G-d. One cannot take a stolen Lulav and do a Mitzvah. One cannot take stolen money and give it to charity. The principle is the same - and the bottom line is: one cannot steal.

Before describing the commandment to build the Tabernacle, the Sefer HaChinuch, the Book of (Mitzvah) Education, offers a preface, in which he explains the underlying reason why HaShem gave us His commandments: in order that we perfect and prepare ourselves to receive the great good that G-d wants to give us. He discusses this in great detail - the Sefer HaChinuch is available in English as well as Hebrew, and you should try to see at least a section of this in Mitzvah 95.

Whatever the Mitzvah, be it a ritual or matter of personal ethics, one should always aim for self-improvement when doing it. And taking a Lulav should also make us better people, and remind us to be certain that it and the money which was used to purchase it were acquired honestly.

Good Shabbos, Rabbi Yaakov Menken

Project Genesis, the Jewish Learning Network learn@torah.org
P.O. Box 1230 http://www.torah.org/
Spring Valley, NY 10977 (914) 356-3040 FAX: 356-6722

Join the Global Learning Revolution! Project Genesis classes:
Torah-Forum-digest / Drasha / DvarTorah / Haftarah / Halacha-Yomi
Halashon / Iyov / Maharal / Rambam / Ramchal / RavFrاند / YomTov
For information on our classes, mail to learn@torah.org with "CLASSES" in the subject line. Use the keyword "SUBSCRIBE" for information on starting, removing, or changing any subscription.
All classes are free of charge - but Project Genesis needs your support.
If you are gainfully employed and enjoy subscribing to several of our lists,