

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON PARSHAS TERUMAH - 5757

For e-mail of current or back issues contact crshulman@aol.com

Some Internet Dvar Torah Lists

VIRTUAL JERUSALEM: E-mail to: listproc@virtual.co.il In msg type: subscribe <listname> Your_Name" Some of lists: Aviner-Eng: Ateret Cohanim; Ask: Ask-the-Rabbi; Bircas: Parsha by Rabbi Dov Rabinowitz; DafYomi: Ohr Somayach; Parasha - Page: by Rabbi Kornfeld; Parasha-QA: Ohr Somayach; Torah-Talk: Parasha by Rabbi Steinberg; Weekly: Ohr Somayach on Parsha; Yhe - MB by Rabbi Rimon; Yhe-UndHalakha by Rabbi Bick and Zvi Shimon; Yhe-IntParsha by Zvi Shimon; Yhe-Pesachim; Yhe-Metho by Rabbi Taragin; Yhe-Sichot - of Rav Lichtenstein and Rav Amital; Yhe-Jewhpi - on Jewish philosophy; Yhe-Parsha: by YHE rabbis (& yhe-par.d); Yhe-Parsha.ml - by Rabbi Menachem Leibtag; YS-Parasha and YS-perso-nalities - from Shaalvim; YITorah; Arutz-7; Camera; Shabbat-Zomet. Send command "lists" for lists.

SHAMASH: E-mail to listproc@shamash.org In message write " sub 'listname' <your name>" Bytetorah: Zev Itzkowitz; Enayim: YU parsha; Daf-hashavua: London; mj-RavTorah: Rav Soloveichik ZTL on Parsha. Send "lists" for list.

PROJECT GENESIS E-mail to majordomo@torah.org with "subscribe listname <your e-mail address>" in message. Lists include: Weekly-Halacha: by Rabbi Doniel Neustadt; DvarTorah: by Rabbi Green; Halacha-Yomi; Mahara; Rambam; Ramchal; RavFrاند; Tefila; Drasha by Rabbi Kamenetcky. Send "lists" for complete list.

SHEMA YISRAEL: E-mail to: listproc@jen.co.il In msg type: subscribe <listname> Your_Name" Some of lists: Peninim - on the Torah by Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum; Outlooks on Parsha by Rabbi Zev Leff; Hear - insights from Rabbi Weber; Companion - Shalom Bayis by Rabbi Feinhandler; Yitorah; Daf-insights, Daf-background, Daf-review, etc. by Rabbi Kornfeld. Send "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 Parsha; W-4) Once Upon A Chasid; W-7) Wellsprings - Chasidic Insight into Torah Portion. Send "lists" for complete list.

ISRAEL NEWS To: Listserv@pankow.inter.net.il Subject: Subscribe Listname <your name> Type "Subscribe <listname> <your name>". Lists include "Israline" and "Israel-mideast". Must confirm w/i 48 hours by sending to same address msg "OK xxxx" with xxxx the code receive in confirmation. Also Jer1 (listproc@virtual.co.il) has Arutz-7.

WWW - Shamash - <http://shamash.org> & <http://shamash.org/tanach/dvar.html>; Jerusalem 1 - <http://www.virtual.co.il>; Maven - <http://www.maven.co.il>; YU - <http://yu1.yu.edu>; YHE - <http://www.virtual.co.il/education/yhe>; OU - <http://www.ou.org>; Chabad - <http://www.chabad.org>; JCN <http://www.jcn18.com>; Project Genesis <http://www.torah.org> (see also <ftp://torah.org> for more archives); ShamaYisrael - <http://www.shemayisrael.co.il>; Children - <http://www.pirchei.co.il>; Aish Hatorah <http://www.thewall.org>; Rav Soloveichik archives - gopher://shamash.org/70/11/judaica/tanach/commentary/mj-ravtorah & <http://shamash.org/mail-jewish/rov.html>; Rabbi Leibtag Tanach archives - <http://www.virtual.co.il/torah/tanach>; Rabbi Mordechai Elon - <http://www.intournet.co.il/mtv/parsha.html>; YOSS Drasha <http://www.yoss.org/windex.htm>; List - http://www.yahoo.com/Society_and_Culture/Religion/Judaism; Israel - <http://www.ac.il>; Good link page - <http://www.ucalgary.ca/~akiva/HOJMI/links.html>; NCYI - <http://www.youngisrael.org>; My link page - <http://members.aol.com/CRShulman/torah.html>; Hebrew fonts - <http://www.virtual.co.il/education/yhe/hebfont.htm>; Congregation Bais Yitzchok - <http://members.aol.com/shtiebel/jamaicaestates.html>; Holliswood Jewish Center - <http://www.geocities.com/CollegePark/3648/>; Upcoming YIJE site - stay tuned!

"jgross@torah.org" "weekly-halacha@torah.org" Terumah-Knots on Shabbos
WEEKLY-HALACHA FOR 5757 COPYRIGHT 1996-7
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 Mishkan of ten curtains (Exo. 26:1) When a thread tore during the weaving process, they knotted the thread... (Shabbos 74b)

The Sages of the Mishnah and the Talmud (1) do not clearly define the exact parameters of the melachah of Knotting, the twenty-first of the thirty-nine forbidden forms of "work" on Shabbos. The description of the Biblically prohibited knot, kesher shel kayama, a permanent knot, is vague enough to allow for much dispute and debate among the rishonim as to its exact

B'S'D' identity. The debate focuses chiefly on the type of permanency required - must the knot be permanent in its intended duration, in its craftsmanship and quality, or in both? This discussion ultimately leads into its natural extension - the definition of a rabbinically prohibited knot. Several other issues are debated among the poskim, such as the amount of time the knot must remain knotted in order for it to be considered permanent; the halachic differences between a professional ("craftsman's") knot and an amateur one; the status of a bow, etc.

Although some of these issues are ruled on definitively, others are not. Consequently, there are various opinions as to the practical halachah. Sometimes, the poskim take into account special circumstances - acute physical discomfort, a pressing need to fulfill a mitzvah, etc. To better understand the practical applications of the halachos, we have listed some daily activities which involve this melachah:

SHOE LACES: Shoe laces are usually tied with a "single knot" (technically, an "overhand" knot, the first stage of tying shoes) followed by a bow. It is permitted to tie a shoe lace in this manner provided that the knot will be undone before 24 hours have elapsed(2). A tight double knot, however, as is often tied on children's shoes to prevent their slipping off, may not be made on Shabbos even if it will be undone on the same day(3). In a case of acute physical discomfort, there are opinions(4) which allow a double knot to be made on Shabbos, if the knot will be undone before 24 hours have elapsed(5).

PLASTIC BAGS: It is prohibited to twist the top of a bag, make a loop, pull the top through the loop and tighten to form a knot. It is also forbidden to take the two top corners of a plastic bag, tie them and make a bow (as if tying a shoelace). These types of knots are prohibited since foods and other items put into plastic bags usually remain in them for several days(6).

There are, however, two permissible ways of knotting a plastic bag on Shabbos: 1) Making a single (overhand) knot only, by taking the two top corners of a plastic bag and tying them (like the first stage of tying a shoelace). Since such a knot will unravel even without manipulation, it is not considered a knot at all. After the single knot has been tied, one may not take the corners of the bag and tuck them under the single knot, since that strengthens the knot(7) (just as a bow - which strengthens the knot - may not be made over a single knot if the knot will not be undone before 24 hours have elapsed); 2) Making a slip knot (a loop which is not completely pulled through and does not form a knot) at the top of the bag. This is not considered a knot but a bow.

PLASTIC TWIST TIES: Some poskim(8) hold that it is prohibited to twist [or untwist] a paper-covered wire twister around a bag and then twist together its two ends. This ruling is based on the view of the Rambam(9) that one who twists two threads together is producing a rope and transgressing the melachah of knotting. According to this view, twisting the two ends of a twist tie together is similar to twisting two threads to make a rope and may very well be prohibited. Although other poskim hold that the two cases are not comparable and it is essentially permitted to twist these ties(10), it is still recommend by some that, if possible, it is better not to use twist ties on Shabbos in this manner(11).

LULAV: It is a mitzvah to tie the three minim of lulav, hadasim and aravos together. This must be done on erev Sukkos, since it is forbidden to tie any knot [double knot, overhand knot, single knot with a bow, single knot with the ends tucked in] around a lulav on Shabbos or yom tov. The only solution for one who failed to prepare his lulav in advance is to wind a lulav leaf, etc., around the lulav, hadasim and aravos, make no knot whatsoever, but merely wind around and around so that the hadasim and aravos are "wrapped" around the lulav. The ends of the lulav leaf, etc., may be tucked in. Tucking in the ends is permitted in this case because no knot at all was made(12).

SEFER TORAH: Some poskim(13) hold that it is prohibited to make a single knot and a bow [or a single knot with the ends tucked in under the band] when putting away the Sefer Torah Shabbos at Minchah. Since this knot will remain intact for over twenty four hours, it should not be made on Shabbos. The custom in most places, however, is to be lenient, and many

poskim accept the leniency(14). Another option is to wind the band around the Sefer Torah without making any knot at all, and then tuck the ends under the band, as we explained earlier in the case of a lulav which is bound on yom tov.. Those congregations that use a band with metal clasps or a special band called a Wimpel(15), avoid this potential problem altogether.

BELTS AND KERCHIEFS: These items may be tied with a knot and a bow, or a loose double knot, since these knots are not normally tightened, and even if they are tightened, they are usually loosened within 24 hours(16).

ADDITIONAL NOTES:

Tying a single knot at the end [or in the middle] of a string as is often done at the ends of tzitzis strings (to keep them from unraveling), is considered a prohibited (double) knot, since this type of knot is firm and permanent.

It is forbidden to make a knot on top of an existing knot(17), or a third knot on top of a double knot, since the third knot strengthens the entire knot(18). A bandage may be tied around a wound - even with a firm double knot - as long as the intention is to remove it within seven days and there is no other way of securing it (e.g. through clips or bows). This, according to many poskim, is a case of acute physical discomfort which may be alleviated by tying a knot(19).

In a case of great need, a non-Jew may be asked to tie a knot - even a firm double knot - provided that the knot is not intended to be "permanent" - to last indefinitely(20).

FOOTNOTES: 1 Shabbos 111b. 2 Mishnah Berurah 317:29. Therefore, when one removes his shoes, he must untie the laces, not merely slip the shoes off. 3 Mishnah Berurah 317:14. See Chazon Ish OC 52:17 who refers to this prohibition as a "chumrah b'almah" which has become the custom. 4 See Rama 317:1 who allows the untying of a double knot when in tzaar. It remains unclear why Rama did not discuss tying under such circumstances. Some poskim suggest that there are not many cases where tzaar can be alleviated by tying - see Menorah Hatehora 317:8, while other poskim explicitly permit tying a double knot in case of tzaar - see Aruch Hashulchan 317:10. 5 Rama's exact language is "tzaar". We have chosen to translate that as 'acute physical discomfort' based on Biur Hagra's (see Damesek Eliezer) comparison of this tzaar to the tzaar caused by an insect bite, which is discussed in OC 316:9. Surely, tying children's shoes so that they do not slip off is not an example of such "tzaar". 6 Shmiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 9:16; Rabbi P.E. Falk (Zachor V'shamor, knotting, pg. 16) 7 Mishnah Berurah 651:11. 8 Harav S.Z. Auerbach in Shmiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 15: fn 166 and in Tikunim U'milluim; Shmiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 9:13; Rabbi P.E. Falk (Zachor V'shamor, Knotting, pg. 16). 9 Quoted in Mishnah Berurah 317:34. 10 Oral ruling heard in the name of Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home pg. 223). See Igros Moshe OC 2:84 for a possible explanation. 11 Shevet Halevi 8:55; Harav Yechezkel Roth (Ohr Hashabbos vol 10, pg. 20). 12 Rama OC 651:1 and Mishnah Berurah 11. 13 Minchas Shabbos 80:155. According to this view, it is also prohibited to knot a Sefer Torah band in this fashion on Thursday, since it has been untied on Shabbos morning. 14 Ktzos Hashulchan 123:9; Tzitz Eliezer 7:29; Harav S.Z. Auerbach quoted in Shmiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 15 fn 178. 15 Used mainly in German congregations. According to Harav S. Schwab (quoted in Knots on Shabbos), this type of band was introduced in order to avoid the issue of knotting on Shabbos. 16 Sharei Tesuvah 317:1 according to the explanation of Kaf Hachayim 317:23 and Shevet Halevi 8:60; See also Badei Hashulchan 123:4; Toras Shabbos 317:2 and Shmiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 15 fn 167 quoting Harav S.Z. Auerbach. 17 Mharsham 6:34. 18 Harav S.Z. Auerbach quoted in Shmiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 15:51. See, however, Tikunim U'milluim where he modifies his decision and remains undecided. 19 See Shmiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 15:52. 20 Mishnah Berurah 317:25.

Weekly-Halacha, Copyright (c) 1997 by Rabbi Neustadt, Dr. Jeffrey Gross and Project Genesis, Inc. The author, Rabbi Neustadt, is the principal of Yavne Teachers' College in Cleveland, Ohio. He is also the Magid Shiur of a daily Mishna Berurah class at Congregation Shomre Shabbos. The Weekly-Halacha Series is distributed L'zchus Haya'el Doniel Meir ben Hinda. Weekly sponsorships are available - please mail to jgross@torah.org .

The series is distributed by the Harbotzas Torah Division of Congregation Shomre Shabbos, 1801 South Taylor Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118 HaRav Yisroel Grumer, Marah D'Asra This list is part of Project Genesis, the Jewish Learning Network. learn@torah.org 3600 Crondall Lane, Ste. 106 Owings Mills, MD 21117 (410) 654-1799 FAX: 356-9931

=====

* PARSHA Q&A * In-Depth Questions on the Parsha and Rashi's commentary. Parshas Terumah

=====

=

Parsha Questions

1. How many times does the word `terumah' appear in the first verse of the parsha? Why? 2. Onkelos translates `tachash' as `sasgona.' Why? 3. What kind of trees did Yaakov plant in Mitzrayim? 4. Describe two uses of: a) oil; b) spices; c) jewels. 5. The Aron was made with three boxes, one inside the other. How tall was the outer box exactly? 6. What does the crown on top of the Aron symbolize? 7. Why is the Torah referred to as "testimony"? 8. What did the faces of the keruvim resemble? 9. What does the crown on top of the shulchan symbolize? 10. On what day of the week was the lechem hapanim baked? 11. What does miksha mean? 12. What was the purpose of the menorah cast their light? 13. In which direction did the flames of the menorah? 14. How did Moshe know the shape of the menorah? 15. What designs were embroidered into the tapestries of the mishkan? 16. How long was the mishkan? 17. How wide was the interior of the mishkan? 18. How high was the copper mizbe'ach? 19. What were the dimensions of the courtyard of the mishkan? 20. Which function did the copper yeseidos serve?

Bonus QUESTION: "... And they shall take for Me terumah." (25:2) Why did the Torah say `take' terumah and not `give' terumah?

I Did Not Know That! "Make a shittim-wood Aron: Two and a half amos long, one and a half amos wide and one and a half amos high.... Make a shittim-wood table, two amos long and one amah wide... (25:10,23) The Aron represents Torah. Its fractional dimensions hint that we delve only a fraction into the Torah's limitless depth, and that our spiritual efforts are never done. The table represents worldly success. Its whole dimensions hint that we should feel `whole' and content with our physical possessions. Kli Yakar (25:10)

=====

==

Recommended Reading List Ramban 25:1 The Mishkan, a "Portable Sinai" 25:10 Universal Torah Involvement 26:33 Making and Placing Ibn Ezra 25:3 The Need for Silver Ohr HaChaim HaKadosh 25:8 The Shechina Within Jewry Sefer Hachinuch 95 Our Need for a Mishkan 96 Utility and Form 97 Blessings and Benefit

=====

==

Answers to this Week's Questions All references are to the verses and Rashi's commentary, unless otherwise stated

1. 25:2 - It appears three times, alluding to three different types of terumah offered. 2. 25:5 - The tachash delights (sas) in its multi-colors (govanim). 3. 25:5 - Arazim -- cedars. 4. 25:6-7 - a) The oil was lit in the menorah and used for anointing. b) The spices were used in the anointing oil and for the incense. c) The precious stones were for the ephod and the choshen. 5. 25:11 - The outer box was one and a half amos plus a tefach plus a little bit, because it rose a little bit above the kapores. [The kapores was a tefach thick (see 25:17).] 6. 25:11 - It symbolizes the crown of Torah. 7. 25:16 - It testifies that Hashem commanded us to keep the mitzvos. 8. 25:18 - The faces of children. 9. 25:24 - It symbolizes the crown of royalty. 10. 25:29 - Friday. 11. 25:31 - Hammered. 12. 25:31 - Purely ornamental. 13. 25:37 - Towards the middle flame. 14. 25:40 - Hashem showed Moshe a menorah of fire. 15. 26:1 - On one side a lion; on the other side an eagle. 16. 26:16 - 30 amos. 17. 26:23 - 10 amos. 18. 27:1 - There are two opinions. Rabbi Yehuda says it was three amos high. Rabbi Yossi says it was 10 amos high. 19.

27:18 - 100 amos by 50 amos. 20. 27:19 - They secured the curtains against the wind.

Bonus ANSWER: If the Torah had said 'give' terumah, each individual would have been duty-bound to give. But for the mishkan Hashem wanted only heartfelt donations, not dutiful ones. Therefore, the Torah commanded that collectors be appointed to 'take' terumah only from willing donors. No one, however, was required to give. Malbim

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Reuven Subar General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Lev Seltzer Prepared by Ohr Somayach

"ohr@jer1.co.il" "weekly@jer1.co.il" Torah Weekly - Terumah

... Insights

Rolling Hills "The staves shall remain in the rings of the ark; they may not be removed from it." (25:15) The Torah is the portable homeland of the Jewish People. For most of their history, the Jews have been in exile. But whether that exile has been Babylon or Italy, Turkey or Maine, the Jew has always been able to roll up his homeland -- the Torah -- and take it with him. It's not so much that the Jews have kept the Torah, than the Torah has kept them. When all the borders are closed to them, when no one will grant them a visa, the Torah welcomes them with open arms. The staves of the Aron were never to be removed from the Aron. They were to remain in their place constantly. The first Beis Hamikdash stood for over 400 years. Throughout all those hundreds of years, the staves remained in their place; the Torah was ready to move at a moment's notice. This was a constant symbol that the Torah is not tied to one place. Wherever the Jews go, willingly or perforce, they roll up their portable homeland and take it with them.

Haftorah: I 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 in this week's Parsha the Torah speaks of the construction of the Mishkan, the Divine 'residence' in the desert, so too the Haftorah describes the first Beis Hamikdash which was built by Shlomo Hamelech (King Solomon) 480 years after the Exodus. Even though the physical statistics of Shlomo Hamelech's construction are staggering, what is important to Hashem is that the real construction should be built from the giving heart. This is what Hashem is saying to Shlomo Hamelech in the above verse: 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 what the Beis Hamikdash is really built of. And since the 'materials' of its construction are really spiritual, so 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."

Sources: o "Rolling Hills" - Rabbi Shimshon Raphael Hirsch
o "Built To Last" - Kochav MiYaakov

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Lev Seltzer (C) 1997 Ohr Somayach International - All rights reserved.

"rmk@torah.org" DRASHA PARSHAS TERUMAH -- JOB PLACEMENT The winged seraphs that rest atop the Aron Kodesh in the Holy of Holies are known as the cherubim. These cherubs, the Midrash explains, have the faces of innocent children -- a young girl and boy. The Aron Kodesh contains the most sacred of our physical entities,-- the Lucho's (Ten Commandments). In the sacred box lay both the Tablets that Moshe carved and the shattered pieces of the G-d written ones that Moshe smashed upon seeing the Golden

Calf. The two cherubs sit atop of a lot of history. They also protect a lot of sanctity. So they must be endowed with great spiritual symbolism. Yet this is not the first reference to cherubim in the Torah. In fact cherubim are mentioned at the onset of creation where they did not sit innocently upon an Aron Kodesh. They stood guard to block Adam and Chava (Eve) from re-entering the Garden of Eden after their expulsion. "Hashem placed the cherubim and the flame of the ever-turning sword to guard the entrance of Gan Eden." (Genesis 3:24) The apparent contrast is striking. How is it possible that the very same beings who guard the sanctity, chastity, and purity symbolized by the Aron Kodesh could be flashing fiery swords at the gates of Eden? Is a cherub an image of peace, love, and tranquillity or is it the symbol of destruction and mayhem? It should not represent both -- unless the Torah is telling us something. And it is.

A Miami rabbi was lecturing to a group of senior citizens about the life of the Chofetz Chaim, Rabbi Yisrael Meir HaKohen of Radin. "This great sage," he explained, "impacted the lives of thousands of Jewish souls with his simple, down-to-earth approach. He published scores of books that applied to everyday living and mastered the art of the parable, imbuing profound Jewish concepts with simple tales." The rabbi proceeded to recount a tale that had circulated in the halls of yeshivos the world over. "Once the Chofetz Chaim was informed that a particular boy in his yeshiva was smoking on Shabbos. The mashgiach (dean of ethics) of the Yeshiva decided that the boy must be ousted from the school. However, the Chofetz Chaim asked to speak to the young man before the eviction was completed. "The young man entered the Chofetz Chaim's study. He was there for only about 15 minutes, and no one knows what the Chofetz Chaim told him, but the story as I heard it," the rabbi from Miami exclaimed, "is that not only did the boy decide to remain a Shabbos observer the rest of his life, he also became a strong supporter of Torah institutions." The speech ended. The crowd shuffled out. But one elderly man remained fixed in his chair. His face was ashen and his eyes were focused directly at the Rabbi. Slowly he got up and approached the lectern. "Where did you hear that story?" he demanded. "Do you know who that boy was?" The Rabbi shook his head in nervous innocence. "No," he stammered. He could not imagine where the conversation was leading. "It was me!" cried the old man. "And you know what the Chofetz Chaim told me?" Again the Rabbi, not knowing what to say, shook his head with nervous ignorance. "I have no idea," he pleaded. "Honestly, I have no idea. What did the Chofetz Chaim say?" The man smiled. "The Chofetz Chaim said absolutely nothing." As his mind raced back more than half a century the old man repeated the words again. "Absolutely nothing. He just held my hand -- the one that held the cigarettes -- and began to cry. Then the Chofetz Chaim slowly began to whisper the words 'Shabbos, Shabbos' over and over in a sad singsong. And the words mingled with the tears that were dripping on my hand that had held a cigarette just hours earlier. "He sat there without looking at me. Crying. He felt the pain of the Shabbos. And I felt his pain, too. Just being there with him for those 15 minutes changed the hand that held the cigarette to the hand that would hold up the Torah."

Rav Yaakov Kamenetzky zt"l used to comment that the same cherubim that held swords as they stood guard at the gates of Eden are not doomed to that position. They can change drastically when they are placed upon an Aron Kodesh. When they are on top of the Aron, they guard it and cherish it. Young children are affected by their whereabouts. Place them as a guards and they will brandish swords. Put them with the Aron Kodesh -- let them feel the sanctity and they will become the cherubim we aspire to emulate. Mordechai Kamenetzky - Yeshiva of South Shore rmk@torah.org 516-328-2490 Fax 516-328-2553 http://www.yoss.org Drasha, Copyright (c) 1997 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, http://www.yoss.org/ This list is part of Project Genesis, the Jewish Learning Network. 3600 Crondall Lane, Ste. 106 Owings Mills, MD 21117 (410) 654-1799

"RavFrاند" List - Rabbi Frاند on Parshas Terumah

"And You Shall TAKE for Me Teruma" -- Doing For Oneself

This week's parsha contains the section in the Torah that deals with the building of the Mishkan. The Torah tells us that the Jewish people were commanded to bring a donation to Moshe Rabbeinu for the purpose of erecting a Mishkan (Tabernacle). The pasuk [verse] uses the expression, "...and take for Me (v'yikchu Li) a donation..." [Shmos 25:2]. The obvious question is that this is a peculiar choice of words. The more appropriate expression would have been "...and give to Me (v'yitnu Li) a donation..." On a simple level, we can say that since G-d really owns everything ("...to Hashem is the Earth and all that it contains..." [Tehillim 24:1]), it is impossible to speak of giving Him anything. Giving usually implies I have ownership and I transfer the ownership to someone else. Therefore, when we talk about the Master of the World, we don't use the expression "giving." Instead, we use the expression "taking." That is to say, G-d already owns everything, we merely 'allow' Him to take that which is already His. In Parshas Vayera, Rav Shlomo Breuer, zt"l has a beautiful thought on this concept of "taking for Me Teruma." Whenever we 'give,' whether we do chessed with our bodies or we do chessed with our money, every giving is actually a 'taking.' Whenever a person does a chessed, he is really doing more for himself than for the person to whom he is giving. The Medrash says in Parshas Vayikra, "More than what a Ba'al HaBayis does for a poor person, the poor person does for the Ba'al HaBayis." If one gives a person a donation, the money is a very temporary thing. Perhaps it pays for the next meal; perhaps it pays for the rent. In actuality, it is very, very finite. On the other hand, the person who 'gives,' in addition to acquiring Olam HaBaw (the World to Come), accumulates something else as well... He acquires that which it does to his personality, that which it does to his soul and to his self-esteem. By helping another person, one is taking far more than he is giving. Rav Breuer points out the first time that we find an act of chessed in the Torah: by Avraham Avinu and the Angels. The invitation extended by our Patriarch Avraham to the Angels, offering them a place to eat and a place to sleep, is the first overt mention of an act of kindness in the Torah. When we look at that parsha we see an interesting thing. How many times does the Torah use the expression "...let water be taken (yuKach nah me'at mayim)..." [Bereshis 18:4]; "...I will take bread (va-eKcha pas lechem)..." [18:5]? What kind of expression is that? Avraham should have said "I will give water; I will give bread." The answer is that Avraham Avinu is instructing his children and telling them, "My children, you should know for all future generations, that when you help someone else, you are not giving; you are taking!" When a person helps someone, he/she does more for himself/herself than he/she does for the other person. This is what the Torah is teaching us with the expression "V'Yikchu Li Teruma." Whether a person gives to an individual or to an institution, he/she is really receiving more than he/she is giving.

Getting Our Priorities Straight: Table/Menorah Flour/Torah

When the Torah explains how the vessels of the Mishkan were set out, the pasuk tells us: "You will then place the cover on the Ark of Testimony in the Holy of Holies. And place the Table outside the curtain and the Menorah should be placed opposite the Table, toward the southern wall; and the Table should be toward the northern wall." [26:34-35] Anyone who carefully looks at the pasuk, sees a redundancy. If the Torah first tells us to put the Table in front of the curtain and then immediately tells us to put the Menorah opposite it on the southern side, any person with power of deduction knows that as a result, the Table is on the northern side. Why does the Torah have to repeat and reiterate the fact that the Table is on the northern side?

I once heard a beautiful interpretation of this from Rav Kulefsky, shlit"a. The sefer "Sifsei Kohen" asks the following question: We know that symbolically the Table represents Parnasa -- the ability for the Jewish people to sustain themselves physically and materially. The Menorah symbolically

represents Torah, the light of the Menorah symbolizes the Light of Torah. Why is it then, asks the Sifsei Kohen, that the Table was placed first, before the Menorah? After all, the Menorah is more significant than the Table? Rav Kulefsky answers, "If there is no flour there is no Torah" [Mishneh Avot 3:17]. If there is no livelihood, there can be no Torah; therefore, first we put out the Table, representing parnasa; then we put out the Menorah, representing Torah. Rav Kulefsky asks further, that the same Mishneh goes on to say, "If there is no Torah, there is no flour!" So what did the Sifsei Kohen accomplish by quoting the Mishneh? The question remains, why give the Table priority over the Menorah? Rav Kulefsky quotes a very important comment from the Gaon of Vilna (in his commentary to Mishlei). The Mishneh also says "If there is no wisdom (chochma) there is no Fear of G-d (Yir-ah)." Then the Mishneh says, "If there is no Fear of G-d, there is no wisdom." The Gaon asks, what does this mean? Which way is it? The Gaon answers that when we speak in terms of chronological priorities then wisdom has to proceed Fear of G-d, because "the ignoramus cannot be pious" [Avot 2:5]. Simply, one who does not know anything cannot be observant. However in terms of goals (tachlis); in terms of what it is all about, then priority is given to Fear of G-d. In other words, if wisdom is not going to lead to observance, (the fellow who writes 'chidushei Torah' on Shabbos while smoking a cigarette), the wisdom is worthless. If the person can learn a blatt Gemara, but he is not an honest person, his learning is not worth much. The same is true here as well. In terms of chronological priorities, unless one establishes a viable means of supporting himself -- one way or another -- if there is no flour, there is no Torah. If one has to go around begging, he is not going to be able to sit and learn. But in terms of what it's all about, in terms of tachlis, if it doesn't lead to Torah, if one is just accumulating money for the sake of making money, then the money is worthless. If one does not use his 'kemach' for the right reasons, it is of no value. This is what the Torah is telling us: First we place the Table, because "if there is no flour, there is no Torah." Then we put the Menorah opposite the Table -- because we need the Table to be there for the Menorah / Torah to exist. Then the pasuk reiterates that the Table should be on the northern side. Now that we have reached the point where we have established the Menorah / Torah, we must realize that the Table's only purpose is to be opposite the Menorah. At this point, we are to realize that the Table's reason for being is only to support the Menorah. Merely having a Table, in and of itself, serves no purpose. We need to have our priorities straight: Without Torah, the 'flour' serves no purpose!

[Menschlichkeit and our Sages: A Comment on last week's Shiur

Several people requested a clarification on the last shiur, asking how it was possible to even imply that Rebbe Yehoshua and the other great Sages might have lacked basic proper conduct in their debate with Rabbi Eliezer, or even more that one could be called "not a mensch." The Jerusalem Talmud itself says that Rabbi Eliezer only disagreed "because they burned that which he deemed pure in front of him." The Korban Eida explains that Rabbi Eliezer felt that doing so reflected a lack of derech erez, proper conduct - yes, menschlichkeit. He believed that they were not acting for the sake of Heaven, but to deliberately aggravate him, and as a result they were all invalid as judges. Again, it is the Korban Eida itself which says that Rabbi Eliezer believed they were invalid as judges as a result of their lack of derech erez, proper conduct. Nonetheless, the questioners are correct to point out that we are discussing people who lived on a tremendously high spiritual level, and it would be a great error to think that they could lack 'menschlichkeit' on our level. What we would consider behavior completely for the sake of Heaven, they would consider grossly lacking, and we must learn on our level while remaining cognizant of the difference between their level of 'menschlichkeit,' and our own. Using the expression "not a mensch" was colorful language, but - obviously - also not accurate. It is an error to say that because a person lacks proper behavior in one area, he is "not a mensch" overall - and it would in any case be inconceivable that a great Sage would indeed be "not a mensch." And, sof kol sof [in the end], the Halacha is not like Rabbi

Eliezer!

-- Rabbi Y. Frand and the Editors]

Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington twerskyd@scn.org
Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Baltimore, MD
dhoffman@clark.net RavFrand, Copyright (c) 1997 by Rabbi Y. Frand and
Project Genesis, Inc.
Project Genesis, the Jewish Learning Network learn@torah.org 3600
Cron dall Lane, Ste. 106 <http://www.torah.org/> Owings Mills, MD 21117
(410) 654-1799 FAX: 356-9931

"mj-ravtorah@shamash.org" Shiur HaRav Soloveichik on Parshas Terumah
(the following is a re-post of the summary on Terumah submitted in 1996.)
"And you shall build a Mikdash for Me and I will dwell in them".

The Mikdash had a two-fold purpose, as noted by the Rambam (Hilchos Bais
Habechira 1:1): 1) the place where sacrifices were to be brought; 2) the
destination for the tri-ennial pilgrimages at each of the 3 festivals. Both these
roles are part of the identity of the Mikdash. These attributes applied to each
Mikdash regardless if it was a temporary one (e.g. the Mishkan in the desert,
Nov, Shilo, Givon) or a permanent one (Yerushalyim).

The second aspect of the obligation to build a Mikdash was to erect a Bais
Habechira, a permanent house which can never be substituted for and whose
place can never be changed. After it was selected, Yerushalyim became the
sole place where the Beis Hamikdash could be erected (see Rambam, *ibid*).
The basis for this special status of Yerushalyim is the verse "And it shall be
the place that Hashem will select to enshrine His name there, you shall strive
to be around him and you shall come there".

The Mishkan, by definition was a temporary notion. It connotes a transient
dwelling. Bais Habechira implies a permanent structure and final site for the
Beis Hamikdash. However, the Torah did not specify when the transition
from Mishkan to Bais Habechira, from temporary to permanent status was to
take place. No prophet ever spoke about this changeover.

The notion of a Beis Hamikdash is inherently difficult to understand. The
difficulty was posed by Shlomo Hamelech and incorporated into his prayer of
dedication at the consecration of the first Beis Hamikdash. Shlomo asked is it
possible to a house for HKB'H? How can HKB'H coexist with our material
universe? How can infinity coexist with finite? The Midrash notes that
Moshe raised the same question when he built the tabernacle in the desert.
Nivhal Moshe, Moshe was frightened! How can Hashem, infinity, coexist
with man, especially in the small confines of the Holy of Holies where the
Shechina Kvayachol, rested within a square cubit of space? The Midrash says
that Hashem answered Moshe by explaining that while Hashem carries the
world, rather than the reverse, Hashem is capable of withdrawal, Tzimtzum,
and through that process can rest quite comfortably even in the small space
between the Cherubim. Moshe requested that Hashem teach him the concept
of infinity can exist in a finite space (Haraini Na Es Kvodecha). Hashem tells
Moshe that he will grant him great wisdom and show him things that no other
human will ever see or know. However, Moshe understood that there could
be no answer to this question. He realized that when Hashem said Vasu Li
Mikdash, even though you will always have the question of infinity within
finite, accept that this is the will of Hashem.

Shlomo did not seek an answer to the question he raised nor did he offer one.
Shlomo, the wisest of men, who finally admitted that he too could not fathom
the meaning of the Parah Adumah did not attempt an answer to this question
that frightened Moshe. He also accepts that the commandment to create a
house for Hashem is not within man's capacity to understand. Man must
accept that this is the divine plan, Ratzon Hashem. As Shlomo says in Shir
Hashirim, Dodi Yarad L'Gani. Hashem, Kvayachol, has descended from his
infinite abode to the finite garden to be with Bnay Yisrael.

[The Rav related a story told to him by Reb Simcha Zelig, the Dayan of
Brisk who was Reb Chaim's closest friend. Reb Simcha Zelig accompanied
Reb Chaim on a visit to a cousin of Reb Chaim who was a "Chabbnadnik".
While they waited for the man to return home they perused some of the
Seforim that were in the house written by the Magen Avos. In one of the

prefaces they read about the disagreement among Chazal as to the divine
purpose in creating the world. The two major opinions were: 1) Hashem
created the world so that it may offer praise to the greatness of Hashem; 2)
Hashem created the world as a manifestation of His great attribute of
kindness. Though he admitted that both ideas might be correct, Reb Chaim
disagreed with both opinions. He said that there is no need to look for
external reasons for creation. Creation, as all that occurs in the world, was
and is the Ratzon Hashem. As we say in Kaddish, B'alma DiBra Kirusay, let
the name of Hashem be glorified in the world that He created to fulfill His
Ratzon. Infinity residing in a finite world, is the Ratzon Hashem and should
simply be accepted as such.]

Shlomo enumerates the various types of prayers that correspond to the needs
of man, that would flow from the Beis Hamikdash. In times of national crisis,
such as facing defeat in war, and natural disasters like famine or infestation,
Hashem should listen to the prayers of His people that will emanate from the
Beis Hamikdash. The Mishnyos in Taanis that discuss the central role of
prayer in times of drought express the same theme. In such times, Shlomo
requests that Hashem grant forgiveness and fulfill the request. In times of
exile, Hashem should listen to the prayers of the people no matter where they
may be scattered. The theme of "And you shall hear them in the heavens, the
place of Your throne". (The Rav added the following parenthetical note: man
should not be embarrassed to pray for the fulfillment of his needs, no matter
how foolish or mundane they might be. If man feels a need for something, he
may ask Hashem for it. Hashem will decide whether to fulfill the request or
not, but will not blame man for requesting).

[The aspect of Tzarah mentioned by Shlomo obligates man to pray. The
Rambam and Ramban disagree as to whether the obligation to pray on a
regular basis is Biblical or Rabbinic. Both agree that in time of crisis, Eis
Tzarah, prayer is a biblical obligation. According to the Ramban, Tzarah is
defined when many people are affected by a crisis of disastrous proportions.
An individual who approaches Hashem for his own needs, does not fit the
criteria of Eis Tzarah, and his obligation to pray is Rabbinic.]

The Rav continued his analysis of the prayer of Shlomo: We can derive the
importance and central role that prayer plays in Judaism from the fact that
Hashem wanted us to construct a home for Him. Various sacrifices were
brought daily. Our daily prayers correspond to these sacrifices. One who is
obligated to bring a sacrifice may send the sacrifice via a messenger and be
granted the atonement provided by the sacrifice without appearing before
Hashem and without leaving the comfort of his home or losing a day of work.
Indeed it is from the Korban Pesach that we derive the Halacha of a
surrogate, that Shelucho Shel Adam Kmoso. When it comes to prayer there is
no concept of Shelucho Shel Adam Kmoso. I can not appoint someone else
to fulfill my obligation to pray.

One may ask: if the Anshei Maamad represented all of Bnay Yisrael for the
daily sacrifices, why is there no concept of surrogacy for prayer that is based
on the daily sacrifices? The Rav explained that the distance between man and
Hashem/the altar does not affect the acceptability of the sacrifice, so long as
it is offered in a way that meets the requirements of the required sacrifice.
Man can be working his fields while his sacrifice is offered. On the other
hand prayer requires a closeness to Hashem, like one who is standing in front
of a king. The essence of prayer is the drawing closer of man and Hashem.
Without this Kavanah there is no prayer. Kavanah implies that I exist before
Hashem, that I can express my needs before Him as I would to someone who
I felt close to and secure with.

The Ramban noted that the main reason for building the Beis Hamikdash
was the Korbanos. Why weren't the Bamos, temporary alters, sufficient for
this purpose? Why build a "house" for Hashem? The Rav explained that this
expresses the desire of Hashem to Kvayachol live near us, to be our close
neighbor. Korbanos can be accepted by Hashem even when great distances
separate Hashem and man. For prayer, man needs to be close to Hashem and
Hashem wants to be close to man, next door, Lshichno Tidrishe Uvasa
Shama. The "house" of Hashem is unique because it is a house of prayer, Ki
Baysi Bais Tefilah.

Shlomo said "and they will admit their sins towards this city and their land".

Prayer is the connection between man and Hashem that represents the strength of their relationship. Man can not embrace Hashem from the distance. He does not feel comfortable unburdening his heart and divulging his foolish dreams by having to shout over a distance. Shlomo knew that the Beis Hamikdash was not required for the Korbanos aspect. Hashem needs to be close to man so that man will feel as comfortable in approaching Hashem through prayer as a young child feels when approaching his father at any time. Hashem Kvayachol contracted to reside in the small space of a cubit by a cubit, so that man can always feel close to the residence of Hashem. Shlomo said "and they shall pray to Hashem via their land". In order to pray, the people must be able to focus and identify where does Hashem reside relative to where they may be. Through their land, through the city of Yerushalayim, through the Holy of Holies.

Shlomo said that Hashem must take up residence in the Beis Hamikdash to be close to the people in order to show that building of the Beis Hamikdash was successful. Prayer must be Panim El Panim, face to face. Such prayer should be heard by Hashem and accepted. No matter what the people may pray for, be it repentance for a sin or for help in times of personal and national crisis. All prayer comes down to a single motive: Teshuva, repenting and returning closer to Hashem. This requires that Hashem be close and approachable, our next door neighbor.

We say Shomeah Tefila Adecha Kol Basar Yavou. The word Adecha is used instead of the word Aylecha (towards you). Adecha implies coming close enough to touch. Prayer requires that man come so close to Hashem, to Kvayachol be able to touch each other. The Beis Hamikdash provided the framework for achieving this closeness. Hashem does not need a house. It is we who require that He be our neighbor, for prayer. We do not have to understand how Hashem allows the infinite to coexist with the finite. We must appreciate the proximity of Hashem to us that enables us to pray and shows that Hashem is indeed interested in our prayers.

Copyright 1996 by Dr. Israel Rivkin and Josh Rapps, Edison, N.J.
Permission to reprint and distribute, with this notice, is hereby granted.
These summaries are based on notes taken by Dr. Rivkin at the weekly Moriah Shiur given by Moraynu V'Rabbeinu Harav Yosef Dov Halevi Soloveichik ZT'L over many years.

"ml@jer1.co.il" Parshat Terumah

THE TANACH STUDY CENTER/ In Memory of Rabbi Abraham Leibtag
[<http://www.virtual.co.il/torah/tanach/>]

HAFTARAH/ PARSHAT TERUMAH [Sefer M'lachim 5:26-6:13]

In this week's Parsha shiur, we discussed the difference between the MIKDASH, a permanent sanctuary, and the MISHKAN, a portable and more temporary structure. We posited that the Mishkan was only necessary for the time period of Bnei Yisrael's stay in the desert and their conquest of the Land. Afterward, once stability was achieved, it would have been more ideal for Bnei Yisrael to construct the PERMANENT Mikdash. [See Dvarim 12:5-13]

This week's Haftara describes the actual construction of that PERMANENT Mikdash, the Temple built by King Solomon. However, this only takes place some 480 years LATER (see 6:1). What took so long?

In Sefer Yehoshua (chapter 18), we are informed that after the first wave of conquest, the Mishkan was set up in the city of Shilo. Chazal tell us that this Mishkan was a semi-permanent structure, as it had stone walls (instead of the "krashim"), but its roof remained the same as in the original Mishkan. [See Rambam Hilchot Bet Ha'bchira 1:1-4] In Sefer Shoftim, it appears that the Mishkan in Shilo was quite neglected, for it is barely mentioned. At the beginning of Sefer Shmuel we find that Elkana and Chana visit Shilo quite often, however the priests who work there are corrupt (I Shmuel 2:11-17). Shilo is then destroyed. The ARON is taken captive by the Philistim and then returned to Bet Shemesh. From there it moves to Kiryat Yearim and finally (in the time of David) to Jerusalem. The Mishkan moved from Shilo to Nov and later to Givon. The ARON never returns to the MISHKAN until the first Bet HaMikdash is built. In general, the Mishkan

appears to have been quite neglected throughout this entire time period. [See I Divrei Hayamim 13:1-5]

David ha'melech is the first leader to actually desire to build the PERMANENT Mikdash (see II Shmuel 7:1-8:15). God tells him YES and NO. YES - that the MIKDASH will be built by a king from the HOUSE OF DAVID, but NO - that in his own lifetime it will not be built, for only his son can build it. Even though David desired to build the Mikdash, neither the country nor the monarchy had reached the state of stability necessary for the BET HA'MIKDASH to be built. Despite his conquests, David's generation was one of war, both against their enemies and among themselves. God told David that the Mikdash can only be built once a generation of peace is secured. [See I Divrei Hayamim 22:5-19/ read carefully!]

In the time of Shlomo, this level of peace and security is finally achieved. Thus, God allows him to build the Mikdash. The first five chapters of Sefer M'lachim describe how Shlomo secures the kingdom and establishes a military and economic empire. Am Yisrael had reached an unprecedented level of prosperity, security, and fame. It is important to note that the Haftara begins with the description of the treaty between Shlomo and Chiram, king of Tyre (in Lebanon). He supplies Shlomo with the necessary building materials to construct the Mikdash. [See M'lachim 5:26-32] Not only do we find positive relations with Chiram, the other nations of the area are at peace with Shlomo as well (5:4-5). Even the Queen of Sheba comes to meet him (chapter 10). The age of Shlomo ha'melech is the FIRST time in Jewish History where we find that Am Yisrael has any type of a positive and constructive relationship with other nations. Until that time, the nations were always our enemies. Now, Israel had reached a level of prominence within the 'league of nations'. It is not by chance that this time period coincides with the construction of the Temple. In contrast to the Mishkan, the permanent Mikdash in Yerushalayim serves a center for prayer not only for Am Yisrael, but for ALL nations (see 8:41-43/ see also Yeshayahu 56:7). Therefore, it can only be built once Am Yisrael achieves a status of respect and a state of peace with its neighbors. This follows the biblical theme that one of the ultimate goals of Am Yisrael is to bring God's Name to all Mankind. In this setting, this messianic goal can be achieved. The Mikdash serves as a vehicle to achieve this goal. The Haftara ends with God's warning to Shlomo that this state of prosperity and the success of the Mikdash is a function of Bnei Yisrael's spiritual behavior. By keeping His mitzvot they can fulfill their divine destiny (6:11-13). Should they leave God, they will no longer fulfill their function as God's special Nation and therefore He will take away their prosperity and ultimately, the Mikdash itself could be destroyed (see 9:6-9). Unfortunately, the messianic time-period of Shlomo was short-lived. [See the story of Yeravam's revolt in chapter 11.] The reason, as usual, leaving God and "sinat achim" (hatred of one another). Let's hope that we learn from our mistakes, shabbat shalom

menachem

A Byte Of Torah VI,XIX Terumah (Zev Itzkowitz) bytetorah@shamash.org
Dvar Torah of the Week

"Make the Altar out of acacia wood. It shall be square, 5 cubits by 5 cubits by 3 cubits high. Make protrusions on all four sides, as an integral part of [the altar], and plate it with bronze." (Exodus 27:1-2)

Why does the Torah insist that the Altar must be square? The majority form of most things produced in nature is circular. The circle, thus, is a pre-determination of shape, nature's "default". A circular shape in relation to a human being may then be seen as allowing us to revert back to nature's specifications. The circle, thus, represents a lack of assertion of our own free-will and a willingness to be ruled by natural forces. In contradistinction, a right angle, must be, by definition, unnatural. It can only occur if something or someone takes control and directs it. In regard to a human being, a right angle indicates someone taking control of themselves and producing something not found among nature's style. The rectangle, therefore, represents Man's mastery over the material world. The Tabernacle, the Ark, the Table and the Altar were all constructed along

rectangular lines. The essence of the Tabernacle was to free one from the forces that directed him/her, and instead help to build a free-willed moral human life. The Altar, in particular, is emphasized to be square for it represents the elevation of the earth upwards to G-d by human efforts. This could only come to fruition through a free-willed being (R. Hirsch).

Mussar of the Week

"Make a screen out of copper net to go around [the altar]." (Exodus 27:4)

The net that is around the Altar is to help free us from the snare that the evil inclination casts over us (Keli Yakar). Life's passions can be very strong, and can often threaten to overpower us. One response is to just give in to these desires, to claim that we cannot escape the snare. Another response is to take inspiration from the Altar. The Altar was surrounded by a net. Yet, it continued to be used in the service of G-d, to help people elevate themselves. We, too, can learn to take those passions and redirect them from ourselves towards the service of G-d, and rise above ourselves.

In New York City? Come spend a Shabbat with us in Astoria.

Please direct any comments, questions, etc. to bytetorah@shamash.org, which will be forwarded to me. Please pass it on to a friend. If you want to subscribe, please send e-mail to listserv@shamash.org with the msg: SUB bytetorah <first name> <last name>. --Zev Itzkowitz Copyright 1997
