

B'S'D'

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET

ON VAYAKHEL PEKUDEI - PARSHAS HACHODES - 5759

To receive this formatted parsha sheet in WP 6.1 file (readable by Word), please email me at crshulman@aol.com (with copy to chulman@chill.com). (Thank you to M. Fiskus and S. Gunsberg for distributing in JE.)

SOME INTERNET DVAR TORAH LISTS Virtual Jerusalem: E-mail to: listproc@jer1.co.il In msg type: subscribe -listname> Your_Name ... SOME OF THE WEEKLY PARSHAS: Parasha-QA (by Ohr Somayach); Weekly (Ohr Somayach on Parsha); YSParsha (from Shaalvim); YITorah (Young Israel); Camera; ShabbatZomet; ...

for himself, if he stands proud with his head high, then matrimony can be very crowding. You can't move an inch. But if a person lowers himself, prostrating his own interests beneath those of his spouse, then there is plenty of room for everyone.

___Hitting the Mark, or Marking the Hit?___ "Ten curtains of linen, twisted with turquoise, purple, and scarlet wool" (36:8) In this week's Parsha, the Torah details the same description of the Mishkan and its furnishings as it did previously in Parshas Terumah. Why the need for this repetition?

The Dubner Magid was famous for his use of the mashal (parable). With a short story he could illuminate a Torah idea, lighting up the eyes and the minds of all who listened. The Vilna Gaon once asked the Dubner Magid how it was that he was able to find such wonderfully telling parables that always seemed to hit the bull's eye. The Dubner Magid, of course, replied with a mashal: There once was a prince who desired greatly to become a master archer. One day while he was traveling he came to a small village. An archery contest was in progress. The prince noticed that one of the contestants' accuracy was uncanny. Each of his targets was pierced exactly in the center. The prince asked this fellow how he was able to achieve such striking results. This was his reply: "Well first I aim at a tree. Then, once I hit the tree, I run up to it and paint a circle around the arrow."

Said the Dubner Magid to the Vilna Gaon: "I do the same. First I find an interesting story, then I look for a relevant verse or Torah thought which it explains." In much the same way, this is what Hashem did when He brought the universe into being. First of all He "wrote" the mashal -- the Torah -- and then He looked into it and created the world. The Torah is the blueprint of the world. But more than an architect's blueprint which is lifeless, the Torah is the dynamo, the source of the spiritual energy that keeps the world turning. A fluorescent light may consume only a few watts whereas an air-conditioning unit will need several thousand.

In the same way, the "spiritual electricity" of one Torah verse alone was enough to sustain all the creatures of the sea: "Let the waters teem with teeming living creatures..." (Bereishis 1:20) However, the Mishkan which was Hashem's "dwelling place" in this world, required the "spiritual current" of a much higher order. This is the reason there are so many verses in the Torah which refer to the Mishkan. Every verse in its description is like another volt, another watt. Sources: * No Previous Experience Required - Ramban, Rabbi Yehoshua Bertram * Room At The Bottom - V.S. * Hitting The Mark, or Marking The Hit? - Rabbi Mordechai Perlman, Rabbi Reuven Subar Written and Compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Eli Ballon Ohr Somayach International E-Mail: info@ohr.org.il Home Page: http://www.ohr.org.il

* TORAH WEEKLY * Ohr Somayach Int'l Highlights of the Weekly Torah Portion Parshas Vayakhel - Pekudei

___No Previous Experience Required___ "And every man came whose heart was lifted up" (35:21) Imagine turning up at a spotless hi-tech computer plant and offering your services to build computer chips. Each chip is no more than a few millimeters square and yet it contains a multitude of components and is capable of making millions of calculations in the time it takes you to say "I'm looking for a job." They say to you: "Fine. What experience do you have?" You say "None. But I know in my heart that I can build all the chips you need." "Yeah, look there's a food factory down the block. Why don't you try over there? Maybe you'd be better off frying their chips than ours..." When Bnei Yisrael left Egypt, they had been slaves for so many years. The only skills that they had developed in those years of apprenticeship were how to stir mortar and shlep stones. Not exactly an ideal training ground for the extremely high degree of artistry necessary for the building of the Mishkan. Where was their training as carpenters, embroiderers, metal-smiths, sculptors, weavers? And yet they came to Moshe and said, "Whatever my lord commands, I will do it." And they did it. Even though the Mishkan performed the incredibly complex task of uniting Heaven and Earth, but because it was a spiritual building, all it needed was the desire of its builders to serve Hashem; then Hashem, as it were, filled in the rest of their resumes. When we want to serve Hashem, to be good Jews and good people, we should remember that no previous experience is required, just a heart that's uplifted to serve.

___Room At The Bottom___ "The keruvim (cherubim)...with their faces toward one another" (37:9) The Mishkan and later the Beis Hamikdash represented the "marriage" of the Jewish People and Hashem. The keruvim (cherubim) that were carved from the top of the cover of the holy ark were like a barometer which showed the state of this marriage. When there was shalom bayis -- "marital harmony" -- between the Creator and His people, the keruvim faced each other, but when the Jewish People strayed and were unfaithful, the faces of the keruvim turned in opposite directions.

The mishna in Pirkei Avos tells us that on Yom Kippur when everyone stood in the courtyard of the Beis Hamikdash, it was jam-packed. You could hardly move an inch. But when time came to prostrate themselves before G-d, there was plenty of room for all. The same can be said about marriage: If a person "stands," if he stands on his dignity, if he stands only

for himself, if he stands proud with his head high, then matrimony can be very crowding. You can't move an inch. But if a person lowers himself, prostrating his own interests beneath those of his spouse, then there is plenty of room for everyone.

___Hitting the Mark, or Marking the Hit?___ "Ten curtains of linen, twisted with turquoise, purple, and scarlet wool" (36:8) In this week's Parsha, the Torah details the same description of the Mishkan and its furnishings as it did previously in Parshas Terumah. Why the need for this repetition?

The Dubner Magid was famous for his use of the mashal (parable). With a short story he could illuminate a Torah idea, lighting up the eyes and the minds of all who listened. The Vilna Gaon once asked the Dubner Magid how it was that he was able to find such wonderfully telling parables that always seemed to hit the bull's eye. The Dubner Magid, of course, replied with a mashal: There once was a prince who desired greatly to become a master archer. One day while he was traveling he came to a small village. An archery contest was in progress. The prince noticed that one of the contestants' accuracy was uncanny. Each of his targets was pierced exactly in the center. The prince asked this fellow how he was able to achieve such striking results. This was his reply: "Well first I aim at a tree. Then, once I hit the tree, I run up to it and paint a circle around the arrow."

Said the Dubner Magid to the Vilna Gaon: "I do the same. First I find an interesting story, then I look for a relevant verse or Torah thought which it explains." In much the same way, this is what Hashem did when He brought the universe into being. First of all He "wrote" the mashal -- the Torah -- and then He looked into it and created the world. The Torah is the blueprint of the world. But more than an architect's blueprint which is lifeless, the Torah is the dynamo, the source of the spiritual energy that keeps the world turning. A fluorescent light may consume only a few watts whereas an air-conditioning unit will need several thousand.

In the same way, the "spiritual electricity" of one Torah verse alone was enough to sustain all the creatures of the sea: "Let the waters teem with teeming living creatures..." (Bereishis 1:20) However, the Mishkan which was Hashem's "dwelling place" in this world, required the "spiritual current" of a much higher order. This is the reason there are so many verses in the Torah which refer to the Mishkan. Every verse in its description is like another volt, another watt. Sources: * No Previous Experience Required - Ramban, Rabbi Yehoshua Bertram * Room At The Bottom - V.S. * Hitting The Mark, or Marking The Hit? - Rabbi Mordechai Perlman, Rabbi Reuven Subar Written and Compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Eli Ballon Ohr Somayach International E-Mail: info@ohr.org.il Home Page: http://www.ohr.org.il

from having to do work on Rosh Chodesh. This is a custom cited in Shulchan Aruch, that women do not do work on Rosh Chodesh [The new moon (beginning of a new lunar month)] [Orach Chaim 417:1]. At what point in time did the women receive this holiday? They received this holiday at the time of the building of the Mishkan, when they distinguished themselves through their willing donation of their jewelry to the Service of G-d. The Da'as Zekeinim explains further that during the incident of the Golden Calf, the men took their wives' jewelry by force. The women had refused to contribute to the Golden Calf. In contrast, by the building of the Mishkan, the women wanted to donate their jewelry. According to the Medrash, the contrast is even starker. The Medrash records that in relation to the Mishkan, there were in fact many men who were reluctant to give their money, while the women were universally enthusiastic. The Da'as Zekeinim theorizes that because the Mishkan was erected on Rosh Chodesh Nissan, it was specifically Rosh Chodesh Nissan which was originally given to the women as a work-free festival. The Da'as Zekeinim concludes that the custom to refrain from work on every Rosh Chodesh was a derivative of this original holiday. What is the significance of Rosh Chodesh that it was seen as a fitting holiday to give to the women? I saw a beautiful interpretation in the sefer [book] Shemen Hatov by Rabbi Dov Weinberger, which answers this question. Later in the parsha, the pasuk says, "And he made the Kiyyor of copper and its base of copper from the mirrors of the legions [women] who massed by the entrance of the Tent of Meeting [Shmos 38:8]. There is a beautiful Rash"i here that elaborates: The women of Israel had used these mirrors when beautifying themselves. Moshe initially rejected these mirrors



for use in the Mishkan, arguing that they were a tool of the Yetzer Hara (evil inclination). G-d overruled Moshe and ordered him to accept them. "These are more precious to Me than anything else". Rash"i explains why these mirrors were so precious to G-d. When the Jews were enslaved in Egypt, the men gave up hope. They did not want to live with their wives. They did not want to have children. The thought of fathering children who would be born into and live and die in slavery was overwhelmingly depressing. As the

Medrash in Shir HaShirim describes, the women went out into the fields and beautified themselves in front of their mirrors and convinced and persuaded their husbands to live with them and to have children. Those mirrors represented Klal Yisroel. Had it not been for those mirrors and that makeup and the beautification efforts of those women, there would not have been a Jewish nation. Consequently, G-d insisted that those precious mirrors did in fact belong in the Mishkan. We see that those women exhibited the attribute of faith in redemption. When all seemed bleak and full of despair, when no future seemed to exist, when there appeared to be no purpose in having children, the women retained a hope in the future. The women kept the dream of rebirth alive. When the men were feeling down and were ready to give up, it was the women who insisted "We must go on." When the time to build the Mishkan arrived (according to many Rishonim this was after the sin of the Golden Calf), the men said, "We don't want a Mishkan". The Mishkan represented a great descent from spiritual heights for the Jewish people. Had there not been a sin of the Golden Calf, there would have been no need for a Mishkan. The Shechinah [Divine Presence of G-d] would have permeated the entire camp. There would have been no divisions -- such as "The Camp of the Divine Presence", "The Camp of the Levites", "The Camp of the Israelites" -- within the Jewish people. The entire camp would have been a "Camp of the Divine Presence". We would have been on such a high spiritual level that G-d would not have had to confine himself to a single Mishkan [Tabernacle]. But after the sin of the Golden Calf, G-d said that He could no longer dwell among the entire camp. He needed a special place -- the Mishkan. Consequently, to the men, the Mishkan represented, not a spiritual height, but spiritual compromise and descent. The men lost their enthusiasm

for contributing to the Mishkan. They were reluctant to donate their gold and silver. The women, however, again prevailed. They came forward enthusiastically saying, "we must go on; do not despair; do not dwell on the negative; there must be a future; there must be rebirth; there must be renaissance". This is a unique attribute of women. They demonstrated this attribute in Egypt, they demonstrated it by the Golden Calf, and they demonstrated it by the Mishkan. This spirit, our Sages say, is most appropriately rewarded through the festival of Rosh Chodesh. Rosh Chodesh represents rebirth, renaissance, and renewal. "This month for you is the beginning of all months..." [Shmos 12:2]. In a homiletic sense, the word haChodesh (this month) is related to haChidush (this renewal). The moon drifts further and further away from the sun, becoming smaller and smaller, until we think it has disappeared. And yet it comes back, renewed and refreshed. Our righteous women symbolize this power of renewal in the Jewish people. Therefore it was only right that the women be given Rosh Chodesh as their own private holiday.

Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington twerskyd@aol.com
 Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Yerushalayim dhoffman@torah.org
 Tapes or a complete catalogue can be ordered from the Yad Yechiel Institute, PO Box 511, Owings Mills MD 21117-0511. Call (410) 358-0416 for further information. Rabbi Yissocher Frand: In Print is available through the Project Genesis On-Line Bookstore: <http://books.torah.org/RavFrand>, Copyright (c) 1999 by Rabbi Y. Frand and Project Genesis, Inc. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800 FAX: 358-9801

From: Torahweb@torahweb.org Subject: Rav Herschel Schachter - Mitzvot Le-Dorot and Hora'ot Sha'ah Rav Herschel Schachter Mitzvot Le-Dorot and Hora'ot Sha'ah

In this week's Torah-portions we learn that the Jews constructed the Mishkan and prepared the bigdei kehunah. Although in both cases the Jews followed the directions they had been given, the Torah stresses at every stage in the preparation of the bigdei kehunah that the work was done "ka'asher tzivah Hashem et Moshe" -- "just as Hashem commanded Moshe" (see Ramban 37:8, 38:22). Why would the Torah stress the fact that the Jews obeyed their orders only regarding the bigdei kehunah? Why not include the phrase by the construction of the Mishkan as well?

To answer this question R. Velvel Soloveichick explained that the verb "tzivah" is a halachic term; whenever it appears in the Torah it denotes the presence of a mitzvah le-dorot (an obligation that is binding throughout the generations), as opposed to a hora'at sha'ah (an obligation that was binding only for a limited time). This distinction between perpetual mitzvot and temporary obligations was noted by tana'im in the Sifra and was quoted by Rashi (Vayikra 6:1); the Ramban also adopted this as a criterion for inclusion in his Sefer ha-Mitzvot (Shores 3). For this reason the Torah only used the phrase "ka'asher tzivah Hashem et Moshe" regarding the bigdei kehunah, whose specifications would never change. It would be inappropriate for the Torah to use the term "tzivah" when referring to the details of the Mishkan, whose boards and curtains would later be superseded by the stones of the Beit ha-Mikdash.

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

The great care that must be exercised when drawing conclusions from the actions of a rav is stressed by the Talmud itself. The Talmud (Chullin 6b) relates that when Rabbi heard that R. Meir ate fruit grown in the town of Beit

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

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

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

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

Excerpt from Drasha of Rabbi Dr. Zalman Kossowsky, Zurich: ...

We are now at the end of the series of Parshiot describing the building of the Mishkan, the special place to which Hashem promised He would come when we called upon Him. It is quite reasonable to expect that the people who were involved in building this special place would also be special people. And so it was. But what was it that made them so special? And what lessons can we draw from them for our time?

The Tora tells us, at the end of Chapter 35, that when it came to the great artistic and architectural work required to build the Mishkan and all the artifacts that went with it, Hashem informs Moshe that He has chosen Bezalel the son of Uri to be in charge. The Pasuk continues and tells us further that Bezalel was chosen because Hashem had inspired him with many attributes, but primarily with the three attributes of "chochma", "tevunah" and "da'at" . Now, Shirley, it is very hard to translate these three words exactly, but in general we understand them as meaning - chochma - knowledge, tevunah - understanding and da'at - wisdom.

It is sometimes easier to translate these terms by defining the behaviours that they relate to. For example, the first attribute was chochma - knowledge [Wissen] . Knowledge is something we learn, like arithmetic and mathematics. Perhaps we could further define it as simply a skill, very much like the ability to take a hammer and nail and learn to drive the nail into a board of wood. Those who have tried doing it, know that it does take some skill and co-ordination to drive a nail straight into a board, without slamming a thumb or finger. For the sake of discussion, we could say that when you have mastered the skill of driving nails into boards, you have also acquired some knowledge.

The next step is to build on our knowledge (skills) and begin to have tevunah - understanding. Let me explain it in this way: If we try to put two boards together, we not only use the actions of our hands, physical skill and knowledge, but we also use some mental effort, with a degree of judgement

as to size and relationship, etc.

The third attribute that Bezalel possessed, besides knowledge and understanding, was the element of da'at -- wisdom. Da'at can be explain as the ability to join the other two attributes together so as to create something meaningful. In other words, it is the knowledge of our hands combined with the understanding of our brain that permits us to build and construct the articles mankind needs.

Bezalel was blessed by Hashem and he had all these three attributes in full measure. In fact, Hashem granted him the skills needed to do everything necessary for the building of the Mishkan. This gift was especially important when you realise that in Egypt the Children of Israel had very little opportunity to develop artistic skills. So these talents that Hashem gave him as a gift were vital if the Mishkan was to be a beautiful place, capable of inspiring all those who would come there to pray to Hashem. Thus too, we find that Hashem also gave the gift of chochma to a number of other people as well, men and women who were thus able to join with Bezalel and be the artisans who created all that beauty.

But what else do we know about those people? Are there any lessons that they can teach us today? I mean, if their skills were a gift from G-d, then what can we plain mortals who are not so blessed learn from them?

I believe that if we study the text of the Tora in this story very carefully we will find something very fascinating. Whenever the Pasuk talks about this gift of chochma that G-d promised to give to the artisans who would join with Bezalel - the Tora describes these people as persons who already have û "chochmat lev" - and this presents us with a riddle. What is this chochmat lev ? Literally it can be translated as "knowledge of the heart ". But what does that mean? And if the person already had chochma in his or her heart, then why did Hashem have to give them any more additional chochma later?

In answering these questions, I believe that we will find a very important lesson. In Jewish thinking, the heart is the seat of feelings and emotions - both good and bad. The so-called yetzer ha'tov and yetzer ha'ra . Every single human being is born with such yetzarim . And these yetzarim affect every single action that a person performs. "Chochmat lev" , according to the Philosophers, is the way through which the person trains him or herself to bring chochma to the emotions and feelings in his or her heart. But in this sense chochma means "discipline" and "structure" - just as the process of learning is one in which one imposes discipline and structure onto all the details of the subject that one is studying. The Tora is telling us here a very important principle.

In the 19th century there was a very popular German writer-philosopher, Nietzsche, who was even considered by some to be a Nineteenth Century 'prophet' of Germany. He taught that pity was depressing, and lessened the energy of the feeling of life. Nietzsche said that when one's life is ruled by the heart, one unconsciously and automatically glorifies "the good, compassionate, benevolent impulses. And this is a mark of weakness, cowardice and decadence. Let your head," he urged, "rule your life, and you will become the superman, who, on beholding the infirm, the diseased, the wretched, is inspired with the desire to crush and exterminate them, not help, comfort and raise them."

We all know what happened in the end. In the last century and the early part of this century, Germany prided itself on its intellectualism, its knowledge and understanding of science and art, philosophy and music, medicine and literature. But underneath all this beauty, understanding and knowledge oozed the feelings propounded by Friederich Nietzsche. Thus Adolph Hitler, in our time, using every kind of racial, political and economic excuse, was able to rise to power in a climate where pity was accepted as a sign of weakness and physical heredity and racial attributes qualified, or disqualified, a person for the simple right to life itself.

The Holocaust was 'knowledge' and 'understanding' put to its basest use. With complete lack of "wisdom of the heart", German ingenuity, precision and science became instruments of torture and death. As we come to the end of this century and we look back at the events that happened here in Europe, especially to our People, we can understand why it was that when the time

came to appoint the artists who would make the Mishkan in which Mankind would learn how to serve G-d and come closer to Him, the Torah's special requirement was that they have chochmat lev. Skill alone and knowledge alone was just not enough. More was required of them, lest their own unbridled passions and emotions contaminate the articles that they were fashioning.

And here, there is a critical point. Chochmat lev was not something that G-d could just give to the artisans. The Psalmist said, in Psalm 111, "reishit chochma yir'at Hashem" -- "the beginning of wisdom is the fear of the L-rd." But the Rabbis taught us that "ha'kol b'y'de shomayim - chutz m'yir'at shomayim" -- "all is in the hands of Heaven, except the 'Fear of Heaven'"; namely, that the 'Fear of Heaven' had to come from the individuals themselves. G-d would not ù in fact, could not ù force that issue. Only after the individual had already 'mastered' his or her heart ù could the gift of technical knowledge and artistic skill be granted to them.

... Remember that what Hashem values most in us -- is the ability to have our wisdom come from our hearts, not just from our heads or hands. Remember also the words of the Mishna in Pirke Avot where we find Rabbi Johanan ben Zakai, asking his disciples what they thought was the finest quality a person could possess. Of all the answers offered - he endorsed the answer, "lev tov" - a good heart.

Yeshivat Har Etzion Israel Koschitzky Vbm Student Summaries of Sichot
Delivered by the Roshei Yeshiva Parashiot Vayakhel-pekudei
Sicha of Harav Yehuda Amital Shlit"A "Men of Spirit and Men of Action"
Summarized by Dov Karoll

The second verse of Pekudei (38:22) states that Betzalel built the mishkan just as God had commanded Moshe. Rashi (s.v. U-vezalel, citing Berachot 55a) points out that the order in which Betzalel built corresponded to order which God had commanded Moshe, but differed from the order which Moshe had commanded Betzalel. When God told Moshe to appoint Betzalel to build the mishkan (31:1-11), He commanded the construction of the ohel, the tent of meeting, first. Only afterward did He command the construction of the keilim (vessels). However, when Moshe informed the people about the appointment of Betzalel (35:30-35), he mentioned his ability to use the raw materials for the keilim (gold, silver, wood) first, and subsequently described his talent at utilizing the materials for the structure (the various dyed fabrics). Rashi records a dialogue between Moshe and Betzalel explaining why Betzalel reversed the order Moshe had told him. Betzalel asked Moshe: Is it not customary to first build a house, and only afterward to put in its utensils? Moshe responded that that is precisely what God commanded him to do. Why do Moshe and Betzalel approach the order differently? Moshe's perspective is that of a "man of spirit" - he organizes the different parts of the mishkan according to their order of importance. Since the vessels are of primary significance, and the tent serves only as its cover, Moshe mentions the vessels first. Betzalel, on the other hand, is a "man of action," and he viewed the mishkan from the perspective of an architect. The architect does not focus on what is more important, but rather on the physical layout of the building. As a "man of spirit," Moshe represents those whose spiritual priorities are set straight. He realizes what actions are central in significance, and which are more peripheral. He then trains his focus on those elements which are primary, while treating the secondary elements as such. However, Betzalel, the "man of action," knows the technical details and can carry out his assigned task. His fulfillment of mitzvot is done "by the book," though it may be lacking a deep understanding of what he is doing.

In modern times, there are many people who follow the model of Betzalel. They know precisely what they are to do, down to every last detail. However, people very often lack the model of Moshe - the perspective and the spirit to realize the true significance of their actions, and which are more central. For people whose Judaism is based exclusively upon reading, and not from living in an environment surrounded by other

observant Jews, this problem is particularly relevant. In my house, growing up, there were no great Torah giants. Nonetheless, it was always perfectly clear which actions were of high significance, and which were more peripheral. People always had their priorities straight. Sometimes, people who read the Shulchan Arukh, or other books of Halakha, learn halakhot such as Shabbat (OC 242-416) and Keriat Shema (OC 58-88), which are central issues. They also see halakhot about what order a person should put on his shoes and the like (OC 2), which are customs much less significant and central. However, a person could get the impression (and people sometimes do) that these halakhot are all on the same level. People very often assume that everything included under the category of "Halakha" is equivalent. They do not distinguish between biblical laws, rabbinic laws, and customs, nor can they tell the difference between cardinal values and secondary ones. Out of an understanding such as this, a person can lose perspective, and place great emphasis upon peripheral elements. This is a very dangerous flaw. What a person should do, in addition to determining the relative significance of different actions, is try to bring certain spiritual elements into the more central actions. He should choose a certain important action, and go beyond the call of duty with regard to it. This can mean extending the time set aside for studying Torah, or doing some comparable action which shows one's particular love and enjoyment of that particular mitzva. Sometimes, this can be done by investing all available effort into a mitzva in a difficult situation. This is significant even if the effort will fall short of the normal expectations of that mitzva. For example, when I was in a forced labor camp during the Holocaust, I used to put my cleanest shirt (although it also was far from clean) in my pocket on Friday morning. I would then put it on an hour or so before Shabbat. Although it was a far cry from my normal Shabbat dress, it was very meaningful for me to put on that shirt, even more meaningful than dressing for Shabbat usually is. Since all of my emotions were focused on this one action (because this was all I could do), it was very meaningful. Since I was forced to work on Shabbat, this constituted the extent of my preparing for and honoring Shabbat. A person should try to have this intent sometimes even when he is able to fulfill all the necessary elements of the mitzva. If occasionally he truly experiences the beauty of a mitzva, he should use that experience to infuse his daily action with some of that same enthusiasm. Hopefully, through setting straight his religious priorities, and through the infusion of additional spirituality to some of those mitzvot, we will be able to more closely model Moshe - the man of spirit.

(Originally delivered at Seuda Shelishit, Shabbat Parashat Pekudei 5757.) Copyright (c) 1998 Yeshivat Har Etzion.

Peninim Ahl HaTorah Parshas Vayakhel-Pekudei
by Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum Hebrew Academy of Cleveland

"And they attached the Choshen by its rings to the rings of the Eiphod - the Choshen shall not budge from the Eiphod." (39:21) We may infer from the pasuk that once the Eiphod and the Choshen were attached, they were to remain that way always. Consequently, Aharon donned a single garment. This is inconsistent with the pasuk in Parashas Tzav (Vayikra 8:7,8), which implies that Aharon put on two separate garments. Horav David Feinstein, Shlita, suggests that in Parashas Tzav the Torah's intention was for the threads which connect the two garments to be loosened or tightened, so that it fits the Kohen Gadol properly. Horav Feinstein proceeds to expound upon the symbolism between the two garments which were worn as one. In the Talmud, Arachin 16a, Chazal state that the Eiphod represents mitzvos bein adam la'Makom, between man and Hashem. The Eiphod, thus, atoned for idol-worship. The Choshen which atoned for the sin of perverting justice, signified those mitzvos which were bein adam la'chaveiro, between man and his fellow man. Undoubtedly, each of these two sets of mitzvos is of equal importance. To differentiate between the importance of "social" mitzvos and "spiritual" mitzvos is unthinkable. One cannot serve the Almighty unless his relationship with his fellow man is in

order. Similarly, one cannot be the paragon of human relations if he is alienated from Hashem. The unseverable bond that exists between these two sets of mitzvos is manifest in the halachah which demands that the Kohen Gadol never don the Choshen without the Eiphod. Horav Feinstein now reverts back to the seeming inconsistency between the pesukim of our parsha and that of Parashas Tzav. Although the bond between these mitzvos is compelling, the relationship must sometimes be adjusted to suit the situation. At times circumstances demand that greater emphasis be placed upon human relations, while in other instances our focus remains upon avodas Hashem, serving the Almighty. This, posits Horav Feinstein, is the meaning behind the disparity between the pesukim. The Choshen/Eiphod is inextricably bonded as one garment. At times, however, the attachment should be relaxed, placing greater emphasis on one half of the garment than on the other. Other circumstances will develop requiring a "tightening" of the garment. In any event, the purpose is to adjust the fit upon the Kohen Gadol. Likewise, our Torah is a living Torah, which-through the Kohen Gadol's interpretation-lends itself to responses which vary in accordance with the circumstances.

Kortz Un Sharf-Short and Sweet Parsha Vertlach by Shaya Gottlieb Vayakhel Moshe Es Kol Adas Bnei Yisroel-and Moshe gathered the entire assemblage of the Bnei Yisroel 35:1 Before the mishkan was assembled, there needed to be 'vayakehel'-the Bnei Yisroel gathering and uniting as one soul. Until the mishkan was assembled, they were permitted to build 'mizbeachos' wherever they were to offer sacrifices, but once the mishkan was assembled it was no longer allowed. The real purpose of the mishkan was to unite Klal Yisroel under one roof, with one ideal. Therefore, the possuk begins with 'Vayakhel'. Shabbos has a similar power, to unite and concentrate the Jewish nation. As the Zohar explains: Shabbos is the conduit through which Klal Yisroel connects with the 'Echod Yochid U'myuchod'- Hakdokosh Boruch Hu. Therefore, the parsha begins with the mitzva of Shabbos, which has the power of 'Vayakhel', so necessary for the completion of the mishkan . -The Sochotchover Rebbe From: Yated Neeman _____

From:Jonathan Schwartz[SMTP:jschwartz@ymail.yu.edu]
Subject:Internet Chaburah--VaYakhel/Pikudei/HaChodesh

Prologue: The Gra, in his commentary to Isiah notes that one has an obligation to rejoice with shabbos through eating and drinking and to honor it via the wearing of a clean garment. The Gra is quick to note that the obligation is in the wearing of the clean garment FOR SHABBOS and not for self-benefit. Hence the possuk's warning, "V'karata L'Shabbos oneg"-the main idea is that which we call shabbos. Hence the gemara's statement (shabbos 118) that one who rejoices the shabbos will come to rejoice in Hashem. This seems to be due to the ability the individual has to enjoy in the pleasure of an external object by internalizing the spirit of the external object.

The Beis Halevi (Parshas Teruma) differentiates between the oneg of Shabbos and that of Yom Tov. Notes the Beisa HaLevi, if one were to eat and drink on shabbos solely for the purpose of self-enhancement, he too would receive credit for the mitzva. This is not true of Yom Tov. The reason he cites, is that possuk from Yeshiah. Notes the possuk, "V'karata L'shabbos Oneg" You call shabbos oneg implying that the main idea is having the association of shabbos to oneg and that one should feel indulged on shabbos. On Yom Tov, the issue is kavod and simcha, without express intent to rejoice because of the day, one is ignoring the yom tov mission.

There is clearly an issue to have oneg on shabbos which does not exist on yom tov. Is there an inyan to have simcha on shabbos? This week's chaburah explores that possibility entitled:

A Time for Joy: or Give it a rest? The possuk notes that during times of Simcha and on Yomim Tovim we blow the chatzotzros.(Bamidbar 10:10). The Sifrei comments that the term "days of joy" refers to shabbos. This is also the opinion of the BaHag and the Baal HaTurim who notes that the gematria of simchaschem equals "gam B'yom HaShabbos." The implication of the above commentaries is that there is a special din of Simcha on shabbos. Now the concept of Oneg on shabbos is clear from the possuk in

Yeshiah (58) which notes that we should attach the term Oneg to shabbos.. The gemara (Shabbos 62b) clearly differentiates between oneg and simmcha . Is there an obligation of simcha on shabbos? Now the miforshim

already quote the yirushalmi (megilla 1:4) which points out that when purim falls on shabbos, we push the seuda until after shabbos because the possuk tells us that these days are "yimei Mishteh V'simcha" and that true simchas purim must take place on days that beit din sits. Shabbos, which is a day which is not determined by the sitting of beis din cannot be a time for simchas purim. Hence, the Yirushalmi attaches a simcha component to shabbos but a different simcha than that of purim. The Tosefes Beracha notes the statement of tefilla "yismichu B'malchusecha shomrei shabbos" also carries a hint that there is a requirement to rejoice on shabbos. The point is that the day was accepted "bahava U'V'ratzon " without the coercion associated with the kabbolos hatorah. Hence it carries a special chiyuv of ahava v'rotzon over the standard simcha associated with all yomim tovim (see Sanhedrin 56b). The talmidei Rabbeinu Yona note that there is no mitzva to drink wine or eat meat on shabbos (Berachos perek 3). This is based on the statement "make your shabbos chol and do not rely on the handouts of man. How can a chiyuv simcha exist without wine and meat?"

Perhaps we can begin by noting that simcha is an emotion that cannot be commanded without a prompt (Hence we say "asher Bara-he created-sasson V'simcha"). So on yom tov, the prompt to the mitzva of simcha is the consumption of items that bring a man to be happy-meat and wine. Shmiras Shabbos alone may serve as that prompt and does not require any external criteria to bring out the simcha on shabbos. Still, the mitzva of simcha exists on shabbos-in its very core. The problem is the wording of Tosfos. Based on Tosfos (Kesuvos 47a) many learn that there is no mitzva of simcha on shabbos-only a mitzva of oneg and eating. (See Divrei Menachgem 426 among others). The sdei chemed (I:256) actually sums up the words of the gaonim to say that there is no obligation to have simcha on shabbos. The Rambam seems to imply that there is some component to a mitzva of simcha on shabbos from his refusal to allow people to marry on shabbos or yom tov because of ein miarvin simcha b'simcha (Ishus 10:14). The Maggid Mishneh notes that the intention of the Rambam is in reference to shabbos chol Hamoed, similar to the peshat of the Rashba (Shitta mikubetzes, Kesuvos 35). One who wants to marry on Shabbos, can according to this peshat without a problem of mixing simcha (implying that no mitzva of simcha exists on shabbos).

Bottom line, there are many proofs that shabbos could carry a mitzva of simcha with it. There are also many ways to dispute those proofs. However, the words of the sifrei still seem to be peshat implying that there is a requirement of simcha on shabbos. Hence we should be careful to keep that simcha in a befitting manner for shabbos.

Battala News Mazal Tov to Dr. and Mrs. Avraham Belizon upon their recent marriage. Mazal Tov to Mr. and Mrs. Avrohom Kevelson upon their recent marriage. Mazal tov to Rabbi Eli Duker upon his aufruf and forthcoming marriage.

Halacha Discussion by Rabbi Doniel Neustadt

Moshe commanded that they proclaim throughout the camp(36:6) From here we derive the prohibition of carrying on Shabbos (Shabbos 96b)

Carrying Garments on Shabbos QUESTION: In an area where it is forbidden to carry on Shabbos, is it permitted to wear a jacket over the shoulders with the sleeves hanging free? DISCUSSION: There are two reasons why it may be forbidden to wear a jacket in this manner: 1) Wearing a jacket over the shoulders may not be considered "wearing" at all, but rather "carrying," since the normal way of wearing a jacket is by inserting the arms into the sleeves; 2) The jacket may slip off and inadvertently be picked up and carried a distance of four amos, thus possibly violating a prohibition of the Torah.

There are conflicting opinions among the poskim regarding the validity of these concerns: Many poskim maintain that neither concern is valid and that one is permitted to wear a jacket over his shoulders(1). Harav M. Feinstein is quoted(2), however, as forbidding it under any circumstances. There are poskim(3) who permit wearing a jacket over the shoulders, but nevertheless advise that it not be worn over the shoulders in a public domain (reshus ha-rabim min ha-Torah). QUESTION: In an area

where it is forbidden to carry on Shabbos, is it permitted to wear a garment that has extra (reserve) buttons sewn onto it? DISCUSSION: Most poskim allow one to wear garments with extra (reserve) buttons sewn onto them(4). There are several reasons given for this leniency: 1) The buttons have no importance in and of themselves and are, therefore, secondary to the garment; 2) Garments are normally manufactured with extra buttons sewn onto them; 3) Since the buttons are sewn onto the garment they are considered an extension of the garment(5).=20 QUESTION: In an area where it is forbidden to carry on Shabbos, is it permitted to wear a garment which has a price tag or a cleaning tag attached to it? DISCUSSION: If the owner of the garment is not planning to remove the tag from the garment, it is definitely permitted to wear the garment on Shabbos(6). This is because the tag is of no consequence to the wearer and thus becomes secondary to the garment.

If the owner of the garment plans to remove the tag, however, some poskim rule that the garment may not be worn in an area where carrying is prohibited(7). In their view, the tag cannot be considered to be of no consequence since it is of sufficient consequence that one cares to remove it. Other poskim, however, permit the garment to be worn with the tag on it. In their view, only expensive objects are important in and of themselves and do not become secondary to the garment(8). Ideally, however, cleaning and price tags should be removed before Shabbos(9). QUESTION: In an area where it is forbidden to carry on Shabbos, is it permitted to wear a garment whose belt is looped through the back loops but hangs loose (unfastened) in the front? DISCUSSION: If the belt is sewn onto the garment, it is permitted(10). If the belt is not sewn onto the garment, there is a difference of opinion among the poskim as to whether the garment may be worn with the belt unfastened(11). QUESTION: Is it permitted to pull plastic bags over shoes in order to ease the shoes into boots? DISCUSSION: Parents often put plastic bags over their children's feet or shoes to enable them to pull their boots on more easily. These plastic bags are not considered garments, and it is therefore forbidden to wear them if one will be walking in an area where one may not carry(12).

1 Tzitz Eliezer 13:33; Az Nidberu 14:14; Orchos Rabbeinu 1:137 quoting the Chazon Ish who permitted doing so and even did so himself; Harav P.E. Falk (Zachor v'Shamor, sec. 39, pg. 43). 2 The Shabbos Home, pg. 107. His reason, however, is not specified. 3 Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 204. See also Be'er Moshe 3:63. 4 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in Rivevos Efrayim 4:87 and in I'Torah v'Hora'ah 1:8); Harav S. Z. Auerbach (quoted in Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215); Harav S. Y. Elyashiv (quoted in Machazeh Eliyahu, pg. 126); Az Nidberu 2:40. 5 The various reasons for leniency are presented in Machazeh Eliyahu 43. For a dissenting, more stringent opinion, see Be'er Moshe 3:67. 6 Shevet ha-Levi 2:61. 7 Az Nidberu 2:45; Harav M. Shternbuch in Teshuvos v'Hanhagos 1:240. 8 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in I'Torah v'Hora'ah 1:8); Minchas Yitzchak 3:36. Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 220. 9 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in I'Torah v'Hora'ah 1:8).=20 10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

10 Mishnah Berurah 301:135. 11 Chelkas Yaakov 2:130; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah, pg. 215; Harav C.P. Scheinberg (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 118) are lenient. Az Nidberu 13:15 and Be'er Moshe 3:62 forbid it. 12 Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 121).

manifestation of the Divine with his physical eyes. It is possible to "meet" G-d even when He appears in a cloud; indeed, in the haftarah for Parashat Pekudei we read, "Hashem has said that we should dwell in the fog." There also are clouds that lead us on the way, just as Bnei Yisrael experienced in the desert. It is easy to sanctify G-d's Name when one is among angels. The uniqueness of the Jewish people and its very purpose is to sanctify G-d in this world, amid its earthiness and materialism. This includes, writes R' Kook, being an active participant in the State [of Israel] and its armed forces. _This_ ultimately demonstrates the sanctity of Torah study. This is the meaning of the Vilna Gaon's teaching that a Jew's soul belongs to the earth. Man's mission is to relate G-d's greatness in this world, with all of its complications, as we say in the Rosh Hashanah prayers, "You are revealed in thick clouds of purity." (Sichot Harav Zvi Yehuda, pp. 409-410)

"Take from yourselves a portion for Hashem, everyone whose heart motivates him shall bring it, as a gift for Hashem: gold, silver, and copper." (35:5) R' Meshullam Faiysh Zvi Gross z"l (20th century rabbi in Hungary and New York) observes: In Parashat Terumah the Torah states (25:2), "Let them take for Me a portion," i.e., the gift is described as being "_for_Hashem_." In our parashah, in contrast, the emphasis is on "_from_yourselves_." Why? Parashat Terumah precedes the sin of the golden calf [which is in last week's parashah]. At that point, everything Bnei Yisrael gave was given purely for the sake of Heaven. Thus, Rashi interprets the pasuk, "Let them take for Me a portion," as meaning "for My name" i.e., with no selfish motives. In contrast, our verse in Parashat Vayakhel follows the sin of the golden calf. Chazal teach that the building of the Tabernacle served as an atonement for the sin of idolatry; therefore the verse says, "Take from yourselves," i.e., for your betterment, in order to atone for yourselves. (Ateret Zvi, p. 202)

R' David Sperber z"l (see "Letters from Our Sages" below) writes: We are taught that the cost of the mishkan was beyond the financial resources of Bnei Yisrael. However, because of the spirit with which the Jewish people brought their donations, Hashem blessed those gifts and the builders of the mishkan were able to stretch the donations farther. This may be alluded to in the above verse: "Take from yourselves," whether it is a large amount or a small amount, so long as "everyone whose heart motivates him," i.e., the gifts are brought with hearts that are motivated. If you do so, "shall bring it as a gift for Hashem" - the gift will bring itself, i.e., even a small donation will go farther. (Michtam Le'David, p.354)

Hamaayan, Copyright (c) 1999 by Shlomo Katz and Project Genesis, Inc. Posted by Alan Broder, ajb@torah.org . www.torah.org/learning/hamaayan/ . www.aacoast.com/~sehch/hamaayan/ Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. http://www.torah.org/ Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800 FAX: 358-9801

From: yhe-parsha.ml-return[SMTP:yhe-parsha.ml-return@vbm-torah.org]
Subject: PARSHAT HA'CHODESH Please add Tehilim & Mishaberach la'choleh this week for Dov Beer Ben Sarah Reizel. [Thank you.]

THE TANACH STUDY CENTER www.virtual.co.il/torah/tanach In Memory of Rabbi Abraham Leibtag PARSHAT HA'CHODESH / Maftir & Haftara

MAFTIR - For maftir, we read Shmot 12:1-20 [from Parshat Bo], where God commands Moshe with the laws of Korban Pesach and chag ha'matzot. We have already sent out several shiurim on this parsha - most recently - the questions for self study and the shiur for Parshat Bo. In case you don't have them, you can download them from the TSC website at the following url addresses: Questions for Parshat ha'Chodesh: <http://www.tanach.org/qss/qchodesh.txt> Shiur on Parshat ha'Chodesh <http://www.tanach.org/special/matzot.txt> and <http://www.tanach.org/shmot/bo2.txt> [Also available on the home page of the TSC WEB Site are various shiurim relating to Pesach from previous years.]

HAFTARAT FOR PARSHAT HA'CHODESH - Yechezkel 45:9-46:18

This week's Haftara is especially fitting for Parshat ha'Chodesh for it discusses a NEW START for the Bet ha'Mikdash which relates specifically to Pesach and Rosh Chodesh Nisan, as well as to the responsibilities of the nation's leadership [the NASI] in times of renewal!

INTRODUCTION To better appreciate this week's Haftara, we must

first discuss its details within the context of its setting in Sefer Yechezkel. As we will show, chapter 45 constitutes an integral section of chapters 40 thru 48 - the concluding unit of Sefer Yechezkel. In this final unit, Yechezkel describes his vision of the 'new' Bet HaMikdash that Bnei Yisrael will build when they return from Galut. These nine chapters focus on the return of God's SHCHINA to Yerushalayim and stand in contrast to the opening 24 chapters of the sefer that described that very same SHCHINA leaving Yerushalayim! Beginning in chapter 40 (after his famous prophecies of redemption in chapters 36-39, one of which we read last week!), Yechezkel describes his prophetic journey from Bavel to a high mountain in the Land of Israel (see 40:1-3) upon which he witnesses the ongoing construction of the new Temple (40:4->42:20). Upon its completion, Yechezkel describes his vision of God's SHCHINA returning to that Temple, in a manner very similar to his original vision of the SHCHINA leaving the first Temple some twenty years earlier (see 43:1-3).

STRUCTURAL CHANGES As we would expect, the structure of the new Temple that Yechezkel envisions is quite different than the structure of the original Temple built by Shlomo ha'melech. As Yechezkel will explain, these changes reflect the 'mistakes' that Bnei Yisrael made with the first Temple. "And God spoke to me saying... this place in which I have dwelled... Bnei Yisrael shall no longer defile My Name, they and their kings... For they placed their threshold next to My threshold and their doorposts next to My doorposts, leaving only a wall between Me and them, and they would defile My Holy Name..." (See 43:8 & its context in 43:1-9) Note how Yechezkel explains the reason for these structural changes. In Shlomo's Bet ha'Mikdash, the King's own palace was built 'next door' to the Temple, and from an architectural perspective, it was part of the same complex. In fact, Sefer Melachim describes the construction of the king's palace (7:1-12) as an integral part of the Temple complex (see 6:1-7:51). [Scan those chapters, note that there is not even a 'parsha break' between 6:38 (the completion of the construction of the HEICHAL) and 7:1 (the beginning of the construction of Shlomo's palace). Note also that the description of remainder of the Temple complex (see 7:13-51) continues immediately after the description of the king's palace!] Now, in the new Mikdash, Yechezkel insists that the King must keep his 'distance' from the Temple, in contrast to the first Temple where: "they placed their threshold next to My threshold and their doorposts next to My doorposts, leaving only a wall between Me and them, and they would defile My Holy Name..." (43:8)! Let's explain why:

ROYAL NEIGHBORS Shlomo Ha'Melech had very good intentions when he first built the Temple complex in this manner. His hope was that the proximity between these two palaces, with the House of God built high ABOVE the House of the King, would emphasize that God rules above all. Even though there was a need for a kingdom of man to rule the nation, seeing the Temple next door and high above him would serve as a constant reminder to that King that there is indeed a Higher King above him! However, despite these good intentions, in practice Shlomo's plan backfired. The 'proximity' between the King's house and the House of God led to many instances when the King acted as though the Temple was his. For example, if the king was in need of a 'loan', he would often freely 'borrow' some from his 'divine neighbor' next door - i.e. from the Temple treasury. [See I Melachim 15:18-20, and II Melachim 16:7-12, 18:14-17.] For additional examples of the king's misuse of the Temple, see also II Divrei ha'Yamim 16:1-4; 25:17-24; 26:16-21; 28:16-25; and 33:1-9 in regard to the acts of Assah, Amatzya, Uziyahu, Achaz, and Menashe in relation to the Bet Ha'Mikdash. In chapter 43 Yechezkel continues to explain how this was one of the reasons why God found it necessary to destroy the first Temple, in order that the Kings would no longer be able to continue in these wicked ways: "...and I consumed them in My anger. Now, let them put their apostasy and the CORPSES OF THEIR KINGS FAR AWAY from Me, and then I will DWELL among them forever." (43:9)

NEW BLUEPRINTS In order to emphasize this message to Am Yisrael in the Exile, Yechezkel informs them of the NEW plans for the next Temple (43:10). These plans put the King far away from the Temple. Instead of the King's palace next door, the Temple will now be surrounded (and

spiritually protected) by large courtyards. [See the previous chapter 42:15-20, read carefully. See also context of the entire chapter. Clearly in 43:10, when Yechezkel tells the people of the plans for the Temple, he is referring to the details found in chapters 40->42.] In fact, the name MELECH (=king) itself is rarely used in Sefer Yechezkel to describe the king. [Only in 37:15-28, where he foresees that the Kingdom will no longer be split between the two kingdoms of Yehuda and Ephraim, which is probably why the name king is used specifically there, to emphasize that the Kingdom will not split again.] Instead, Yechezkel consistently refers to the national leader as the NASI - the prince. [Just like Vayikra 4:22.] This is yet another indication of God's disgust with the kings of Israel during the first Temple period. [It is not by chance that a Kingdom (and dynasty), like that of Bayit Rishon, never developed during Bayit Sheni. Yechezkel's rebuke left a lasting impression upon the nation. He may have even been a bit too successful, "v'akaml"!] Therefore, Yechezkel instructs Bnei Yisrael (in Exile) to study the new architectural plans for the Bet HaMikdash which reflect this change. By doing so, they will realize their sins and thus be better prepared for their return (see 43:10-12, read carefully!).

NEW KORBANOT FOR THE NASI Not only does Yechezkel foresee a new structure for the Mikdash, he also describes the institution of a special set of KORBANOT that specifically the NASI [the king of political leader] must offer in this new Bet ha'Mikdash, as described in chapters 45 and 46. First of all, in chapter 43 we find the plans for the new MIZBAYACH (43:13-18), a special dedication ceremony (43:18-17), and the decree that the only Kohanim who will be permitted to officiate will be from the family of ZADOK, for only that family remained worthy (43:19 and also 44:15-16!). Not only does Yechezkel 'demote' the appellation of the king from MELECH to NASI, he also requires him to offer special korbantot in the Mikdash. Most likely, these korbantot serve as a constant reminder to the king of the proper relationship between God and king. These special korbantot are discussed in this week's Haftara. First, we are told that the 'funding' for these korbantot is to be collected from the people (25:16-17 /after all, he does represent the nation and furthermore, if he had to buy them with his own money it would become quite a financial burden.) Then, after bringing a special korban on Rosh Chodesh Nisan (similar to "yom ha'shmini" in Vayikra 9:1-5 which coincided with Rosh chodesh Nisan), the NASI is commanded to bring a special korban chatat on the 14th of Nisan, together with the korban Pesach (see 45:18-22). Then, during each of the seven days of chag ha'matzot, the NASI must bring 7 "parim" and 7 "eilim" for an OLAH and a "seir" for a chatat. [See 45:23-24.] In a similar manner, the NASI is also commanded to bring this same korban for each of the seven days of SUCCOT (see 45:25)! Now, even though these specific korbantot are very similar to the regular korban MUSAF brought by the "tzibur" as described in Parshat Pinchas (Bamidbar 28:16-23; 29:12-16), it is important not to confuse them! [They can't be the same korbantot tzibur, for a navi is not permitted to change the laws of the Torah - see Rambam Hilchot Yeshodei ha'Torah chapter 9!] [It is important to note that Rashi understands these korbantot as a one time commandment, even though they were for an entire year, sort of a new MILUIM process which included chag ha'matzot and succot that year. Other commentators explain that these laws reflect a new level of kedusha, which required the NASI to offer additional korbantot - see Radak, see also Avrabanel and Malbim.] As we explained above, the necessity for the NASI to offer these additional korbantot may reflect his need to properly recognize the nature of his relationship with God. To ensure that the problems caused by the haughty attitude of the kings (of the first Temple period) would not repeat themselves, the NASI to demonstrate his humility by offering these korbantot whenever the nation gathers en-masse at the Mikdash (i.e. on Pesach and Succot). A similar restriction of the NASI is discussed in chapter 46. When the NASI comes to the Mikdash to bring his korbantot, he can only come up to the gate, present his korbantot to the KOHANIM (who will offer them), then he must bow down and leave (see 46:1-2), just as the rest of the people do (see 46:3). Afterward Yechezkel describes an additional korban which the NASI must bring every shabbat (six kvasim! see 45:4-5), and on Rosh Chodesh (one

par, one ayil, and six kvasim/ see 45:6-8). Yechezkel even tells us that when the NASI enters and leaves the Mikdash, he uses the same entrance and exit as the people (and should 'mingle' with them! / see 45:9-10). The Haftara concludes with one final limitation upon the NASI. He can only control the land which is part of his "nachala", but can no longer expropriate the land of others. Yechezkel assures the people that the 'next time around' the king will longer take advantage of his power and 'cheat' them from the land which God has given them (see 46:16-18). Even though Yechezkel's prophecy of the final Bet Ha'Mikdash has not yet been fulfilled, his guide for the proper relationship between the people, their political leaders, and God remains our guide for all generations. shabbat shalom & chodesh tov, menachem

Yeshivat Har Etzion Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash Alon Shevut, Gush Etzion 90433 E-mail: Yhe@vbm-torah.org or Office@etzion.org.il

From: owner-daf-insights[SMTP:owner-daf-insights@shemaisrael.com] Dear fellow Dafyomi students, As Pesach approaches, D.A.F. asks you to help us continue to help you and thousands of others learn through Shas. Dollar for dollar, I would be hard put to think of a sounder investment in Torah and Torah-study, the highest form of Tzedakah (Yoreh Deah 249:16 -- from Shekalim bottom of 15a). (1) Your entire contribution goes towards researching and posting the study material; our overhead is minimal. Since your contributions are our only source of funding -- IT IS ONLY THROUGH YOUR GENEROSITY THAT WE CAN CONTINUE. (2) Our accomplishments speak for themselves. Besides the thousands worldwide who subscribe to our English and Hebrew mailings -- our website often gets over 1,000 hits a day! (3) The volume of our output is growing, and we are answering more questions. BE'H at the end of the current Dafyomi cycle we will have a full range of commentaries on the entire Shas available to all who seek Torah. (4) We remain unique in our field. No other organization in the world is harnessing the new communications technology that Hashem gave us in such a manner. Our meticulous beginner-to-scholar Talmud resources will be used by many thousands for many years to come. Help us keep it up. Please send your U.S. tax-deductible donation to the following address, or write to donations@dafyomi.co.il for more information: D.A.F. 140-32 69 Ave. Flushing NY 11367 Donations in other currencies can be sent to Kollel Iyun Hadaf, P.O.B. 43087, Jerusalem, Israel. Our very best wishes for a Pesach Kasher v'Same'ach, May we be able to continue learning together for many years to come! -Rabbi Mordechai Kornfeld Rosh Kollel, Kollel Iyun Hadaf Kollel Iyun Hadaf [Email: kornfeld@dafyomi.co.il] Tel:(02)6522633 P.O.B. 43087 | donations@dafyomi.co.il|Fax:9722-6522633 Har Nof, Jerusalem,ISRAEL| daf@write.com|US:(718)520-0210

THOUGHTS ON THE DAILY DAF brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf of Har Nof Rosh Kollel: Rav Mordechai Kornfeld

Yoma 66 YOMA 59-88 have been dedicated to the memory of the late Dr. Simcha Bekelnitzky (Simcha Gedalya ben Shraga Feibush) of Queens N.Y. by his wife and daughters. Well known in the community for his Chesed and Tzedakah, he will long be remembered.

1) "AND UPON HEARING THE NAME OF HASHEM THE PEOPLE BOWED DOWN" QUESTION: The Mishnah states that when the Kohen Gadol mentioned the Name of Hashem during the recitation of the Viduy on the Se'ir ha'Mishtale'ach (the third Viduy of the day), all of the people gathered there in the Mikdash would bow down and prostrate themselves. It seems that by bowing down upon hearing the Name of Hashem the people were giving honor to Hashem. (The Yerushalmi says that when they heard the Name of Hashem, the people who were near the Kohen Gadol would bow down, and the people who were far away would say, "Baruch Shem Kevod Malchuso...") A similar Mishnah earlier (35b) states that the Kohen Gadol mentioned the Name of Hashem during the first Viduy on the Par. Similarly, the Mishnah (39a) states that the Name of Hashem was used in the second Viduy on the Par. Another Mishnah (41b) states that the Name of Hashem was mentioned when performing the Goral to choose the Se'ir la'Shem. The Beraisa (39b) summarizes and says that the Name of Hashem was uttered ten times on Yom Kipur -- three times during each Viduy and once during the Goral. Why does the Mishnah in all of those places completely omit any mention of the people bowing done during those Viduyim when the Kohen Gadol uttered the Name of Hashem? Why is it only mentioned in our Mishnah? ANSWERS: (a) The VILNA GA'ON deletes this text from our Mishnah and maintains that the Mishnah does not say that the people bowed down. (The DIKDUKEI SOFRIM, #100, also points out that many early manuscripts and printings of the Gemara did not include that line in the Mishnah.) According to the Vilna Ga'on, no mention is made in any of the Mishnayot about the people prostrating themselves. Even though it is true that they bowed down as the Beraisa and Gemara mention, the Mishnah does not mention it because it is not a detail in the laws of Yom Kipur, but rather it is a detail in the laws of Hazkaras Hashem, mentioning the Name of Hashem, and thus it does not have to be brought in the Mishnayot discussing the Avodos of Yom Kipur. The Mishnah in Sotah (37b-38a) mentions the differences between the Birkas Kohanim that was recited in the Beis ha'Mikdash and the Birkas Kohanim recited everywhere else. One of the differences is that in the Beis ha'Mikdash, the Birkas Kohanim included the actual utterance of the Name of Hashem. The GEVURAS ARI here (see also Insights to 37) asks that the Mishnah should also mention prostrating (upon hearing Hashem's name) as a difference, since it was done in the Beis ha'Mikdash but not elsewhere. According to the Vilna Ga'on, the answer is that there is no need for the Mishnah in Sotah to mention it as a difference, because it goes without saying that whenever the Name of Hashem is mentioned the people bowed down, which is why the Mishnayot in Yoma also do not mention that the people bowed down. (In the RAMBAM's text of the Mishnah, the fact that the people bowed down is mentioned in the earlier Mishnah (35b) discussing the first Viduy, which is the first time that the Mishnah says that the Kohen Gadol uttered the Name of Hashem. Thereafter, the Mishnah does not need to mention that the people bowed down, because it relies on the first Mishnah.) (b) RAV YOSEF DOV SOLOVEICHNIK (Avodas Yom ha'Kipurim, 37a) writes that perhaps the purpose of the prostration

of the people was not in order to honor the Name of Hashem. Rather, it was a specific act related to the Viduy of the Se'ir ha'Mishtale'ach, and as such, it is fitting that only the Mishnah here mentions it and not the earlier Mishnayot. RASHI (21a, DH Mishtachavim) writes that the people used to bow down when reciting Viduy in the Beis ha'Mikdash. If bowing down is related specifically to Viduy, then it makes sense that the people did not bow down except when the Name of Hashem was said during "the people's Viduy" (the Viduy which the Kohen Gadol said on the Se'ir ha'Mishtale'ach was for atonement for the sins of the entire nation). Even though the Name of Hashem was mentioned during the Goral, the Goral was not a Viduy and thus they did not bow down. When the Name of Hashem was uttered during the first and second Viduyim, the people also did not bow down, because those two Viduyim were for the Kohen Gadol himself (in the second Viduy, the rest of the Kohanim also gained atonement, but only "mi'Kufya"). The Viduy of the Se'ir ha'Mishtale'ach, though, was the Viduy for all of the Jewish people, and therefore they bowed down upon hearing the Name of Hashem. (See TOSFOS YOM TOV here DH v'Hakohanim, who hints at such an approach but ultimately rejects it, without citing the Rashi on Daf 21a.) As an aside, Rav Soloveichik points out that in the Tefilas Musaf that we recite on Yom Kipur, we bow down four times -- once for each Viduy and once for the Goral. Why do we bow down those four times? We should bow down ten times, corresponding to the ten times that the Name of Hashem was uttered and the people bowed down (i.e. according to the understanding of the Rishonim and Acharonim, or only during the Viduy of the Se'ir according to his own explanation)! He answers (see also PERISHAH OC 621) that the prostrations which we do during Musaf on Yom Kipur are not done out of honor for the Name of Hashem, but rather we are acting out a representation of what was done in the Avodah of Yom Kipur in the Beis ha'Mikdash. We bow once during each Viduy to demonstrate what was done in the Beis ha'Mikdash. For this it suffices to bow once for each Viduy.

2) "TIT'HARU!" In the repetition of Musaf on Yom Kipur, we paraphrase a passage from our Mishnah. The Chazan recites the text of the Viduy which the Kohen Gadol would say in the Beis ha'Mikdash. When he comes to the words "Lifnei Hashem" in the verse, "Ki ba'Yom ha'Zeh Yechaper Aleichem... Lifnei Hashem Titharu," he pauses, and everyone assembled says the next words in the Mishnah, "v'ha'Kohanim v'ha'Am... Hayu Mishtachavim" and everyone bows down (in some communities, the custom is for only the Chazan to recite those words and bow down). After everyone has bowed down, the Chazan continues and says "Titharu," the last word of the verse he started. RAV SHALOM SHVADRON, zt'l, the well-known "Magid" of Yerushalayim, who served as the Ba'al Tefilah for many years on Yom Kipur (in the Chevron Yeshivah in Givat Mordechai, Jerusalem) pointed out that although it is true that in the Beis ha'Mikdash, the people bowed down immediately upon hearing the Name of Hashem, there is no reason for the Chazan to split up the verse and mention the last word of the verse, "Titharu." *after* saying the other words of the Mishnah describing how the people bowed down. Rav Shalom claimed that there is absolutely no source for interrupting the verse without completing it, and therefore when he served as Chazan he would complete the verse and say, "Lifnei Hashem Titharu" before saying "v'ha'Kohanim v'ha'Am..." (It is possible that the current practice originated in a practice of saying the word "ha'Shem" -- as in "Ana Hashem -- instead of the the Holy Name, Hashem, when quoting the verse "Lifnei Hashem Titharu," as proposed by the TUR in the name of RAV SA'ADYA GAON. Since the Name of Hashem wasn't used, there was nothing wrong with stopping in middle of a verse. Later, the practice was changed and the Holy Name of Hashem was recited by the Chazan as he said the verse, as the Tur cites from RAV YITZCHAK IBN GE'AS. Mistakenly, the printers of the Machzor did not correspondingly add the word Titharu to change the practice of interrupting in middle of the verse with "v'ha'Kohanim v'ha'Am..." before finishing the verse. -M. Kornfeld) daf@shemaisrael.co.il

Yoma 69 1) "KIL'AYIM" IN THE "BIGDEI KEHUNAH" QUESTION: The Gemara discusses whether it is permitted for a Kohen to derive benefit from the Bigdei Kehunah while he is not performing an Avodah. Does deriving benefit from the Bigdei Kehunah constitute Me'ilah or not? The Gemara provides various proofs to permit deriving benefit from the Bigdei Kehunah. The first proof is from our Mishnah, which states that the Kohen Gadol may wear the Bigdei Kehunah when he reads from the Torah (which is not an Avodah). Second, the Gemara quotes a Beraisa which says that the Kohanim are permitted to sleep in and to walk around while wearing the Bigdei Kehunah. Finally, the Gemara cites a Beraisa which says that the Kohanim are permitted to place the Bigdei Kehunah beneath their heads when going to sleep.

The Gemara rejects the last proof and says that the Beraisa does not mean that it is permitted to place the Bigdei Kehunah *underneath* their heads, but rather *beside* their heads. The Gemara lends support to this interpretation by pointing out that if it actually meant under their heads, there would be a problem of deriving benefit from Kil'ayim (for the Avnet was made of wool and linen). Why is the Gemara addressing the problem of Kil'ayim only at this point? If there is a problem wearing the Bigdei Kehunah because of Kil'ayim, then why did the Gemara suggest at the beginning of the Sugya that it is permitted to wear the Bigdei Kehunah even when the Kohen is not doing an Avodah? Even if there is no Isur of Me'ilah, there is still an Isur of Kil'ayim! Why does the Gemara only address the problem of Kil'ayim now, when discussing placing the Bigdei Kehunah underneath one's head? ANSWERS: (a) TOSFOS (Menachos 40b-41a, DH Techeles) and TOSFOS YESHANIM here point out that there is strong proof from this Sugya for the opinion of RABEINU TAM. Rabeinu Tam asserts that since it is permitted to wear a garment with Kil'ayim in order to fulfill the Mitzvah of Tzitzis, one may wear that garment even at a time when no Mitzvah is being fulfilled (such as at night). (That is, Rabeinu Tam maintains that the reason it is permitted to wear a garment with Kil'ayim in order to fulfill the Mitzvah of Tzitzis is not merely because of "Aseh Docheh Lo Ta'aseh," but because the Torah completely permitted -- Hitirah -- the Isur of Kil'ayim on a garment with Tzitzis.) A similar principle may be applied to Kil'ayim in the Bigdei Kehunah. Since the Kohen is permitted to wear Kil'ayim while he is performing the Avodah, he may also wear the Bigdei Kehunah with Kil'ayim while he is not performing the Avodah. The Isur of benefiting from Kil'ayim will apply only when the Kohen is *not* wearing the Bigdei Kehunah, but is wearing himself with them in another manner. The Torah permits Kil'ayim only when the Kohen is *wearing* the Bigdei Kehunah, but not when he is sitting on top of the Bigdei Kehunah or resting his head on them. (See also RA'AVAD, Hil. Kilayim end of 10 and Hil. Klei ha'Mikdash 8:10, who rules like Rabeinu Tam and argues with the Rambam on this point.) (b) The MEFARSH in Tamid (27a) says that the question of Kil'ayim *does* refer back to the beginning of the Sugya, and the Gemara indeed could have asked it there. The Gemara, though, knew that the answer to the question would apply to the entire Sugya, to all the cases of wearing the Bigdei Kehunah with Kil'ayim. The

Gemara answers that the garment with Kil'ayim is made of a very hard material, to which the Isur of Kil'ayim does not apply. The Mefaresh learns that not only is it permitted to lie on Kil'ayim when the garment is made of a hard material, but there is no problem of even *wearing* Kil'ayim when the garment is made of a hard material, because it does not warm a person while he wears it, and if it does not serve to warm it is not Kil'ayim. (See below, Insight #3.)

The Weekly Daf #265 Yoma 65 - 71 Parshas Vayakhel-Pekudei
<http://www.ohr.org.il/yomi/yomi265.htm>

Restorers of the Crown's Glory "Anshei Knesses Hagedolah -- Men of the Great Assembly." This is the title given to the extraordinary body of 120 Sages, including the last of the Prophets, who led the Jewish People at the beginning of the Second Beis Hamikdash era. How did they gain the title "great?" asks Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi. "By restoring," he answers, "the crown to its former glory." This Sage cites four passages to explain this point. * Moshe referred to Hashem as "Great, Mighty and Awesome." (Devarim 10:17) * Yirmiyahu described Hashem as "Great and Mighty" (Yirmiyahu 32:18) but did not use the term "Awesome." * Daniel directed his prayer to the "Great and Awesome G-d" (Daniel 9:4) but did not mention "Mighty." * The Anshei Knesses Hagedolah returned to Moshe's full, original praise of Hashem, referring to Him as "Great, Mighty and Awesome." (Nechemia 9:32) Why did Yirmiyahu and Daniel, each in his own era, delete one of the praises mentioned by Moshe? Yirmiyahu saw the Babylonian heathens noisily carousing in the Sanctuary and asked himself "Where is G-d's Awesomeness?" He therefore deleted "Awesome" from his praise. Daniel saw the Babylonians and Persians subjugating the Jews during the seventy years of exile and asked himself "Where is G-d's Might?" He therefore deleted "Mighty" from his praise. The Anshei Knesses Hagedolah offered another perspective in their time. "On the contrary," they said, "G-d's might is expressed in the power to restrain Himself and allow the heathens to carry out their oppression (so that their victims will be moved to repentance). G-d's Awesomeness is expressed in Jewish survival amongst the nations." ("How great is the lamb which survives against seventy wolves!" said the Roman ruler Andrianus to Rabbi Yehoshua about Jewish survival. "How great is the Shepherd who saves them!" answered the Sage. -- Midrash Tanchuma) How could Yirmiyahu and Daniel, asks the gemara, divert from the praise instituted by Moshe? These sages, explains Rabbi Elazar, were aware how much Hashem values truth, and they would not be untruthful in any way. Maharsha reconciles the divergences in the praises by pointing out that each of the aforementioned praised Hashem according to what he witnessed in his own time. All of them spoke of Hashem's Greatness which is revealed at all times in His creation. Moshe, who witnessed Hashem's power in the miracles of the Exodus from Egypt and forty years in the wilderness, added "Mighty and Awesome." Yirmiyahu saw the destruction of the Beis Hamikdash and could not truthfully testify to witnessing G-d's "Awesomeness." He therefore deleted this term from his praise. Daniel did not witness that destruction and was still able to experience Hashem's "Awesomeness," but he and his generation suffered what Yirmiyahu did not -- enslavement in Babylonian captivity. He could therefore not truthfully testify to Hashem's "Might." Therefore he deleted that term. The Anshei Knesses Hagedolah, however, arrived on the scene at the end of that seventy year exile. They witnessed the miraculous survival of their people in the face of so many troubles, such as the deliverance from Haman's genocidal plot. In retrospect, they were capable of truthfully testifying, on the basis of their own experience, to Hashem's Might, expressed in His restraint which allowed time for the lesson to be learned, and the Awesomeness evident in Jewish survival. * Yoma 69b Written and Compiled by Rabbi Mendel Weinbach General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Eli Ballon Prepared by the Jewish Learning Exchange of Ohr Somayach International 22 Shimon Hatzadik Street, POB 18103 Jerusalem 91180, Israel Tel: 972-2-581-0315 Fax: 972-2-581-2890 E-Mail: info@ohr.org.il Home Page: <http://www.ohr.org.il> (C) 1999 Ohr Somayach International - All rights reserved.
