

פרשות ויקהל-פקודי

We are accustomed to encountering that which appears to be contradictory information in the Torah. That type of event is hallowed in the famous B'raisa of Rabi Yishmael which introduces Midrash Toras Kohanim on Sefer Vayikro and is found in our Siddurim immediately before *P'sukei D'zimra*.

We read there:

שני כתובין המכחישים זה את זה עד שיבא הכתוב השלישי ויכריע ביניהם.

When two verses [appear] to be mutually contradictory...until a third verse comes and decisively explains them.

That is, the third verse introduces new information that demonstrates the parameters of each of the two verses so that we understand their meaning and why they are not in opposition with each other.

However, when we are faced with an individual verse that that seems self-contradictory, the above rule is not effective.

We have such an instance in our Parsha where a particular Posuk seems to be inconsistent, at the very least, if not contradictory.

In the first of our two Parshos, Parshas Vayakhel, we read of the transmission of the commandment of the Mishkan to B'nei Yisroel. In the previous Parshos, we have learned that which HaKodosh Boruch Hu transmitted to Moshe and now all of Israel is informed of this magnificent national project.

The order of our Parsha is:

- Moshe's transmission of the items required for the Mishkan (Perek 35/P'sukim 4-9);
- A general invitation to those capable of producing the necessary items to come forward and volunteer (P'sukim 10-20);
- The people's donations (P'sukim 21-29):

- Moshe informs the people of the overseers of the building of the Mishkan (P'sukim 30-35); the overseers begin to approach their work (Perek 36/P'sukim 1-3);
- The overseers see that there is no need for further gifts to the Mishkan and inform Moshe of such who then announces that there are to be no more gifts (P'sukim 4-7).

It is the final verse of this last section that draws our attention. It reads:

וְהַמְּלָאכָה הַיְתֵה דַּיִם לְכֹל הַמְּלָאכָה לַעֲשׂוֹת אֹתָהּ וְהוֹתֵר:

The work was enough for all of the work to do it; and there was more [than enough].

We note at this point, and will discuss it later, that the term used for the required activities is *melacha*, not *avodah*.

The tension in the Posuk is evident. If the goal of the verse is to tell me the quantities that were brought by the people, then it should tell me that it was: 'not enough', 'enough', or 'in excess'. It appears as if the verse is giving me two pieces of information that will only confuse me.

Was there 'enough' or was there 'more than enough'?

As Or HaChaim HaKodosh phrases it:

הֵם שְׁנֵי דְבָרִים הַפְּכִיִּים אִם דַּיִם אִינוּ הוֹתֵר וְאִם הוֹתֵר אִינוּ דַּיִם

They are two opposites: if there was enough, then there was not extra. If there was extra, [it cannot be termed] enough.

Let us see first how our *meforshim* explain this Posuk to us.

Targum Yonoson adds a word before 'וְהוֹתֵר' - and there was extra. The word he adds is בָּרָם, 'in truth' and thus the Posuk is understood as 'there was enough and, in fact, more than enough'.

Rabbenu Bachye does something similar and in his explanation adds the word וְעַדִּין, 'and still' before the word 'and there was extra.

Both Malbim and Netziv understand that the 'extra' to which the Posuk refers is in reference to a necessary stockpile to use a reserve for future building.

Malbim writes:

והמלאכה. ובכל זה היה המלאכה דים, ודרך המכין חומריים למלאכה שיכין יותר מהצורך, כדי שיהיה ממין הזה לתקן את אשר יצטרך תיקון בעתיד, אמר שהמלאכה היתה דים בין לעשות המלאכה ובין להותיר מה שדרך האומנים להותיר:

The melachah – with all of this the *melachah* was sufficient. It is the practice of those who prepare material for work to prepare more than that which is necessary in order that there will be the appropriate material to make repairs in the future. Therefore the verse says that the work was sufficient – both in regard to doing the work itself and in regard to having extra, as workmen do.

Netziv writes similarly – but with an addition:

והותר. דדרך אומנים כשחסר להם איזו חתיכה קטנה כסף וזהב להכלי, עושים מהפתיתים ששפו במעשה עוד חתיכה קטנה ולצרף אותה חתיכה לגוף הכלי, אבל אין בזה תפארת הכלי אלא שהיה די והותר, שהפתיתים ניתותרו:

And there was extra – it is the practice of artisans that when a small piece of material, be it silver or gold, is missing from an object, that they take the small scraps that remain from fashioning the object and they make another small piece, and solder it to the body of the object.

However, such a practice is not in keeping with the *tiferes*-beauty of the object. [Thus in the Mishkan they did not use these scraps.] Therefore there was extra- the scraps were not used.

It seems that we can trace these explanations of Malbim and Netziv to Seforno who wrote:

לעשות אותה והותר. לעשות אותה המלאכה ולהותיר, באופן שלא היו צריכים לצמצם אופן עשייתם מדאגה פן יחסר החומר:

To make it and there was extra – [There was enough] to do the work and to have extra so that they would not have to be sparing in their work out of worry that there would not be enough material.

Kedushas Levi who preceded both Malbim and Netziv understands our verse from a very different standpoint. He writes:

...הנה הוא יתברך 'א...ל ש...ד...י', 'אל' הוא מלשון חוזק, כמו 'ואילי הארץ' (יחזקאל יז/ג¹), ו'שדי' הוא השפעה מלשון 'שדים', והקדוש ברוך הוא 'א...ל ש...ד...י' שמתגבר כביכול על השפעתו, וזה שדרשו חכמינו ז"ל (חגיגה יב א) שאמר לעולמו די. דהנה כל דבר הבא מכח אין סוף אז יכול הדבר ההוא להתרחב ולהתפשט עד אין שיעור וערך, ואם כן כיון דהוא יתברך ברא העולמות, אז היו רוצים להתפשט בלי גבול, והוצרך הקדוש ברוך הוא לומר די, וליתן כך וכך סידור עולמים לפי מה שהבין יתברך בחכמתו עליונה כמה צריך לפי סדר הבריאה, ואז אמר די, וזהו גבורה וצמצום שהוצרך יתברך לצמצם כוחו.

Hashem Yisborach is known as *Kel Sha...dai*, Almighty G-d.

E...I is an expression of strength as we read in the verse in Yechezkel 'the powerful ones of the land.'

Sha...dai is an expression of showering abundance and it is the same expression as 'breast' [which implies giving abundance].

Hashem is *E...I Sha...dai* meaning that , He overcomes, as it were, His abundance.

That is what Chazal explained that He told His world 'enough' [when He created it].

This is because anything which is derived from the infinite will expand and spread in an unlimited fashion.

¹ The entire verse reads:

וַיִּקַּח מִזְרַע הַמְּלוּכָה וַיְכַרְתֵּם אֹתוֹ בְּרִית וַיָּבֵא אֹתוֹ בְּאֵלֶּה וְאֵת אֵילֵי הָאָרֶץ לָקַח:

Nevuchadnetzar took from the royal family and he made a covenant with them and he imposed an oath upon them and he took the powerful ones of the land.

Thus, since Hashem is the Creator of all the worlds, all of the worlds wished to spread out without limit and thus Hashem had to say 'enough' and order the world the way it should be, according to His supreme wisdom, and then He said 'enough'.

That is G-d's strength and ability to limit that He limited His own power.

That is, והותר refers to the fact that the Mishkan was endowed with the expansiveness of *Ruach Hashem* and even though it was limited, that *Ruach Hashem* left its mark with the fact that that 'which was enough' was 'excessive' and thus it had to be stopped if it would expand continuously.

However, in addition to the questions regarding the *p'shat* of this verse it and the preceding Posuk have Halachic implications as well.

Let us first see our Posuk in context. We read (P'sukim 2-7):

וַיִּקְרָא מֹשֶׁה אֶל בְּצַלְאֵל וְאֶל אֹהֲלִיאָב וְאֵל כָּל אִישׁ חָכֵם לֵב אֲשֶׁר נָתַן ה' חֲכָמָה בְּלִבּוֹ כָּל אֲשֶׁר נָשְׂאוּ לְבוֹ לְקִרְבָּה אֶל הַמְּלָאכָה לַעֲשׂוֹת אֹתָהּ: וַיִּקְחוּ מִלִּפְנֵי מֹשֶׁה אֶת כָּל הַתְּרוּמָה אֲשֶׁר הֵבִיאוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְמַלְאכַת עֲבֹדַת הַקֹּדֶשׁ לַעֲשׂוֹת אֹתָהּ וְהֵם הֵבִיאוּ אֵלָיו עוֹד נְדָבָה בְּבִקְרָר בְּבִקְרָר: וַיָּבִיאוּ כָּל הַחֲכָמִים הָעֹשִׂים אֶת כָּל מַלְאכַת הַקֹּדֶשׁ אִישׁ אִישׁ מִמְּלָאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר הֵמָּה עֹשִׂים: וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֶל מֹשֶׁה לֵאמֹר מְרֵבִים הָעָם לְהֵבִיא מִדֵּי הָעֲבֹדָה לְמַלְאכָה אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה ה' לַעֲשׂוֹת אֹתָהּ: וַיֵּצֵא מֹשֶׁה וַיַּעֲבִירוּ קוֹל בַּמַּחֲנֶה לֵאמֹר אִישׁ וְאִשָּׁה אֵל יַעֲשׂוּ עוֹד מַלְאכָה לְתְרוּמַת הַקֹּדֶשׁ וַיִּכְלָא הָעָם מִהֵבִיא: וְהַמְּלָאכָה הַיְתֵה דַיִּם לְכָל הַמְּלָאכָה לַעֲשׂוֹת אֹתָהּ וְהוֹתֵר:

Moshe called to Betzalel and Oholiov and each man with a wise heard that Hashem placed wisdom in his heart, everyone whose heart raised him to approach the word and to do it. They took from before Moshe all of the gifts that B'nei Yisroel brought for the *melachah* of the labor of the holiness to do it; they brought other gifts in the morning and the morning.

All of the wise men who do the work of holiness, each one from the *melachah* that they were doing.

They said to Moshe saying, 'The people are bringing in excess of the labor for the *melachah* that Hashem commanded to do it.

Moshe commanded and they passed a voice in the camp saying, 'Man and woman, do not do any more *melachah* for the donations for the holiness; and the people stopped bringing.

The narrative of the Posuk implies that almost immediately upon being told of the various donations that were required to build the Mishkan, the people responded immediately and completely.

In fact, the Midrash comments on the words **בבוקר בבוקר** and says that in just two days, after two mornings, all that was necessary for building the Mishkan had been brought as we read in these verses. We read (Sh'mos Rabba Parshas Pekudei Parshata 51/2):

לכמה ימים הביאו כל הנדבה, אמר רבי יוחנן לשני בקרים הביאו והותר,

How many days did it take to bring the entirety of the contributions? Rabi Yochanan said 'They brought [it all] in two mornings and there was a surplus.

The narrative of the verses also implies that the evaluation of the materials needed was made by the various artisans and craftsman under the leadership of Betzalel and Oholiov.

Now that the donations were more than enough, there was no need to have further collections.

How were the people informed that additional donations were unnecessary? We read above:

וַיִּצַו מֹשֶׁה וַיַּעֲבִירוּ קוֹל בְּמַחֲנֵה לְאֹמֶר אִישׁ וְאִשָּׁה אַל יַעֲשׂוּ עוֹד מְלָאכָה לְתִרוּמַת
הַקֹּדֶשׁ וַיִּכְלָא הָעָם מִהֵבִיא:

Moshe commanded and they passed a voice in the camp saying, 'Man and woman, do not do the *melachah* of the donations for the holiness and the people stopped bringing.

It is apparent that 'passing a voice' is an unusual phrase. The Torah could have said that they 'told' or that they 'informed'. What is the meaning of passing a voice?

In Masseches Shabbos (96 b) Chazal understood this phrase to teach us about one of the 39 *melachos* that are forbidden on Shabbos. They write:

הוצאה גופה היכא כתיבא? - אמר רבי יוחנן: דאמר קרא ויצו משה ויעבירו קול במחנה. משה היכן הוה יתיב - במחנה לוי, ומחנה לוייה רשות הרבים הואי, וקאמר להו לישראל: לא תפיקו ותיתו מרשות היחיד דיכחו לרשות הרבים.

Where is the prohibition of carrying² itself written? Rabi Yochanan said, [It is from] the verse, 'And Moshe commanded, and they passed a voice in the camp'. Where was Moshe sitting? – in the encampment of *Levi'im* which had the status of a public domain and Moshe told Israel, 'Do not take out and bring from your private domain [your home] to the public domain'.

² In Masseches Shabbos 73 a, in the Mishnah, we read the list of the 39 *melachos*. The final *melacha* there is

המוציא מרשות לרשות

One who takes out from one domain to another.

The domains under discussion here are *רשות היחיד*, a private domain, and *רשות הרבים*, a public domain.

In the context of the *melachos* of Shabbos, 'private' and 'public' refer to the type of structure of the domain, not to its ownership.

A private domain is an enclosed area. A public domain is an unenclosed area with a minimum width of 16 *amos* which is between 24 and 32 feet and one where 100,000's of people would frequent on a regular basis.

For a more specific and precise definition of these two domains and others that have the status of Rabbinic enactments, see Simon 345 in Shulchan Aruch *Orach Chaim*.

הוצאה מלאכת is the Torah's Shabbos prohibition of taking an object from a *reshus ha'yochid* to a *reshus ho'rabbim* or vice-versa.

We used the commonly accepted term of 'carrying' to refer to this *melachah*.

וממאי דבשבת קאי, דילמא בחול קאי, ומשום דשלימא לה מלאכה? כדכתיב והמלאכה היתה דים וגו'. - גמר העברה העברה מיום הכפורים. כתיב הכא ויעבירו קול במחנה וכתוב התם (ויקרא כה/ט³) והעברת שופר תרועה, מה להלן - ביום אסור, אף כאן - ביום אסור

How do you know that this announcement was meant to refer to [a] Shabbos [prohibition]? Maybe it [had nothing to do with Shabbos] and was [only] a [standard] weekday announcement telling the people not to bring anymore because work of bringing material was completed? [It is learned] from that which is written, 'And the *melachah* was enough etc.

Chazal learned the meaning of this word by means of a *gezeira shava*⁴. The term העברה, passing, is used here and regarding Yom HaKippurim. Here it is written, 'And they passed a voice in the camp' and by Yom HaKippurim it is written, 'You shall pass the Shofar that sounds the *teru'a*'. Just like the use of העברה, passing, there is used in the context of a day of prohibitions [Yom HaKippurim] so too here, the use of העברה is on a day of prohibitions [Shabbos].

Thus, by means of this מידה שהתורה נדרשת בה, this means of Torah exegesis, we understand that this unusual phraseology comes to teach us the final of the Shabbos *melachah* prohibitions.

Before we examine this complicated interpretation and some of its implications, let us first wonder regarding the need for an explicit verse in the Torah to teach us that there is a prohibition of carrying from one domain to another on Shabbos.

³ This verse, referring to Yom HaKippurim on the *Yovel* years reads in full:

והעברת שופר תרועה בחדש השבעי בעשור לחדש ביום הכפורים תעבירו שופר בקל ארצכם:

You shall pass the shofar of the *teru'a* in the seventh month on the tenth of the month on Yom HaKippurim you shall past the shofar through all of your land.

⁴ A *gezeira shava* is a means of Torah exegesis when one had a tradition that the use of the same word in two different contexts joined the contexts and made them interrelated.

We are familiar with the fact that the individual 39 *melachos* are not written in the Torah⁵, a fact emphasized by the Mishnah in Masseches Chagiga.

We read there (Mishnah 8):

הלכות שבת...הרי הם כהררים התלויין בשערה שהן מקרא מועט והלכות
מרובות...

The Laws of Shabbos are like mountains suspended by a strand of hair.
There are very few P'sukim and very many Halachos.

⁵ The attentive reader may ask why we are making a special point regarding *מלאכת הוצאה*, the prohibition of carrying on Shabbos. Our Parshas Vayahkel states another *melachah* far more clearly as we read (Perek 35/Posuk 3):

לא תבערו אש בכל משבתיכם ביום השבת:

Do not make a fire in any of your dwellings on the Shabbos day.

הבערה, making a fire, is one of the 39 *melachos* and here it is written in the clearest of manners!

The answer is that Chazal teach us that it was unnecessary to write this verse if it was meant to teach us regarding the actual prohibition of הבערה on Shabbos. It is clear that this *melacha* as well as with the other 37, excluding carrying, do not require a special verse.

Thus, Chazal ask (Masseches Pesachim 5 a), and Rashi brings it here:

למה הבערה יצאת?

Why did this prohibition of lighting a fire leave the general principle [of not doing *melachah* on Shabbos and was written individually]?

The Gemara gives two answers, one of which reflects on a uniqueness of this specific prohibition and the other which uses this prohibition as an archetype for all of the *melachos*.

However, the Gemara does not consider the possibility that we need this verse to teach us that there is a prohibition of making a fire on Shabbos.

See the commentary of Rav Shimshon Rafael Hirsch on this verse for a discussion why *מלאכת הבערה* was chosen to specified.

Tosfos Yom Tov, citing the Gemara's explication of this Mishnah, explains that although there are many verses forbidding *melachah* on Shabbos, there are almost none that deal with the particulars, including basic principles such as:

מלאכת מחשבת אסרה תורה

The Torah forbids purposeful acts [that have important consequences].

This basic principle is found in our Parsha in connection with the Mishkan, as we read (Perek 35/Posuk 33):

וּבְחֶרֶט אֶבֶן לְמִלֵּאת וּבְחֶרֶט עֵץ לַעֲשׂוֹת בְּכֹל מְלָאכֶת מַחֲשָׁבֶת:

[In the Mishkan one is involved with] engraving stones for settings and carving wood to do for all of the *melechtes machsheves*, purposeful acts.

We learn the *melachos* of Shabbos from the Mishkan but specification dealing with Shabbos in the Torah is not found.

Why, then, should the *melachah* of carrying require its own verse?

In fact, this is the gist of the Tosfos (d.h. *hot'tzo'oh gufoh*) on this Gemara who write:

ואף על גב שהיתה במשכן כדאמר הם הורידו קרשים מעגלה כו' מכל מקום אי לאו דכתיב לא הוה מחייבי עלה לפי שמלאכה גרועה היא כדפירשתי לעיל.

Even though carrying was done in building the Mishkan as the Gemara says that taking the boards from the wagon [which had a status of *reshus hayochid*] and placing them in the *Machaneh Levi* [which had a status of *reshus harabbim*] was part of the building of the Mishkan, nonetheless if the *melachah* of carrying did not have a specific verse, we would not have known to include it in the *melachos* that the Torah forbids because it is a *מלאכה גרועה*, a 'weak' *melachah* as we explained above.

That is, at the very beginning of the Masseches (2 a d.h. *poshat*) Tosfos explained that the *melachah* of carrying is 'weak' in comparison to the other *melachos* of Shabbos.

The 'weakness' is that the act of carrying does not bring about any positive, purposeful result. An object that is carried from one place to another remains unchanged. That is in contrast to all of the other 38 *melachos* which change the object upon which the *melachah* is performed.

Thus, because of the inherent distinction between the *melachah* of carrying and all of the other *melachos*, Chazal on their own would not have known to take the act of carrying that was done as part of the construction of the Mishkan and establish it as a *melachah* of Shabbos.

Therefore, the Torah *had* to write the prohibition against carrying in the context of Shabbos to make it one of the forbidden acts.

However, we cannot yet be satisfied with this explanation. We understand that the prohibition of carrying on Shabbos had to be written in the context of Shabbos for us to know that it was forbidden.

But, why didn't the Torah write the prohibition clearly and explicitly – do not carry on the Shabbos day? Why was this prohibition written in a way that is almost indiscernible when we read the words themselves?

Why did the Torah use the 'voice' that was passed throughout the camp to indicate that objects cannot be passed/carried throughout the camp?

Perhaps we can understand the reason for this medium of the 'voice' being used as an indication of 'carrying' when we once again revisit the concept of 'carrying' as being a *מלאכה גרועה*, a 'weak' *melachah*.

A voice is elusive. Sounds are not viewed as substantial and concrete. It is true, of course, that scientifically sound produces waves that are measurable and thus have substance. But sounds are not thought of that way.

In fact, for the past centuries philosophers grappled with the question:

If a tree falls in a forest and no one is around to hear it, does it make a sound?

Now, I think that the answer is ‘of course it makes a sound’⁶, but there were great thinkers who questioned that.

Thus, when the Torah writes that a sound is ‘passed’, it objectifies the sound and makes it more concrete. By showing that the ‘sound’ has substance and it can be moved from one place to another⁷, the Torah is giving support to the idea that carrying, moving something from one place to the other is an act with substance and then with the various means with which the Torah is interpreted, we can know that there is the Torah’s prohibition of מלאכת הוצאה.

We now have an additional insight to the verse with which we began. We read:

וְהַמְלָאכָה הַיְתֵרָה דִּימֵ לְכֹל הַמְלָאכָה לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶתָּה וְהוֹתֵר:

The work was enough for all of the work to do it; and there was more [than enough].

We approached the seemingly contradictory words of דים and והותר, but we did not deal with the word מלאכה in this context⁸.

In fact, upon consideration we might have been hard-pressed to justify the usage of *melachah* there. After all, no construction was taking place. All that was

⁶ And I was reassured when I once read that Albert Einstein agrees with me.

⁷ It is interesting to note that when we talk about hearing someone from afar we say ‘his voice *carries*’. I do not know if such a phrase is a peculiarity of the English language or is found in others.

⁸ In Masseches Shabbos (49 b) there is an opinion that we learn that there are 39 *melachos* on Shabbos from the fact that the word מלאכה is mentioned 39 times in the Torah.

The difficulty is, as the Gemara there teaches, is that the word מלאכה, in its various forms with prefixes and suffixes, appears in the Torah a total of 40 times!

The Gemara there continues with a discussion regarding which usages of מלאכה could be excluded from the count and the word מלאכה in our Posuk is one of the candidates.

happening was that people were bringing/*carrying* their donations from the privacy of their tents to the public area where Moshe Rabbenu resided.

We are now ready to see Rashi on this verse, the absence of which previously may have been quite conspicuous.

He writes:

והמלאכה היתה דים לכל המלאכה - ומלאכת ההבאה היתה דים של עושי המשכן.
לכל המלאכה של משכן לעשות אותה ולהותיר:

The melachah was enough for all of the melachah – The melachah of bringing was sufficient for all those who would be making the Mishkan for all of the [various] types of melachah to do each one. And there was extra.

Rashi, it seems, has already told us that in this context the initial usage of *melachah* refers to a specific act – the one of bringing from reshus hayochid to reshus harabbim.

Rashi continues to tell us that the second usage of melachah in this context refers to all of the other 38 acts of Melachah that were necessary for constructing the Mishkan.

Thus, Rashi teaches that the Torah is telling us that the melachah of carrying is equivalent to and of equal status with each of the 38 melachos.

And why does the Torah write וְהוֹתֵר? The answer is that not only were the materials brought excessive, more than enough, it was the מלאכת הוצאה that brought the materials that was also excessive, more than enough. Since carrying is one of the *melachos*, had they carried such on a Shabbos it would have been excessive and thus prohibited.

No other Mitzvah in the Torah is as associated with the Mishkan and the Beis HaMikdosh as is Shabbos.

When HaKodosh Boruch Hu concludes commanding all of the Mitzvos of the Mishkan to Moshe Rabbenu, He again teaches him about Shabbos. We read in Parshas Ki Siso (Sh'mos Perek 31/P'sukim 12-13):

וַיֹּאמֶר ה' אֶל מֹשֶׁה לֵאמֹר: וְאַתָּה דַבֵּר אֶל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר אַךְ אֵת שַׁבְּתוֹתַי תִּשְׁמְרוּ
כִּי אוֹת הוּא בֵּינִי וּבֵינֵיכֶם לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם לְדַעַת כִּי אֲנִי ה' מְקַדְּשְׁכֶם:

Hashem said to Moshe saying: You should speak to B'nei Yisroel saying, 'But you will keep My Shabbosos because it is a sign between Me and between you for your generations to know that I am Hashem Who sanctifies you.

Moshe Rabbenu introduces the building of the Mishkan to B'nei Yisroel by mentioning Shabbos at the very outset as we read in the beginning of our Parshas Vayakhel (Sh'mos Perek 35/P'sukim 1-2):

וַיִּקְהַל מֹשֶׁה אֶת כָּל עֵדֹת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם אֱלֹהֵי הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה ה' לַעֲשׂוֹת
אֲתֶם: שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תַּעֲשֶׂה מְלָאכָה וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי יִהְיֶה לָּכֶם קֹדֶשׁ שַׁבַּת שַׁבְּתוֹן לַה' כָּל
הָעֹשֶׂה בּוֹ מְלָאכָה יוּמָת:

Moshe assembled the entire congregation of B'nei Yisroel and he said to them, 'These are the words that Hashem commanded to do them. Six days your work shall be done and on the seventh day will be holy for you, a Shabbos of Shabbos for Hashem; anyone who does melachah on it shall die.

From the very outset Moshe was told that the purpose of having the Mishkan was for the Shechinah to reside among Israel. Thus we read (Sh'mos Perek 25/Posuk 8):

וַעֲשׂוּ לִי מִקְדָּשׁ וְשֹׁכְנֹתִי בְּתוֹכְכֶם:

They shall make for Me a sanctuary and I will dwell in their midst.

By surrounding the Mitzvah of Mishkan with the Mitzvah of Shabbos, Israel was told that the structure of the Mishkan alone will not be the sole means that will bring the Shechinah into Israel's midst. All the Torah must be observed and Hashem gives unique value to the observance of Shabbos.

This idea is important when we read the alarming verse with which the second of our two Parshos, Parshas Pekudei begins. We read (Perek 38/Posuk 21):

אֵלֶּה פְּקוּדֵי הַמִּשְׁכָּן הַמִּשְׁכָּן הָעֹשֶׂה אֲשֶׁר פָּקַד עַל פִּי מֹשֶׁה עַבְדְּת הַלְלוּיִם בְּיַד אִיתְמָר בִּן
אֶהֱרֹן הַכֹּהֵן:

This is the accounting of the Mishkan, the Mishkan of testimony, which was accounted for according to the word of Moshe, for the service of the Levi'im, by I'somor the son of Aharon the Kohen.

Rashi, noting the repetitious usage of Mishkan tells us of what Chazal teach. He writes:

המשכן משכן - שני פעמים, רמז למקדש שנתמשכן בשני חורבנין על עונותיהן של ישראל:

The Mishkan, Mishkan – It is [written] two times as a hint to the Beis HaMikdosh that was taken back by Hashem as collateral in the two destructions for the sins of Israel.

That is, the Mishkan was given to Israel conditionally. If the Torah will be observed, My Shechinah can be among you. If not, not.

When the Torah cameos Shabbos as the introduction to building the Mishkan, we understand that Shabbos is a most significant guarantee that we are fulfilling G-d's wishes and that He does not need to take back the Mishkan that He gave us on condition.

How are we to feel about this verse when we live in a time that its dire prediction has been realized fully? Twice G-d took back His gift and He hasn't returned it to us for two millennia.

Chazal tell us (Yerushalmi Masseches Yoma Perek 1/Halachah 1):

כל מי שלא נבנה בית המקדש בימיו כאילו נחרב בימיו

Anyone for whom the Beis HaMikdosh is not built in his days, it is as if it was destroyed in his days.

If we are moved by the fact that following the construction of the Mishkan with the full participation of Israel with extraordinary generosity, enthusiasm and dedication that, at the outset, its sad end would be predicted, then we can find our motivation to make our Shabbos observance, avoiding its prohibitions and fulfilling its *Mitzvos Aseh*, as our tool of telling the Shechinah that we await its

return. Shabbos is the master key for that return and it is in the hands of each and every one of us.

Shabbat Shalom

Chodesh Tov

Rabbi Pollock