

עַל־דֵּשֶׁה

**Alei Deshe - Weekly Torah Insights and inspiration on
the Parsha from the Rosh Yeshiva Shlit"o of Gur**

Actualizing The Power Of Shabbos

לֹא תִבְעֵרוּ אֵשׁ בְּכָל מִשְׁבְּתֵיכֶם בְּיוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת

You shall not kindle fire in any of your dwellings on the Shabbos day
(Shemos 35:3).

The Sfas Emes¹ makes the following observation, in the name of the Chiddushei HaRim. Whereas in Parshas Ki Sisa, the Torah mentions Shabbos after discussing the construction of the *Mishkan*; in Parshas Vayakhel, the order is reversed. The Chiddushei HaRim explained the difference: Parshas Ki Sisa discusses these topics before the *Cheit HaEigel*, while Vayakhel comes after the *Cheit HaEigel*. Before the *Eigel*, Bnei Yisrael were on a *madreigah* where through their weekday *avodah* – represented by the construction of the *Mishkan* – they would grow day by day, ultimately reaching the highest level, the level of Shabbos. Thus, Shabbos is discussed after the *Mishkan* in Parshas Ki Sisa.² But after the *Cheit HaEigel*, the weekdays themselves need Shabbos to help them stay true to course, so in Parshas Vayakhel, Shabbos is mentioned first.

The Chiddushei HaRim then explained a statement of the Midrash,³ that after the *Cheit HaEigel*, Hashem warned *Klal Yisrael*, “You have ruined

1 *Hachodesh* 5631

2 This is certainly so according to the Ramban (Shemos 35:1), who holds that the order of the *parshiyos* represents the chronology of the events. But even according to Rashi (31:18), who maintains that the *Eigel* preceded the commandment of the *Mishkan*, the Torah's order when discussing the *Mishkan* and Shabbos reflects the relationship of that *parshah* to the *parshah* of the *Eigel*.

3 *Shemos Rabbah* 27:9

‘*Na’aseh*’ by making the *Eigel*; take care to uphold ‘*Nishma*.’” Certainly, this doesn’t mean that we are no longer bound to *na’aseh* – to fulfilling the mitzvos – *chas v’shalom*. It means that originally, when we were singularly committed to Hashem, *na’aseh* – fulfillment of mitzvos –

brought one to *nishma*, to ever-higher depths of understanding; but after the *Eigel*, the precedence of *na’aseh* to *nishma* was lost, and instead, *nishma* – understanding – brings one to *na’aseh*, to fulfillment of mitzvos. The Chiddushei HaRim connects this with the above principle of Shabbos influencing the weekdays following the *Eigel*. Shabbos effects a mindset of *nishma*, opening the hearts of Yidden to hear – so that during the weekdays to come they can have a proper *na’aseh*.⁴

However, we must take care that the inspiration of Shabbos doesn’t remain mere inspiration; we must create a ‘vessel’ out of it, bringing it into the practical realm. The pasuk in our parshah (Shemos 35:3) states, לֹא תִבְעֵרוּ, אֵשׁ בְּכָל מִשְׁבְּתֵיכֶם בְּיוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת

You shall not kindle fire in any of your dwellings on the Shabbos day. The Gemara (Shabbos 70a) teaches that the Shabbos prohibition of *hav’arah*, kindling a fire, is not a *melachah* like all others.⁵ There is a message in this. Sometimes, a person becomes motivated to improve himself. But when the power of the moment passes, the inspiration is gone. Such inspiration is worthless. It is only when a *hav’arah* begins the process of positive action

4 See *Sefer Hazechus*, Vayakhel; Sfas Emes, *Likutim* Vayakhel; בפרשת; Sfas Emes, Ki Sisa 5632

5 *Tosafos* (Beitzah 23a) writes that since *hav’arah* is not a *melachah*, it is permitted on Yom Tov.

“
**We must take care
that the inspiration of
Shabbos doesn’t remain
mere inspiration;
we must create a ‘vessel’
out of it, bringing it into
the practical realm**”

לְעִלּוֹי נִשְׁמָה
מִדָּת
עֲקָא עֲדָנָה
צְפוּרָה ע"ה
בֵּית מִשָּׁה מְנַחֵם הַלּוֹי ז"ל

that the original spark of inspiration has value. Since the *hav'arah*-inspiration is only the beginning of the *melachah*, the action, that follows it, it is not considered a *melachah* of its own.

The crucial importance of turning inspiration into deed is taught in *sefarim*⁶ in connection with the pasuk (31:4, 35:32), לְחֹשֶׁב מְחַשְׁבֵּת לַעֲשׂוֹת - *To think thoughts, to do*. Positive thoughts and motivations are helpful only when they are translated into action. Inspiration must be firmly grounded in order to lead to practical change.

The pasuk (35:5) states, קָחוּ מֵאִתְּכֶם תְּרוּמָה לַה' כֹּל נָדִיב לִבּוֹ יִבְיֶאֱהָ - *Take from yourselves a portion for Hashem, everyone whose heart motivates him shall bring it*. The *mefarshim* note the unusual wording of קָחוּ מֵאִתְּכֶם, *take from yourselves*. Why doesn't it say תְּנוּ מֵאִתְּכֶם, *give from yourselves*?

The pasuk (35:27) states, וְהִנְשָׂאִם הַבְּיָאוּ אֶת אֲבְנֵי הַשֹּׁהַם וְאֶת אֲבְנֵי הַמַּלְאִים וְהַלְחִיטוּן וְלַחֲשׂוֹן - *The nesim brought the shoham stones and the stones for the settings of the Eford and the Choshen*. The Gemara (Yoma 75a) says that the stones were brought by clouds, together with the *mann*. *Chasam Sofer*⁷ wonders: If this is so, the *nesim* didn't actually contribute anything toward the Mishkan. *Chasam Sofer* answers that the stones didn't fall *in addition* to the *nesim*'s portions of *mann*, but rather *as part* of it, so the *nesim* ended up with a smaller quantity of *mann* than they would otherwise have. Since they did come at the expense of the *nesim*, the stones are seen as their contribution.⁸

6 See *Imrei Emes*, Terumah 5693; *Sfas Emes*, Vayakhel 5641

7 Gittin 35a

8 It would seem that the *nesim*'s sacrifice was not their physical food per se, but rather the spiritual *hasagos* (depths of understanding) that one acquired by eating *mann*, of which they had less.

This form of contribution – at one's own expense – wasn't exclusive to the *nesim*. True, the other contributions to the physical Mishkan were in a manner of תְּנוּ, of giving away possessions, but this was only a one-time event. For all time afterwards, Klal Yisrael would make contributions for Hashem in a manner of קָחוּ מֵאִתְּכֶם תְּרוּמָה לַה', taking of oneself and giving it up for Hashem; when a Yid would face temptation, he would give up his wishes and desires for Hashem. This form of contribution is not termed *giving*, since it isn't a physical item being handed over; instead, we are told קָחוּ מֵאִתְּכֶם, *take of yourselves, relinquish your wants for the Ribono shel Olam*.

This offering of one's desires for Hashem is the תְּרוּמָה חֲדָשָׁה, the new contribution for *korbanos* that is to be made for the month of Nissan (Megillah 29b). From this point on, we should forge a new, proper path of life. This Shabbos during *Minchah*, we read Parshas Vayikra, the parshah of *korbanos*. The pasuk (Devarim 12:27) says, וְעָשִׂיתָ עֲלֵתֶיךָ הַבָּשָׂר וְהַדָּם - *You shall perform your burnt-offerings, the flesh and the blood*. Our *Rebbeim* explained that one must sacrifice for Hashem his own flesh and blood. This is particularly true in one's younger years, when one's blood churns with the *yetzer hara's* temptations. A person must rise above this, taking his desires and offering them up to Hashem.

(ויקהל פקודי – ה'חודש תשפ"א, ס"ג מאמר ב)

The Greatness Of Ba'alei Teshuvah

In the last *ma'amar* of his life, the Chiddushei HaRim expounded on the pasuk (Shemos 35:22), וַיָּבֹאוּ הָאֲנָשִׁים עַל הַנָּשִׁים - *The men came with the women*. When bringing contributions for the *Mishkan*, the men are mentioned first. Why is this?

The men had sinned by donating their jewelry for the creation of the *Eigel*; by contributing toward the *Mishkan*, they were rectifying that sin. This *teshuvah* elevated them to a greater spiritual height than the women, since במקום שבעלי תשובה עומדין, אין צדיקים גמורים יכולים לעמוד, *even perfect tzaddikim cannot stand in the place of ba'alei teshuvah* (Berachos 34b).⁹

9 See *Likutei HaRim*, Vayakhel p. 253

What is the greatness of *ba'alei teshuvah*? It is their humility and brokenheartedness, ashamed as they are of their previous sins. Although *tzaddikim*, too, are aware and brokenhearted over their shortcomings, as no man is perfect; nonetheless, a *tzaddik's* shortcomings are primarily in the realm of עֲשָׂה טוֹב, having neglected to properly fulfill his obligations, but a *ba'al teshuvah's* sins were in the realm of מֵרַע טוֹר, active transgression of *aveiros*. Negative activity is certainly worse than insufficient positive activity, and consequently, *ba'alei teshuvah* are far more brokenhearted than *tzaddikim*. Since the pasuk (Tehillim 34:19) says, קָרוֹב ה' לְנִשְׁבָּרֵי לֵב וְאֵת דַּכְּאֵי - *Hashem is close to the brokenhearted;*

and those crushed in spirit, He saves, even a true tzaddik cannot stand in the place of a ba'al teshuvah.

The Chiddushei HaRim's words contain a remarkable *chiddush*. One might have thought that the donation toward the *Mishkan*, which was the very foundation of Bnei Yisrael's generosity of heart and desire for Hashem, would have been most notable when made by the greatest *tzaddikim* of Klal Yisrael, those who did not sin. The Chiddushei HaRim teaches us that to the contrary, it was primarily the humble spirit of *ba'alei teshuvah*, and the opportunity to rectify their sins, that built the *Mishkan*.

(בנאות דשא – ויקהל פקודי-ה'חודש תשפ"א)

Crowns Of The Mishkan

This Shabbos we recite *birkas hachodesh* for the month of Nissan. On Rosh Chodesh Nissan, the Mishkan was erected, and Aharon and his sons began the *avodah* of *korbanos* after the seven inaugural days of the Mishkan. The Gemara (Shabbos 87b) says about that Rosh Chodesh Nissan, אֹתוֹ, יוֹם נִטַּל עֶשְׂרֵת עֲטֻרוֹת, *that day took ten crowns* — there were ten momentous aspects to that day. One of them was ראשון למעשה בראשית, *the first day of Creation*. Rosh Chodesh Nissan of that year fell on Sunday; this was one of the distinctions that that day carried.

*Maharam Schiff*¹⁰ wonders about this: Isn't every Sunday the first day of Creation? What was special about that particular Sunday? *Maharam Schiff* answers that at the end of the first day of Creation, the Torah states (Bereishis 1:5), וַיְהִי עֶרֶב, וַיְהִי בֹקֶר יוֹם אֶחָד - *And there was evening and there was morning, one day*. Instead of יוֹם ראשון - *the first day*, the Torah says יוֹם אֶחָד - *one day*; the word ראשון is missing from the story of Creation. However, with the completion of the Mishkan, which was reminiscent of *Brias Ha'Olam* — Chazal say Hashem rejoiced with its completion as the day the heaven and earth were created — it is written (Bamidbar 7:12), וַיְהִי הַמִּקְרִיב בַּיּוֹם, הֶרְאִישׁוֹן - *The one who brought his offering on the first day*. Thus, the missing ראשון was at last filled in. This, says *Maharam Schiff*, is what Chazal meant that that Rosh Chodesh Nissan was ראשון למעשה בראשית, *The first day of Creation*.

Although this sounds like a nice play on words, there is a lot of depth to it.¹¹ Rashi explains that the first day of Creation is termed אֶחָד and not ראשון because at that point in time, Hashem was the One and only being in the world; *malachim* were not created until the next day. In truth, Hashem remains the One and only true existence of this world; nonetheless, He created mankind because there cannot be a king without a nation. Hashem desired a world with Yidden who would

serve Him. Their *avodas Hashem* would express itself most strongly in the Mishkan, where they would bring Hashem *nachas ruach* through their *korbanos*, and Hashem would rest His *Shechinah*. This may be what Maharam Schiff meant: with the inauguration of the Mishkan, the missing ראשון of *Brias Ha'Olam* was filled in; Hashem was, in a sense, no longer alone in this world, as there was now a Mishkan where Yidden would serve Him.

Perhaps there is another meaning to that day's distinction as למעשה בראשית. R. Baruch of Mezhibuzh once remarked, "World, world, how

That Rosh Chodesh Nissan was ראשון למעשה בראשית, because it was unlike every Sunday that preceded it. The world was like a new world, unlike how it had been until then: it had just experienced the seven-day purification of Aharon and his sons, who had become 'elevated above the world,' turning the world ever more luminous. It was the first Sunday of a newly illuminated world, a world with people who abstained from physicality and rose above nature.



The above Gemara lists ten 'crowns' that distin-

Hashem remains the One and only true existence of this world... there cannot be a king without a nation. Hashem desired a world with Yidden who would serve Him.

radiant you are to the one who is elevated above you, and how dark and gloomy you are to the one who is deeply entrenched in you."¹²

We have no understanding of the *madreigos* of Aharon and his sons, but certainly, the physical separation that was required of them during the seven inaugural days of the Mishkan brought upon them a great spiritual cleansing. Just as Moshe Rabbeinu was required to separate before going up Har Sinai, and the *Kohen Gadol* would separate each year before entering the *Kodesh HaKodashim*, so did Aharon and his sons undergo separation at this time. Through such prescribed separation, one is spiritually cleansed and lifted above this natural world.

gushed the Rosh Chodesh Nissan when the Mishkan was erected. Notably, Rosh Chodesh is not counted as one of them. Why not?

The Midrash¹³ states that originally, Rosh Chodesh was to have been a Yom Tov, but this was cancelled after the *Cheit Ha'Eigel*. The Sfas Emes states that had Klal Yisrael not sinned with the *Eigel*, there would have been no need for a Mishkan, since Hashem would have rested His *Shechinah* in Bnei Yisrael themselves. It can be understood, then, that Rosh Chodesh was not seen as a 'crown' of the Mishkan's inauguration.

(בנאות דשא – ויקהל פקודי-החודש תשפ"א)

10 *Derushim Nechmadim*, end of Chullin

11 See Bereishis Rabbah 3:9; Maharsha *Chiddushei Aggados*, Shabbos 87b end of s.v. *v'oso yom*

12 וועלט, וועלט, וויא לעכטיג ביסטו צו איינער וואס איז דערהויבען פון דיר, און וויא שווארץ און פינסטער ביסטו צו איינער וואס ליגט טיף אין דיר

13 Pirkei D'Rabi Eliezer

Miraculous Melachah

וַיָּבִיאוּ אֶת הַמִּשְׁכָּן אֶל מֹשֶׁה

They brought the Mishkan to Moshe

(Shemos 39:33).

Rashi comments that because Moshe had not taken part in the construction of the Mishkan, Hashem tasked him with erecting it. Nobody was able to lift the *kerashim* due to their great weight, so Moshe said to Hashem, "How can a person raise them?" Hashem replied, "Involve your hands in the activity; it will appear like you are raising them, but they will stand up on their own." This is the meaning of the words (40:17) הַמִּשְׁכָּן הָיָה עֲרֹמֵהוּ, *the Mishkan was erected* – it was erected on its own.

There is a well-known question on this. At each of Bnei Yisrael's encampments throughout their forty years in the desert, the *Levi'im* would reassemble the Mishkan – having disassembled it when leaving the previous encampment – as the pasuk (Bamidbar 1:51) states, וּבְנִסְעָה הַמִּשְׁכָּן יִרְדּוּ אֹתוֹ הַלְוִיִּים, *When the Mishkan journeys, the Levi'im shall take it down, and when the Mishkan encamps, the Levi'im shall erect it*. How was this possible, since Moshe couldn't do it without a miracle?¹⁴ R. Eliyahu Mizrachi writes that apparently, each time the *Levi'im* erected the Mishkan it necessitated a miracle as well.¹⁵

This seems problematic. Since the *kerashim* were so heavy, it would seem that carrying them, as well, was impossible without a miracle. This is also the implication of *Chasam Sofer*¹⁶ as well as *Pnei Menachem*.¹⁷ If so, how are the Shabbos *melachos* of *hotza'ah* and *hachnasah* (carrying) learned from the Mishkan,¹⁸ if the *Levi'im's* carrying of the *kerashim* was not their own labor, but the work of a miracle. Even if we suppose that the *kerashim* could be carried naturally, and only necessitated a miracle to be erected; how is the *melachah* of *boneh* (building) learned from their erection,¹⁹ since it was done miraculously? And if, indeed, a *melachah* can be learned from an act involving a miracle, one should be liable for doing a *melachah* even when outside help was contributed.²⁰

The answer to this question would seem to lie in a *chakirah* (deliberation) of *Eglei Tal*.²¹ Are the *melachos* of Shabbos derived only from the actual activities that went into constructing the Mishkan, or is it any activity that would typically be required for such a construction, although it may not have been done for the Mishkan's construction?²² Following the second line of reasoning, the same may be said regarding our question. Since one would typically carry and erect *kerashim* when building a Mishkan-like structure, the relevant actions are considered *melachos* even though for the Mishkan they were actually performed miraculously.²³

(בנאות דשא – ויקהל פקודי-החודש תשפ"א)

14 See *Sifsei Chachamim*; see also *Pnei Menachem, Parshas HaChodesh* p. 257

15 This seems questionable, since Chazal deduce from the words הַמִּשְׁכָּן הָיָה עֲרֹמֵהוּ that the Mishkan was erected on its own for Moshe; regarding the *Levi'im*, however, the pasuk states – וּבְנִסְעָה הַמִּשְׁכָּן יִרְדּוּ אֹתוֹ הַלְוִיִּים, *the Levi'im shall erect it*, implying that they did actively erect it.

16 Naso 5592

17 Naso p. 55

18 See Shabbos 49b

19 See *Rashba*, Shabbos 102b

20 For example, carrying a live person, since a live person carries his own weight in part. It should be noted that this question is only in accordance with R. Eliyahu Mizrachi's opinion that the *Levi'im's* erection of the Mishkan, as well, was miraculous; if we assume that only Moshe's was miraculous, then the *melachos* of Shabbos could be learned from the *Levi'im's* erection of the Mishkan, which was natural. See also *Chemdas Yisrael (Kuntres Acharon to Ner Mitzvah 18:6)*.

21 *Pesichah*, 1

22 *Charishah* (plowing) and *zeri'ah* (planting), for example, were not necessary in the Mishkan's construction, because Klal Yisrael had the actual spices they needed.

23 There is, in fact, a difference between these forms of work and plowing and planting. Bnei Yisrael could have plowed and planted, but they didn't need to, since they had the spices they needed; in contrast, they were incapable of erecting the *kerashim*. Nonetheless, since the *kerashim* needed to be erected for the Mishkan, the manner of work necessary for erecting such items is deemed a *melachah*.

Chasam Sofer (Shabbos 92a) writes that we do not learn *melachos* from the carrying of the *Aron*, since it miraculously carried those who carried it. This would seem to imply that *melachos* are not learned out of miraculous work of the Mishkan. However, it seems that *Chasam Sofer* meant this only regarding the principle of טְעוּנָה דַּמְדְּלִי אֵינִי לְכַתְּפִיהָ לְתִלְתָּא דְטְעוּנָה הוּי (Sotah 34a), which relates to the manner of carrying. The actual act of carrying would, though, be learned from the *Aron*, since in the absence of a miracle it would have been done naturally.