



# Likkutei Sichos

Volume 21 | Vayakhel-Pekudei

Each Soul, a Part of One Whole

---

Translated by Rabbi Kivi Greenbaum

General Editor: Rabbi Eliezer Robbins | Editor: Rabbi Y. Eliezer Danzinger

Content Editor: Rabbi Zalmy Avtzon

© Copyright by Sichos In English 2023 ◦ 5783

A note on the translation: Rounded and square brackets reflect their use in the original *sichah*; curly brackets are interpolations of the translator or editor. The footnotes in curly brackets are those of the translator or editors and do not correspond to the footnotes in the original. Bolded words are italicized in the original text.

Considerable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the translation, while maintaining readability. As in all translations, the possibility of inadvertent errors exists.

**Feedback is appreciated — please send comments to: [info@projectlikkuteisichos.org](mailto:info@projectlikkuteisichos.org)**

## 1.

### THE NAMES DON'T MATCH

As mentioned many times<sup>1</sup> regarding the names of the *sedros*, the theme of each *sedrah* is hinted at in its name.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, in our *sedrah*, the name “*Vayakhel*” expresses the essential subject of the first *sedrah* while “*Pekudei*”<sup>3</sup> expresses the essential subject of the second *sedrah*.

Seemingly, the subjects of both *sedros* do not match their names. Moreover, the subjects of the two *sedros* appear to be **contradictory** to the subjects {alluded to by their respective names}, as explained below.

The meaning of “*Vayakhel*” according to *pshat*<sup>4</sup> is the gathering and the assembling of numerous individuals or components. The difference between “*Vayakhel*” and other expressions that denote the coming together of many individuals or components, such as “*asifah*,” “*kibbutz*,” or “*lekitah*,” and so on, is that the other expressions convey only the idea of assembly — gathering a number of people (components) in one place (or with one objective) — but even after getting together, etc., those entities might remain separate entities. “*Vayakhel*,” on the other hand, which means to congregate, alludes to the **collective** (of people or components), not as a combination of many disparate elements but as they exist together as a new whole — one congregation.<sup>5</sup>

“*Pekudei*,” which connotes counting,<sup>6</sup> emphasizes the distinctiveness of each entity, as only then is the counting meaningful.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 5, p. 57 ff.; vol. 15, p. 145 ff.; et al.

<sup>2</sup> Not only because this word (or these two words) are the beginning of the *sedrah*, as proven from the names “*Noach*” and “*Toldos*.” See *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 5, p. 354 ff.; et al.

<sup>3</sup> It is Jewish custom to call these *sedros*, “*Vayakhel*” and “*Pekudei*,” but in the *Siddur* of Rav Saadia Gaon (*Seder Krias HaTorah*) and in Rambam (at the end of his “*Seder Tefillos*” [end of *Sefer Ahavah*]) it is “*Vayakhel*” and “*Eileh Pekudei*.” See *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 5, p. 58, fn. 9.

<sup>4</sup> {The plain meaning of Scripture. Though there are many levels and depths of interpretation on the Torah, Rashi adopts a straightforward approach.}

<sup>5</sup> See *Vayikra* 4:13 ff.; see *Yevamos* (57a) — a congregation of converts is not called a congregation; et al; note Rashi’s commentary (on *Shemos* 12:6), s.v., “*kehal adas Yisrael*”; see *Tzafnas Paneach*, “*Klali HaTorah VeHaMitzvos*,” s.v., “*tzibbur*.”

<sup>6</sup> See *Targum Onkelos and Targum Yonason ben Uziel*, beg. of *Pekudei*. See Rashi, *ibid*. See *supra*, ch. 2.

Accordingly, the following is unclear: The subject matter of these two *sedros* are actually contradictory {to their names}. Both *sedros* speak about the building of the *Mishkan* and its utensils; however, there is a fundamental difference between the two. *Parshas Vayakhel* speaks about the building of each separate part of the *Mishkan*:<sup>7</sup> the curtains separately, the beams separately, and every utensil of the *Mishkan* separately — the *menorah*, the *shulchan*, *etc.*

The *chiddush*<sup>8</sup> of *parshas Pekudei* regarding the construction of the *Mishkan* is that after the overview — the **sum total** of gold, silver, and copper (which comes as a side note, concluding the account in *parshas Vayakhel* of the making of the parts of the *Mishkan* and the narrative of the making of the priestly clothes, subsequently) — *parshas Pekudei* recounts the **sum total** of everything as it was **brought collectively** to Moshe;<sup>9</sup> it records Hashem's command to set up **everything together** (the *Mishkan* and its utensils)<sup>10</sup> along with **all** their *avodos*<sup>11</sup> (that are mentioned only **in general**) and how Moshe had accomplished this **all together** (the setup and the *avodos*)<sup>12</sup> until there was one complete *Mishkan*, and, “the glory of Hashem filled the *Mishkan*.”<sup>13</sup>

Accordingly, the content of each of these *sedros* is exactly the opposite of what their names connote. The content of *parshas Vayakhel* (regarding the *Mishkan*) includes the **details** and the components of the *Mishkan* — each item is described as a self-contained detail and entity — unlike the idea of “**Vayakhel, he assembled.**” *Parshas Pekudei* deals with **combining** and joining of all the details — how all the parts and components of the *Mishkan* become amassed into one entity (an assembly — the *Mishkan*), a complete *Mishkan*. This is the opposite of what “*Pekudei*” emphasizes — counting every component for itself!<sup>14</sup>

## 2.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Shemos* 36:8 ff.

<sup>8</sup> {Original idea.}

<sup>9</sup> *Shemos* 39:33 ff. {Now they brought the *Mishkan* to Moshe, the tent and all its furnishings, its clasps, its planks, its bars, its pillars and its sockets, the covering of rams' skins dyed red....}

<sup>10</sup> *Shemos* 40:1 ff.

<sup>11</sup> {“*Avodah*” denotes Divine service; in this context, *avodos*, plural, are the Temple services.}

<sup>12</sup> *Shemos* 40:17 ff.

<sup>13</sup> *Shemos* 40:34-5.

<sup>14</sup> See Ramban, beg. of *Pekudei*; see Rashi, beg. of *Pekudei*, s.v., “*avodas ha'leviim*,” and the commentaries on Rashi; see *Abarbanel* and *Kli Yakar*, et al.

Simply speaking, we might venture to answer:

According to *pshat*, “*Vayakhel*” denotes assembling all **Jews**.

Accordingly, we can also explain the connection between “*Vayakhel*, he assembled” (as in the assembly of Jews) and the construction of the *Mishkan*, which is spoken about {in the *parshah*} subsequently:

The idea of *Vayakhel*,<sup>15</sup> that all Jews became one congregation, is a prelude to, and preparation for, the construction of the *Mishkan*. In order for the *Mishkan* to be for all of Israel — “Make for me a Sanctuary, and I will dwell in them,”<sup>16</sup> within all Jews — each individual Jew’s contribution and donation toward the construction of the *Mishkan* needed to be made in a manner in which the money would no longer be considered the property of an individual (money that belongs to many individuals), or even money of partners (individuals who become partners), but rather, their contributions would become assets that are owned by a single entity, **communal** assets.<sup>17</sup> Therefore, the prelude to this is to bring together all (Jewish) individuals and make them into one congregation.

However, the issue persists regarding “*pekudei*, counting,” where there isn’t a **tally**, but a **sum total** of gold, silver, and copper.

Furthermore, this explanation is inadequate regarding “*vayakhel*, gathering.” Since matters of Torah are absolutely precise, it stands to reason that just as a name always expresses the substance of the entity associated with the name, the same applies concerning the names of the *sedros*. In the context of our discussion, “*Vayakhel*” not only expresses the introduction to the primary subject of the *sedrah*, but it (also) conveys its central point.

---

<sup>15</sup> See *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 6, p. 217 ff.

<sup>16</sup> *Shemos* 25:8.

<sup>17</sup> See *Rosh Hashanah* 7b.

### 3.

#### WHAT IS RAMBAM TEACHING US?

This will be clarified by prefacing with what the Rambam says (in *Sefer HaMitzvos*)<sup>18</sup> regarding the mitzvah of building the *Beis HaMikdash*: “

We are commanded to build the *Beis HaBechirah*<sup>19</sup> to serve {Hashem}. In it, we offer sacrifices, burn the eternal flame.... The source of this mitzvah is Hashem’s statement,<sup>20</sup> “Make Me a Sanctuary.”

Subsequently, Rambam continues:

This general term {“Sanctuary”} includes many components. They are: the *menorah*, the *shulchan*,<sup>21</sup> the Altar and the other components — all of them are parts of the Sanctuary, and everything together is called “Sanctuary.” And the Torah already gave a distinct command for each component.<sup>22</sup>

This needs to be clarified: After the Rambam describes how the utensils are all “parts of the Sanctuary, and everything together is called “Sanctuary,” why does the Rambam spell out that “the Torah already gave a distinct command for each component?” This seems to emphasize a **contradictory** point, that every individual utensil of the sanctuary is a distinct entity and a distinct mitzvah?

On a more general note, what practical difference does this additional line in the words of the Rambam make?

---

<sup>18</sup> Rambam’s *Sefer HaMitzvos*, “Positive Mitzvah 20; see his wording there, “*shoresh 12.*”

<sup>19</sup> {Lit., “the Chosen House.”}

<sup>20</sup> {*Shemos 25:8.*}

<sup>21</sup> {The table for the showbread.}

<sup>22</sup> See at length in *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 11, p. 116, ff.

## 4.

### THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE GENERAL AND PARTICULAR

The explanation:

The relationship between the utensils of the *Mishkan*, and the *Mishkan* itself, can be understood in several ways, **resembling** the way we can associate every general concept with the individual components of which it is comprised:<sup>23</sup>

a) Individual components do not have an autonomous identity. Their entire purpose is to integrate with other components and become one entity — a whole. In other words, the individual components are merely a prerequisite for the whole.

[An **inexact** illustration of this:<sup>24</sup> Reish Lakish maintains that a half-measure is permitted according to Torah law.<sup>25</sup> However, when two half-measures are joined, they create a **new entity**, and a prohibited entity according to the Torah is then **created**.]<sup>26</sup>

b) Individual components are also entities in their own right, but when they come **together**, they form a new entity that was not present earlier when each component was distinct.

[This resembles the principle that ten Jews are required to recite sacred readings.<sup>27</sup> Each individual Jew possesses inherent holiness; however, when **ten** Jews gather, a heightened level of sanctity is (also) generated, allowing sacred readings to be recited.]

---

<sup>23</sup> See *Mefaneach Tzefunos*, ch. 4 for several ways of explaining the relationship between a general concept and its specifics; see **the sources cited there**.

<sup>24</sup> We could offer an example of a mitzvah (not just a prohibition as mentioned in the text): One of the four **strands** of *tzitzis* has no identity for itself; only when all four strands are combined, they become one entity — *tzitzis*.

<sup>25</sup> *Yoma* 74a.

<sup>26</sup> See *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 7, p. 110.

<sup>27</sup> {In the Hebrew original, “דבר שבקדושה”; such as public prayer, or the reading of the Torah.}

- c) The individual components are not considered significant on their own. However, when they come together to form a whole, each component also gains **its own** significance.

[Similarly, concerning the *Mishkan* and *Beis HaMikdash*: The Courtyard, the Tent of Meeting, and the Holy of Holies<sup>28</sup> on their own (**prior** to the actuality of the complete *Mishkan* and its sanctity), do not possess the sanctity of the *Mishkan*. After all, since the *Mishkan* does not yet exist, the Courtyards etc., cannot be imbued with its sanctity. However, once the entire *Mishkan* (*Mikdash*) is fully erected, sanctity is imbued into each specific component: the Courtyards, Tent of Meeting, and Holy of Holies. This is besides the overarching sanctity of the *Mishkan* — the *Mikdash*.

Possibly, the holiness of the individual parts **remains**, biblically, even when the Jewish people traveled and so the *Mishkan*<sup>29</sup> was disassembled, or after the (entire) *Beis HaMikdash* was destroyed. Or possibly, this holiness only remains rabbinically.<sup>30</sup>]

## 5.

### THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN *MISHKAN* AND UTENSILS

Similarly, we could say concerning the utensils of the *Mishkan*:<sup>31</sup>

- a) **Initially**, they had no importance (sanctity). However, once all the utensils were completed, or after the *Mishkan* was erected and the utensils were placed within it for the first time, it was then<sup>32</sup> that a *Mishkan* was created — “It

---

<sup>28</sup> See *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*,” ch. 1, par. 5.

<sup>29</sup> See *Zevachim* 60b ff. and commentaries, loc. cit.; *Menachos* 95a ff.; *Sifrei Zuta*, on *Naso* 7:1: “The *Mikdash* was sanctified when standing and **disassembled**... what is the source when disassembled...; see *Amavuha* of *Sifrei*, loc. cit.

<sup>30</sup> See *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*,” ch. 6, par. 14-15; *Hasagas HaRaavad*; commentaries, loc. cit.

<sup>31</sup> For the following, see *Tzafnas Paneach*, *Al Hatorah* on *Vayakhel* 35:10; and in the notes there and on *Pekudei* 40:9. See *Tzafnas Paneach*, the second ed., end of 73c ff., 81a, 82c-d *Mefaneach Tzefunos* ch. 2, sec. 1 (p. 83), ff.

<sup>32</sup> Or **only** after its purpose was completed (sacrifices were offered in it) or also when the Divine Presence descended (or after the entire dedication (even that of the princes) was completed. See *Tzafnas Paneach*, second ed., 10a.)

is called *Mikdash*.” However, they received no individual distinction or importance. Rather, they were like parts of a building’s edifice — beams of the *Mishkan* and curtains — that are just components that all together make up the *Mishkan*. The same applies regarding the utensils.

In other words, the definition of *Mishkan* is that there are curtains, beams, sockets, the *shulchan*, the *menorah*, and the altars. However, the utensils do not have any significance **on their own**, just as the curtains and beams and sockets are no more than a part of the overall building. The command,<sup>33</sup> “They shall not come and look when the holy {utensils} are being wrapped up...”<sup>34</sup> (and so forth) is an entirely new command, not an extension of the command regarding the sanctity of the Holy of Holies, for the entire *Mishkan* is disassembled.<sup>35</sup>

b) The utensils possess their own significance even before the entire *Mishkan* was complete — the *Menorah* on its own; and similarly, the *shulchan* and the altars. Once, however, they had been placed within the *Mishkan*, they also completed the *Mishkan*, and then the *Mishkan* became whole.

c) Individually, when they were created, they had no significance<sup>36</sup> **of their own**, but after the *Mishkan* had been erected and the utensils had been placed within it, then each utensil was imbued with its own unique significance. A unique sanctity was attached to each individual utensil — there was a {distinct} sanctity of the *menorah*, the *shulchan*, etc. (This is in addition to an overarching sanctity it had as part of the *Mishkan*, in general.)

---

<sup>33</sup> {*Bamidbar* 4:20.}

<sup>34</sup> {Which implies that the vessels are holy even after the structure of the *Mishkan* was disassembled.}

<sup>35</sup> See the sources in fn. 29 above. *Tzafnas Paneach*, the second ed., 73c.

<sup>36</sup> However, even according to this approach, we could say that they do have their own significance (sanctity) and afterwards, an **added** sanctity.



## 6.

### THE DIFFERENCE

One of the key halachic differences between the above approaches is as follows:

The utensils of the *Mishkan* (and *Mikdash*) need to be made *lishmah*<sup>37</sup> — all the utensils must initially be made for sacred purposes.<sup>38</sup> The distinction in practical terms would lie in the intention behind this *lishmah*:

If we follow the first approach — that the conception of the utensils is that they are only a part of the *Mishkan* — making the utensils *lishmah* would refer to {their intended use for the sake of} the sanctity of the ***Mishkan***.

According to the second approach above — that the individual utensils had their own significance even prior to becoming part of the *Mishkan* — *lishmah* (when making the utensils) would refer to that particular utensil's sanctity: the menorah, the *shulchan*, etc.

According to the third approach above — since by making the utensils and placing them into the *Mishkan*, they obtain not only the general name and sanctity of the *Mishkan* but also a discrete sanctity — the intent when first making the utensils is for both purposes: the “*lishmah*” for the sake of the (mitzvah of the) sanctity of the *Mishkan*; and the particular “*lishmah*” for the sake of the particular utensils.

In light of this, we can explain why **after** the Rambam says, “all of them are parts of the Sanctuary, and everything together is called “Sanctuary,” Rambam adds, “the Torah already gave a distinct command for each component.” This additional statement teaches us that although “this generality (the mitzvah to “make for Me a Sanctuary”) includes many components,” meaning the initial command implies, at the outset, to construct a *Mishkan* **that**

---

<sup>37</sup> As Rashi remarks: “*Make for Me a Sanctuary* — make a House of holiness **for My sake**.” (*Terumah* 25:8)

<sup>38</sup> *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*,” end of ch. 1.

**includes utensils**, after the *Mishkan* was completed, a distinct command<sup>39</sup> was in force for each utensil; therefore, each utensil possessed its own sanctity (like the third approach). Therefore, the *lishmah* intent, when making the utensils, has to mirror this idea, as discussed.

## 7.

### BACK TO VAYAKHEL AND PEKUDEI

This is hinted at in the name of our *sedrah*, “*Vayakhel*,” where it speaks about the construction of the parts of the *Mishkan*: “*Vayakhel*” alludes to the **way** the utensils were made, in that the construction of the *Mishkan* and all its utensils was done in a manner of “*vayakhel*, gathering.” Although the Torah uses the term, “he made,”<sup>40</sup> for every utensil and part of the *Mishkan* individually, the intent when making each individual utensil was not (only) to make each part as a separate item, but it was “*vayakhel*” – gathering all parts of the *Mishkan* together to make one *Mishkan*.

This is because before the entire *Mishkan* was completed, each individual utensil did not have (its own) importance – its entire identity was as a detail of the (overall) *Mishkan*.

In *parshas Pekudei*, where it says, “He finished all the work of the *Mishkan*, the Tent of Meeting,”<sup>41</sup> and he erected the *Mishkan* with all its utensils, then the message of “***Pekudei***” was sensed: Aside from the *Mishkan* as a whole, there is (also) a reality of its individual parts, as discussed. Because after the entire *Mishkan* is erected, each utensil attains its own importance, as discussed at length.

---

<sup>39</sup> Although it is not considered a **distinct** positive mitzvah.

<sup>40</sup> See the wording of *Rambam’s Sefer HaMitzvos*, “*shoresh 12*”; *Tzafnas Paneach*, “*Vayakhel*.”

<sup>41</sup> *Shemos* 39:32.

## 8.

### ALL FOR ONE AND ONE FOR ALL

Every idea in the Torah is eternal, and so is its lesson. Even more so is this true concerning the *Mishkan*, which exemplifies the message, “*Make for Me a Sanctuary and I will dwell in them*” – within every Jew.”<sup>42</sup> This means that the above idea of “*vayakhel*, gathering” and “*pekudei*, counting,” said regarding the building of the *Mishkan*, also applies to “I will dwell in them,” said about Jewish people.

We say that the Jewish people are all one community; all Jews together make up one complete body,<sup>43</sup> and when there is, G-d-forbid, a deficiency in one Jew, the entire body is faulty.<sup>44</sup>

However, we also say that each individual Jew is a “complete world”<sup>45</sup> to the extent that “every person must say: ‘The world was created for me.’”<sup>46</sup> This means that the entire world, the entire continuum of creation, including every Jew of the Jewish nation, was “created for me.” This obligation applies to everyone, even “your woodchoppers” and “your water carriers,”<sup>47</sup> from the most prominent people to the humblest members of society,

In connection to this, there is a lesson to be gleaned from the names of the *sedros*, “*Vayakhel*” and “*Pekudei*”:

A Jew may consider himself, foremost, an individual, not egotistically, but as a holy being – a **Jew** {in line with the dictum that} “the servant of a king is a king,”<sup>48</sup> {whose purpose is} to serve his Creator:<sup>49</sup> He has a **unique** role and mission. However, besides this, he also unites with the collective of Israel.

---

<sup>42</sup> *Reishis Chochmah*, “*Shaar HaAhavah*,” toward the beg. of ch. 6; *Shelah*, “*Shaar HaOsiyos*,” *Os Lamed*; et al.

<sup>43</sup> See *Likkutei Torah*, “*Nitzavim*”; et al.

<sup>44</sup> See Tzemach Tzedek’s *Sefer HaMitzvos*, ‘*Mitzvas Ahavas Yisrael*’; *Kuntres Ahavas Yisroel*.

<sup>45</sup> *Sanhedrin* 37a, *mishnah*.

<sup>46</sup> {*Sanhedrin* 4:5.}

<sup>47</sup> *Devarim* 29:10.

<sup>48</sup> *Sifri* (Rashi) on *Devarim* 1:7; Rashi on *Bereishis* 15:18.

<sup>49</sup> End of *Kiddushin*.

We inform him that as he crafts the utensils for the *Mishkan*, where each utensil is made differently from the others — as the Torah says, “he made” for each utensil separately, reflecting the unique qualities of the utensil — the Torah of Truth teaches that this is actually an embodiment of “*vayakhel*, gathering”: their identity is expressed by being a part of the *Mishkan*, as a whole.

Likewise, a Jew must realize that the starting point and central focus of everything, before anything else, is for him to come together in unity with all other Jews, “*vayakhel*,” such that his identity is defined by his being part of a community.

Therefore, even before a Jew goes to pray for his own needs (which is a positive biblical mitzvah — the mitzvah of prayer),<sup>50</sup> he needs to unite with all Jews by taking upon himself the mitzvah, “Love your fellow like you love yourself.”<sup>51</sup>

In fact, this love is also expressed by the dictum: “Do not separate from the community,”<sup>52</sup> so that a person’s prayers for his own needs are not formulated in the singular — he is not asking just for **himself** — but in the **plural**: “Graciously, grant **us** from you.”; “Our Father, cause **us** to return”; etc. The same applies to all the blessings. They are made for all Jews as one.

Conversely, when someone performs an act of service for the community, he may think that the service has no bearing on his personal perfection. And while his own perfection is linked to his individual service, he is willingly to forgo his perfection for the sake of the community.

We tell him that, on the contrary, erecting the *Mishkan* for the community of Israel was done in the manner of “**pekudei, counting**.” Meaning, how each utensil was brought to Moshe is related separately. Afterwards, Hashem’s command to Moshe about the utensil is related, and then how Moshe fulfilled

---

<sup>50</sup> See Tzemach Tzedek’s *Sefer Hamitzvos*, beg. of “*Shoresh Mitzvas HaTefillah*.”

<sup>51</sup> Beginning of *Shaar Hakavonos*; et al.; in Alter Rebbe’s *Siddur im Dach*, this is recited before “*Mah Tov*”; see Tzemach Tzedek’s *Sefer Hamitzvos*, “*Mitzvas Ahavas Yisrael*.”

<sup>52</sup> *Avos* 2:4; see *Berachos* 29b ff.

the command regarding the utensil. This process for each utensil is related **separately** (attributing importance to each utensil). When a person acts for the sake of the community of Israel, this (also) brings perfection to himself as an **individual**.

## 9.

BOTH ARE ONE

The underlying reason for the need for this “integration” — for an individual to take care of his own affairs in a way that embodies “*vayakhel*, gathering” can be explained as follows:

For a Jew to include himself as part of the community; and on the other hand, to erect a *Mishkan* for the community of Israel, in a manner of, and that brings about, “*pekudei*, counting,” the perfection of every Jew as an **individual** is feasible {and expected} because essentially, for a Jew, both perspectives — his “*vayakhel*, gathering” and “*pekudei*, counting” — are **one**. [Therefore, many (most) years, *Vayakhel* and *Pekudei* are joined, which shows that they become **one sedrah**.]<sup>53</sup>

Overtly and superficially (on the level of “revelations”) the “general” and the “particular” {or the “collective” and the “individual”} are mutually exclusive. Or at least, they represent two distinct perspectives of perfection. Therefore, when emphasizing the importance of the collective, the importance of the individual is weakened. And the more one emphasizes the individual, the more one detracts from the importance of the collective.

However, from the perspective of the essence and inner dimension of a Jew, where all Jews are complementary, “**one** Father for all of them,”<sup>54</sup> and similarly (which is also the cause), from the perspective of Hashem’s essence,

---

<sup>53</sup> See *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 18, p. 380 ff.

<sup>54</sup> *Tanya*, “*Likkutei Amarim*,” ch. 32.

multiplicity does not contradict oneness and simplicity.<sup>55</sup> As known,<sup>56</sup> precisely because of the simplicity Above, there exist many differences {below}. However, not only does multiplicity not contradict simplicity, but, on the contrary, the great multiplicity {below} expresses the supernal simplicity.

Therefore, this correlation is mirrored in Jews, concerning whom we say, Israel and Hashem are one.<sup>57</sup> That all Jews comprise “one nation” does not contradict the individuality of every Jew. On the contrary, since this unity comes from the essential character of the Jews (which is one with Hashem’s Essence, so to speak), this unity also is expressed in the identity and particular “form” of every Jew, because the essence is found in **every** particular.<sup>58</sup>

## 10.

### THE SAME IS IN A TORAH SCROLL

Just as the two *sedros* of “*Vayakhel*” and “*Pekudei*” can be joined {in their reading and implied *avodah*} for the Jewish people, so, too, we find the overt unity of the “general” and the “particular” {or the collective and the individual} (*Vayakhel* and *Pekudei*), in a Torah scroll:

A Torah scroll comprises hundreds of thousands of **distinct** letters, and all the individual letters make up **one Torah** (“*Vayakhel*”). Once it becomes a single and solitary Torah scroll, in a state of perfection and sanctity, every letter in its state of holiness is surrounded by parchment,<sup>59</sup> isolating it from other letters.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> {In the original, “פשיטות.”}

<sup>56</sup> See *Toras Chaim*, “*Noach*,” *Maamar “Vaehi Kol HaAretz*,” ch. 27 ff; (70b ff.); *Maamar “Mi Mada 5662*”; et al.

<sup>57</sup> See *Zohar*, vol. 3, 73a.

<sup>58</sup> See a similar idea in *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 9, p. 159, ff; see *Likkutei Sichos* vol. 18, p. 115 ff.

<sup>59</sup> *Menachos* 29a; *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Tefillin*,” ch. 1, sec 19; *Tur* and *Shulchan Aruch*, “*Yoreh Deah*,” sec. 274, par. 4; “*Orach Chaim*,” sec. 32, par. 4; Alter Rebbe’s *Shulchan Aruch*, sec. 32, par. 5.

<sup>60</sup> See *Likkutei Torah*, “*Shir Hashirim*,” 5a; 46c, et al.; see *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 20, p. 421 ff.

Since the Jewish people, the Torah, and Hashem are all one, it is also expressed openly in the Torah scroll, by how the general and the particulars are connected and united.

This is the lesson and the motivation taken from the *parshiyos Vayakhel-Pekudei* — we should increase our alacrity to unite all Jews. This effort should include something timely, by pursuing the aim of every Jew acquiring a letter in one of the **collective** Torah scrolls that will be written to unite all Jews. Through participation in this initiative, firstly, the perfection of every Jew as a detail and an individual is manifest. By every Jew possessing a letter, a Jew's {individual} connection with Torah is revealed, since he will be present in the Torah (scroll) by the {particular} letter that he possesses in the Torah scroll.<sup>61</sup> Secondly, participation in this initiative brings about the perfection of the nation of Israel as a **collective**, one community. Everyone will be united in a true unity through the eternal Torah of Truth, with an eternal unity.

In this way, we quicken and hasten the true and complete redemption, which will be a personal redemption. Hashem will “actually hold **each and every person** with His hands to take him from his place, as it says,<sup>62</sup> *You shall be gathered, one by one, children of Israel.*”<sup>63</sup> Together with this personal redemption, there will be a complete collective redemption — “A great **congregation** will return<sup>64</sup> here,”<sup>65</sup> speedily in our days, literally.

— Based on talks delivered on Shabbos *parshas Vayakhel-Pekudei*, 5740 (1980) and 5742 (1982)

---

<sup>61</sup> See *Sefer HaMamaarim 5706*, p. 46; *Sefer HaMamaarim 5709*, p. 41 (second {p. 41}).

<sup>62</sup> {*Yeshayahu 27:12.*}

<sup>63</sup> Rashi on *Devarim 30:3*.

<sup>64</sup> It can be said that this {“will return, ישובו”} also connotes repentance, תשובה.

<sup>65</sup> *Yirmiyahu 31:7*.