



Likkutei Sichos

Volume 16 | Pekudei | Sichah 2

The Eternal Temple

Translated by Rabbi Mendel Blesofsky

General Editor: Rabbi Eliezer Robbins | Copy Editor: Rabbi Y. Eliezer Danzinger
Content Editor: Rabbi Sholom Zirkind

© Copyright by Sichos In English 2022 ◦ 5782

A note on the translation: Rounded parentheses and square brackets reflect their use in the original *sichah*; squiggly parentheses are interpolations of the translator or editor. The footnotes in squiggly parentheses are those of the translators or editors and do not correspond to the footnotes in the original. Considerable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the translation, while at the same time maintaining readability. The translation, however, carries no official authority. As in all translations, the possibility of inadvertent errors exists. **Your feedback is needed — please send all comments to: info@projectlikkuteisichos.org**

1.

THE REPETITION OF *MISHKAN* ALLUDES TO THE TWO TEMPLES

On the verse,¹ “These are the accounts of the *Mishkan, Mishkan* of testimony...,” our Sages say² that the repetition of the word “*Mishkan*” alludes to “the Temple which was taken as collateral {*mashkon*} the two times it was destroyed” — the destruction of the First and Second Temples.

This is unclear (as supercommentators ask):³ Only the second use of the word “*Mishkan*” is superfluous (since the first use of “*Mishkan*” is necessary for Scripture to make its point). If so, how can we expound the repetition, “the *Mishkan, Mishkan*,” as alluding to **two** (“destructions,” of both) Temples?

From this question itself, it is understood that this teaching derived from the words “the *Mishkan, Mishkan*” is based on (not **an exposition** from a **redundancy**, but **an allusion** — in the words of Rashi {when quoting the above-mentioned teaching of our Sages} —) made by the repetition of “*Mishkan*”: “{It alludes to the Temple} which was taken as **collateral**.” Meaning, corresponding to the straightforward meaning of the words “the *Mishkan, Mishkan*,” Scripture is speaking of the *Mishkan*. But at the same time, the word “*Mishkan*” **alludes** to the word “collateral” {“*mashkon*”}, and the repetition of “the *Mishkan, Mishkan*,” refers to the “collateral” of the two Temples.

¹ {*Shemos* 38:21.}

² *Tanchuma*, “*Pekudei*,” sec. 2; *Shemos Rabbah* 51:3; Rashi on *Shemos* 38:21.

³ *Maskil LeDavid* and *Sifsei Chachamim* on Rashi, *ibid*.

2.

THE ETERNAL *MISHKAN*

*Seforno*⁴ explains that the verse, “These are the accounts of the *Mishkan*...” expresses the extraordinary specialness of the components and utensils of the *Mishkan*, for which reason, “they were not ruined.” (As our Sages say,⁵ “Perhaps you will say {that now that the *Mishkan* is no longer extant, the hope of it being restored to use is} lost. To dispel this notion, Scripture says,⁶ “acacia wood, standing,” indicating that they stand for ever and ever.”) Moreover — “none of them fell into the hands of the enemies.”

The verse specifies the specific qualities “that made it {the *Mishkan*} suitable to last eternally and not to fall into the hands of the enemies”: “{These are the accounts of...} the *Mishkan* of testimony, which were counted according to the word of Moshe; the work of the levites under the direction of Isamar... and Betzalel...” Due to all of these qualities, “the *Shechinah*⁷ dwelled in their handiwork, and it did not fall into the hands of enemies.”

In contrast, with respect to the First Temple, which did not have all of these qualities, “although the *Shechinah* rested in it, its components were ruined... and eventually, it all fell into the hands of enemies.” The same is true of the Second Temple (and to a greater extent than the First) — “It did not have **even one** of these qualities. The *Shechinah* did not rest in it, and it fell into the hands of enemies.”

[We can suggest that the source for this exposition (at least in a broad sense) is from the statement of our Sages in the *Talmud*⁸ that “their enemies did not gain control” over Moshe’s handiwork. Therefore, “When the First Temple was built, the *Mishkan* **was hidden** — its beams, its hooks, its bars, its pillars, and its sockets” (and they didn’t fall to the hands of the enemies). This is the

⁴ *Seforno* on *Shemos* 38:21.

⁵ *Yoma* 72a; *Sukkah* 45b; quoted in *Seforno*, *ibid.*

⁶ *Shemos* 26:15. See the commentary of *Bachaye* on the verse.

⁷ {The Divine presence.}

⁸ *Sotah* 9a.

basis for the explanation that the components and utensils of the *Mishkan*, being “counted **according to the word of Moshe**,” are eternal, etc.]

3.

THE ETERNAL TEMPLES

This specialty of the *Mishkan* over the Temples is based on a **straightforward** reading of Scripture. Meaning, as readily understood and **evident**, only the *Mishkan* is eternal (being the handiwork of Moshe — as it says, “...which were counted according to the word of Moshe”). In contrast, the Temples fell “into the hands of enemies” and were destroyed.

From the **allusion**⁹ in the verse, the verse’s **inner** dimension, however, the Temples are also eternal.

On this basis, we can resolve a very puzzling difficulty — Scripture alludes to the **destruction** of the Temples by using the word “*Mishkan*” — “which was taken as collateral” {“*mashkon*”}: Collateral is not forfeited by its owner and is not transferred **completely** into the ownership of the lender. Rather, it resides temporarily with the lender. Eventually, the **same** object (the **collateral**) is restored to its owner.¹⁰

So, too, is this true of the Temples: Their destruction does not mean that they were utterly lost, G-d forbid. They were only taken as “collateral.” Eventually, the Temple itself (the First, and likewise, the Second) will be restored to the Jewish people.

⁹ {*Remez*, in the Hebrew original. *Remez* is a method of exposition based on hints and allusions in the text.}

¹⁰ {If so, how can the Temple’s **destruction** be alluded to through the term *collateral*, which only implies a temporary loss? Based on the above explanation that from the perspective of Torah’s inner dimension, the Temples were never destroyed but exist eternally, this enigma is resolved.}

4.

THE HOLINESS OF THE TEMPLE' SITE WAS MORE ETERNAL THAN THE SITE OF THE *MISHKAN*

The above-mentioned advantage of the eternity associated with the *Mishkan*, in contrast to the Temples, only relates to the **components and utensils** of the *Mishkan*. However, regarding the everlasting sanctification of the grounds— {a function of} the indwelling of the *Shechinah* at the place of the *Mishkan* and the Temples — the Temples possesses an advantage {over the *Mishkan*}. As *Rambam* writes in *Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*:¹¹

The *Mishkan* constructed by Moshe is already described in the Torah. It was {only} **temporary**.... After the Temple was built in Jerusalem, it became forbidden to build a sanctuary for G-d, or to offer sacrifices, in any other place. For all generations, there is no Sanctuary other than in Jerusalem, and {specifically} on Mt. Moriah....

(Subsequently, *Rambam* also quotes a supporting verse:)¹² “This is My resting place **forever**.” {Meaning,} the sanctity of the *Mishkan*'s grounds was only transient. In the words of Scripture,¹³ “I have moved about **in a tent**...” {However} the only “**house** (for the **permanent** indwelling of the *Shechinah*) for all generations” is (the sanctuary) in Jerusalem. This is also true in a negative sense: “{Once the Temple was built in Jerusalem,} it became forbidden to build... in any other place....”

Moreover, the construction of the First Temple did not only create a fixed place for the indwelling of the *Shechinah* at that time, but the actual indwelling of the *Shechinah* was effected in an everlasting manner. As *Rambam* rules,¹⁴ the “original consecration, sanctified the Temple and Jerusalem for eternity... because the sanctity of the Temple and Jerusalem derives from the *Shechinah*, and the *Shechinah* can never be nullified.”

From this it is understood that the aforementioned point, i.e., on a deeper level (based on an “allusion” in the verse), the Temples are **also** eternal like the

¹¹ Ch. 1, par. 1-3.

¹² *Tehillim* 132:14.

¹³ *Shmuel* II 7:6.

¹⁴ *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*,” ch. 6, par. 14-16.

Mishkan, means that not only the sanctity of the Temple grounds “can never be nullified,” but that the Temples **also** possess at least a semblance of the eternity of the *Mishkan*’s components and utensils.

Parenthetically, from the perspective of the site possessing sanctity, on the contrary, the Temple (is **primary** and) is superior to the *Mishkan*, as explained above. {As such, this advantage would not have been merely alluded to in the verse that speaks about the *Mishkan*.}

5.

RESTING PLACE AND HERITAGE

To understand this more clearly, we need to preface with a teaching of our Sages on the verse,¹⁵ “For you will not yet have come to the resting place and to the heritage.” Our Sages explain:¹⁶ “‘The resting place’ refers to {the *Mishkan* of} Shiloh; ‘the heritage’ refers to {the Temple of} Jerusalem.”

Simply understood, Jerusalem is specifically referred to as “the heritage,” while Shiloh is referred to only as “the resting place,” because the term, “heritage” connotes permanence more than does the term “resting place” (which can also be temporary). Therefore, Jerusalem {about which it says} “there is no sanctuary **for all generations** except in Jerusalem,” is referred to as “the heritage.”

This explanation, however, is insufficient, since according to one opinion,¹⁷ “‘the resting place’ refers to Jerusalem and ‘the heritage’ refers to Shiloh,” although **all agree** that Jerusalem is superior to Shiloh.

We must say {therefore} that “the resting place” also has an advantage over “the heritage.” Namely, “resting place” and “heritage” denote two different qualities, and each has an advantage that the other lacks.

¹⁵ *Devarim* 12:9.

¹⁶ *Megillah* 10a; *Zevachim* 119a.

¹⁷ *Zevachim* *ibid.*; *Sifri*, “*Devarim*” 12:9.

The explanation: As discussed, the advantage of the *Mishkan* is that its **components and utensils** are eternal. However, the *Mishkan* was only a temporary dwelling **place** for the *Shechinah*; it was a “tent.” On the other hand, the opposite was true of the Temple: The **site** of the Temple has an eternal sanctity — “it can never be nullified.” The building itself and its components, however, “were ruined,” and fell into the hands of our enemies.

These two different qualities are alluded to by the two terms, “resting place” {in Hebrew, *menucha*; literally, “rest”} and “heritage.” The **simple** difference between them is:

“Rest” portrays the condition of a person (the subject) — he is not wandering from place to place {but is at rest}. This term also refers to the state of the portable goods which {usually} accompany him, since, as is clearly evident, a person’s chattels affect his state of mind,¹⁸ and are more personal to him than his residence. {Thus, when the chattels are in a state of “rest,” it reflects that the person himself is in a restful state.} “Heritage,” in contrast, describes the state of **the thing itself** (the object) — the land and the like.¹⁹

Accordingly, we can understand that the *Mishkan* of Shiloh — part of which was made from the “*Mishkan* that Moshe made,” as *Rambam* says,²⁰ “{From there they came to Shiloh} built a house..., and spread the curtains of the ***Mishkan*** over it” — had the quality of “resting”: Its **components and utensils** — things that accompany a person — are eternal; therefore, when they settled “permanently” in Shiloh,²¹ it was called the “resting place,” which describes the state of the **person** {the subject}, as discussed above.

¹⁸ *Berachos* 57b.

¹⁹ {In other words: When we describe someone as having reached a “resting place,” we are describing the person’s state — *he* (together with his utensils) are settled and not moving from place to place. In contrast, the description “heritage,” describes the object — the *place* being referred to is a place of heritage. We are not speaking of the state of the person, the subject, but of the place — the object.}

²⁰ *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*,” ch. 1, par. 2.

²¹ As opposed to earlier, when they were traveling in the desert, etc.

In contrast, the Temple, whose outstanding feature was (not its components and utensils, but) its **site**, is called the “heritage,” which describes the state of the **site**, as explained above.

6.

ONLY HASHEM CAN CREATE SOMETHING ETERNAL

The explanation of these differences between the *Mishkan* and the Temple:

Something eternal cannot be produced by people, by created beings who are limited. This can only be accomplished by Hashem.

Therefore, the individual components of the Temple were not eternal, for they were (in the words of the *Zohar*²²) “made by **people**.” In contrast, the fact that the **site** of the Temple has eternal sanctity is not something that people achieved, but {it stems from the fact that} it is “the place that **Hashem, your L-rd will choose** to have His Name dwell there.”²³ In the words of *Rambam*:²⁴ “The sanctity of the Temple... derives from the **Shechinah** and the *Shechinah* can never be nullified.”

Meaning, the construction of the Temple did not **cause** the *Shechinah* to dwell in the Temple eternally — it only served as preparation, so that the site would be fit for this indwelling (and so that it would be revealed). The indwelling {of the *Shechinah*} itself came as a result of the fact that Hashem chose this location, and consequently, it is eternal.

Regarding the *Mishkan*, however, the opposite was true: The indwelling of the *Shechinah* did not come as a result of Hashem choosing the **location** of the *Mishkan* to “have His Name dwell there,” but as a result of the construction of the *Mishkan* — “And they shall make Me a sanctuary” (and thereby), “I will dwell

²² *Zohar* vol. 3, 221a; similarly in *Zohar* vol. 1, 28a.

²³ *Devarim* 12:11; *Sifri* and Rashi on this verse.

²⁴ *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*,” ch. 6, par. 14-16.

among them.”²⁵ (When the cause {of the indwelling of the *Shechinah*} — the constructed *Mishkan*, “They shall make Me a sanctuary,” was withdrawn from that location, the effect — “I will dwell,” was withdrawn from that location.)

The components and utensils of the *Mishkan*, in contrast, were Moshe’s handiwork. — And Moshe is the **servant** of Hashem, a faithful servant;²⁶ a servant whose entire being is identified with the being of his master.²⁷ This relationship is especially evident according to the explanation²⁸ that the maxim, “whatever a servant acquires, his master acquires,”²⁹ means (not that the slave {first} acquires it for **himself**, and through him, his master acquires it, but) that **from the outset**, “his master acquires it.” — Therefore, just as Hashem’s handiwork is eternal, so the handiwork of Moshe, the servant of Hashem, is eternal.

7.

IN THE MERIT OF KING DAVID YOUR SERVANT

This is also why the *Shechinah* dwelt in the Temple in the merit of King **David**. As our Sages say,³⁰ only after King Shlomo prayed to Hashem, “Hashem, O L-rd, do not turn away the face of your anointed; remember the kind deeds of David Your servant,”³¹ was he able to gain entry for the Ark into the Holy of Holies — “and the *Shechinah* dwelt in the Sanctuary”:³²

²⁵ *Shemos* 25:8.

²⁶ As the verse says (*Bamidbar* 12:7), “He {— Moshe} is **faithful** throughout my house.” See, at length, *Hemshech* 5666, p. 317ff.

²⁷ See at length *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 5, p. 233 ff; vol. 9, p. 323-4; see also *Hemshech* 5666, p. 326-7, et al. See, regarding **our subject**, Rashi on *Bamidbar* (12:8): “{My servant, Moshe....} And the servant of a king is {uplifted to the level of} a king.” {See *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 30, p. 10.}

²⁸ *Rashba* on *Kiddushin* 23b.

²⁹ *Pesachim* 88b; *Kiddushin*, *ibid.*

³⁰ *Shabbos* 30a; *Sanhedrin* 107b; *Midrash Tehillim* ch. 24; *Bamidbar Rabbah* 14:3; et al.

³¹ *Divrei Hayamim II* 6:42.

³² *Bamidbar Rabbah* 14:3.

Since an indwelling of the *Shechinah* that would be **eternal** needed to be made, this required that the “human” preparation be linked with someone similar to Moshe, whose handiwork was everlasting.

For that reason, it came about in the merit of King David, who was the personification³³ of **a servant** of Hashem.³⁴ (Therefore, Shlomo had emphasized “David, **Your servant**” in the above prayer.)

Consequently, King David’s handiwork was everlasting, and any enemies were powerless over them (similar to the handiwork of Moshe), as explained in the *Talmud*.³⁵

8.

THE THIRD TEMPLE

According to the above explanation regarding the advantage connoted by the term “resting place,” we can also explain the fact that we also find the term “resting place” used to describe Jerusalem, as it says,³⁶ “Hashem has chosen **Tzion** {— **Jerusalem**}... this is My **resting place** for all time.” For seemingly, since “the heritage’ refers to Jerusalem (and ‘the resting place’ refers to Shiloh),” it should have said, “This is **my heritage** for all time”!

The **Third** Temple will possess both qualities — that of a “heritage” and of a “resting place”: Its eternity will not only be regarding the **site** of the Temple (as with the First and Second Temples), but even regarding the **structure itself** (regarding which the term “rest” applies, as explained above) — it will exist eternally. For Hashem Himself will build it, as the verse says,³⁷ “the sanctuary, my L-rd, that Your hands established”; and as the *Zohar* states,³⁸ The Third Temple will be constructed “by Hashem (and therefore), it will endure for all generations.”

³³ {In the Hebrew original, “*inyano*.”}

³⁴ See also *Hemshech* 5666, p. 313.

³⁵ *Sotah* 9a. See *Pesikta Rabbasi* 2:6; *Midrash Tehillim* at the end of ch. 62; *Yalkut Shimoni Shmuel II*, remez 145. Quoted in *Or Hatorah*, *VaEschanan* p. 65; p. 92.

³⁶ *Tehillim* 132:13-14.

³⁷ *Shemos* 15:17. *Mechiltah* and Rashi there.

³⁸ *Zohar* vol. 1, 28a. See *Zohar* vol. 3, 221a.

9.

THE COMPONENTS OF THE TEMPLES ARE ALSO ETERNAL

A question may be raised regarding this explanation: According to its straightforward meaning, the verse, “This is My resting place for all time” is not (only) speaking of the era of the Third Temple, but {also} of the First Temple. Furthermore, *Rambam* cites this verse as a rationale for the law:

Once the {First} **Temple** was built in **Jerusalem**, it became forbidden {to build...} in any other place....

Accordingly, on what basis is the Temple **then** referred to as “This is **My resting place...**”?³⁹

The explanation: Regarding the encampments of the Jewish people in the desert, the *Talmud* says in tractate *Eruvin*:⁴⁰ “Since it is written about them,⁴¹ ‘By the word of Hashem they would camp, and by the word of Hashem they would travel,’ it is considered as if they had permanence.” Meaning, although “the Jewish people in the desert lived in **tents**, which are not permanent,”⁴² nevertheless, since their encampments (in tents) were “by the word of Hashem,” it was “considered as if **they** {the tents} **had** permanence”: The encampment itself, (the **tent**) was permanent (while they were encamped).

The same is true in our case: Since the Temple was called “a **house**”⁴³ “by the **word of Hashem**,” (because until the {construction of} the Temple, {Hashem said,} “I **walked in a tent...**”⁴⁴) — it is “considered as if they had permanence.” The {structure of the} Temple itself was not “temporary.” Rather it

³⁹ {In the previous Section, the Rebbe explained that the reason why Jersulaem is called “resting place” is on account of the Third Temple. However, the Rebbe now remarks that this can't be the (full) explanation because even the First Temple is referred to with this title.}

⁴⁰ 55b; see also *Shabbos* 31b.

⁴¹ *Bamidbar* 9:20.

⁴² Rashi on *Eruvin*, *ibid.*, s.v. “*Ela leachorehen.*”

⁴³ See *Shmuel* II 7:5ff.

⁴⁴ *Shmuel* II 7:6.

(resembled) the quality of a resting place — eternity — “it is considered **permanent**.”⁴⁵

Therefore, the description “resting place” is also appropriate in relation to the First (and Second) Temple: Although only the Third Temple will be a **perfect** resting place (like the components and utensils of the *Mishkan*), nonetheless, there was a semblance of this quality even in the First and Second Temples, since “by the word of Hashem,” they were called (not a “tent,” but) a “**house**.”

[This is also the reason why the **preparations** for the building of the Temple were carried out by King David, as related in *Nach*⁴⁶ — since his handiwork is everlasting (as explained above in Section 7). Because of this, there was also a semblance of the quality of eternity in the structure of the Temple.

Nevertheless, “eventually it all fell into the hands of enemies,” since the actual construction of the Temple was through King Shlomo, and only the preparation was done through King David.]⁴⁷

10.

THE *MISHKAN* AND THIRD TEMPLES COMMON DENOMINATOR

We cited *Seforno* above (in Section 2) as saying that one of the qualities of the *Mishkan* “that made it fit to last eternally...” was that it was the *Mishkan* of testimony — that it contained the tablets of testimony.

Just as the *Mishkan* and the Third Temple share a common denominator in that their components and utensils are eternal (in a revealed sense), so, too, the cause of their eternity (“that made it fit to last eternally...”) is also shared: In both the *Mishkan* (in the desert) and the Third Temple, the Ark remains in its

⁴⁵ Rashi to *Eruvin* *ibid.*, s.v., “*keivan dichsiv*.”

⁴⁶ *Divrei Hayamim* I, ch. 28-29.

⁴⁷ See *Pesikta Rabbasi* 2:6; *Midrash Tehillim* at the end of ch. 62; *Yalkut Shimoni* “*Shmuel II*,” *remez* 145.

designated place {in the Holy of Holies} throughout the **entire** period of their existence. In contrast, the Ark was never in the Second Temple.⁴⁸ Even in the time of the First Temple, “King Yoshiyahu **hid it**” (at the end of this period).⁴⁹

11.

THE ARK

As discussed above at length, the First and Second Temples also had the quality of eternity. However, this quality primarily and overtly (did not relate to the components of the Temple, but) related to the indwelling of the *Shechinah* in the place of the Temple. Meaning, unlike the eternity of the *Mishkan*, in which the **physical** components and utensils of the *Mishkan* were eternal, {in the Temples}, the indwelling of the *Shechinah* was eternal spiritually — “the *Shechinah* can never be nullified.”

Accordingly, we must say what the Ark contributed to the quality of eternity {in the Temples} — was (not the eternal nature of the indwelling of the *Shechinah*, *spiritually*, but) specifically the eternal nature of the components and utensils of the *Mishkan*, materially.

12.

THE ARK IN A JEW’S HEART

This will be clarified by prefacing with a discussion of the meaning of the Ark in our divine service:

Every Jew is a “*Mishkan*” and a Temple for Hashem, as our Sages say⁵⁰ in their well-known teaching on the verse,⁵¹ “They should make Me a sanctuary, and I will dwell **within them**.” Just as in the Temple, there were “three

⁴⁸ *Yoma* 21b.

⁴⁹ *Divrei Hayamim* II 35:3; *Yoma* 52b and the sources quoted there; *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*,” beginning of ch. 4.

⁵⁰ *Reishis Chochmoh*, “*Shaar Hoahavah*,” ch. 6 s.v. “*Ushnei*”; *Shaloh* “*Shaar Haosiyos*,” *Ois Lamed* (and in other sources). {The fact that the verse concludes, “I will dwell among **them**,” and not “in it” (i.e., in the *Mishkan*), implies that the verse is also referring to the Jewish people themselves. Every Jew can make a sanctuary for Hashem within themselves, and through doing so, Hashem will dwell “in them” — within every Jew.}

⁵¹ *Shemos* 25:8.

precincts” — the Courtyard, the Holy, and the Holy of Holies⁵² (which housed the Ark) — these three “precincts” also exist in the individual Temple within every Jew:

In our *avodah*,⁵³ the Courtyard, which housed the outer Altar, symbolizes the external aspect of the heart;⁵⁴ the Holy, which housed the inner Altar, represents the inner aspect of the heart;⁵⁴ and the Holy of Holies, which housed the Ark, {represents} the innermost aspect of the heart,⁵⁵ the *Yechidah*,⁵⁶ about which it says,⁵⁷ “they do not have a shadow of a shadow.”⁵⁸ Even regarding levels {of the soul} much lower than the *Yechidah*, we say that “it remained faithful to Hashem even while a sin was being committed.”⁵⁹ It is always whole (i.e., eternal), and it is not possible that something (“enemies”) will rule or affect it.

This quality {symbolized by the Ark} is the “Moshe” that is within every Jew,⁶⁰ analogous to how Moshe personified the Ark (Torah⁶¹), {as the verse indicates} “Remember the Torah of My servant Moshe.”⁶²

⁵² *Or Hatorah*, “*Vayakhel*,” p. 2195; *Maamer* s.v. “*Vhu Omaid*” 5663 ch. 2; beginning of the *Maamer* s.v. “*Ki Hu Yevarech*” 5700; note *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*,” ch. 1 par. 5.

⁵³ {Divine service.}

⁵⁴ As is known, the outer Altar and the inner Altar represent the outer and inner aspects of the heart — *Toras Chaim*, *Terumah* p. 443a ff; *Or Hatorah*, *Vayakhel* p. 2213; *Derech Mitzvosecha* 86b ff. Et. al. {The outer aspect of the heart refers to the emotions of the heart that are influenced and aroused through the contemplation of the mind. When a person contemplates the greatness of Hashem, it arouses a corresponding feeling of love and awe in the heart. The inner aspect of the heart refers to the deepest feelings of a person, which are not influenced by the mind. Every Jew has a natural feeling of love and connection to Hashem that is completely beyond understanding, and not limited by his comprehension of G-dliness. See *Igeres Hakodesh* ch. 4, and many other sources.}

⁵⁵ See *Likkutei Torah*, “*Ki Seitzei*” (36a) {where it is explained} that even the inner aspect of the heart contains an {innermost point —} the inner aspect of the inner aspect.

⁵⁶ {The fifth, and highest, level of the soul, where a Jew’s essential connection to Hashem is expressed.}

⁵⁷ *Yevomos* 122a, and the sources quoted there.

⁵⁸ *Likkutei Torah*, “*Ki Seitzei*,” 37c; et al. {The *Talmud* explains how to distinguish a demon from a human. Although demons have shadows, their shadows do not have shadows, unlike humans. *Chassidus* explains that the ‘shadow’ represents the transcendent level of the soul that does not clothe itself in the body — the level of *Chayah*. The “shadow of the shadow” represents the deepest level of the soul, the soul’s essential connection to Hashem — the *Yechidah*. The forces of unholiness also have a “shadow,” a level that is transcendent, corresponding to the level of *Chayah*, but they do not have a “shadow of a shadow,” the level of *Yechidah*.}

⁵⁹ *Tanya* at the end of ch. 24.

⁶⁰ *Tanya* beginning of ch. 42. See *Bamidbar* 11:21; *Eitz Chaim*, *Shaar* 32 ch. 1; *Shaar* 38 ch. 6; et al. See *Likkutei Torah*, *Pekudei* (p. 5d), which explains that the spark of Moshe within every Jew is the quality of complete self-sacrifice and self-nullification for the Oneness of Hashem. {*Tanya* explains that every Jew’s soul contains something of the quality of Moshe, which gives him the ability to connect and attach himself to Hashem.}

⁶¹ {The Ark is Torah,} for “there was nothing inside the Ark but (the) two tablets...” — *Melachim* I 8:9; *Divrei Hayamim* II 5:10.

⁶² *Malachi* 3:22; *Shabbos* 89a.

On this basis, we can understand the fact that in these two times — the time of the *Mishkan* and in the Future Era — the Ark (the innermost aspect of the heart, the level of “Moshe”) is found in its designated place in a revealed sense: The generation of the desert was a “generation of knowledge”⁶³ — the entire generation was on the level of Moshe, whose level was that of Supernal Knowledge (as explained in the writings of the *Arizal*).⁶⁴ In the time of Moshiach as well (when the verse, “**Hashem your G-d, will circumcise your heart**”⁶⁵ will be fulfilled — including the “thin membrane”) the “innermost **point** of the heart”⁶⁶ — the level of Moshe — will be revealed.

In contrast, at the (end) of the period of the First Temple, and (throughout the entire period of) the Second Temple, although the Ark was whole even then, and did not fall into the hands of enemies, G-d forbid — it was, however, concealed: “Yoshiyahu **hid it.**”

13.

THE SANCTUARY OF THE DESERT

In light of the above discussion, we can also explain, from the perspective of Torah’s deeper dimension, why *Rambam* specifically calls the *Mishkan* “the sanctuary of the **desert**”⁶⁷ (since, as known, in his work, *Rambam* alludes to many matters of *Kabbalah*⁶⁸ — and the same is true in our case):

⁶³ See *Vayikra Rabbah* 9:1; *Bamidbar Rabbah* 19:3; et al.

⁶⁴ *Eitz Chaim*, “*Shaar HaKelalim*,” ch. 11; *Shaar* 32, ch. 1; *Shaar HaPesukim*, beginning of *parshas Shemos* and in other sources. {In the Hebrew original, “*Daas Elyon*.” This level of supernal knowledge reveals the innermost point of the soul. See *Torah Or*, p. 75. *Mamaarim* entitled “*Ve’eileh Hamishpotim*” 5711, 5714, et al.}

⁶⁵ *Devarim* 30:6.

⁶⁶ *Igeres HaKodesh* ch. 4 — see there at length. {In circumcision, there is a thick foreskin and a thin membrane. In the spiritual counterpart, the thick foreskin refers to the coarser, physical desires which we can remove on our own. The thin membrane represents the subtle worldly desires that cover and conceal the inner love and desire a Jew has for Hashem. Since they are subtle and “thin,” they are very difficult for a person to remove. Only when Moshiach comes, Hashem will remove it completely for us.}

⁶⁷ *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*,” ch. 1 par. 12.

⁶⁸ {As is seen} at the beginning of his work, the *Yad Hachazakah*, {where *Rambam* begins;} “*Yesod Hayesodos Ve’amud Hachochmos*” {“The foundation of all foundations and the pillar of wisdom”}. The first letter of each of the four words {of the phrase in the Hebrew original} spell the Tetragrammaton, {Hashem’s ineffable name} (*Shaar HaGedolim* of the *Chidah*, entry *Rambam* — in the name of *Reb David Hanagid*, *Rambam*’s grandson). See *Sefer Hasichos* 5700 p. 41, and the fn. there; *Likkutei Sichos* vol. 3, p. 768, fn. 18.

The phrase “the sanctuary of the **desert**” alludes to the above-mentioned advantage of the *Mishkan* (that within it, the Ark was in its designated place in a revealed sense), for the innermost aspect of the heart is {referred to as} the level of the “desert” of the soul. A desert is a place where “no person had dwelt.”⁶⁹ {Spiritually, the term “person” connotes the structure of intellect and emotions. Accordingly, the innermost aspect of the heart is a level where “no person has dwelt”} in a positive sense, since it is **higher** than the level of “person” {i.e., the framework} of the soul. {It is the level of} self-sacrifice that transcends understanding.⁷⁰ {And this level was revealed in the *Mishkan* in the desert.}

{Similarly, the third Temple is also associated with the innermost part of the soul, which is completely unbounded}. Therefore, we also find the level of “*me’od*” {מאד, lit., “exceedingly”} — which is a loftier level than that of a {regular, structured} “person” {אדם} — applied to Moshiach: “Behold My servant shall succeed; he shall be exalted and raised up, and and **exceedingly** {*me’od*} lofty.”⁷¹ “*Me’od*” (although “מאד” shares the same letters as “אדם,”⁷² the way these letters are combined in מאד) expresses “the level of absolute infinity”⁷³ — beyond the combination {that spells} *Adam* — {which is synonymous with the abovementioned level of} the holy **desert**. This is the level of the Ark, and it will be returned to its place in a revealed sense through Moshiach.

⁶⁹ *Yirmiyahu* 2:6.

⁷⁰ See *Likkutei Torah, Bamidbar* 4c ff; *Shir Hashirim* 22a; 23b ff, et. al. {The level of “person” refers to a limited level of G-dliness, where the G-dly light is enclosed and limited by vessels (*keilim*). It is referred to as “person,” since the definition of a *person* is a limited being, whose emotions are controlled and restricted by his limited mind. See the source quoted in fn. 72.}

⁷¹ *Yeshayahu* 52:13.

⁷² *Torah Or* 46d, based on *Bereishis Rabbah* 8:5 (and Rashi there).

⁷³ *Hemshech “Vekocho”* 5637 ch. 20.

14.

PHYSICAL ACTION

As known,⁷⁴ the term “אדם,” “person,” alludes to the three levels of *thought*, *speech*, and *action*. (The א represents *thought*, “מהשבה,” the ד represents *speech*, “דיבור,” and the מ represents *action*, “מעשה”). Accordingly, the combination {of letters which spell} “מאד”, which is loftier than the {structured} form of a person, begins with the letter מ — **action** {מעשה}.

The explanation: Self-sacrifice {which corresponds to the level of “מאד”} is exhibited specifically through the medium of action, because “the beginning {i.e., the deepest level of the soul } is specifically wedged in the end,”⁷⁵ { i.e., the level of action, the lowest capability of the soul}. Similarly it is explained⁷⁶ regarding {the prayerful declaration} “there is none comparable to You in *this* world,”⁷⁷ that specifically in this physical world {the lowest of all worlds} does the “incomparability” of the {essence of G-d, the highest of all levels} become manifest. The same holds true of a Jew: The supremacy of the power of self-sacrifice of the innermost aspect of the heart is expressed specifically by a person’s power of action.

This is the connection between the two qualities of the *Mishkan* and the Third Temple: (a) in an overt way, the **Ark** is found in its designated place ; (b) the **physical** components and utensils of the *Mishkan* and Temple are eternal.

Because the innermost core of the heart — which the Ark symbolizes — is expressed specifically through the medium of action: the **physical** eternity of the components and utensils of the *Mishkan* and the Temple.

— From talks delivered on the eve of Rosh Chodesh Menachem Av, and the 15th of Menachem Av, 5736 (1976)

⁷⁴ *Likkutei Torah*, “Behaaloscha,” p. 31c.

⁷⁵ {*Sefer Yetzirah* 1:7.}

⁷⁶ *Hemshech* 5672 vol. 2 p. 1151, 1155; *Sefer Hamaamorim* 5711 p. 113 ff, p. 117 ff., et al.

⁷⁷ {*Siddur, Shacharis* for Shabbos and Festivals, “Blessings of the *Shema*.”}