

“Moshe did according to everything that Hashem commanded him.” (40:16)

Throughout the parsha, we note how Moshe Rabbeinu acted in accordance with Hashem’s command – es Moshe; “to Moshe” (i.e., 39:1,5,7,21,26; 40:19,21,23,25,27). Should it not have said oso; “to him,” rather than “to Moshe” as the Torah expresses here? Are they not one and the same? Horav Elchanan Wasserman, z.l., was wont to say that Moshe did not attribute any significance to himself in regard to his position as Moshe, the quintessential leader of the Jewish People. There was Moshe – the man, and Moshe – the leader: two different people. It is as if Moshe, the man, was standing by the side as Moshe, the leader, was involved in constructing the Mishkan. In this instance, when Moshe was instructed by Hashem to anoint and dress Aharon in the Priestly vestments, as well as Aharon’s sons, the pasuk says oso, “to him,” rather than “to Moshe.” I submit that the language reflects the manner in which Moshe carried out Hashem’s command. When he anointed and dressed his brother and nephews, he was acting as Moshe the man, and not Moshe the leader, hence it says oso.

When the Mashgiach of Baranovitz, Horav Yisrael Yaakov Lubchenski, zl, was gravely ill, Rav Elchanan, the Rosh HaYeshivah, came to visit him. As he walked in, the Rebbetzin lamented the fact that her husband would not permit his students to assist him in any way. Rav Elchanan mused, “I do not understand. Perhaps for himself he might not want to take advantage of his students, but what about the Mashgiach? He needs the students to help him, so that he can recuperate more quickly from his illness. Indeed, the Mashgiach should see to it that the Mashgiach gets better, since the yeshivah badly needs the Mashgiach.” He supported his statement by relating the way Moshe viewed “himself.” This is the outlook of one whose attitude is molded by Torah perspective.