

**Date:** 2 Adar 5786 (February 19, 2026)

**Torah Portion:** Terumah

**Topic:** Kingship, Dwelling, and Authority

As written (Mark 12:37), “David himself calls Him ‘Master.’ In what way then is He his Son?” The relationship of this week’s Torah portion is not immediately obvious at the surface level. One text records a debate in the Temple during the Second Temple period; the others describe the construction of the Tabernacle in the wilderness and the building of Solomon’s Temple in Yerushalayim. Yet when read canonically, these passages are bound together by a shared theological axis: divine kingship, sacred dwelling, and the question of ultimate authority.

In Mark 12:37, the discussion centers on Psalm 110: “David himself calls Him ‘Master.’ So how is He his son?” The question is not merely genealogical. It is royal. If David refers to someone as “my Master,” then that figure must possess authority greater than David himself. The issue raised is therefore one of hierarchy: Who stands at the summit of covenantal kingship? Who truly reigns?

To understand the weight of this question, we need to return to Exodus 25–27. There, immediately after the covenant at Sinai, YHWH commands YIsrael to construct the Mishkan. The stated purpose is clear: “Let them make Me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them” (Exod. 25:8). The Mishkan is not merely ritual space; it is a royal dwelling. The Ark functions as the footstool of the divine throne. The Menorah radiates royal light. The altar mediates covenant loyalty. The entire structure proclaims one central truth: YHWH is King in the midst of YIsrael.

This wilderness sanctuary establishes the foundational theology of sacred kingship. YIsrael has no human monarch at Sinai. The divine Presence itself occupies the center of the camp. Authority flows outward from the dwelling of YHWH. Holiness, law, and priesthood all derive legitimacy from this central throne.

Centuries later, in 1 Kings 5–6, this theology is monumentalized. Shlemo builds the Temple in Yerushalayim, transforming the mobile sanctuary into a permanent royal house. The language echoes Exodus: “I will dwell among the children of YIsrael and will not forsake My people YIsrael” (1 Kings 6:13). Yet a crucial element appears alongside this promise: conditionality. The divine dwelling depends on covenant faithfulness. The Temple is not autonomous; it is sustained by obedience.

The Temple therefore becomes both throne and test. It symbolizes divine kingship, yet it also exposes human leadership to judgment. Solomon may build the structure, but the true Sovereign remains YHWH.

This background sharpens the force of our verse. The conversation takes place within the Temple precincts. The debate is not abstract theology but a confrontation about authority at the heart of sacred space. Psalm 110, quoted in Mark 12, is itself a royal enthronement psalm: “YHWH said to my Master, Sit at My right hand.” It assumes a throne, priesthood, and Zion-centered kingship. By invoking this psalm, the discussion enters the world of Temple theology established in Exodus and Kings.

The question becomes explosive: If David calls the coming figure “Master,” then this figure transcends the Davidic dynasty. Yet the Temple was historically linked to David’s line—conceived by David, built by Shlemo. If a future Master surpasses David, then he also surpasses the dynastic structure that shaped the Temple institution.

Thus, the arc of the three passages forms a theological progression. Exodus establishes divine kingship dwelling among YIsrael. Kings institutionalizes that dwelling in Yerushalayim. Mark raises the question of whether the anticipated royal figure stands above even David and, by implication, above the Temple system associated with him.

Importantly, none of these texts diminish the central claim of Exodus: YHWH alone is King. Rather, the tension lies in how human leadership relates to that kingship. The Mishkan proclaims unmediated divine sovereignty. The Temple integrates monarchy under divine rule. Our verse confronts the audience with the possibility that the anticipated “son of David” is not merely dynastic heir but participates in a higher order of authority.

The “great multitude” hearing gladly in Mark 12:37 signals recognition that the issue is larger than lineage. It concerns the structure of covenantal authority itself. Who truly occupies the throne implied in Psalm 110? Who mediates divine rule in the sacred center of Yisrael?

When read together, our Torah portion revolves around a single axis: the dwelling of divine kingship among Yisrael and the identity of the one who stands in relation to that kingship. The Tabernacle establishes the throne. The Temple monumentalizes it. Mark interrogates who ultimately shares in or represents that throne.

In this way, the conversation in Mark is not detached from Yisrael’s earlier sacred architecture. It stands precisely within it. The debate about David’s Master unfolds inside the very system that began when YHWH first said, “Let them make Me a sanctuary.” The question of kingship in Mark is therefore inseparable from the theology of dwelling in Exodus and Kings.

Shalom.