

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON PARSHAS TZAV- 5757

For e-mail of current or back issues contact crshulman@aol.com.
For instructions and listing of Torah e-mail lists and web sites see
<http://members.aol.com/crshulman/torah.html> .

B'S'D' koshered as well.

How do you prepare a utensil for hag'alah? Hag'alah purges the taste of non-kosher food which is absorbed into the walls of the utensil, but has no effect on actual food, residue or dirt which may be on the surface! of the utensil. Accordingly, it is imperative that before the hag'alah process begins, the utensil must be scrubbed clean of any actual residue or dirt. Rust spots(26), too, must be removed, since it is possible that particles of food are trapped between the rust and the utensil. One need not be concerned with rust stains, etc., however, since no food particles can be trapped there(27).

Because of this prerequisite, there are several utensils which should not be koshered by hag'alah since they cannot be cleaned properly and thoroughly(28): Utensils which have crevices or cracks where food may be trapped, a pot that has a cover which is attached by hinges(29), a mixer, food processor, blender(30), thermos bottle(31), sieve, strainer(32), grater, grinder, rolling pin, kneading boards(33) and anything else which cannot be scrubbed thoroughly and cleaned in every spot where food may possibly be trapped. If hag'alah is performed on a utensil which was not completely cleaned, it is not valid even b'dieved and the hag'alah process must be repeated. Handles and covers must be cleaned as well as the utensils themselves. Any handle which is attached with screws should be removed and the area cleaned before hag'alah takes place. If the space between the handles and the utensil cannot be cleaned, the vessel may not undergo hag'alah(34).

Our custom (based on several halachic factors) does not allow a utensil to be koshered by hag'alah if it was used for non-kosher within the previous 24 hours(35). B'dieved, or in a situation where it is difficult to wait 24 hours, a rav may permit hag'alah even within twenty four hours under certain specific conditions(36). Before hag'alah, the utensil being koshered should be totally dry(37).

In what type of pot is the koshering done? When koshering for Pesach, it is preferable that the vessel used for the koshering process be either brand new or kosher for Pesach. If this is difficult to arrange, then one may use a vessel which was previously used for chometz, provided that 24 hours have passed since it was last used(38). The custom is to kosher the vessel itself by hag'alah before using it as a receptacle for koshering the other utensils(39). After the hag'alah, the koshering pot should be put away. If it is needed for Pesach, it should be koshered again(40).

When koshering from non-kosher to kosher, the non-kosher utensil should be immersed in a kosher pot. After the koshering process is over, the pot should be koshered again. When koshering a meaty utensil which became non-kosher through contact with dairy or vice versa, the koshering pot may be either meat or dairy. Neither the utensils being koshered nor the vessel in which the koshering is being done should be used for the previous twenty four hours.

The koshering process: The following is the correct, l'hatchilah procedure for koshering utensils by hag'alah(41): A pot with clean(42) water is placed on the fire and the water is boiled until bubbles appear (approx. 212 degrees). Care must be taken that the water continues to bubble throughout the koshering process. In certain cases(43), the hag'alah is invalid if the water was not bubbling at the time of koshering.

The entire non-kosher utensil, including its handles, is placed inside the bubbling water. It should not be withdrawn immediately nor should it be left in too long(44). A few seconds is the right amount of time for the utensil to be immersed in the bubbling water(45). If a utensil is too large to be inserted all at once into the koshering pot, it may be put in part by part(46). L'hatchilah, care should be taken that no part be put in twice(47). Immediately upon removing the utensil from the koshering pot, it should be rinsed with cold water. B'dieved, if it is not, the hag'alah is still valid(48).

Although anyone is halachically permitted to kosher utensils, nevertheless, since the halachos are numerous and complex, hag'alah should not be performed without the supervision of a talmid chacham who is knowledgeable in this area. No blessing is recited over hag'alah keilim(49).

FOOTNOTES: 1 Pesachim 30b. 2 Gold, silver, copper, steel, aluminum, etc. 3 OC 451:8. 4 Rama OC 451:8. 5 Pri Megadim Mishbetzos Zahav end of

weekly-halacha@torah.org Parshas Tzav-Kashering Utensils
By Rabbi Doniel Neustadt

An earthenware vessel in which it was cooked shall be broken; but if it was cooked in a copper vessel, that should be purged and rinsed in water (Lev. 7:21)

HAG'ALAH: A KOSHERING PROCESS As the Biblical verse above states, not all utensils which become non-kosher by absorbing the taste of non-kosher food can be purged, or koshered. For instance, it is impossible to! purge "taste" from earthenware(1). Once an earthenware utensil is rendered non-kosher, it must be shattered and thrown away. On the other hand, metal vessels can be purged of their absorbed taste through a procedure called hag'alah, purging. The halachos of hag'alah are complicated, and what follows is merely an outline of its basic principles. [Unless otherwise noted, the following halachos apply to the Pesach koshering process as well.] Our discussion here refers only to the process of hag'alah, not to be confused with other types of koshering such as libun kal and libun chamur, which have different rules altogether and will be discussed elsewhere.

Which materials can be koshered by hag'alah? Utensils made from any type of metal(2), stone, wood(3), bone(4) leather(5) or natural rubber(6) may be koshered by hag'alah. Earthenware(7), china, porcelain(8), glassware(9) and paper(10) utensils cannot be koshered by hag'alah(11). The poskim(12) differ as to whether hag'alah applies to utensils made out of the following materials: Plastic, melmac, nylon, corningware, corelle, pyrex, duralex, enamel, formica, teflon and silverstone. When possible, these utensils should not be koshered by hag'alah. In cases of absolute necessity or great financial loss, there are poskim who permit these items to be koshered. A rav must be consulted. Any utensil which may get ruined during the hag'alah process may not be koshered, since we are concerned that its owner will not kosher the utensil properly for fear of damaging it(13). If one koshered such a utensil anyway, it should not be used(14). However, if it was used, the food that was placed or cooked in it does not become forbidden to eat(15).

Which utensils can be koshered by hag'alah? A utensil becomes non-kosher (or meaty or dairy) if it comes into contact with a non-kosher food item in one of the following manners(16):
DIRECT FIRE: A utensil which is placed directly on the fire with no liquid or minimal oil, butter or shortening added (such as baking pans or parts of a barbecue grill), cannot be koshered by hag'alah(17). A frying pan(18), too, should preferably not be koshered by hag'alah.
INDIRECT FIRE: A utensil which contains liquid and is placed over the fire (such as a pot cooking on a range or a spoon stirring food in a pot on a burner) can be koshered by hag'alah.
HEAT CONTACT: Utensils which come into direct contact with hot, non-kosher food, such as hot non-kosher food placed on a plate, eaten with a fork or poured into a cup, etc.. These utensils may be koshered by hag'alah.
COLD CONTACT: Utensils which come in direct contact with cold non-kosher food must be thoroughly washed with cold water(19). Hag'alah is not required. If the non-kosher food was a liquid and it remained in the utensil for a period of 24 hours or more, hag'alah is required(20).
COLD "SHARP" CONTACT: A cold but "sharp" non-kosher liquid (e.g., onion soup)(21) that was in a utensil longer than 18 minutes(22), or a cold but "sharp" non-kosher solid food that was cut with a knife(23) . The utensil or knife, etc., require hag'alah. Whenever a utensil needs to be koshered, its cover(24) and handles(25) need to be

451. 6 Igros Moshe OC 2:92. 7 OC 451:1. 8 Mishnah Berurah 451:163. 9 Rama OC 451:26. 10 Pri Megadim OC 451 quoted in Kaf Hachayim 126. 11 In certain cases these types of utensils may be koshered if twelve months have elapsed since they were last used. This kosherization can be done only under the supervision of a rav, since there are several factors involved. 12 There are basically 3 groups of opinions in the poskim regarding koshering these materials: Some allow them to be koshered from non kosher to kosher but not for Pesach; others allow them to be koshered for Pesach as well, while others do not allow koshering them at all. If at all possible, therefore, koshering these items by hag'alah is not recommended. In extenuating circumstances, however, a rav has leeway to permit koshering these materials. It is important to mention to the rav the manner in which these utensils were rendered non-kosher, since many poskim allow these materials to be koshered if they were not in direct contact with fire. 13 Mishnah Berurah 451:23 and 57. 14 See Aruch Hashulchan 451:20 who holds that once done it may be used, but other poskim imply that even believed the hag'alah should not be relied upon. 15 Pri Megadim 451 Aishel Avrohom 19. 16 There are also other issues which need to be explored before declaring a utensil non-kosher, such as the type of food, the amount of food, the degree of heat, etc. All the facts must be presented to a rav for a decision. 17 Mishnah Berurah 451:27. 18 Rama OC 451:11 and Mishnah Berurah 67 and Biur Halachah. 19 YD 121:1. 20 OC 451:21. 21 Mishnah Berurah 447:42; 451:124. 22 Tiferes Yisroel Pesachim 2:4. 23 Mishnah Berurah 447:86. 24 OC 451:14. 25 OC 451:12. Even the poskim who object to koshering plastic by hag'alah will agree that plastic handles may be koshered - Sheorim Hametzuyanim B'halachah 116:10. 26 We are primarily concerned with rust spots inside the utensil. Rust spots on the outside of the utensil which rarely come into contact with food need not be removed - Mishnah Berurah 451:43. 27 Mishnah Berurah 451:22. 28 See OC 451:3 and Mishnah Berurah 22. 29 Mishnah Berurah 451:44. 30 Rama OC 451:18. See Mishnah Berurah 102 that these utensils pose other problems as well. 31 Mishnah Berurah 451:120 and 156. 32 Rama OC 451:18. 33 Rama 451:16 and Mishnah Berurah 94. See also Biur Halachah. 34 OC 451:3 and Mishnah Berurah 23. 35 Rama OC 452:2; YD 121:2. Some poskim require that the utensil not be used at all in the previous 24 hours, even for kosher items. Accordingly, the utensil should be scrubbed clean before the 24 hours begin - See Mishnah Berurah 452:20 an! d Shaar Hatzion 25. 36 See Igros Moshe YD 2:31. 37 Magen Avraham 452:9. 38 Mishnah Berurah 452: 39 Shaar Hatzion 452:15. 40 Mishnah Berurah 452:10. If the volume of the water in the koshering pot was sixty times greater than the volume of the non-kosher utensil, then the koshering pot need not undergo hag'alah, but this is sometimes difficult to calculate. 41 Unless otherwise noted, all the halachos are based on OC 452 and Mishnah Berurah. 42 The water should not be dirty or filled with detergents and cleaners. Even if, during the koshering process, the water became dirty or filled with brine, it should be changed before proceeding with the hag'alah. 43 It depends whether the utensils became non-kosher by being placed directly on the fire or by coming into contact with heat. A rav must be consulted. 44 Shaar Hatzion 452:28. 45 Shaar Hatzion 452:3. 46 OC 451:11. See Hagolas Keilim pg. 460. 47 Shaar Hatzion 428:28. 48 Mishnah Berurah 452:34. 49 See Darkei Teshuvah YD 121:2; Kaf Hachayim OC 451:200.

THIS ISSUE IS SPONSORED IN HONOR OF THE MARRIAGE OF DOVID AARON GROSS to CHANI BIALA Weekly-Halacha, Copyright (c) 1997 by Rabbi Neustadt, Dr. Jeffrey Gross and Project Genesis

peninim@shemayisrael.com Peninim on the Torah - the Weekly Torah Portion by Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum

... Any (korban) Chatas from which some blood has been brought to the Ohel Moed, to effect atonement within the Holy shall not be eaten; it shall be burned in fire. (6:23) Horav Raphael Katz, zl, the author of the Marp Lashon, infers a profound lesson in avodas Hashem, service to the Almighty from this pasuk. There are instances during a man's spiritual growth when, with all good intention, he attempts to "jump the gun" and

ascend to a higher spiritual plane for which he is not yet ready. A man must build upon a solid foundation of spiritual development. Otherwise, everything he has done--even his previous accomplishments--will lose its integrity. He proves his thesis from the fact that if a Korban Chatas is offered inside the Heichal, the blood is invalid and will not atone. Furthermore, the laws concerning blood which is sprinkled inside the Azarah are more stringent than those concerning blood which is sprinkled outside the Azarah. If one were to accept the blood in two cups and one was inadvertently sprinkled outside of the Azarah, the remaining cup remains acceptable for use. If, however, one of these cups was sprinkled inside the Heichal, the second cup is rendered invalid. Entering into an area where the sanctity is greater is worse than entering outside to a place of decreased sanctity.

The same idea applies to people. If a person "wanders" outside of the perimeter of kedushah and commits an aveirah, sin, he does not forfeit all of the Torah and mitzvos that he has accumulated. The good that he has done remains his just like the two cups of the blood of a Sin-offering; if one is sprinkled outside the perimeter, the remaining one maintains its holiness. If a person, on the other hand, attempts to go where he does not belong, he risks losing everything. Who is a greater example than Ben Azzai, who was one of the four tannaim that entered the Pardes and lost his mind? He went to a place not accessible to everyone, and he paid dearly for it. This can be compared to one who stuffs himself with food to the point that he regurgitates everything he had eaten earlier. How important is this lesson in contemporary times when everyone seeks to outdo his friend in the area of spirituality! One's spiritual growth should be systematic, building upon a strong foundation of commitment and observance. One should not attempt to ask questions in those areas from which he is adjured to stay away. Likewise, one should not philosophize in areas which are beyond his realm of understanding. Then, he will grow me'chayil el chayil, from strength to strength, increasing his spirituality at a pace commensurate with his personal level of achievement.

<http://www.ucalgary.ca/~akiva/HOJMI/drosho.html>
 Congregation House of Jacob-Mikveh Israel Calgary
 Parshiyot Vayikra - Tzav 5757
 Rabbi Moshe Shulman
 THE GORY DETAILS

In one of our adult education classes on the laws of Shabbat, somebody remarked, "so many details, so much to remember".

There is a major dispute between the giants of Jewish philosophy, Maimonides and Nachmonides, over whether there is, in fact, an explanation and rationale for every intricate detail of Halacha. The focus of this dispute is over the service in the Holy Temple, for nowhere is there more "detail" than in the sacrificial service described in these Torah portions; where to bring the animal... how to place one's hand over the animal's head... which animals to bring, for what purpose... what to do with the blood... where to sprinkle it... how many times... for each type of sacrifice... on and on...

Generally speaking, we view the sacrificial service of the Temple as a means to "come close" to G-d, taking the root of "Korban" as derived from "Karov", "close". Standing at the foot of the altar one realized that, in some small way, just like Isaac, we ourselves should be sacrificed on the altar! But instead, we are spared in order to learn that we should LIVE in Sanctity, rather than die in Sanctity. That's very true. But why do we need all the DETAILS? Who cares if the blood is sprinkled once, twice, four or seven times, or what parts of the animal are burnt, what parts are eaten and by whom? If the goal is the "experience", why get bogged down in tedious Halachic minutia?

In fact, Maimonides argued that, indeed, there is no explanation for the minutia. It simply had to be somehow! "The law that sacrifices should be brought is evidently of great use, but we cannot say why one offering should be a lamb, whilst another is a ram; and why a fixed number of them should be brought... You ask why must a lamb be sacrificed and not a ram? But the same question would be asked, if a ram had been commanded instead of a

lamb..." (Maimonides, translation from Studies in Shemot, Nehama Leibowitz, p. 499) The philosophical explanations of the Mitzvot are to explain the general concepts, while the details are required because without details you cannot do the act!

Nachmonides, Abarbanel, Akedat Yitzchak, and many other commentaries, on the other hand, take the approach that every detail is significant, whether for symbolic, philosophical or mystical reasons.

Take, for example, the construction of the Menorah. In Maimonides' view, the Menorah had seven branches because "the Torah had to chose a number". While to the other commentaries, the number of branches is philosophically significant: 7 days of the week, the Sanctity of Shabbat as the seventh day, Shmittah as the seventh year, Yovel as the seventh Shmittah, 7 branches of wisdom...

Today, most people are used to the approach of Nachmonides. They feel there must be a rational to the why's and wherefore's of every Halachic detail. But I think there is a danger here, and I'd like to explain Maimonides' view as well.

When we look at the Torah reading of the Parshiyot of Vayikra, we see a great deal of technical information, a great deal of "gory detail". What was the purpose of all of this? There answer is expressed in one phrase: "Veyeira aleichem kevod Hashem", "And the Glory of the Almighty shall appear to you." (Lev. 9:6) The entire service in the Tabernacle, with all its detail, was for the purpose of experiencing the presence of G'd, to "feel spiritually elevated", to have a religious experience equal to what we felt at Mt. Sinai!

Yet, through all these technical halachot, we ask "where's the experience?" The answer is that **WITHOUT THE DETAIL THERE CAN BE NO EXPERIENCE**. That's what Maimonides is saying. It's not that the details are meaningless. It's that without the effort, the care, the meticulousness, without the planning, learning, and caring about exactly how to perform each Mitzvah, each Mitzvah loses its meaning and its significance, and we lose the EXPERIENCE!

Look at the laws of Shabbat. Shabbat is defined as a day in which to recognise the Majesty of G'd, Creator of the universe. We have 39 categories of Melacha, from building and ploughing to how to cut up a salad. "Who needs all the details?" we ask. Shabbat is a day to declare our faith in Hashem. "I believe in Hashem. So I no longer need all the details! Right?" Wrong! Sure we can SAY we recognise G'd. But we cannot EXPERIENCE what recognising G-d's Mastery, we cannot FEEL what being subordinate to the true Master of Nature means unless we are willing to let go of our own mastery over nature and become truly subservient to G'd rather than beholden to the world around us! Shabbat cannot be just "observed", or even "understood". It has to be EXPERIENCED, it has to encompass every aspect of our lives that day, and re-focus everything we are, everything we think, and everything we do. Without the details, Shabbat is reduced from an EXPERIENCE to a PHILOSOPHY; it becomes mere words, lip-service, and is meaningless!

Imagine what Pesach would be like without the laws of Chametz, without the cleaning for Chametz, the going through the cupboards and shelves, the koshering of dishes, the questions over which products we can use, and which we cannot. Imagine if we could just forget all that, and just sit down to a seder, eat Matzah and go through the Pesach Seder. Big deal if there's a bit of Chametz under the kitchen sink! Pesach would be so much easier, but so much emptier! The Torah requires us not only to eat Matzah, but, in a sense, to BECOME Matzah, to be free of all chametz not only on the table, but in our homes, and in every corner of our lives. The Torah wants us to EXPERIENCE Pesach with the totality of our being. Sure it's harder! It's always harder to EXPERIENCE than to merely expound a philosophy. It's harder - but it works! It's the details of Pesach that in reality help us EXPERIENCE the Exodus from Egypt.

There 613 Mitzvot, each one with hundreds of details. We call these details Halachot!! Tefillin is one Mitzvah - with many Halachot, how to wear them, how to make them, what colour they should be, even the order of the scrolls inside them!! Kashrut is a handful of Mitzvot with hundreds of Halachot defining every detail.

Maimonides didn't say that the details aren't important! On the contrary, without them we can never EXPERIENCE the Mitzvot!

There is a beautiful statement of the Sages conveying this idea. "Rav said: the Mitzvot were given only to forge better human beings, for, after all, does G-d really care if we slaughter from the front of the neck of the back of the neck? Rather, the Mitzvot were given only to forge better human beings." (Breishit Rabbah 44) The purpose of Torah is to forge better people, more spiritual, better in our relationship with ourselves, with others, with the world around us, and with G'd, "forged" in the furnace of self-discipline, as a servant of the Almighty. We cannot just "believe" in self-discipline! We must become self-disciplined.

That's what went on in the Temple. To us it may sound like a lot of "gory detail". Because we only read about it. We don't see the great EXPERIENCE that it was to actually feel the presence of the Almighty. "And the Glory of Hashem appeared to them." We dare not belittle the minutia of Halacha, for it, and it alone, leads us to experience the spiritual heights of Judaism!

parasha-qa@jer1.co.il ohr@jer1.co.il In-depth questions on Parashat HaShavua w/ Rashi Parshas Tzav -- Parshas Parah

Parsha Questions 1. In verse 6:2, Hashem tells Moshe, "'Tzav' (command) Aaron..." When is the word 'Tzav' used? 2. Until when may the fats and limbs of an Olah be placed on the Mizbe'ach? 3. If, while removing the ashes from the Mizbe'ach, the Kohen finds limbs that were not consumed, what must he do with them? 4. What was the first Korban (sacrifice) brought each day? 5. If someone extinguishes the fire on the Mizbe'ach, how many Torah violations have been transgressed? 6. When a Kohen is inaugurated to serve in the Beis Hamikdash, what offering must he bring? 7. How often must the Kohen Gadol bring a Korban Minchah? 8. What is the difference between a "Minchas Kohen" and a "Minchas Yisrael"? 9. When is a Kohen disqualified from eating from the Chatas (sin offering)? 10. What is the difference between a copper and earthenware vessel regarding the removing of absorbed tastes? 11. Can an animal that has already been dedicated for an Asham be replaced with by another animal? 12. List three types of Kohanim who may not partake of the Asham. 13. List three types of Kohanim who have no share in the skins of the Olah offering. 14. In which 4 instances is a Korban Todah brought? 15. How does a Korban become "Pigul"? 16. How does the Torah punish a tamei person who eats a Korban? 17. What position did Moshe fill during the seven days of the inauguration of the Mishkan? 18. How many days prior to Yom Kippur must the Kohen Gadol separate from his family? 19. What other service requires that the Kohen separate from his family? 20. What are the 5 categories of Korbanos listed in this Parsha?

Bonus QUESTION: This is the law of the flour offering: The sons of Aharon shall bring it near.." (6:7) "This refers to bringing the flour offering to the Altar." -- Rashi >From here we see that the 'sons of Aharon,' -- the kohanim -- are commanded to bring the flour offering to the Altar. But in last week's Parsha Rashi states (2:2) that the kohen's obligation starts only after the flour offering is already brought to the Altar. This implies that a non-kohen may bring the offering to the Altar. How can this apparent contradiction be resolved?

I Did Not Know That! If a person feels unenthusiastic about Torah study or mitzvah observance, he should say the verse, "A continuous fire should burn on the Altar, do not extinguish it (6:6)." Rashbaz (Thanks to Rabbi Sholem Fishbane)

Recommended Reading List Ramban 6:7 Minchah Laws 6:18 Korbanos 7:8 Hides of Korbanos 7:14 Leavening in Korban Todah 8:1 Chronology of Mishkan Chapters 8:7 Garments of the Kohanim 8:11 Solution to Rashi's Source 8:22 Role of Different Korbanos in Miluim Sefer Hachinuch 132 Hiding the Miracle 136 The Kohen Gadol's Offering 143 Dignity and Trust 144 The Benefits of Kashrus

Answers to this Week's Questions All references are to the verses and Rashi's commentary, unless otherwise stated 1. 6:2 - It is used to indicate a command that urges performance now, and for future generations. 2. 6:2 -

Until morning [dawn]. 3. 6:3 - Return them to the Mizbe'ach. 4. 6:5 - The Tamid offering. 5. 6:6 - Two. 6. 6:13 - A Korban Minchah -- A tenth part of an ephah of flour, half of it in the morning and half in the afternoon. 7. 6:13 - Daily. 8. 6:15 - The Minchas Kohen is burnt completely. Only a kometz (handful) of the Minchas Yisrael is burnt, and the remainder is eaten by the Kohanim. 9. 6:19 - If he is tamei (spiritually impure) at the time of the sprinkling of the blood. 10. 6:21 - In a copper vessel the absorbed taste can be removed through "scouring and rinsing" while in an earthenware vessel it can never be removed. 11. 7:1 - No. 12. 7:7 - a) A Tvul Yom -- A tamei person who has gone to the Mikveh and is awaiting sunset to become Tahor (spiritually pure); b) A Mechusar Kipurim -- A Tamei person who has gone to the Mikveh but has yet to bring his required sacrifice to become Tahor; c) An Onan -- a mourner prior to the burial of the deceased. 13. 7:8 - a) A Tvul Yom; b) A Mechusar Kipurim; c) An Onan (see answer 12 for more detail). 14. 7:12 - a) After a safe arrival from an ocean voyage; b) After a safe arrival from a desert journey; c) After being freed from prison; d) After recovering from illness. 15. 7:18 - The person slaughters the animal with the intention that it be eaten after the prescribed time. 16. 7:20 - With Kares (spiritual excision). 17. 8:28 - He served as the Kohen. 18. 8:34 - Seven days. 19. 8:34 - The burning of the Parah Adumah (red cow). 20. Olah (6:2); Minchah (6:7); Chatas (6:18); Asham (7:1); Shlamim (7:11).

Bonus ANSWER: Bringing the flour offering to the Altar is a mitzvah, but it is not an absolute requirement. That is to say, the offering is valid even if it is not brought to the Altar. Only a kohen can fulfill the mitzvah of bringing the offering to the Altar. If a non-kohen brings the offering to the Altar, the mitzvah has not been fulfilled, but the offering is valid nonetheless. Moznaim L'Torah

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Reuven Subar General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Lev Seltzer (C) 1997 Ohr Somayach International - All rights reserved.

<http://www.intournet.co.il/mtv/parsha.html>

Shirum by Rav Mordechai Elon PARSHAT PARAH (TZAV)

This Shiur was delivered in Bar Ilan in 5755.

Parshat Parah, the third of the four special Parshiot read before Pesach, is read as Maftir this week, and is taken from Parshat Chukat, discussing the Halachot of the Red Heifer, Parah Adumah. We will discuss the difficulties usually associated with and asked about this Mitzvah, but we must first must analyze why this Parsha is read at all, and why now, as specifically the third of the four special Parshiot.

NO INTERRUPTION BETWEEN THIRD AND FOURTH PARSHA & CUP The Talmud Yerushalmi (Megillah 25b) discusses the four special Parshiot and then says: "It is forbidden to separate (Shabbatot) between Parshat Parah and Parshat Hachodesh" Thus, although there can be a "free" Shabbat between Parshat Shekalim and Parshat Zachor, and then again between Parshat Zachor and Parshat Parah, there can never be a Shabbat between Parshat Parah and Parshat Hachodesh. In this same passage, Rabbi Levi gives us a "sign" in order to remember this Halacha. At the Seder on Pesach night, it is permitted to drink other liquids and even wine between the four cups of wine, except between the third and fourth cup, where it is forbidden to drink anything. Thus, just as there cannot be a HEFSEK-interruption between the third and fourth cup, so, too, there cannot be a HEFSEK-interruption between the third and fourth Parsha. This is very strange. Since the special Parshiot come BEFORE the Seder, the sign should have been that the Halachot of the Parshiot should remind us of the Halacha with the cups of wine. Furthermore, we must try to understand if there is a deeper idea connecting these two Halachot.

THE ORDER OF THE PARSHIOT IS NOT CHRONOLOGICAL

But why is Parshat Parah read here at all? We know that Parshat Shekalim must be read before Rosh Chodesh Adar, since it was during Adar that the Half Shekel was collected from every person. We also understand why we read Parshat Zachor the week before Purim, as Haman in the Megillah is a descendant of Amalek. We even understand the reason why Parshat

Hachodesh is read on or the Shabbat before Rosh Chodesh Nisan, as a special Mitzvah is tied to Rosh Chodesh Nisan. But why Parshat Parah now? In that same Talmudic passage, Rabbi Levi explains that in reality, Parshat Parah should have been read AFTER Parshat Hachodesh because on Rosh Chodesh Nisan, the Mishkan was dedicated, and only on the second day of Nisan, was the Parah Adumah brought. If so, why, then, is Parshat Parah read before Parshat Hachodesh? The Gemara says that it is because the purity of the people (through Parah Adumah) is important. The Pnai Moshe commentary explains these words and says that since Parah Adumah had the power to purify all Jews who were ritually impure, it takes precedence. If that is so, why couldn't God have seen to it that the Parah Adumah was brought before there was a dedicated Mishkan? We understand that technically, the Parah Adumah needed a Mishkan to fulfill its precepts, as its blood had to be sprinkled opposite the Tent of Meeting after the Mishkan was "fully running," as the verse says "And Eleazar the priest shall take of its blood with his finger, and sprinkle of its blood directly before the Tent of Meeting seven times" (Numbers 19:4). So in that first year, the Parah Adumah (Parshat Parah) had to be brought after the Mishkan's dedication (Parshat Hachodesh). Why, then, is this unique characteristic, "the purity of Israel," so vital that it justifies changing the chronological order of reading the Parshiot?

The author of the Korban Ha-aida commentary combines both the concepts mentioned until now, and says that since the purity of the people is a primary concept, Parshat Parah must be read before Parshat Hachodesh. But since the chronological order was changed, THAT is why it is forbidden to have an interruption between Parshat Parah and Parshat Hachodesh. The distance between the two has to be as small as possible because it is in the wrong "order." These words need explanation. What would be so terrible if there were an interruption between the two? And why does the Talmud relate to the chronological order in that first year the Mishkan was erected? Every other year, the concept of the Parah Adumah is an ongoing idea and Mitzvah, making the order insignificant. If the idea of purity is so important, why couldn't God alter the order, causing the Parah Adumah to be brought before the Mishkan's dedication? After all, other sacrifices were brought before this time? And if chronology is so important, why, then, not read Parshat Parah last anyway? We will return to these questions later in the Shiur.

TWO ANSWERS EXPLAINING THE CONCEPT OF PARAH ADUMAH Regarding the essence of this strange concept called Parah Adumah, the Midrash (Midrash Rabbah, Numbers 19:8) discusses the famous question that was asked to Rabbi Yochanan Ben Zakkai about the Parah Adumah "An idolater asked R. Yochanan b. Zakkai: 'These rites that you perform look like a kind of witchcraft. You bring a heifer, burn it, pound it, and take its ashes. If one of you is defiled by a dead body you sprinkle upon him two or three drops and you say to him: "Thou art clean!"' R. Yochanan asked him: 'Has the demon of madness ever possessed you?' 'No,' he replied. 'Have you ever seen a man possessed by this demon of madness?' 'Yes,' said he. 'And what do you do in such a case?' 'We bring roots,' he replied, 'and make them smoke under him, then we sprinkle water upon the demon and it flees.' Said R. Yochanan to him: 'Let your ears hear what you utter with your mouth! Precisely so is this spirit a spirit of uncleanness; as it is written, And also I will cause the prophets and the unclean spirit to pass out of the land (Zechariah 13:2). Water of purification is sprinkled upon the unclean and the spirit flees.' When the idolater had gone, R. Yochanan's disciples said to their master: 'Master! This man you have put off with a mere makeshift but what explanation will you give to us?' Said he to them: 'By your life! It is not the dead that defiles nor the water that purifies! The Holy One, blessed be He, merely says: "I have laid down a statute, I have issued a decree. You are not allowed to transgress My decree"; as it is written, (ZOT CHUKAT HATORAH) This is the statute of the law (Numbers 19:2)." In a variant text, the last line reads "I have laid down a statute, I have issued a decree. You are not allowed to THINK ABOUT IT (LEHARHAIR ACHAREHA)." We will soon see if this difference is significant.

The Midrash continues: "Why are all the [communal] sacrifices male and this one a female? R. Aibu explained: This may be illustrated by a parable. A

handmaiden's boy polluted a king's palace. The king said: 'Let his mother come and clear away the filth.Æ In the same way the Holy One, blessed be He, said: æLet the Heifer come and atone for the incident of the CalfÆ!" The same Midrash is brought in a different context (Midrash Tanchuma Varsha, Chukat 3), based on another verse in our Parsha of Parah Adumah. The verse says "And he who burns it shall wash his clothes in water, and bathe his flesh in water, and shall be unclean until the evening" (Numbers 19:8). The non-Jew asks how is it possible that the very Parah Adumah that purifies so many impure people, also, at the same time, renders the Kohen who does the sprinkling, to be impure? A similar answer is given as before to the questioner, and when he leaves, the students receive the "real" answer about GodÆs laws and decrees. That Midrash also ends describing the Parah Adumah as the mother coming to atone for the sin of its child, the Golden Calf. Both of these Midrashim invite a number of obvious questions. How is it that the Parah Adumah atones for the Golden Calf? What is the underlying principle that separates between the response to the non-believer and the response to the students? Why wouldnÆt the simple and powerful answer of "It is GodÆs decree" satisfy the non-believer as well? Those who are bound by the laws and Mitzvot are not permitted to question. But the non-believer, the non-Jew, may INDEED question God. Why try to explain to him about this strange "spirit or demon"? Is it less logical to say that certain laws exist and that we cannot question these laws?

THE UNDERLYING CONCEPT OF THE NADAV AND AVIHU STORY

It appears to Rav Elon that everything we spoke about until now (the "wrong" order of Parshiot, the essential concept of Parah Adumah), might be comprehended, based on one aspect from next weekÆs Parsha, Shmini -- the story of Nadav and Avihu. We usually try to understand the nature of their sin, which the Torah describes four separate times as "a strange fire" (Leviticus 10:1, Numbers 3:4, 17:2, 20:61). We also usually concentrate on the reaction of Aaron and the ensuing mourning period. But these ideas must be preceded by the actual action of Nadav and Avihu, and the relationship of the Jewish people to this act, which occurred on the great day of celebration, the day the Mishkan was dedicated, Rosh Chodesh Nisan. Thus, the very first act performed in the Mishkan causes this great tragedy. What happened?

The verses tell us: "And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took each of them his censer, and put KITORET-fire in it, and put incense on it, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not. And there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord. Then Moses said to Aaron, This is what the Lord spoke, saying, I will be sanctified in them that come near to me, and before all the people I will be glorified. And Aaron held his peace" (Leviticus 10:1-3). Rav Elon focuses on this first action in the Mishkan. In the commandments regarding the Mishkan, one central command was the bringing of the Kitorer spices as a sacrifice, which would be an atonement for the people (Exodus 30:7-10). Then Nadav and Avihu took their censers, put KITORET-fire in them and brought them to God. And what happened the first time that the Mishkan was formally used by these great Kohanim, bringing the KITORET? In view of the entire people, as they brought this KITORET, they are struck down by God and die. There, in the very first act of the Mishkan while bringing the KITORET, tragedy strikes.

THE PEOPLEÆS OBJECTION TO THREE OBJECTS IN THE MIDRASH The Rabbis (Midrash Tanchuma Bishalach 21) explain this phenomenon in a Midrash that is brought concerning the staff of Moshe. There are three things that the people claimed were used for destruction instead of for their benefit: the KITORET, the staff of Moshe, and the Holy Ark. The KITORET involves the incident of Nadav and Avihu just described. The Holy Ark involves the incident of Uza, who died when he touched the Ark on its return route to Israel at the time of King David (II Samuel 6:1-11). The staff of Moshe that should have been used for positive purposes became a staff of destruction when it was used in the Ten Plagues and killed Egyptians in the Splitting of the Sea. To all three, God responded to their claim. Later on, by Korach, the same Kohen Gadol is commanded to take the KITORET (along with KorachÆs 250 people) and offer it to God. The Torah

there explains that KITORET will be a source of atonement for the people, as it says "And Aaron took as Moses commanded, and ran into the midst of the congregation; and, behold, the plague had begun among the people; and he put on incense (KITORET), and made an ATONEMENT for the people" (Numbers 17:12). Similarly, the Holy Ark which they claimed was the cause of destruction, later on was used as a source of blessing, as it says in the next verse in the Uza incident "And the ark of the Lord continued in the house of Obed-Edom the Gittite three months; and the Lord BLESSED Obed-Edom, and all his household" (II Samuel 6:11). By the staff of Moshe, the very staff that made dry land out of water later on made water out of dry land (the rock) and quenched the peopleÆs thirst.

IT IS GOD, NOT ANY OBJECT, WHICH HAS POWER

Rav Elon believes that this Midrash demonstrates a fundamental principle that may explain the words of Rabbi Yochanan Ben Zakkai. When the Jews claimed that the KITORET, the Ark and the staff were instruments of destruction, it signifies that the people believed that these OBJECTS in themselves had some power to destroy. It is the KITORET itself (or the Ark or the staff) which caused the destruction. The entire battle that began on the day of the dedication of the Mishkan involves the following idea: **THE KITORET ITSELF DOES NOT KILL NOR DOES IT ATONE. THE SERPENT DOES NOT KILL, AND THE HANDS OF MOSHE DO NOT WIN OR LOSE WARS. ALL OF THESE ARE SUBORDINATED TO THE WILL OF GOD.** There is nothing special about the KITORET itself. It neither kills nor atones. This lesson is learned in the most severe manner in that first incident in the Mishkan. When Nadav and Avihu took that KITORET, there was only one thing wrong with it. It was not brought **PRECISELY** as God commanded, as it says "which he commanded them not" (Leviticus 10:1). But one fact becomes clear on the day of the dedication of the Mishkan: by bringing KITORET in any way not exactly commanded, it shows that on some level, there was a belief that there was something in the KITORET (and not in the command) which made it special, and this borders on idol worship.

There is no power at all in the KITORET itself. When God heard that the people believed that the KITORET had the power to kill, He proved to them that it has the power to atone. When the people thought that the Holy Ark killed, God proved to them that it was a source of blessing. Those who believe that the Ark causes blessing are no less idol worshippers than those who believe it kills. By showing that these items are capable of both, God is demonstrating that the object itself is not capable of ANYTHING. The Ark is subordinated to the command of God. It is only a vessel, a symbol. It is something that through it, GodÆs command can be seen. On the Dedication Day of the Mishkan, with the deaths of Nadav and Avihu, it now becomes clear what the Torah states "I will be sanctified in them that come near to me." The simple understanding of these words is that through this terrible tragedy itself, it becomes clear that the only things that are holy are those things that God declares as holy. When Nadav and Avihu fall as they try to bring the KITORET, there is a tremendous lesson to be learned. By bringing KITORET in a manner not commanded, they show (in a negative way) how everything is subordinated to GodÆs will. There is nothing intrinsically important in their sacrifice and in the KITORET. Similarly, the Kohen who burns the ashes of the Parah Adumah and purifies those impure, becomes impure himself in the process. Do these ashes, then, purify or make impure? This phenomenon comes to show us that the ashes do **NEITHER**. They do not purify nor make impure, **BUT THIS IS WHAT GOD COMMANDED**. At the very moment the ashes purify, they make someone else impure, showing that they have no intrinsic power in themselves. All service to God is essentially the ability to free oneself from any self worth or worth of anything else, and then subordinate to God. Perhaps this is the deeper understanding of the second Midrash.

HOW THE MOTHER BRINGS ATONEMENT FOR THE CHILD

The Midrash stated that the mother cow (the Parah Adumah) brings atonement for its child (the Golden Calf). What happened at the Golden Calf? This incident is the prime example of giving worth to a particular object. When it says that the mother will clean up the mess of the child, it is not mere

imagery. When one gives value to any object, such as a Golden Calf, it is as if it dirties the palace of God Himself. Thus, the concept of Parah Adumah is the negation of giving intrinsic value to anything, and thus atones for the opposite concept demonstrated by the Golden Calf. Since there is no logic in the laws regarding this cow, it shows that it is the Mitzvah alone, and not the object, that motivates this ritual.

WHY WE CANNOT "THINK ABOUT" A MITZVAH

This brings us to the words in the Midrash "God created a CHOK-law and decreed a decree." And here we find two different variations in the text. In the first variation, it ends with "one is not permitted to violate it (the decree)." We usually understand this in the same way we understand the second variation "one is not permitted to think about it." What does this forbid? We usually think and decide if we should keep or not keep a particular Mitzvah. This is how we normally understand the phrase: we will only do something if it makes sense to us. But this same phrase can and should be understood in a totally different manner. Rav Charlop and others explain that this is their understanding of the Rambam in his commentary to the sixth chapter of Shmoneh Perakim. Rambam writes that this phrase cannot mean to decide to keep or not keep a Mitzvah, since it is not up to us to keep or not keep a Mitzvah even if it is "perfectly understood." Rather, it means that it is forbidden to search for a reason for the Mitzvah, like the non-Jew who asked for a reason for the Parah Adumah. The non-Jew, who is not commanded in Mitzvot, IS permitted to search for a reason. But the Jew cannot search for a reason or explanation. Rabbi Yochanan did not merely tell the non-Jew a simplistic explanation to satisfy him. Rabbi Yochanan is revealing to us the fundamental concept of the definition of CHOK-law and a GEZAIRA-decree.

People certainly do look for reasons. And when they find an explanation for a Mitzvah, they feel better. But what makes them feel better? Because it is now himself who that person is now worshipping better. That person is putting himself and his logic at the center. Whether the Mitzvah passes a certain test of logic should not legitimize it or not. "I have laid down a statute, I have issued a decree. You are not allowed to transgress My decree." One is not permitted to think IN ORDER TO FIND A REASON. For one who finds a reason, it becomes less of a CHOK-law and less of a GEZAIRA-decree. And the person now places value in the Mitzvah itself, and not in God's desire. That cow has nothing in it, other than that "God commanded it."

In the Midrash (Bamidbar Rabbah 19:3-4), it explains that when King Solomon says "All this have I proved by wisdom; I said, I will be wise; but it was far from me" (Ecclesiastes 7:23), this refers to Parah Adumah which he could not understand, and it also says that God revealed the reason for Parah Adumah to one person only -- Moshe Rabbeinu. The Midrash does not tell us why it was revealed only to him. But if we are correct in our analysis, it becomes clear. Moshe is the epitome of the person who understands that he is nothing in and of himself. He is totally subordinated to God, as it says "And the man Moses was very humble, more than any other men which were upon the face of the earth" (Numbers 12:3). This modesty, represents total subordination to God. Only Moshe, when he understands the reason for Parah Adumah, will not use this understanding to give value to himself or to his logical processes. For Moshe, Parah Adumah still remains God's decree. The first encounter of the Jewish people in the ecstasy of the dedication of the Mishkan, is not only the deaths of Nadav and Avihu, but it is also the KITORET that atones for death. In the most tragic manner, the world understands that the KITORET itself does not kill and also does not atone. And the words "I will be sanctified in them that come near to me," according to Ramban, tells us that the incident ITSELF teaches us that one may not abuse God's holiness by ascribing holiness or worth to anything not designated by God. Moshe also teaches this same idea to the people when he smashes the Tablets (according to the Meshech Chochma). If people can give worth to a calf, reasons Moshe, then they can also give worth to the Tablets themselves, and will be looked upon as a different type of idol. Thus Moshe smashes them, but the smashed pieces are also stored in the Ark with the second Tablets (Berachot 8b). This reminds the people that the (second) Tablets have no value in and of themselves, and its only worth is that it

comes from God and His decrees, revealed through the Tablets.

WHY THERE MUST BE A CONNECTION BETWEEN THE 3RD AND 4TH Now we can return to Parshat Hachodesh and Parshat Parah. We review the difficulties. The Midrash said that Parshat Hachodesh should come before Parshat Parah because Parshat Hachodesh occurred on Rosh Chodesh Nisan while Parah Adumah occurred on the second of Nisan. Nevertheless, we read Parshat Parah first because the Rabbis said that the concept of purity is an important idea. If this is so, does that mean that God does NOT think this concept is important? Could not God have arranged Parshat Parah to come first? And what is the connection to the symbol of not interruption between the third and fourth cups?

Parshat Parah and Parshat Hachodesh reveal the same lesson as the third and fourth cups at the Seder. If we compare the four cups to the four expressions of redemption (Exodus 6:6-7), then the first cup is "I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians." The second cup is "I will rid you from their slavery," while the third cup is "I will redeem you with a outstretched arm, and with great judgments" and the fourth cup is "I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God." The concepts of the third and fourth cups are completely different from the concepts of the first two cups. The first two describe the stoppage of the work. But stopping the suffering of slavery does not necessarily bring redemption or even the end of the concept of slavery. It is certainly not yet freedom. After the second cup, the Jew can be a Diaspora Jew who is no longer enslaved.

The third cup represents physical freedom: "and I will redeem you with a outstretched arm, and with great judgments." This is extremely important and necessary. But this stage still lacks the purpose, the unique culture, the ultimate goal. This is the fourth cup of "I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God." The entire purpose is for God to be our God and we His nation. There indeed can be a separation between the concepts of the first and second cups, and even between the second and third cups. That is the nature of the world, as the Jewish people go from one Diaspora to another Diaspora, from one type of slavery to the cessation of slavery, onto another type of slavery and on again -- in the Diaspora. But once a people reaches a state of physical freedom (the third cup), in its own land, it is very simple to stop there and separate between this freedom and the spiritual freedom, the ultimate goal. After a nation attains independence and establishes a country, a people feel free. But what happens now? Will they now connect with God or not? Will they fulfill of "I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God" or not? IF PHYSICAL FREEDOM IS NOT CONNECTED TO SPIRITUAL FREEDOM, THEN IT HAS NO PURPOSE. If between the third cup and fourth cups there is an interruption, then all four cups are worthless. There is no reason for "I will redeem you" without "I will be to you a God."

Why, then, not have "I will be to you a God" first or alone? Because one cannot have "I will be to you a God" without first having "I will redeem you." Even in the future final redemption this will be the order, as we see in this week's Haftarah (Ezekiel 36) followed by the famous Dry Bones prophecy. When these bones come to life, they first will be given a body, and only then a soul. This MUST be the order, and, thus, it is not accidental that the physical Mishkan HAD to exist and be in operation before the Parah Adumah (spiritual purification) could be sacrificed. This is how it was and how it should be. First there is a Mishkan, a Jewish state. But then, there is the danger that a great tragedy could occur -- if there is a break between the physical and spiritual. On the Dedication Day of the Mishkan, this idea became clear in a traumatic way, proving that the KITORET has no value in and of itself. The physical has no value without the spiritual meaning infused in it by God. It all must be subordinated to God, and this subordination is called TAHARA. When man exists for himself, this is TUMAH-impurity. A vessel that already has a name attached to it is subject to TUMAH-impurity. That which comes directly from God, without man's intervention, is called TAHARA. Man's ability to become TAHOR is when he connects to things in their pristine, original form. Water that was carried by man-made pipes cannot ritually purify or make anything TAHOR. But rain water or a natural pool can be used for this purpose. The minute man steps in and puts himself

in the picture (such as brining his own KITORET not commanded), that is already a partial Golden Calf.

Parshat Hachodesh, representing the physical, should come before Parshat Parah, representing the spiritual. But to become TAHOR, one must connect first and only with that which came from God, the Parah Adumah. But if we ONLY deal in the spiritual realm, in purity, in the "Shtetl," we may think that we do not need the "I will redeem you" or the Mishkan at all. Life seems so good. What do we need it for? Thus, the Halacha is that one must not separate between the two. It is "wrong" to have Parshat Parah first, and it wrong to have Parshat Parah alone. Therefore, one may NOT separate by having a symbolic Shabbat between these two ideas. Since we did change the order, we must make sure never to separate these two concepts. For the same reason, it is forbidden to have a HEFSEK-interruption between the Tefillin of the hand and the Tefillin of the head. He who separates between the Tefillin of action, the physical (the hand), and does not connect it to the Tefillin of the spiritual (the head), violates not only this particular Halacha, but also the concept of connecting these two indispensable components of Judaism.

How can a Jew connect Parshat Parah with Parshat Hachodesh? By understanding that the Parah itself does not purify or make impure, and that the KITORET itself does not kill or create atonement. That person can be totally subordinated to God. When that happens, then not only will there be no separation between the third and fourth cups, but there will also be a connection to the fifth and final cup, "And I will bring you into the land," (Exodus 6:8), the Final Redemption.

mj-ravtorah@shamash.org Shiur HaRav Soloveichik on Parshas Tzav '97 (shiur date: 3/28/78)

Rashi (8:28 Vayakter) comments that Moshe functioned as a Kohen Gadol during the 7 day consecration period for Aharon as Kohen Gadol, his children as Kohanim and the Mishkan itself. The Gemara (Taanis) asks what clothes did Moshe wear during this 7 day period that he acted as a Kohen Gadol? The Gemara answers that he wore a simple white garment (Chaluk Lavan). The Rav asked if Moshe was truly a Kohen Gadol during this period why didn't he wear the special clothes that were worn by the Kohen Gadol? It was obvious that as a Kohen Gadol, Moshe should have worn the priestly garments (Bigdei Kehuna). The Gemara wants to know what class of Begadim Moshe wore during the 7 days: did he wear Bigdei Kehuna or regular clothes (Bigdei Chol). The Gemara answers that he wore something entirely different: Chaluk Lavan. Why did Moshe go beyond either Bigdei Chol or Bigdei Kehuna? If he could not wear Bigdei Kehuna then why not wear Bigdei Chol? The Rav asked what was the significance of this type of clothing vis a vis Moshe?

The Rav explained that Chazal tell us that Moshe functioned in many different capacities. For example, he was considered a king and the equivalent of the Sanhedrin. Chazal tell us that Moshe had another job as well. He was also a Kohen Gadol, as evidenced by his role in the 7 day period. One might think that this was a temporary role (Horaas Shaah) for Moshe that lasted 7 days, at which time Aharon assumed the role of Kohen Gadol. Chazal tell us that is not the case, Moshe functioned as a full fledged Kohen during this period, and he retained his status as Kohen even after the 7 day period.

If Moshe was a Kohen Gadol, why did he not undergo the same consecration ceremony as Aharon, appointment (Minuy), and anointing with the special oil (Shemen Hamishcha)? Also, according to the Ramban, the verse Vayehi Byeshurun Melech refers to Moshe's status as king. Why didn't Bnai Yisrael formally appoint him to the role of king and leader of the Sanhedrin?

These special roles attributed to Moshe have a common theme: they each add a dimension of Kedusha to the individual who fills the role. For example, the Kohen Gadol has a higher level of Kedusha than a Kohen Hedyot. Yet both are higher than a Yisrael. We reiterate this notion whenever the Kohanim pronounce the blessing of Asher Kidshanu Bkdushaso Shel

Aharon, they are declaring that they have been granted an added dimension of Kedusha above and beyond that given to a regular Jew.

We can readily see that a Kohen Gadol has a higher level of Kedusha beyond the other Kohanim because the Kohen Gadol has special Mitzvos that apply only to him, to the exclusion of all other Kohanim. The status of Kohen Gadol does more than permit the individual (to the exclusion of all others) to perform the service in the Beis Hamikdash. Rather, it imbues the individual with the added Kedusha that comes from the extra Mitzvos that he now has, that only he can fulfill. This is the Kedushas Aharon that the Kohanim refer to. Hence the Kohen is praising Hashem for giving him a higher level of Kedusha, Kedushas Aharon. Reb Chaim said that even if the appointment of a Kohen Gadol is rescinded for some reason, the special laws of Tumah and restrictions on who he may marry still apply to him. This special status of the Kohen, the Kedushas Gavra, comes through either Meshicha (anointing with oil), or when there is no Shemen Hamishcha, through performing the ritual of the Avoda.

A king also has a higher level of Kedusha because he has certain Mitzvos that apply specifically to him. For example, he is restricted as to the number of horses he may own and the wives he may take. Indeed, the Tosefta states specifically that a king has an added dimension of Kedusha. This added Kedusha comes from the anointing process and the appointment to his position by the Sanhedrin. The leader of the Sanhedrin also has a special Kedusha. The Rambam includes the Nasi of the Sanhedrin among the list of people that one may not curse. Like the king, his appointment to his role grants him an added level of Kedusha.

These higher degrees of Kedusha, (for a king, Kohen Gadol and Nasi), are all rungs in the ladder of Kedushas Yisrael. They all require Minuy, appointment from an external source, to attain the role. These people require a uniform to remind them that they have been appointed by the people to represent them.

Moshe Rabbeinu did not require his appointment to be sanctioned by Bnai Yisrael. His inner personality anointed him and sanctioned his roles as Kohen Gadol, king, judge and teacher. The statement that Moshe wore Chaluk Lavan during the 7 day period, indicates that Moshe was above appointment by the people. After all, how could a uniform describe his status as the greatest of all men, the one chosen by Hashem to receive the Torah directly and trusted with the task of transferring it to Bnai Yisrael? Moshe, who was constantly in a state of Lifnay Hashem, standing within the inner circle of Hashem, Kvayachol, did not require external symbols to sanctify him. Moshe did not wear Bigdei Chol, symbolic of his higher level of Kedusha relative to the rest of Bnai Yisrael. He had no need for Bigdei Kehuna, since he was beyond the need for a Minuy and was able to function as a Kohen Gadol without an external sanctification process. He wore a Chaluk Lavan, something that was unique, as he was.

This summary is Copyright 1997 by Dr. Israel Rivkin and Josh Rapps, Edison, N.J. Permission to reprint and distribute, with this notice, is hereby granted. These summaries are based on notes taken by Dr. Rivkin at the weekly Moriah Shiur given by Moraynu V'Rabbeinu Harav Yosef Dov Halevi Soloveichik ZTL over many years. To subscribe to this service, send email to listproc@shamash.org with the following message: subscribe mj-ravtorah your_first_name your_last_name