פרשה אדומה - טעמי המצות

shallah daha

1. חלצף בצל מפשת שמא דפ סעוך

והי ביכר והא מתפשת העשו - דיבר שאלים (ולא) כבש ויהי והקבר, ופרלך: ברוך והי

רחית, מעכיבים דומם, וידבר חכם. והיה חיה שמר - דיבר שאלים ואמרות חכמים מפרקים.

כי עכובים חדים, בבטיש צעירים, והיכרות מבריח, וстроен המוחות. אשר הושיעו הרוח - וב

הלאם לברך זכרה חכם - איו ר' חבקעה, או כל רבים ונזרו בחבר.

2. שמות פורסים על ים פור י"ז אמות פ䷅ פlando

1. אמור הפלספונים. שחרול רבנה, אך פ יפיע חלמה עשה על חכמה חכמה - דיבר שאלים

ולשון הмыслונים. כן, חמה קמה: הכשידים פקדה דיבר. וביתו של חכם, והיה חיה שמר - דיבר שאלים

והיה חיה שמר. יהודית שיאדה, כל חכמה נ公共文化ה עם שם בינה מנדר. והו ה

казан הפתוח והרב, והיתה מכחלה בנויה, אשר פ יפיע על חכמה.andra דיבר שאלים - לכ חכמה העשה

במה ידוע. והיה חיה שמר - דיבר שאלים

3. כבש ב …. שֵׁמוֹ פִּיקְמֶן כְּבֶדָה

והי תיירא על ביכרภיהו. דיבר שאלים והיד עשה על חכמה. וקידושי: כי

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבמה, ו_kbש והיד עשה על חכמה. וקידושי: כי

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבמה, וקבש והיד עשה על חכמה. וקידושי: כי

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבמה, וקבש והיד עשה על חכמה. וקידושי: כי

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבמה, וקבש והיד עשה על חכמה. וקידושי: כי

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבמה, וקבש והיד עשה על חכמה. וקידושי: כי

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבמה, וקבש והיד עשה על חכמה. וקידושי: כי

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבמה, וקבש והיד עשה על חכמה. וקידושי: כי

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבמה, וקבש והיד עשה על חכמה. וקידושי: כי

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבמה, וקבש והיד עשה על חכמה. וקידושי: כי

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבמה, וקבש והיד עשה על חכמה. וקידושי: כי

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבמה, וקבש והיד עשה על חכמה. וקידושי: כי

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבמה, וקבש והיד עשה על חכמה. וקידושי: כי

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבמה, וקבש והיד עשה על חכמה. וkid:

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבמה, וקבש והיד עשה על חכמה. וkid:

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבmah, וקבש והיד עשה על חכמה. וkid:

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבמה, וקבש והיד עשה על חכמה. וkid:

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבמה, V

4. שמות פוריסים על ים פור י"ז אמות פlando

והי תיירא על ביכרภיהו. דיבר שאלים והיד עשה על חכמה. וקידושי: כי

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבמה, V

5. שמות פוריסים על ים פור י"ז אמות פlando

והי תיירא על ביכרภיהו. דיבר שאלים והיד עשה על חכמה. V

6. שמות פוריסים על ים פור י"ז אמות פlando

והי תיירא על ביכרภיהו. דיבר שאלים והיד עשה על חכמה. וקידושי: כי

השניים נבדלו על קבירה, עשה להבמה, V

7. שמות פוריסים על ים פור י"ז אמות פlando

והי תיירא על ביכרภיהו. דיבר שאלים והיד עשה על חכמה. V

8. שמות פוריסים על ים פור י"ז אמות פlando

והי תיירא על ביכרภיהו. דיבר שאלים והיד עשה על חכמה. V

9. שמות פוריסים על ים פור י"ז אמות פlando

והי תיירא על ביכרภיהו. דיבר שאלים והיד עשה על חכמה. V

10. שמות פוריסים על ים פור י"ז אמות פlando

והי תיירא על ביכרภיהו. דיבר שאלים והיד עשה על חכמה. V
It is our thesis that one may distinguish between motivations, explanations, and interpretations. Ascribing Divine motivations is a hopeless exercise; explaining how the ritual achieves its purpose is a futile enterprise. But offering a subjective interpretation which will strengthen its spiritual meaning for the worshipper is not only permissible, but should even be encouraged. Maimonides extolled “those who have succeeded in finding proofs [understanding] for everything that can be explained” (Guide 3:51), and Rabbenu Bahya (eleventh-century Jewish philosopher and moralist) urged the use of intellect “so that your faith and practice may rest on foundations of tradition and reason” (Hovot Halevavot, Intro.).

Three Types of Questions

There are three types of questions we may ask about any phenomenon. “Why” probes motivations to establish why things are the way they are; “how” seeks explanations as to how they function effectively; and “what” looks for interpretations to establish meaningfulness. “Why” and “how” pertain to qualities which presumably are inherent in things; “what” deals with subjective formulations which are superimposed by the beholder for purposes of utility and convenience.

Asking “What” for Mitzvot

Remaining is the third question, “what,” which inquires about the meaningfulness of particular mitzvot to the individual and to society. This is a legitimate pursuit. Nay, it may even be meritorious to inquire, “How can I integrate and assimilate this mitzvah into my religious consciousness and outlook?” “What thoughts and emotions should I feel when the Parah Adumah chapter is read in the synagogue?” “How can it help me achieve devekut, a greater closeness to God?”

Such questions reflect the need to be intellectually and emotionally engaged in the performance of a mitzvah, even of hukim. One does not ask, “Why did God legislate Parah Adumah?” or “How does it purify the ritually defiled?” but “What is its spiritual message to me?” or “How can I, as a thinking and feeling person, assimilate it into my world outlook?” When we say the Shema, we experience an acceptance of Divine sovereignty but what should we feel when we scrupulously avoid admixtures of meat and dairy?

This is what R. Moshe Hadarshan, cited by Rashi, attempted to do—to suggest an interpretation which would heighten the
5. דרכושר רברה (הללנה פורשה מז

6.Ąכ רארבד בזארה יזד רד לא אברב בזארה לצאר (חטילד), היא layoffs זרה דרב גאראמרו פורשה מז

איה כל התחזקה בב או אדרים המאימים היא לע קרן התחזקה זרה בר לא גאראמרו על המאימים שונות.
notin מי-

בתחזקה, כי הוא יאכספת על זרכה'ו, כי שStateChanged יזד זרה, כי מי שвлажн מי השאר,
לע举报ו הזבר וצאר

8. שאר יאקה שאמיר עזר

בזיזילוים זפה שיאל-יא א🛍 פרד שוח שניזאמו מנקז התחזקה פורשה מז.
(elem דוגמה: עלון אלען חכמים)
Death as the Hukah

We propose that the singular שָׁנָה here is not merely in the performance of the ritual but rather in the mind-deifying mystery of death itself, whose defiling effects the watery ashes seek to counter. Death, the Torah tells us, has a contaminating effect; contact with it disqualifies us from entering the Temple and from participating in other matters of holiness. Death is a mocking fate which awaits us all, a trauma of human helplessness which disturbs our existential serenity. It is an absurdity which undoes all of man’s rational planning, his dreams and hopes. We wonder, why should the foremost of God’s creations have an awareness of his mortality and, therefore, live in constant dread and distress in face of its inevitability?

[In the animal world is not tragic. The species is not diminished by the death of an individual. Among brutes, the individual’s significance is only as a representative of a particular class. God’s concern is with the preservation of the species. “In the subluminary portion of the universe. Divine Providence [compassionate concern] does not extend to individual members of the species, except in the case of man” (Maimonides, Guide 3:17). Man, however, does not live as a representative of his group but because of his own inherent individual worth. He has autonomous value.

Each person is a microcosm, an olam katan, an individuality with dignity, an original with worthiness. “A single man was created to proclaim the greatness of God, for man mints many coins with one die, and they are all like one another; but God has stamped every man with the die of Adam, yet not one of them is like his fellow” (Sanh. 38a). Man’s singular humanity establishes his status, not the class or society of which he is
created," bishvili nivra ha-olam (ibid.). Again, "only a single person was created to teach us that he who destroys one individual, Scripture imputes it to him as though he had caused, the whole world to perish, and he who saves a single individual, it is as if he preserved an entire world" (ibid.). That is why human death is so abhorrently ugly.

How They Differ

The two cleansing acts, haza’ah and tevillah, are strikingly dissimilar in the manner of their performance, and one may derive lessons from each. Tevillah requires that the defiled enter the water entirely on his own initiative, bowing his head, bending his knees, and submerging in a sea, river, lake, or any other mikveh. He then emerges a tahor, cleansed. Only he can do it; if he is lazy or fearful of water, his status cannot be changed. The defiled must perform the act himself; it cannot be done for him. He defiles himself and he must cleanse himself. Tevillah, therefore, implies a capacity to change one’s condition. It is suggestive of all forms of human initiative, creativity, and freedom, the ability of man to transform his life, to raise himself because he has free will. Man can remain defiled if he so wishes, and be reconciled to the restrictions it imposes, simply by not going to the mikveh. Or, if cleansing is desired, he must muster the initiative and pull himself up; it is all up to him.

Haza’ah also involves water, but the situation is different. The tamei cannot sprinkle it upon himself; it must always be “and a clean person shall sprinkle it upon the unclean person” (Num. 19:19). He cannot liberate himself; he is dependent upon others; only a tahor can help him. His is a condition of dependency, and his own initiative is not enough. Both tevillah and haza’ah remove defilement and render one eligible to participate in the holiness of the Temple. In the former, it is self-liberation; in the latter, he must depend on others.

Why is tevillah not sufficient for tumat-met as it is for other tumot?
Aesthetic Ugliness and Existential Ugliness

Tumat-met represents existential ugliness. An awareness of one's mortality casts a melancholic cloud of gloom upon all of men's strivings. Kohelet wrote: "For that which befalls the soul of man befalls the beasts; as one does, so does the other. Yea, they have but one breath; so man has no permanence above the beasts; for all is vanity." (Eccles. 3:19.) Other forms of tumot, however, involve aesthetic, not existential, ugliness; they are reactions to sense experiences which are jarringly disturbing. Both are depressants and are incongruous with holiness.

Aesthetic ugliness can be washed away by the waters of tevillah. The putrefaction and decomposition that characterize most tumot are negative and upsetting, but immersion can be psychologically rejuvenating. One submerges from the visual world and rises as if reborn, changed in status and identity, a zriyah hadashah. Tevillah, which is required for converts to Judaism, also connotes a total transformation of identity. For aesthetic ugliness, tevillah seems the appropriate therapy; it is an emotional antidote to an emotional ailment. But what does one do with tumat-met, which is an experience that, besides its aesthetic effects, also represents the frustration of man's dignity and hopes? This is an intellectually perceived ugliness which is unit into the human condition; it is more than a reaction to an disturbing emotional experience.

Aesthetic ugliness yields to a corrective aesthetic cleansing. Existential ugliness, however, which is due to an awareness of one's inexorable mortality, is not effaced so readily. Tevillah, becoming a new person, does not remove this dread; death continues to frighten. How, then, can we come to terms with its morbid forebodings and overcome its life-negating effects? An additional method, haza'ah, besides the palliative tevillah, is needed.

The real cleanser of the morbid state induced by threatening death is God Himself. We have faith that He compassionately cares about us and that we will not be abandoned. We accept, both intellectually and emotionally, a sense of surety that the human soul, the real "I" in the human personality, is immortal, and that death is a transition, not a termination. These considerations assuage the terrors of death; it is no longer nihilistically destructive.

Eschatologically (b'ahrit ha-yamin, in the end of days), we are assured by the prophet that God will conquer and undo death, nullifying its power to inflict anguish. "He will destroy death forever; and the Lord shall wipe away tears from all faces." (Isa. 25:8.) We confront death directly and deface it of its terror. As the psalmist said: "Into Thy hand I commend my spirit; Thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of truth." (Ps. 31:6.)

The ultimate purifier, metaher, from the defilement of tumat-met is God Himself. Our Sages clearly suggest that only He can lift from us the debilitating effects of contact with human death.

On the verse "And one who is clean will gather up the ashes" (Num. 19:9), v'asaf'ish tahor, the Tanchuma (B.) adds: "This refers to the Holy One." Verses are cited to support this interpretation.9 It is the Almighty, represented by the Tahor, who is the ultimate purifier of the scourage and terror of death.

The totally irrational ritual of the Parah Adumah suggests that human efforts to comprehend death and to lessen its dread are futile without an acceptance of a providential God. The ineradicability of death as a human condition comes from Him, and only He can cleanse us. We cannot achieve it by ourselves.

Why Both Tevillah and Haza'ah?

We may now appreciate that haza'ah is necessary for tumat-met. Why, however, is tevillah also required for tumat-met? Why is not haza'ah sufficient? The answer is that, in addition to our faith in God as the ultimate conqueror of death, we ourselves must also be engaged in the day-to-day struggle with death, to deface its boldness and aggressiveness. Tevillah, which connotes human initiative, should also be employed to reduce the incidence of death, to relieve pain and its debilitating
effects. To prolong life and to enhance its quality are dignified and noble endeavors. The Torah supports scientific research in the healing arts and sanctions the physician’s role. On the verse, “And shall cause him to be thoroughly healed,” v’rapo yerapel (Ex. 21:19), our Sages add: “This teaches us that authorization was granted by God to the physician to heal” (B. Kamm. 85a). Maimonides ruled that healing the sick is not only permissible but mandatory. The Shulhan Arukh adds: “He who withholds his services, it is considered as if he were shedding blood.” Also, “if a physician advises that an ill person eat on Yom Kippur, he is to be obeyed even if the patient wishes otherwise” (Yoma 83a). Clearly, sickness and death are not to be accepted with complacency as Divine decrees, but are to be resisted on the premise that the Creator wishes us to utilize all resources to preserve life and health.

We cannot defeat death, but we can alleviate its effects upon us, both medically and psychologically, to limit its frequency and terror. Longevity can be extended through human initiative, is symbolized by tevillah. Earthly immortality, however, will continue to elude us, and only with God’s help can we cleanse ourselves of morbidity and go on with our life’s work. This is the symbolic message of haza’ah. Tumat-met, therefore, requires a double procedure of purification. The ultimate enigma, Zot hukat hatorah, is adam ki yamut, man’s mortality.

Why is Parah Adumah in Sidra Hukat?

We are guided by the principle of Nahmanides that there is an idhat ha-torah, a chronological unfolding of themes in the Torah, and that there is a logical continuity in the sequence of narratives. He writes: “I have insistently maintained that the Torah is faithful to chronology except where the text specifically states otherwise, and even then, when it is dictated by contextual and ideological needs” (Num. 16:1).

Why, then, is the chapter of Parah Adumah situated in Hukat (Num. 19), surrounded by seemingly unrelated subjects? We have already explained that it is not grouped with the other tumot in Shemini, Tazria, and Metzora (all in Leviticus) in order to emphasize that tumat-met is of a separate rank of severity whose taharah requires haza’ah in addition to the usual tevillah. But the question persists: what is it doing in Hukat?

The Thirty-Year Blackout

The chapter of Parah Adumah is a bridge spanning events that happened thirty-eight years apart, from the rebellion of Korah (chaps. 16–18) to the arrival at the wilderness of Zin (chap. 20). It is a somber reflection of those tragic years during which the exodus generation, Yitzei Mitzrayim, was dying in the desert, making way for the generation of the desert, dor hamidbar, who were to enter the Holy Land. To represent the tragic death of an entire generation, the Parah Adumah chapter, with its message of triumph over the melancholy of death, is appropriately situated.

The logical transition of chapters may be explained as follows:

1. Sidra Shelah (chap. 14). The sin of the meraglim (spies) and the hysterical despair of the exodus generation, brought on the Divine decree that “you shall bear your punishment for forty years, corresponding to the number of days, forty days, that you scouted the land; a year for each day . . . in this wilderness they shall die to the last man.” The Midrash describes the deaths which occurred annually on Tisha B’Av, the anniversary of their loss of faith in reaction to the negative reports of the meraglim. Our Sages noted that their profuse weeping that night was without justification. Had they not left Egypt and crossed the Red Sea miraculously? And were they not fed each day with manna! And had they not experienced the awesome Revelation at Sinai, where God spoke to them directly! Such despair was unwarranted. It testifies to a scarred and slavish mentality which rendered them unworthy and physically incapable of conquering the land (Maimonides, Guide 3:24).

2. Korah’s Rebellion. According to Nahmanides, the Korah