# WHAT'S GOING ON?

- Summer Machane applications are NOW OPEN for Ari, Aleph, Aleph Chalutzi, Bet Base and Gimmel. To apply, please go to bauk.org/camps. For more information, please email Rafi H at camps@bauk. org

- Bet Midrash Programme has returned!! Sign up: bauk.org/bmp-tafkid. For more information, please email Eli at chinuch@bauk.org

- Student Bet Midrash continues every Thursday night at Kinloss! Come along for a great opportunity to hear amazing speakers, have some great food and learn with friends or madrichim! Please feel free to email Eli at chinuch@bauk.org for more details or if you have any questions

- We had an amazing **Purim** with loads of Chaverim joining us for the **Women's Megillah reading** and our **80's themed Purim Seuda!** Thanks to everyone who read the Megillah and to everyone who came and can't wait to do it all again next year!!

- **Svivot** are continuing all over the country. To get involved (or to even start a sviva) please email Rafi C at svivot@bauk.org

- Hatzlacha to Hendon, South Hampstead, and Chigwell on their Shabbatot Ha'Irgun!

PLEASE

**OUERIES** 

Thank you for all the hard work put in by all the Tzvatim!!

- 2019 marks the 80th birthday of BAUK!! Keep an eye out for events in your local community!

> - We are writing a **brand new** Sefer Torah in honour of our 80th birthday, and we need YOUR help! Join this amazing mitzva and sponsor a word, pasuk or more, by visiting https://bauk.org/ torah

- Mazal tov to Daniel Glass (Rosh of Aleph Winter Machane 5778, Shevet Hagvura) on his engagement to Esther Shira Gaffin!

## FOOD FOR THOUGHT

1. Why was the sin-offering of the people a he-goat, while that of Aharon was a calf? (See Rav Yosef Dov Soloveitchik on 9:3)

2. Is there any significance to the Torah specifically saying that Mishael and Elzaphan were Aharon's cousins? (See Rav Yaakov Kamenetsky on 10:4)

#### SHABBAT SHALOM!!!

(Don't forget to turn your clocks one hour forward on Motzei Shabbat!)

CHINUCH@BAUK.ORG



ELI

AT

CONTACT



PARASHAT SHEMINI

SHABBAT PARAH



זכור את־יום השבת לקדשו. ששת ימים תעבד ועשית כל־מלאכתך;

### SPONTANEITY OR Structure? Jacob Seitler Shevet Morasha

In this week's Parasha we account the death

of Nadav and Avihu, the sons of Aharon. Many commentators offer explanations for this tragedy, but the simple answer given is that they acted with their own initiative, and without having been commanded they offered unauthorised fire.

This is not the first time in the Torah where someone acts with their own initiative. Moshe, when coming down Har Sinai smashed the Luchot on seeing Bnei Yisrael rejoice around the Golden Calf. In this case, Rashi, in his last comment of the Torah, praises Moshe for acting spontaneously. Why was it wrong for Nadav and Avihu to act spontaneously but it was acceptable for Moshe to behave in this manner?

Nadav and Avihu's role as Kohanim was different from Moshe's role as a Prophet. The role of a Prophet is one that is constantly changing depending on the situation, however, the role of the Kohanim remains constant over time.

An example of these twin perspectives

strength of Yeshaya Noson ben Shira Gittel can be seen with regards to Tefilla. There is a dispute between Rabbi Yossi Ben Chanina and Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi in the Gemara (Berachot 26b) as to whether Tefilla was instituted by the אבות or it came to replace the קורבנות. This seems to have no practical ramifications, but the argument can be seen through the perspectives we saw before. If Tefilla was instituted by the אבות then its origins are prophetic and therefore Tefilla should be personal and spontaneous, whereas if Tefilla came to replace means the origins are priestly and Tefilla should be structured and communal.

This can explain why we say the Amidah twice, the personal Amidah to reflect the prophetic, personal experience of Tefilla, and the Chazan's repetition to reflect the priestly, communal perspective. The lack of repetition at Maariv can be explained by the lack of a קרבן in the evening.

Nadav and Avihu's flaw was that they acted like Prophets rather than Kohanim. As Jews, we have both traits ingrained which allows us to flourish; without structure, there would have been no continuity but without spontaneity, there would be no fresh life. The challenge is the maintain the balance without confusing the place of each.

#### JACOB IS A MADRICH AT SALFORD SVIVA AND WAS A MADRICH ON BET BASE MACHANE 5778

London	In: 18:13 Out: 19:21	Oxford	ln: 18:14 Out: 19:26	Leeds	In: 18:17 Out: 19:32
Manchester	In: 18:20 Out: 19:34	Bristol	In: 18:19 Out: 19:31	Liverpool	In: 18:23 Out: 19:36
Cambridge	In: 18:09 Out: 19:21	Birmingham	In: 18:18 Out: 19:30	Jerusalem	In: 18:20 Out: 19:34

## SHABBAT PARAH 5779: **INNOVATION AND CONSISTENCY**



**RAV AHARON HERSKOVITZ | RAV SHALIACH** 

This week we read Parashat Parah in addition to the regular Torah reading. This addition, which deals with the process of becoming pure after impurity caused

by contact with the dead, has at its centre the command of the פרה אדומה, the red heifer. Chazal connect the use of this animal for the purity process to the sin of the golden calf (Bamidbar Rabbah 19:3):

'And why are all sacrifices brought from male animals, but this (the red heifer) is a female? Rabbi Ayvo said: this is a parable to the son of the maidservant, who soiled the palace of the king. The king said: his mother should come and clean up the mess! So too Hashem declared "The heifer should come and atone for the sin of the golden calf." '

Commentators over the centuries have tried to understand the connection between the sin of the golden calf and the command to use the red heifer for our purification process: at first glance, the two topics don't seem to be related one to the other. Additionally, the sin of the golden calf did not take place with an actual calf at all, but with an idol; why is the red heifer acting as its "mother" and repairing the sin that was done?

Rav Kook, in his work Midbar Shur (Drush 35), attempts to answer this question with another question: if we examine the sin of the golden calf, we can see that the people desired not to create a new god, but to have a replacement for Moshe. In other words, to still serve Hashem, but to be able to do so with an intermediary that would help them achieve a greater connection. What is the problem with what they did? If people feel that certain things will bring them closer to Hashem, shouldn't they be encouraged to do them? This question could be asked as well on this week's Parasha itself, with some interpretations of the sin of Nadav and Avihu being that they tried to initiate a service of Hashem that had not been commanded to them: surely voluntary worship should be encouraged!

Rav Kook explains that our human ability to innovate, while beneficial in other areas, can

often end up being harmful in the area of religion. Even if we believe that we know that a certain act would be a positive contribution to our service of Hashem, it is entirely possible that we will miss the mark due to the finite nature of our understanding, and that what we perceive as beneficial is actually harmful. In this light, the sin of the golden calf was the fact that Bnei Yisrael instituted a human initiative when they had no business doing so.

Contrastingly, the red heifer is an act that flies in the face of human understanding, the fact that the heifer "purifies the impure and defiles the pure" (Yoma 14a). We are told that when Shlomo Hamelech attempted to understand the entirety of the Torah, he testified that he could understand all besides for this command, as "it is out of my grasp" (Bamidbar Rabbah, ibid). The seeming contradiction of the red heifer is precisely the point of the command: the declaration that our knowledge is limited, and we accept the fact that Hashem's plan is complete, even though we are not necessarily able to comprehend it. For this reason, the heifer comes to purify from death specifically. If we believe in a benevolent God, One Who desires life, how does He allow death in His world? Our response to this confusion is to engage in a mitzvah that we do not fully understand, as a statement that our own knowledge is limited.

This, explains Rav Kook, is the connection between the golden calf and the red heifer: the golden calf represented an illegitimate attempt by humans to add on to Hashem's Torah, while the red heifer is a declaration that we do not understand all of God's ways, as our own understanding is limited.

Although this does not mean that the entire endeavour of human initiative in religion is to be frowned upon, I think that it should give us pause when we contemplate ideas regarding our individual and communal service of Hashem. May Hashem grant us the wisdom to understand what is right and desirable.

### **DVAR HALACHA** - WEEKLY QUESTION WITH RAV AHARON



travelling by myself, should say Tefillat Haderech before leaving, or along the way?

Answer: The Gemara in Berachot 29b-30a says: אמר ליה אליהו לרב יהודה

אחוה רב סלא חסידא "וכשאתה יוצא לדרך המלך בקונך וצא." מאי "המלך בקונך וצא"? אמר רבי יעקב אמר רב חסדא זו תפלת הדרך. ואמר רבי יעקב אמר רב חסדא כל היוצא לדרך צריך להתפלל תפלת הדרך...אמר רבי יעקב אמר רב חסדא משעה שמהלך בדרך.

Eliyahu said to Rav Yehuda the brother of Rav Sala Chasida: "when you journey, ask permission from your Creator and go out." What does it mean "to ask permission from your Creator and go out"? Rabbi Yaakov said in the name of Rav Chisda: This is referring to Tefillat Haderech. And Rabbi Yaakov said in the name of Rav Chisda: All who go on a journey must say Tefillat Haderech...Rabbi Yaakov said in the name of Rav Chisda: **From the time that** one is walking on the path.

The Gemara indicates that one must wait to say the Tefilla until they are **actually** walking on the path: משעה שמהלך בדרך. Even though that is the text in our Gemara, it appears clear that the Rishonim had a slightly different version, that of - from the point at which one - משעה שהחזיק בדרך has "grabbed/taken hold of the path." This is

### A TASTE FROM ISRAEL **GEMMA DENBY** SHEVET TZION

This year, I am privileged to be studying at Midreshet Harova in the Old City of Jerusalem, while also participating in the Bnei Akiva Torani program, which continuously provides me with a wide range of opportunities, such as developing a deeper understanding of Israel, and building upon the lewish values instilled in me through Bnei Akiva.

Two weeks ago, I ran the Jerusalem marathon and raised money for three worthy organisations: Mizrachi, Bnei Akiva

and Tikvot. Running with thousands of runners was incredible, especially because so many people of diverse backgrounds united to contribute to the single ultimate cause of giving. This was also my first marathon, and I enjoyed pushing myself to my physical and mental limits, ultimately achieving

Question: When I'm the version brought by the Shulchan Aruch (OC 110:7). Many still interpret this phrase in the same way as our version of the Gemara, that one must first start **actually** travelling before saying it. For example, the Magen Avraham (sk 14), Mishna Berura (sk 29) and others write that one must leave the 70 amot closest to the city before saying it (approximately 35 metres).

> However, the Taz (sk 7) writes that what one can (and should) say Tefillat Haderech before actually going, once they are certain that they will be travelling: "taking hold of the path" means that they are no longer merely planning, but that they have reached a stage in which their departure is certain. He provides further support for this position from the practice of the Maharam M'Rotenberg (recorded in OC 110:6), who would say Tefillat Haderech in the morning as part of Birkot Hashachar in order to have the beracha be close to another beracha; it seems clear from this that he had not yet set out on his way. Although the Mishna Berura records (sk 29) a list of Acharonim who disagree with the Taz (including the Eliyah Rabbah and Pri Megadim), he writes that they agree that bedieved one can rely on the Taz's opinion. For this reason, when your kavannah would be lacking (such as because you are driving), it would be preferable to say Tefillat Haderech before the journey, like the opinion of the Taz.

what I thought I couldn't!

On the Shabbat following the marathon, I had the opportunity of hearing from Dr Asael Lubotsky, a young IDF Commander during the Second Lebanon War, who was irreversibly wounded in both of his legs after a tragic missile attack. Today, he is a paediatric specialist at the Shaare Zedek Medical Center, in Jerusalem. I found Asael's story particularly moving because it reminded me of the powerful impact I can have as an individual -- by merely fundraising for Tikvot, I was able to help rehabilitate Israel's wounded soldiers like Asael, and other victims of terror, which was humbling and rewarding.

I look forward to the rest of the remaining time of my gap year and to our upcoming Torani Kibbutz-Pesach seminar!

#### GEMMA WAS SGANIT AT EDGWARE UNITED SVIVA 5778