בית מדרש הראל

BEIT MIDRASH HAR'EL

ע"ש בלדה קאופמן לינדנבאום

IN MEMORY OF BELDA KAUFMAN LINDENBAUM



SHAVUOT READER

BEIT MIDRASH HAR'EL

5786/2026

FROM BONDAGE TO FREEDOM

A Special Reader in Preparation for Shavuot

Beit Midrash Har'el presents this special reader in the lead-up to Shavuot 5786, featuring a collection of relevant articles published by Rabbi Herzl Hefter, Rosh Beit Midrash, over the past several years. Many have been updated or refreshed for clarity and timeliness.

We hope that this provides good food for thought, discussion, and further learning in the days before and during Shavuot. Chag Sameach.

About Rabbi Herzl Hefter

Rabbi Herzl Hefter is the founder of Beit Midrash Har'el, a unique Orthodox program where men and women learn together for smicha/rabbinic ordination. The Beit Midrash is committed to high-level learning and confronting the challenges of modernity with empathy and intellectual honesty.

Rabbi Hefter is a graduate of Yeshiva University and was ordained at Yeshivat Har Etzion. He has taught at the Gruss Kollel and served as the head of the Bruria Scholars Program at Midreshet Lindenbaum. He writes and lectures frequently for the Beit Midrash and beyond.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Arguing with God ..... page 4

The Exodus Story Is an Outer Garment ..... page 7

Transitions Can Be Hazardous for the Health of the Jewish People .. page 10

Is Belief in Revelation Possible in the Post-Modern Age? ..... page 12

Understanding Sinai: The Theological Uncertainty Principle ..... page 15

This Shavuot: A Time of Reckoning ..... page 18

God Must Be Saying, “Do These Guys Work for Me?” ..... page 21

A Way Forward: “And What Does the Lord Ask of You?” ..... page 23



Arguing with God

The New Moon of Nissan is associated with the anticipation of the joy of redemption. Yet the first Rosh Chodesh Nissan after the great Exodus from Egypt was one in which joy was mingled with tragedy, and Aharon the High Priest left God hanging.

According to our sages, the inauguration of the *Mishkan* took place on the New Moon of Nissan. On that day, God returned to dwell among the Jewish people following the sin of the Golden Calf. In the ecstasy of the moment, two of Aharon's sons violated the boundary between the human and the divine and were consumed by God's fire. A moment of joy was thus marred by tragedy.

The death of Aharon's two elder sons, Nadav and Avihu, is followed by an uncharacteristically legalistic exchange between Moshe and Aharon:

"And Moshe diligently sought the goat of the sin offering, and behold, it was burned; and he was angry with Elazar and Itamar, the sons of Aharon who were left alive, saying: Why have you not eaten the sin offering in the holy place, seeing it is most holy, and God has given it to you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord? … And Aharon said to Moshe: Behold, this day they have offered their sin offering and their burnt offering before the Lord; and such things have befallen me—had I eaten the sin offering today, would it have been accepted in the sight of the Lord? And when Moshe heard this, he was pleased." (Vayikra 10:16–20)

Our sages are divided as to the identity of the sin offering (Zevachim 101a–b). I wish to explicate the opinion that it was the sin offering of the New Moon—Rosh Chodesh—that was not consumed. Investigating this possibility will not only uncover the hidden meaning of this minor festival but also teach us something fundamental about our relationship with God.

But first, some necessary background. On the New Moon, an additional sacrifice (*musaf*) is brought in the Temple. It consists of a goat as a sin offering (*ḥatat*), in addition to the burnt offerings. Portions of the sin offering are eaten by the *kohanim*. Concerning this aspect of the ritual, the Talmud states that "the *kohanim* eat, and the owners of the sacrifice are atoned for" (Pesaḥim 59b). By accepting and eating the food provided by the sinner, the *kohen* shows that something redeeming has emerged from the sin and thus participates in its expiation (*kapparah*).

Moshe is concerned that the atonement effected by the sin offering will be incomplete, since the offering was burned rather than eaten.

For which sin does the sin offering of the New Moon atone?

The Talmud (Ḥullin 60b) provides a staggering answer:

R. Shimon b. Pazzi pointed out a contradiction [between verses]. One verse says, "And God made the two great lights," and immediately continues, "the greater light" and "the lesser light." The moon said to the Holy One, blessed be He: "Sovereign of the Universe! Is it possible for two kings to wear one crown?" He answered: "Go then and make yourself smaller." "Sovereign of the Universe," cried the moon, "because I have suggested that which is proper, must I then make myself smaller?" … On seeing that it would not be consoled, the Holy One, blessed be He, said: "Bring an atonement for Me, for making the moon smaller."

It is God Himself who is in need of atonement for having diminished the moon.

Surely, R. Shimon b. Pazzi would have been banished from numerous rabbinic associations had he lived today – but that may not be the most counterintuitive lesson here.

What does the diminishing of the moon symbolize that it should be considered a sin requiring atonement? The light of the sun is powerful and steady. It has come to symbolize eternity and God's enduring beneficence. The moon, by contrast, palely reflects the light of the sun; it waxes and wanes. Just prior to the new moon, total darkness prevails. The reemergence of the moon symbolizes hope and regeneration—hence the proclamation in the blessing of the new moon, *David, melekh Yisrael ḥai ve-kayam*. Yet the waning moon symbolizes deterioration and death.

The moon thus comes to symbolize creation itself. Its diminishment by God represents the imperfection inherent in creation. Our world is full of beauty, wonder, and astonishing harmony, and yet it is also fatally flawed and unspeakably cruel. Natural disasters and human atrocities conspire to bring immeasurable suffering into the world. Religious preachers of all persuasions tend to trumpet the former; atheists forcefully point to the latter.

Death is the embodiment of all that is imperfect in God's creation. For Aharon, death and evil are no abstractions; he has just encountered them most personally. By refusing to partake in the sin offering of God, he is refusing to absolve God of responsibility for death and suffering in the world.

This point is sharpened when we realize that this sin offering was brought on the *first* Rosh Chodesh. While later generations consumed the sin offering of Rosh Chodesh—thereby accepting God and the imperfect world He created—Aharon registers his protest. God will have to bear His sin alone; Aharon will not atone for Him.

From where does Aharon draw the fortitude—and the sheer *ḥutzpah*—to defy God's will and law? To answer this, we must return to Avraham's argument with God on the eve of the destruction of Sodom:

"Far be it from You to do such a thing—to slay the righteous with the wicked… Shall not the Judge of all the earth do justice?" (Bereishit 18:25)

There appears to be a natural law that precedes God's law, accessible to the moral sensibilities of a healthy and refined human being. On one level this is true. There exists a sense of right and wrong embedded in human consciousness, standing independent of divine revelation. For Aharon, this moral sense erupts as outrage, sharpened by personal tragedy.

Yet while the Torah presents morality as axiomatic and independent of God, it simultaneously presents righteousness and justice as *the way of God*:

"For I have chosen him, so that he may instruct his children and his household after him to keep the way of the Lord by doing what is right and just." (Bereishit 18:19)

The natural law that Avraham invokes against God is, in fact, the way of God. God is both the Giver of the Law and the Creator of the world. As Giver of the Law, His voice is heard as external command; as Creator, His will is embedded in nature and accessible to human moral intuition.

We encounter this dual source of morality in the dialogue between Moshe and Aharon. Moshe speaks in the language of command; Aharon responds with reasoning tempered by sensitivity.

This exchange may appear to present a dichotomy between divine authority and human moral sensibility. Yet Aharon's response ultimately transcends that dichotomy. Here the Torah gestures toward a source of morality that lies beyond the question of whether it is natural or divine in origin.

What is Moshe Rabbenu's response upon grasping this? "And Moshe was pleased."

The preacher apologizes for God and believes he is thereby protecting Him. The atheist denies Him. God needs no protection and suffers no apologies. An authentic relationship with Him must be grounded, first and foremost, in honesty.

(Inspired by the Beit Ya'akov, Parashat Shemini 20)

The Exodus Story Is an Outer Garment

“And here the child asks…”

The mitzvah of recalling the Exodus is fulfilled in the form of questions and answers. That is not incidental. It means that the Seder is not a lecture and not a proof. It is a ritual of interpretation.

So the question is not only *what do we say?* The question is: **what kinds of questions does Torah train us to ask?**

One often hears the question “Did the Exodus really happen?” . It is an interesting historical question. But it is the wrong question, because it misunderstands what kind of book the Torah is — and what kind of religious consciousness the Torah is trying to cultivate.

The Zohar will help us here.

Rabbi Shimon said:

“Woe to the person who says that the Torah comes to give instructions and tell descriptive stories and simple tales… Every word in the Torah reflects higher wisdom and higher secrets… The narratives of the Torah are only the outer garment of the Torah. Whoever thinks that this outer garment is, in fact, the Torah and there is nothing underneath the clothing is spiritually backward…”[1]

The Zohar is not taking a stand on the historicity of the Torah.. It is not saying the surface reading is false. It is saying the surface is not the point.

A garment is not a deception. A garment is how something sacred and intangible enters the world in a form that human beings can grasp. The Torah comes clothed in narrative and Law because these construct individual and society.

This is why the Haggadah, in the heart of *Maggid*, is not the telling of the Exodus story per se as it is told inn the book of Shmot but rather leans heavily on how the Torah ***tells*** the story in the book of Dvarim.[2] The Seder is built around how the story is told, transmitted, and absorbed. Meaning is not an afterthought. Meaning is the mitzvah.

The Baal Shem Tov and the Apikores

A Hasidic teaching makes the point sharply.

“It happened that someone came before the Baal Shem Tov who had studied science and philosophy and concluded, based upon his studies, that the splitting of the sea was a

natural phenomenon. If so, what is all the hullabaloo around this “miracle”? Peddling this question, the person sowed confusion everywhere he went.

The Baal Shem Tov gathered the town and said:

God is the author of natural phenomena; and since He engraved into the nature of the sea that it would split for Israel, this only increases the miracle, because the very nature of the sea was created in anticipation of redemption.”[3]

Significantly, the Baal Shem Tov does not deny the possibility that the event was “natural.” What renders the apikores an apikores is not the explanation. It is the interpretation: *the assumption that “natural” means empty of religious meaning*.

But it is not only about the sea. It is about the fault line that shapes Jewish life now.

On one side is the impulse to reduce Torah to its outer garment — to collapse Torah into surface and superficial reading. In that posture, the question we become obsessed with is: *Did it happen?* That Torah is fragile and shallow; if the surface is challenged, the whole edifice trembles.

On the other side is the opposite impulse: if Torah is not reducible to surface reading, then there may be a tendency to spiritualize it, draining it, from binding commitments and halakhic life.

These are the two poles: **naïve literalism** and **spiritualization.**

The path of Beit Midrash Har’el is guided by both poles and seeks to pursue a more balanced course. We have our eyes on the spiritual meaning of the Torah along with uncompromising commitment to the normative way of life the narratives and Law of the Torah demand.

The Torah’s narratives and Law are not the whole Torah — there is a deep spiritual meaning which is disclosed through them. They are the medium through which Torah enters the world. The task is not to idolize the garment, and not to discard it, but to learn how to read it as Torah: as something that obligates us, refines us, and disciplines our moral imagination.

This is precisely why the Seder is structured around questions. Not because “everyone’s perspective is equally valid,” but because Torah assumes that mature commitment requires interpretation. Our Sages, by structuring the seder around questions and answers are teaching us the through our interpretations we find the meanings embedded in the Torah. That Jews must never stop asking hard questions from a place of solid commitment.

“And here the child asks…”

That line is not just a narrative tool. It is the whole enterprise.

Notes / Sources

[1] Zohar, Bemidbar, Beha’alotecha, 148b.
[2] Devarim 26:5–9 (“Arami oved avi”), central to Maggid in the Haggadah.
[3] Baal Shem Tov, Shemot, Beshalach 7.



Transitions can be hazardous for the health of the Jewish people

Historically, the time between Passover and Shavuot is one of trepidation and foreboding. This year in the modern State of Israel is no different

The transitional period during which the "omer" is counted that follows the festival of Passover and leads to Shavuot should be considered a festive interlude. We are proceeding from redemption from Egypt to the revelation at Mount Sinai, setting the Jewish people on a path with principle and purpose for the future. In fact, Nachmanides likens this time to *hol ha-moed* — the intermediate days of rejoicing between festival days.

Yet, historically, this period has become associated with tragedy and mourning, primarily because of the talmudic story of the death of the 24,000 disciples of Rabbi Akiva. All agree that these students died as punishment because they did not respect one another as they should, though some blame plague and others the Bar Kochba revolt.

This association between *sefirat ha-omer* and trauma is not coincidental — because transitions are hazardous. In the biblical story, the Children of Israel are in a very vulnerable position during the period after their exodus from Egypt. Following their initial exuberance, the people must then settle into the difficult existence of desert life. Inspiration evaporates in the heat of the desert and is replaced by thirst and hunger. Passions run high and there is one incident after another: complaints about food and water, nostalgia for Egypt, attacks on leadership, the unprovoked attack by Amalek and ultimately the sin of the golden calf.

The people need some framework to maintain cohesion and solidarity in order to survive the ongoing challenges of the wilderness. Moses striking a rock and interceding with God — relying on the stature of one individual to "make things right" — is not a long-term solution.

Politically, as well, the people are in limbo. With their redemption, they have shaken the heavy yoke of their Egyptian taskmasters, but they have not yet received the Torah at Sinai. They have political freedom without law — i.e., the institutions and governing framework a society needs to function.

This is a very precarious place to be. Freedom without the responsibilities and boundaries of the law is not sustainable and can too quickly degenerate into a state of anarchy in which "everyone did that which was right in his own eyes." (Judges 21: 25)

The trepidation and foreboding which have come to characterize the period of *sefirat ha-omer* resonates greatly during the current circumstances today in the State of Israel. We

too are in a state where we seem to enjoy political freedom without the grounding of a clear set of laws that provide guideposts and stability in our society. This impending chaos exposes us to internal discord as well as external threats.

We have secured political freedom during the first 75 years of the state, at a significant price in terms of blood, sweat and tears. Yet, like the Children of Israel plodding through the desert before arriving at Sinai, we see that is not enough. We are in need of a contemporary equivalent of Sinai to consolidate and preserve our freedom and forge a just and secure society which will not only survive but thrive.

As we lead up to Shavuot, it is also worth examining what happened at Sinai and how this fractious people was brought together. All stood together, saw the fire and smoke of the mountain, and heard the laws being commanded. They shared a formative experience that involved everyone present and they all responded in unison, *na'aseh v'nishma*, we will do and we will understand. This consensus forged a peoplehood that endured, even though challenges continued to arise.

We should think about the current push for legal reforms in this context. Our biblical history makes the case for the importance of a legal framework to shape the contours of our freedom and to provide clear ground rules for society. We also see the need for consensus to launch such a grand national enterprise, where there is active buy-in and acceptance is broad based.

As Israelis — secular, religious, left, right, Jew and non-Jew — we all need to be concerned. Rushing through a set of legal reforms without first achieving the kind of national unity modelled at Sinai — solidarity that we desperately need to aspire to today — should give everyone pause. And today, we see a lack of respect for one another that is ominously reminiscent of the students of Rabbi Akiva. S*efirat ha-omer* reminds us of the dangers in this transitional period leading up to the giving of the law — and what happens when we demonize our opponents and don't engage with dignity in society.

We must heed the warning signs of the period of *Sefirat Ha-omer*. Our "start-up nation" needs a new Sinai moment to institute a healthy system of law, with checks and balances to moderate the dangers of unchecked passions and interests, which we can all endorse – our own *na'aseh v'nishma* moment.

In the desert, it was the leadership who shepherded the people to Sinai. Today, the tables are turned and we the people must demand this of our leaders.

Is Belief in Revelation Possible in the Post-Modern Age?

The post-modern era in which we live poses unprecedented challenges to the foundations upon which traditional faith is based. Those of us who received a conservative (lower-case "c") religious education were nurtured on the certainties of Jewish tradition: the Almighty created the world in six days, revealed the Torah to Israel at Sinai, and will redeem His people—and with them the entire cosmos—at the end of days. Until that time, we are bound to follow God's will as expressed through the commandments of the Torah.

In broad strokes, that about sums it up: creation, revelation, and redemption, with Torah and mitzvot in the interim. We imbibed, in both form and content, the opening words of Maimonides in his *Mishneh Torah*:

It is the foundation of foundations and the pillar of all wisdom to know that there is something—that is, God—that existed before anything else…

How different is the contour of post-modern discourse! We inhabit a world of relative truths, subjective realities, and personal "narratives." Claims to metaphysical truth are greeted with skepticism at best, and more often with scorn.

Post-modernity is rooted in the Platonic distinction between ideal forms and their particular instances. Plato made use of this distinction in his famous parable of the cave:

Socrates: And now, let me show in a figure how far our nature is enlightened or unenlightened. Behold! Human beings living in an underground cave, which has a mouth open toward the light…
Glaucon: You have shown me a strange image, and they are strange prisoners.
Socrates: Like ourselves… and they see only their own shadows, or the shadows of one another, which the fire throws on the opposite wall of the cave.
Glaucon: True…
Republic, Book VII

The unfortunates who dwell in the shadow of the cave mistake their perceptions for true reality. Twenty-two centuries later, Kant drew a similar distinction between reality in itself (*das Ding an sich*), the noumenon, and reality as perceived, the phenomenon. We do not perceive the world as it is; only an image of reality becomes known to us through our subjective sense perceptions.

Today, however, we find ourselves inhabiting a world assaulted by mass media and interconnected by the internet. Virtual reality imitates reality—and at times supplants it. Whereas in the past philosophical inquiry focused on the correspondence between the world of our senses and the world as it truly is, today we are left wondering whether anything exists beyond our subjective perceptions at all. Is there any substance behind the plethora of images that invade our consciousness and imprint themselves upon our minds?

The unique challenge post-modernity poses to traditional faith does not concern particular articles of belief—the existence of God or the divine origin of the Torah, for example. Post-modernism does not so much undermine *what* we believe as *how* we believe.

The ramifications of these conflicting worldviews are especially significant for members of the Modern-Orthodox community. We live a somewhat schizophrenic existence. On the one hand, we respect the right of others to hold beliefs very different from our own. We adopt basic Western democratic values such as equality among races and between the sexes. On the other hand, in our religious lives we tenaciously cling to notions of absolute truth. There exists, so to speak, a short circuit between our hearts and our minds. We live out the bifurcated existence advocated by the mid-nineteenth-century Russian *maskil* Judah Leib Gordon, as the Haskalah ideal: *"Be a Jew in your home and a man outside it."*

Does traditional Judaism have a cogent response to the post-modern challenge?

In this short essay, I wish to mine the thought of Rabbi Mordechai Yosef of Ishbitz (1801–1854) for such a response. Let us consider the following comment on Parashat Yitro:

"'I (Anochi) am the Lord your God.' The verse does not state 'Ani,' for had it stated 'Ani,' it would imply that the Holy One, blessed be He, revealed the totality of His light to Israel—precluding the possibility of further delving into His words, since everything would already be revealed. The letter kaf (in Anochi), however, denotes that the revelation is not complete, but rather an estimation and comparison to the light which God will reveal in the future."

The *kaf* of *Anochi* is the *kaf ha-dimayon*—the letter of comparison. The verse should thus be read: *"I am as the Lord…"* Even the revelation at Sinai, the paradigm of all subsequent revelations, must be understood as partial and incomplete, an *as if*.

This came to me as a true shock, given my previously held belief that the revelation at Sinai was perfect, and that subsequent Jewish history is but an effort to recapture the clarity of that pristine and intimate moment with God. Rabbi Mordechai Yosef not only claims that God's revelation is imperfect—but that it must be so.

He continues:

"The reason the commandment 'You shall not make for yourself a graven image' follows the commandment of Anochi… is because a graven image is cut according to specific dimensions—perfect, lacking nothing. This teaches that nothing is revealed to man completely."

To claim perfect clarity and understanding is, according to this view, to transgress the second commandment. Certainty and complete comprehension exist only within an idolatrous worldview, where the gods are finite and definable. Rabbi Mordechai Yosef thus equates certainty with idolatry.

God and His will are infinite; we, by contrast, are finite beings with limited capacity to understand. Insisting upon perfect knowledge of God and His will is therefore necessarily idolatrous, for the so-called "perfect perception" ultimately proves to be nothing more than a projection of ourselves. We end up creating God in our own image.

Rabbi Mordechai Yosef draws a sharp distinction between *God as He is* and *God as He is perceived*. The space between these two is occupied by uncertainty. I term this approach **the Theological Uncertainty Principle**. Rabbi Ya'akov Leiner of Ishbitz, son of Rabbi Mordechai Yosef, articulates this explicitly:

"Creation is merely a veil, creating the appearance of a world distinct from God. The Blessed One established a shield and a barrier concealing His light in this world… so that human beings might experience themselves as separate and autonomous. To this end, God created the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil—that is, the tree of uncertainty—which envelops the entire world, concealing the Divine light to such an extent that it is possible to doubt even the existence of the Creator."

The ramifications of the Ishbitz approach are monumental. Prior to this, certainty and steadfastness were generally equated with religious faith. In fact, according to the "Theological Uncertainty Principle" of Rabbi Mordechai Yosef and Rabbi Ya'akov Leiner, the opposite is true. Uncertainty is an essential feature of the God-created spiritual topography we inhabit. It is precisely within this landscape of uncertainty that we grow as religious beings.

Our tradition possesses the strength and resilience to confront the challenges of post-modernity. Indeed, our exposure to post-modern thought may bear important fruit. Yet we must avoid the cynicism and suspicion that are its most noxious byproducts. For us, uncertainty must serve as an opening to authentic humility—and to a deeper, more profound faith in God.

Understanding Sinai: The theological uncertainty principle

If we set aside our idealized, nostalgic reconstructions of the past, we can engage in the changing present with all its possibilities and surprises

The post-modern era in which we live poses unprecedented challenges to the foundations upon which traditional faith is based. I wish to put forward an understanding of the Revelation at Sinai that will help us meet the challenge.

Those of us who received a conservative (lower case "c") religious education were nurtured on the certainties of Jewish tradition as encapsulated by the opening words of Maimonides in his Mishneh Torah:

*It is the foundation of foundations and the pillar of all wisdom to **know** that there is something [namely God] that existed before anything else…*

The unique challenge which post-modernity poses to traditional faith does not concern particular articles of faith as such, the existence of God or the divine origin of the Torah. Post-modernism does not so much undermine ***what*** we believe, rather ***how*** we believe. We are accustomed to thinking that our core beliefs are derived from the corpus of tradition, point in a clear way to objective metaphysical truths. This is what I mean by ***how*** we believe. Post-modernity is at odds with this way of believing. Belief systems are seen to be products of the particular civilization which spawned them. It would be the cardinal sin of post modernity to insist on the absolute superiority of the belief system of one civilization over another.

As a matter of fact, post-modernity is hostile towards any totalizing system of belief or interpretive method. Nietzsche famously disparaged the human desire to construct systems:

*The will to a system: in a philosopher, morally speaking, a subtle corruption, a disease of character; amorally speaking, his will to appear more stupid than he is… I am not bigoted enough for a system – and not even for **my** system." (See Kaufmann, Nietzsche p. 80)*

The post-modern French philosopher Jean Francois Lyotard put it this way: "Simplifying to the extreme, I define post-modern as incredulity towards meta-narratives." By meta-narratives Lyotard meant totalizing narratives such as the redemption of humanity in Christianity, the utopianism of Marx or the triumph of science. This attitude applies equally

to the narratives of the Torah along with our halachic system which mandates normative behavior.

The ramifications of these conflicting world views are very significant for the members of the Modern Orthodox community. On the one hand, we respect the right of the other to his or her beliefs even though they may differ fundamentally from our own. We adopt basic Western democratic values such as equality of all races and between the sexes. On the other hand, in our religious lives, we hold tenaciously to the absolute truth of our own meta-narrative. We live the bifurcated existence advocated by the mid-19th century Russian *maskil,* Judah Leib Gordon, as the Haskalah ideal: "Be a Jew in your home and a man outside it."

J.L. Gordon's call to divorce our Judaism from our humanity has serious, if not tragic, consequences for both. His approach engenders the psychological phenomenon of cognitive dissonance, the mental state resulting from conflict between stated beliefs and way of living. This state of affairs causes mental suffering and is unsustainable in the long term. If we venture to contemplate our situation, we are dissatisfied with our religious lives. Our children sense this, and it has become increasingly difficult to pass on our tradition to the next generation.

I propose an alternative approach, which I refer to as the Theological Uncertainty Principle, that empowers us to engage with a world which questions the existence of objective truths, is suspicious of authority, and is skeptical of all systems of belief — while at the same time constructs a framework for belief and practice that is authentic and intellectually honest.

The Theological Uncertainty Principle

"The Theological Uncertainty Principle" emerges from the teachings of Rabbi Mordechai Yosef Leiner of Izbica (The Ishbitzer Rebbe, 1800-1854). Let us consider the following commentary offered in his work, Mei HaShiloah on Parshat Yitro:

*I (Anokhi) am the Lord your God." The verse does not state "Ani," for if it stated "Ani" that would imply that the Holy One Blessed Be He revealed then the totality of His light to Israel, precluding the possibility of further delving into his words, for everything is already revealed. The letter "khaph" (of Ano**kh**i) however, denotes that the revelation is not complete, rather merely an estimation and comparison to the light which God will reveal in the future." [R. Mordechai Yosef is referring to the Hebrew grammatical phenomenon called the **Khaph ha dimayon**, the **khaph** of comparison or approximation.]*

According to R. Mordechai Yosef, then, the revelation at Sinai, the paradigm of all subsequent revelations, must be approached with great humility and comprehended as a partial and incomplete picture of the divine, merely an approximation of the divine truth.

This understanding is at odds with the traditionally held belief that the revelation at Sinai was perfect, that the Torah and how we generally interpret it was passed down more or less complete from Moses to the Elders of Israel and so on, and that subsequent Jewish history is an effort to recapture the clarity of that pristine and intimate moment with God. Not only does the Mei HaShiloah contradict this approach, he goes so far as to assert that insisting on perfectly clear revelation is tantamount to idolatry:

"The reason that Commandment of Thou shall not make for yourself a graven image [follow s the commandment of anokhi]…is because a graven image is cut according to specific di mensions, perfect, lacking nothing.…this is to teach us that nothing is revealed to man completely."

Total comprehension of the Divine leaves no room for human development and is a distortion of the revelation. The depths of the divine reality and the divine will are infinite and must necessarily unfold over time. The perception of the revelation at Sinai as complete turns out to be but a projection of ourselves. We would be creating God in ***our*** image.

The ramifications of this alternative approach are monumental on both the meta-narrative and the individual-religious planes. On the meta-narrative level, R. Mordechai Yosef teaches us that a system with pretensions to explain everything in the most certain terms must be naïve and ignorant of the complex and constantly changing world in which we live.

Instead, oOur meta-narrative must embody a principle which is diametrically opposed to the very nature of meta-narratives: uncertainty. The Theological Uncertainty Principle would lead to deliver a Jewish tradition less characterized by commitment to an idealized, nostalgic memory of the past and not obsessed with reconstructing eras of perceived perfection and greater authority, but rather engaged in the constantly changing present with its infinite possibilities and surprises.

On the individual-religious plane, prior to this approach we generally equated certainty and steadfast faith as being more "religious." In fact, the "Theological Uncertainty Principle" asserts that the exact opposite is true. Uncertainty is an essential part of the God-created spiritual topography which we inhabit. Knowledge does not require Faith. Faith can only exist where uncertainty reigns. The obstacles we overcome and the lives we live in the landscape of uncertainty is spiritually edifying; it is precisely here that we develop as devoted religious human beings.

The Theological Uncertainty Principle provides an opening for authentic humility and a more profound faith in God.

This Shavuot: A time of reckoning

If we look to the Torah for why we do what we do, then we must make sure that the outcomes of those actions promote peace, compassion and human perfection

On Shavuot, we commemorate the giving of the Torah at Sinai. Traditionally, it has been a celebration of renewed commitment to the precepts of the Torah and its study. It is also a celebration of our becoming a nation within the context of Divine revelation. This is a very powerful story.

There is another aspect of Shavuot which is especially germane today — and it is connected to Yom Kippur. If we calculate the biblical sequence of events following Shavuot, we see that the giving of the second set of Tablets of the Law took place on Yom Kippur. It is for this reason that Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik used to say that, while Shavuot was the holiday of the Written Law, Yom Kippur was the holiday of the Oral Law.

I believe that the connection between Yom Kippur and Shavuot should work in the opposite direction as well.

The primary characteristic of Yom Kippur is that it is a day of introspection and soul searching, *heshbon nefesh*, a day of accounting. Shavuot should also be considered a time of *heshbon nefesh*, specifically regarding how our society embodies the values and precepts of the Torah as the ongoing unfolding of the revelation at Sinai. We should pay attention to what the Torah itself says about the impact it is supposed to have in the world -- and how we are doing in meeting those expectations. That is the soul-searching I propose for this Shavuot.

Note that the Torah assumes that living in accordance with its Laws will have a natural appeal to the sensibilities of nations of the world. They will readily perceive the superior value and good in the way of life that the Torah engenders:

“Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations who shall hear all these statutes, and say, ‘Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people.’” Deut 4: 6

Maimonides reiterates this in his Guide to the Perplexed III Ch. 31, 32:

“…The sole object of the Law is to benefit us. Thus we explained the Scriptural passage, ‘for our good always, that He might preserve us alive, as it is this day’” (Deut. 6:24). Again, “which shall hear all those statutes (ḥuḳḳim), and say, surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people” (ibid. 4:6)…”o establish proper relations in society, to diminish evil, to train in good manners or to warn against bad habits.”

Even more so, according to classic Hasidic theology, the purpose of the Torah is to bring one to *Dveikut*, a consciousness of cleaving to and love of God:

The personal piety which the Torah is expected to engender should be readily recognizable by others. In the words of the Hasidic master, R. Simcha Bunim of Parshyscha, a person's piety may be discerned by how devoutly they fulfill the commandment of "Love they neighbor as yourself."

The Torah and its sages are supposed to propagate peace in the world:

This [namely the law that the Halacha must be transgressed in order to save a human life] teaches that the judgments of the Torah do not [bring] vengeance to the world, but rather bring mercy, kindness, and peace to the world. (Maimonides, Laws of the Sabbath Ch. 2.)

And, finally, the well-known conclusion to a number of Talmudic tractates:

Rabbi Elazar said that Rabbi Ḥanina said: Torah scholars increase peace in the world, as it is said: "And all your children shall be taught of the Lord, and great shall be the peace of your children."

We see from this that the ideal of a Torah-driven society is a perfection of the characteristics of the individual, middot and piety, and the creation of a society that fosters love and peace in the world. This, to me, is a sort of Torah-dictated litmus test of how Torah-based society is doing in achieving this vision.

At present, the assessment isn't very good — from the actual influence of our political leaders on how our society is perceived, both from within and without, to the peace, middot and piety engendered by our religious leaders.

Consider:

• The OECD Social Institutions & Gender Index has ranked Israel the lowest of all OECD countries in gender equality (ranking behind examples of enlightened governance such as Turkey). This is true partially because of the inferior status which women suffer in the religious courts which govern issues of personal status.

• Prominent religious leaders continue to display deep-founded contempt for the healthy Zionist enterprise and the idea of an Israeli society based upon fairness and shared responsibility by vociferously opposing the conscription of Haredi men to the IDF. Chief Rabbi Yitzchak Yosef went so far as to "threaten" mass exodus of Haredim from Israel if conscription were forced upon them.

• It is painful to cite the outrageous, genocidal statements made by ministers in our government and supported by prominent rabbis. Rabbi Eliyahu Mali, head of a yeshiva in

Jaffa said we should kill everyone in Gaza, including babies. Heritage Minister Rabbi Amichai Eliyahu called for striking the Gaza Strip with a nuclear

bomb. These statements and others like them contributed to Israel being hauled before the ICC recently.

• We see third-world style corruption in the recent reporting about the Transportation Ministry, as well as incompetence and lack of taking responsibility for the 2021 Meron disaster which claimed the lives of 45 people.

Instead of justice, fairness, piety and loving of peace we find too much corruption, selfishness, worship of power and moral callousness.

The Hasidic master, R. Nahum of Chernobyl was often to say that the Torah is akin to a mirror; a person will perceive in it according to their own character. A person of noble constitution will perceive a benevolent, gracious and humane Torah, while a crude and vulgar individual

will perceive a very flawed Torah. The Torah, in other words, is not alchemy; it cannot transform base metal into gold. The therapeutic, healing and perfecting qualities to which the Torah lays claim are 'user dependent.'

The outcome of this realization is that we who choose to live according to the Torah cannot absolve ourselves from the moral responsibility of choices or paths that we help enable. If we point to the Torah as motivating or justifying our actions, we also need to examine the consequences of those actions directly, from a Torah perspective, and without apologetic naivete.

This Shavuot, we can't just focus on celebrating Torah, but need to take a hard, realistic look at how the Torah is embodied in our society, in practical ways, and to explore how best to rectify our society's shortcomings, especially those which are propagated in the name of the Torah.

That is why the opportunity afforded by Shavuot to foster more of the soul-searching normally associated with Yom Kippur is so important. We see, increasingly, that our actions and approaches are not engendering the world vision set forth by the Torah. We need to hold a mirror to ourselves and ask difficult questions such as: What is motivating our approach? Are we truly acting altruistically, *l'Shem Shamayim*, and not because of vested interests? And if our actions — the Torah as we live it — don't promote peace, compassion and human perfection, what do we need to do differently?

God must be saying, “Do these guys work for me?”

Once again I find myself writing about women’s ordination as rabbis. I am trying to understand why. The stated reasons for the stubborn refusal of some sectors of what could be called “orthodoxy” to accept this phenomenon are not convincing. We find weak halachic arguments such as women being ineligible to carry authority, or the need to protect “the boundaries of mainstream Orthodoxy,” along with other such vapid public-policy arguments. When multiple poor arguments all lead miraculously to the same conclusion, something else is going on. The significance of this question goes beyond the issue of women rabbis. It touches upon what religion in general — and our Torah in particular — are about.

The key to understanding what else is going on is the recurring phrase “mainstream Orthodoxy.”

The term “orthodoxy,” of course, does not appear in the *Shulhan Arukh* or any other code of Jewish law. It is a sociological classification, not a religious denomination. Yet the Chief Rabbinate in Israel views itself as reinforcing the boundaries of an ill-defined mainstream of a halakhic non-entity called “orthodoxy.” On this basis, they seek to deny women the ability to take exams to become rabbis, depriving the Torah world of gifted educators and teachers of Torah, wisdom and knowledge.

I assume that the rabbis in the Rabbinate have the best interests of his community and the Jewish people at heart (though sometimes I question that assumption). That is why it is so important to understand the dynamics of what is happening. Post-modernity is a very unfriendly place for traditional religions, Judaism included. Peter Berger, the great sociologist of modern religion, characterized the difference between traditional and modern societies. Modernity, he wrote, is characterized by the ability to choose. One can choose anything today — even their gender. In traditional societies such choices are unthinkable. It is the open-endedness, lack of clarity, and ability to choose and create one’s own reality that causes a great deal of anxiety for people committed to tradition.

I count myself among those people. I have studied with them in yeshiva, taught some of them *Yoreh De’ah*, sat with some of them in Rav Soloveitchik’s shiur, and — most importantly — share their uncompromising commitment to Torah and mitzvot.

So let us return to the “mainstream.”

There are two ways to respond to this challenging situation. The first, chosen by the Israeli Rabbinate, is to withdraw into the tradition and seek solace, comfort, and security — the "security" of belonging to the mainstream. The second is to view challenges and change as opportunities to grow into uncharted territory.

As tempting as this first possibility may seem, it is not the traditional Jewish response. Tradition is all about pushing up against our comfort zone. The Torah is not about making us feel complacent and self-satisfied. The Torah views that mindset as contemptuous, as the very attitude that precipitates exile. Abraham, our forefather, was hailed by our Sages for his courageous ability to stand contra the "mainstream." They tell us that Abraham was called *HaIvri* to signify that the entire world was on one side while he stood on the other.

Furthermore, the prophets of ancient Israel carried on the tradition of Abraham; if we can say anything about them, it is that they possessed the nasty habit of making the mainstream feel very uncomfortable.

By invoking the mainstream, the rabbinate is effectively saying that there are no substantive arguments to be made against women serving as rabbis. We should not tolerate women rabbis because they push us out of our collective comfort zone.

If we applaud and look to our tradition solely for providing us comfort, then in the end we are worshipping only ourselves and our convenience. The great critics of religion — from Marx to Nietzsche to Freud — would be entirely justified in their critiques.

Rabbinic ordination for women, as important as it is, is secondary to what the mainstream response to the issue symptomizes: paternalistic self-contentment and spiritual laziness.

When new challenges arise, our tradition has always possessed the courage to view them as opportunities rather than threats. I believe that God sends us these challenges to keep us spiritually alive. The complacency of the mainstream is spiritual death; it sees life and vibrancy as a threat.

And here, what are we talking about? Women seeking not only to deepen their understanding and commitment to the Torah, but to be included in the chain of our tradition — our *mesorah*. If I had any anthropomorphic tendencies, I would say that God must be scratching His head in disbelief, saying of the Rabbinate, "Do those guys work for me?"

A Way Forward: “And what does the Lord ask of you?”

Our tradition demands both **obedience** and **conscience**. Obedience is acquiescence to a higher external voice, one that can save us from the narcissistic illusion that the world belongs to us and revolves around us. The model of God as Lawgiver, who sits on high, is a cornerstone of Jewish faith from earliest times. It is a basic assumption upon which the Torah is founded.

But the Torah also recognizes and reinforces personal moral sensibilities and conscience. When Avraham invokes the principle of fairness in his argument with God about Sedom — *“That be far from Thee… Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?”* (Bereishit 18:25) — he is not relying on an external revelation of God’s will, but on his own refined intuition and moral conviction. In contrast to revealed divine law, conscience is the higher voice we experience internally; we disregard it at great peril.

Much of what is occurring today in the Jewish Orthodox world, both in Israel and the diaspora, revolves around the tension between obedience to authority and personal autonomy, responsibility, and conscience. We need a path to help us navigate this thorny problem. That path begins with a deeper understanding of the nature of the Torah as God’s revelation — and our part in it.

In this piece I present a model that I hope Jews of all affiliations will find helpful and meaningful. We must understand that there are, in a sense, **two Torahs**: the **Torah of the Heart** and the **Torah of the Mind**. The relationship between them must be navigated through a process some have called *berur* — discernment — which draws upon both our intellectual and intuitive faculties. These ideas are not new, but I hope to frame them in a way that will speak to the modern Jew seeking a way through this quagmire. At the end of this piece, I will revisit the question of ordaining women rabbis as an application of this model.

I. Torah of the Mind and Torah of the Heart

It is told of the Brisker Rav, R. Yitzhak Zev Soloveitchik, that when litigants came before him to adjudicate a disagreement, he would place his prayer shawl over his head so as not to look upon them. Only after rendering his decision would he greet them warmly as guests in his home. His behavior reflected the biblical prohibition to “fear no man” (Devarim 17:17) in the administration of justice and to show no favoritism, even toward the weak (Shemot 23:3; Vayikra 19:15). By covering his eyes, the Brisker Rav modeled the principle that justice

is — and must be — blind. The administration of justice must be impersonal and, to the best of the adjudicator's ability, objective.

Yet this anecdote illustrates only part of the picture. Reality is often more complex than any halakhic text can anticipate. At times, the judge must access his intuitive, subjective side if he is to reach a just outcome.

II. Balance

These two Torahs are distinguished by how we approach and experience them. The Torah of the Mind is experienced as originating from an external authority — God speaking to us through the text. We struggle with our intellect to comprehend the law. In contrast to the formal halakha, the Torah of the Heart extends into the grey area of judgment and values and is accessed through an intuitive faculty that rests in the heart, not in the mind. We experience this not as a voice of authority but as our own inner voice.

Focusing exclusively on either the Torah of the Mind or the Torah of the Heart can lead to serious — even dangerous — distortions. If we neglect the legal aspect, we risk being swayed by the transient values of the day and by our own passions and biases. We could end up worshipping ourselves and calling it Torah, emptying the idea of a divinely revealed law of any substantial meaning. This is the very real fear of many right-wing Orthodox Jews.

On the other hand, silencing our inner voice and focusing excessively on submission and obedience to the formal side of halakha opens us to the hazardous possibility of becoming "a scoundrel who lives within the letter of the Law" — *naval birshut haTorah*. This can manifest in subtle ways and aligns with what Erich Fromm described as the "authoritarian personality":

"...for the authoritarian character can do nothing but submit. The authoritarian character worships the past. What has been, will eternally be. To wish or to work for something that has not yet been before is crime or madness. The miracle of creation — and creation is always a miracle — is outside the range of his emotional experience." (*Escape From Freedom*, New York, 1941, pp. 168–169)

The authoritarian personality is blind to the unique circumstances of the present, seeing them only through the lens of the past, and is incapable of appreciating the challenge of what is new and fresh. When this attitude meets the Torah, our relationship with God risks becoming stagnant and ossified. Superficially, such an approach may appear more religiously devoted because of its conservative predisposition. In fact, it is characterized by fear and a lack of faith in the Torah's ability to meet the challenges of the present authentically. The authoritarian approach contributes to the dilution of public discourse, to a paucity of understanding, and to spiritual mediocrity.

III. Recognizing Conflict: Honesty Is the Best Policy

The relationship between the Torah of the Heart and the Torah of the Mind is nuanced and complex. At times the two Torahs nurture and reinforce each other; at other times they stand in tension. This should not surprise us, since as human beings we often experience a similar conflict between our minds and our hearts.

The first step in any conflict resolution is simply to recognize the conflict, even when we have no immediate solution. The honesty and struggle involved in acknowledging the tension is itself edifying. One may even argue that the most significant aspect of the model of the two Torahs is precisely the edifying work of grappling with the conflicts that arise between them.

"Our Sages of the Talmud possessed honesty and courage. They had absolute faith in the Torah and did not fear or repress the conflicts which they saw."

Consider the following midrash:

"And the son of an Israelite woman, whose father was an Egyptian, went out among the children of Israel…" (Vayikra 24:10). R. Hiyya taught that he "went out" as a result of the section of genealogies. He attempted to pitch his tent in the camp of Dan, claiming descent from Dan through his mother. He was told, however, that tribal affiliation follows the father. He appealed to Moses' court and lost — and in his anguish, he cursed God.

Another exposition (Kohelet 4:1) interprets the verse as referring to *mamzerim*: *"And behold the tears of the oppressed…"* If their parents sinned, why should these children suffer? The midrash identifies the Sanhedrin — acting under the authority of Torah law — as the "oppressors," while God declares, *"I shall be the one to comfort them."*

This midrash identifies the son of the Egyptian man and the Israelite woman as a *mamzer* and highlights the conflict between the halakha of *mamzerut* and basic fairness — between the Torah of the Mind and the Torah of the Heart. Our Sages extend understanding and compassion toward the one who cursed God, casting Moshe and the Sanhedrin in the role of oppressors. Moshe and the Sanhedrin represent the Torah of the Mind; God's voice in this midrash is that of the Torah of the Heart. No practical resolution is offered. I believe our Sages, by boldly casting Moshe and the Sanhedrin as the villains and invoking the poignant verses from Kohelet, intended to shock us into grappling with the issue.

In another midrash, our Sages go so far as to say that Torah study itself may interfere with perceiving God's presence:

"And Ya'akov awoke from his sleep (mishnato)…" R. Yohanan reads this as *mimishnato* — "from his study of Torah" (Bereishit Rabbah, Vayetzei 69:7).

Here, the Torah of the Mind is portrayed as a barrier to the Torah of the Heart. The intellectual activity of Torah study may, at times, dull the intuitive faculty that perceives the presence of God.

IV. What Renders Subjective Value Judgments Valid? The Process of Discernment

When we encounter a conflict between the Torah of the Heart and the Torah of the Mind, we must navigate terrain that resists systematization. There are no magic formulas. At best, we can outline a process of *berur* — discernment — the subtle exercise of judgment within a cognitive and spiritual context that can yield reliable conclusions.

a) The Cognitive Elements of Discernment — What Enters the Internal Conversation?

The values associated with the Torah of the Heart both emerge from, and are a priori to, the formal halakha.

From where did Avraham derive the principle of fairness he invoked in his argument with God over Sedom? On what revealed criteria is the Torah deemed "wise and understanding" in the eyes of the nations (Devarim 4:6)? What could have led the Rashba to deviate so dramatically from Torah law and describe strict adherence as potentially destructive to the world? And why should we trust R. Tukichinsky's appeal to sound judgment when it effectively overrides Torah law and risks rendering it a dead letter?

The examples of Avraham and the nations suggest that these meta-principles are *a priori* — axiomatic and part of what it means to be human. As a matter of faith, we may say that these sentiments and moral convictions are a subtle form of divine revelation, rooted in the fact that human beings are created in God's image. For the Rashba and R. Tukichinsky, we may add that their lifelong immersion in the Torah of the Mind refined their intuitions, enabling them to perceive the Torah of the Heart with clarity.

In summary, **three cognitive elements must be brought into conversation** when charting a course of action in the realm of the Torah of the Heart:

- The externally experienced voice of halakha or divine revelation
- A priori human judgment
- Sensitivity born of devoted study and contemplation of the Torah

A striking example of this appears in the responsa of Rabbi Yitzchak Yaakov Weiss, head of the *Eida Chareidis* rabbinical court in Jerusalem. In issuing a lenient ruling in a case of *mamzerut*, he quotes an earlier authority:

"...when they came before him with some question, first he would consider with his own reason what seems to be true according to human common sense (*sekhel enoshi*), and afterwards research according to the laws of our holy Torah. I too, when a question of *agunah* or the like comes before me, if it is clear to me according to reason and what makes sense to people that something is true, then I make every effort to find a leniency according to the laws of our holy Torah." *(Minchas Yitzchak IX:150)*

Here, the Minchas Yitzchak begins with the moral value of freeing a chained woman and with healthy common sense — the Torah of the Heart — and then proceeds to work within halakhic principles — the Torah of the Mind — to reach the desired outcome.

There is a delicate dance between mind and heart within the consciousness of the *posek*. In this case, the dynamic is explicit, which makes the description so striking, but it may also operate unconsciously. The *posek* begins with refined intuition and then moves to formal legal analysis, which he consciously or unconsciously bends to align with that intuition. Crucially, this intuition is universal and consistent with the biblical tradition of Avraham arguing with God and with the common sense attributed to the nations.

b) The Context of Discernment

Returning to the conclusion of the Rashba's responsum:

"...In any case the adjudicators need to act only after serious consideration and deliberation. Their actions must always be for the sake of Heaven."

The Rashba identifies **three conditions** for setting aside Torah law:

- **Serious consideration** — an introspective process
- **Deliberation** — no individual may make such determinations alone; humility requires listening to others
- **Purity of motivation**

On the basis of these principles, the Torah of the Heart and the Torah of the Mind are brought into genuine conversation.

V. Important to Note...

We have presented several instances in which intuition, common sense, or moral conviction — what I have called the Torah of the Heart — shapes, influences, and at times even contradicts the objective halakhic principles of the Torah of the Mind. Not all such instances are the same, however.

In the biblical narrative, Avraham's moral conviction stands in opposition to the revelation of God Himself, not merely to halakha as filtered through history and human interpretation. The example from Maimonides' Code is relatively mild compared to the responsum of the Rashba, who advocates abrogating Torah law for an entire community and replacing it with punitive measures that themselves violate Torah law. Each situation is different and requires its own quality of discernment. The level of clarity and moral conviction necessary to argue with God is not the same as the inner conviction required to reinterpret a *tosafot* or adjust a *gemara*. Cases that do not involve laws of great severity — or that involve no explicit halakhic prohibition at all but rather the modification or abrogation of *minhag*, generally accepted practice — require a different kind of discernment.

For example: a very strong halakhic case can be made for allowing the ordination of women as rabbis. (This is not the place for a full halakhic analysis; this post is already too long. I refer anyone interested to Rabbi Michael Broyde's comprehensive and well-reasoned article on the subject.) In my view, the only real halakhic objection that may be raised is that this was not the *minhag* until now.

The decision Rabbi Sperber and I made to confer *semikha* upon our students — two of whom were women — is, despite its novel application, entirely consistent with the dynamics of halakhic and meta-halakhic decision-making as they stretch from the Bible through the midrashim of our Talmudic sages, our medieval authorities, and down to the later authorities of our own day.

Plato once said that one who loves philosophy cannot deny its pleasures to others. This is even more true regarding Torah study. The intellectual and emotional effort to bring the Torah of the Mind and the Torah of the Heart into balance is the fuel of the edifying process that forges us into the image of God we are responsible to become. This is why *Talmud Torah*, the intensive study of Torah, has stood at the center of Jewish religious life for centuries, if not longer.

It is ironic that some who view themselves as defenders of tradition and faith would deny Torah knowledge to women. Advocating such a position is not only morally reprehensible but denies the healing and edifying power of God's Torah and its centrality in Judaism. It reflects a divorce of the Torah of the Mind from the Torah of the Heart. To nurture and transform us — men and women — into the image of God we are meant to become, the two Torahs must engage in their subtle dance.

VI. In Summary

We have outlined two aspects of the Torah: the Torah of the Mind and the Torah of the Heart. To arrive at proper action, the two must be brought into conversation. This requires

serious introspection, the ability to listen to others, and the requisite human understanding, commitment to, and knowledge of, the Torah.

“The moral grey area of the Torah of the Heart is not necessarily a comfortable place to dwell. It is very tempting to be safe and avoid ambiguities by clinging to the perceived certainties of divine revelation and the *Shulchan Arukh* exclusively. That safety, though, is an illusion. The Torah of the Heart places the burden of freedom and responsibility upon our shoulders. As a Breslover friend of mine once said, ‘Life is an extreme sport.’”

There is no simple answer to the eternal question echoed in the words of the prophet Micah: *“What does the Lord ask of you?”*




אנכי ה'
לא יהיה
לא תשא
לא
זכור את
עבד את
לא תרצח
לא תנאף
לא תגנב
לא תענה
לא תחמד

Beit Midrash Har’el

Jerusalem

A unique Orthodox Beit Midrash where men and women learn together at the highest level, preparing for smicha and advanced Torah leadership.

Our mission is to cultivate Torah scholars who combine intellectual rigor, spiritual depth, moral courage, and a commitment to confronting the challenges of modernity with honesty and integrity.

Learn more about our programs, classes, and community,
or inquire about applying to the Har’el Semicha Program.

Visit: www.studyharel.org
Email: info@har-el.org

חג שמח!