

# Maamarei Mordechai

הסבר לפי ממש פשוט

Parshas Tazria 5785

D. Mordechai Schlachter

Special laws are learned out from our eternal Torah.

דָּבַר אֶל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר אִשָּׁה כִּי תִזְרִיעַ וַיִּלְדָּה זָכָר וְטָמְאָה שִׁבְעַת יָמִים כִּימֵי נִדָּה  
דִּוְתָה תִטָּמָא:

“Speak to Bnei Yisroel saying, ‘A woman because she will issue seed, and she will birth a son, and she shall be tameh for seven days, like the days of her menstrual cycle rule her tameh.” (Vayikra 12:2).

The Torah once again proves itself to be well-beyond the capacity of human writing. The Torah, here, is so far ahead of the science of the times, that it proves it was not man-written. Notice how the Torah does not write “a woman who has a son.” The word for pregnancy is *hara* as in “And she became pregnant and birthed Kayin.” (Bereishis 4:1). That word is used plenty of times in the Torah, when indicating a woman is having a child. (Ibid 16:4 – Yishmael, 21:2 – Yitzchok, 25:1 – Yaakov and Eisav). Here, the Torah is teaching something beyond regular observable science. It says that the woman is the one that issues seed. As it takes two parts to create a child, here the Torah is referring exclusively to the woman’s portion – the egg. What can be learned out?

This pasuk teaches that any issue from a Jewish woman is fully Jewish. This is matrilineal heritage. There is another place that Chazal try to learn it out, but as written *infra*, this pasuk states it a bit more clearly. There came out of Bnei Yisroel a man who was born to a Yisroel woman and an Egyptian father. (Vayikra 24:10). He fought with another – a fully Yisroel man. (Ibid). The man from the Egyptian father blasphemed Hashem’s name. (Ibid 24:11). He was then stoned as a Yisroel would be. (Ibid 24:23). Since he was treated like a Yisroel it shows that the son of a Yisroel mother is Jewish, even with a gentile father. However, there are some difficulties with this passage.

The Torah says the father was Egyptian, but he could have been from the eirav rav – the mixed multitude that left with Bnei Yisroel from Mitzrayim. The Torah does not say much about what happened to them after they left with Bnei Yisroel. The eirav rav might have converted. They almost certainly joined Bnei Yisroel in their homes in Goshen for the sederim on the eve of Makos Bechoros. The Torah only allowed those that were circumcised to eat korban pesach. These eirav rav were likely other indentured servants and servants of Pharaoh that were escaping Hashem’s destruction of the country.

Their joining Bnei Yisroel and leaving with them, and then not being referred to again, could mean they converted. That can also be why the Torah says the “convert and the citizen” have the same laws by korban Pesach. (Shmos 12:19). It is referring to these people. Also, the Torah uses that expression a lot. For example, “there is one Torah for the citizen and then stranger.” (Ibid 12:49). The stranger is mentioned with the citizen by Shabbos (ibid 20:10 and 23:12), chagim (Vayikra 16:29), and kosher (ibid 17:12).

Lest one argue that the eirav rav only converted by Makos Bechoros and this incident happened in the second year – giving no time for the child to become an adult – the incident is only mentioned there because it is sandwiched in between the chagim and laws of shmitah. The Torah is teaching who a Yisroel is and that all strangers and citizens get treated the same. The problem seems to be, though, that the Torah is saying at the incident of the blasphemer that the law is the same for the stranger and the citizen alike. (Ibid 24:16). It could infer that the son of an Egyptian and a Yisroel woman would have to be treated like a convert. After all, tribal status comes from the father. Perhaps such a child has to convert officially to be Jewish. The Torah repeats the rule that there shall be one rule for citizens and the converts when the man is executed. (ibid 24:22). And this man was born to an Egyptian, not a convert. Therefore, regardless of being half stranger and half Yisroel he is treated like a full Yisroel.

Our pasuk is a clearer source. If a woman issues seed, regardless of who the father is, then that child has the status of her son. “When the days of her tahara are full for her son or her daughter...” (Ibid 12:6). In Mitzrayim, the decree against the children were against the “sons” not the “males.” “When a Hebrew woman has a child...if it is a son, it should be left to die.” (Shmos 1:16). The Torah could have called it a male. Using the term “son” instead shows that any male issue from a Hebrew / Yisroel woman is a son. A full Yisroel son. The Torah talks woman-centric in the current parsha. Any issue from her – regardless of the father’s status – shall be her son: fully Yisroel, fully Jewish.

Another lesson to learn from this pasuk is the status of a child from invitro-fertilization or Intrauterine Insemination. “A woman that issues her seed.” The pasuk could have just said she gave birth. Conceiving is obvious. The use of the extra phrase means, even if her seed is not joined in the normal fashion. If she issued the seed and she births it then it is hers. Surrogacy would not make it her son because it is not her seed issue. That is someone else’s and a different set of rules. When it comes to IVF or IUI, so long as it is her seed, and she ends up delivering it, then it is her “son” and she remains tameh and tahar for the days mentioned in the Torah. If it is her seed but someone else delivers, she does not become tameh. Also, would it be her child because she does not have both, her seed and her birth? The surrogate would also have a question as it is her birth but not her seed.

The Torah was hinting at this process by using the term “a woman who issues seed and births a male.” It did not use the regular term of she gets pregnant. That would indicate the natural way. It went far ahead of its time to predict a future when woman can conceive in other ways.

There is the extra word “because.” This means because it is her seed and because it is natural that she would have seed that requires inseminating. Here, the Torah again showed the science well ahead of its time. The understanding of the menstrual cycle and reason for uterine bleeding only became known in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The Torah already equated “because she has seed” to “the menstrual impurity.” The Torah is teaching that one way or another she will become tameh from her seed. Either because she conceives, she births, and she become tameh. Or she does not conceive and it sheds and she become tameh. The Torah taught what man could not have known at the time.