



# Likkutei Sichos

Volume 17 | Metzora | Sichah 1

## The Interpreters

---

Translated by Rabbi Eliezer Robbins  
Edited by Rabbi Y. Eliezer Danzinger

A note on the translation: Rounded parentheses and square brackets reflect their use in the original *sichah*; squiggly parentheses are interpolations of the translator or editor. The footnotes in squiggly parentheses in this translation are those of the translators or editors, and do not correspond to the footnotes in the original. Great effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the translation, while at the same time striving for readability. However, the translation carries no official authority. As in all translations, the possibility of inadvertent errors exists. **Your feedback is needed — please send all comments to: [info@projectlikkuteisichos.org](mailto:info@projectlikkuteisichos.org)**

## 1.

### REPETITION

In his commentary on the verse,<sup>1</sup> “The *kohen* shall take from the blood of the *asham*,<sup>2</sup> and the *kohen* shall place it on the *tnuch*, תְּנוּחַ, of the ear of the person being purified,” Rashi quotes the word “*tnuch*” and explains: “The middle wall of the ear. The word *tnuch* is unknown to me, but the interpreters<sup>3</sup> call it *tendros*.”

We need to clarify: Although the word “*tnuch*” is uncommon in the Torah, it does appear **previously** in the *Chumash* in *parshas Tzav*,<sup>4</sup> and earlier, in *parshas Tetzaveh*.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, in *parshas Tetzaveh*, Rashi **explains** the term: “*Tnuch* — This is the cartilage, the middle wall within the ear, called {in Old French} *tenros*.” As such, why does Rashi need to repeat his explanation in our *parshah*? He already explained the word “*tnuch*” **previously!**

Regardless, if Rashi had reason not to be content with his explanation in *parshas Tetzaveh* and needed to reiterate his explanation in our *parshah* where “*tnuch*” is mentioned again, he should have repeated his explanation **previously** in *parshas Tzav*!

## 2.

### A LACK OF BREVITY

Seemingly, this difficulty can be resolved simply: There (in *parshas Tzav*) Rashi prefaces,<sup>6</sup> “I have explained the entire passage involving the investiture in *parshas VeAtah Tetzaveh*.” So Rashi does not even need to

---

<sup>1</sup> *Vayikra* 14:14.

<sup>2</sup> {Commonly translated as “a guilt offering.”}

<sup>3</sup> {Superficially, this term refers to early biblical interpreters; the deeper meaning behind Rashi’s use of this term will be discussed in detail in sec. 7, below.}

<sup>4</sup> *Vayikra* 8:23,24.

<sup>5</sup> *Shemos* 29:20.

<sup>6</sup> *Vayikra* 8:5.

repeat his explanation of “*tnuch*,” since it was previously explained in *parshas Tetzaveh*, which deals with the same topic. In contrast, in our *parshah*, the word “*tnuch*” is mentioned in a completely different context.

This still needs to be clarified, however, since Rashi’s wording in our *parshah* implies clearly that Rashi’s intent is not only to repeat his explanation of the word *tnuch* from *parshas Tetzaveh*. For in his commentary in our *parshah*, Rashi **adds** to, and **diverges** from, his commentary in *parshas Tetzaveh*. Rashi writes: (a) “The word *tnuch* is unknown to me,” and (b) “the **interpreters** call it...” In light of these differences, we are compelled to say that Rashi’s intent here is to explain something **new** about “*tnuch*” which is necessary in order to understand **our parshah**.

[In addition, there are several difficulties in his commentary {supporting the contention that Rashi’s intent is not simply to restate his earlier interpretation}: a) Why *does* Rashi have to repeat his explanation of a word that he gave previously; b) Even if there is a need to do so, it would have sufficed to explain **succinctly**, “the middle wall of the ear.” (A *succinct* explanation of the word *tnuch* would be similar to his *succinct* explanation of the word “*bohen*” that appears later in our verse:<sup>7</sup> In *parshas Tetzaveh*, Rashi already explained, “This is the thumb, and {the blood was to be applied to} the middle joint,” so in contrast, in our *parshah*, Rashi writes concisely, “This is the thumb.”)]

### 3.

UNKNOWN TO ME

We also need to clarify:

- a) What does Rashi mean by saying, “The word *tnuch* is unknown to me”? If his intention is to say that the word “*tnuch*” does denote “the middle wall of the ear,” there are many nouns in the Torah which

---

<sup>7</sup> *Vayikra* 14:14.

have no semantic connection to the items they describe. [We see this even in our verse itself: Rashi explains that *bohen* means “thumb”; he does not say, “The word “*bohen*” is unknown to me,” even though he notes no connection between the word “*bohen*” and “thumb.”]

- b) Why does Rashi write that it is “**unknown** to me” — using an expression that he uses nowhere else in his commentary — rather than an expression (that he does use elsewhere) such as, “I don’t know,” or the like ?
- c) By writing “the **interpreters** call it *tendros*,” Rashi’s obvious point is that *tendros* is a translation of the word “*tnuch*” in Old French.<sup>8</sup> As such, Rashi should have said (as is his practice), “In Old French, it is translated as *tedros*” (or, “*tendros*’ in Old French”).

[It is difficult to posit that Rashi himself did not know the translation of **this word** specifically, and so needed to rely upon the “interpreters” to translate this term.]

- d) Even if we could come up with an explanation as to why Rashi doesn’t specify, “in Old French,” it remains unclear why Rashi uses specifically such an irregular appellation, “the interpreters,” rather than (a commonplace title, such as) “the commentaries,” “the authors,” or the like (as Rashi writes elsewhere,<sup>9</sup> “Menachem ben Saruk<sup>10</sup> explained it,” or “...classified it,” etc.).

---

<sup>8</sup> {In the Hebrew original, “בלע”ז,” an acronym for “בלשון עם זר”; lit., “in the (local) foreign (non-Jewish) language.” For Rashi, the “foreign language” he referred to was Old French.}

<sup>9</sup> *Bereishis* 15:2, 30:8, 41; and in **several** other places.

<sup>10</sup> {Lived in Spain (c. 920-980), and compiled *Mechaber*, a dictionary of the Hebrew language which is quoted frequently by Rashi.}

## 4.

### AN UNKNOWN EXPLANATION

The explanation: Rashi's intent in writing here, "The word *tnuch* is unknown to me" (based on *pshat*<sup>11</sup> — Rashi's approach in his Torah commentary) is to negate the explanation of the *Toras Kohanim* on our verse, which clarifies the connection between "*tnuch*" and the "middle wall" of the ear (as discussed below in section 5). Since the explanation of the *Toras Kohanim* does **not** accord with *pshat*, Rashi **precludes** it by saying, "the word *tnuch* is unknown to me."

(Although Rashi's approach is not to **negate** other interpretations, but rather to begin immediately with his own based on *pshat*, and to disregard halachic interpretations,) Rashi had to negate the interpretation of the *Toras Kohanim* because quite a few of Rashi's remarks on our *parshah* (and on *Sefer Vayikra* generally) are based on *Toras Kohanim*, as **Rashi himself** notes in several instances. Moreover, in his commentary on the previous verse, Rashi quotes the **beginning** of the *Toras Kohanim*'s interpretation and concludes, "**etc.** {as is found} in *Toras Kohanim*." Meaning, Rashi intimates that we **should see** *Toras Kohanim* for the conclusion of the interpretation.

As such, it is possible that when one notices that the source of Rashi's interpretation, "the middle wall of the ear," is the *Toras Kohanim*, he will think that Rashi also adopts the *Toras Kohanim*'s **explanation** (of this connection between "*tnuch*" and "the middle wall"). For this reason, Rashi immediately says, "The word *tnuch* is unknown to me."

On this basis, these two difficulties [(a) Rashi's wording, "the word *tnuch* is **unknown** to me," and (b) the reason why Rashi does not say this in *parshas Tetzaveh*] automatically disappear:

---

<sup>11</sup> {The plain meaning of the Torah text.}

Rashi can't write, “**I don't know** the {definition of the} word *tnuch*, because he knows the definition of “the word *tnuch*” (the definition in *Toras Kohanim*). Rather, the *interpretation* “is **unknown**” — “to **me**.” I do not recognize this *definition* as an acceptable and fitting *interpretation*, for “I have only come to explain **pshat** in Scripture {and not to provide lexical definitions}.”

Consequently, Rashi adds these remarks in our *parshah* and not in *parshas Tetzaveh*. For (aside from Rashi's general practice not to negate other interpretations, including halachic interpretations of our Rabbis (with his exception in our *parshah*, as discussed)) in our Rabbis' remarks on the verse in *parshas Tetzaveh*, we find no explanation of “the word *tnuch*” in the *Mechilta*, or elsewhere.

## 5.

### EXTRA AND MISSING LETTERS

*Toras Kohanim* on our verse writes:

I might think that {the blood was to be placed} on the very inside {“*toch*,” תוך} {of the ear}; therefore, it is written, “on the ‘*nuch*,” נוך. If so, I might think that the top of the ear was intended; therefore, it is written “*toch nuch*,” תוך נוך {“the inside of the *nuch*”}. How is this accomplished? {The blood is placed on} the middle wall of the ear {beneath the tip, i.e., the anti-helix}.

The commentators<sup>12</sup> explain that the intent of the *Toras Kohanim* is to teach us that “*tnuch*” is not a standard **name** connoting “the middle wall.” Rather, it is: a) etymologically related to “*toch*” — the inner part; the letter *nun* is interposed {revising the word to “*tnuch*”}, similar to many words in Hebrew which are sometimes written with an additional *nun*, and

---

<sup>12</sup> See *Malbim*, ad. cit.; see the explanations of *Raavad* and *Korban Aharon* on *Toras Kohanim*; *Tosfos YomTov*, “*Negaim*,” ch. 14, *mishnah* 9.

sometimes without; and b) etymologically related to “*nuch*,” נַח — “*chomas anach*, חומת אֵנַךְ {a wall made by a plumbline},”<sup>13</sup> connoting the *height* or the *top* of something.

This word is written here without an *aleph* {*tnuch*, rather than *anach*} and there {in *Amos*} without a *tav* {*anach*, rather than *tnuch*} as is common in Hebrew, as mentioned above.

We see quite a few words in Scripture in which the letter *aleph* **or** *tav* is added to a root, making the word into a noun. For example, the word *anach* itself (according to Rashi’s commentary),<sup>14</sup> and the word “*uwisvunah*,” which Rashi explains to mean<sup>15</sup> “understanding things...,” and the like.

Since the word “*tnuch*” connotes **both** “*toch*” and “*nuch*,” we understand that Scripture is referring to the “middle wall.”

— This is especially important to note after having learned **previously** in **Rashi’s** commentary that<sup>16</sup> the “*anafah* is the **hot-tempered** *dayah*.”<sup>17</sup> That is, “*anafah*” (with the letter *nun*) connotes anger and temper, as “*af*” connotes temper.

Meaning, even according to Rashi’s commentary that is based on *pshat*, there are words that are sometimes written with an **additional** letter (*nun*), and sometimes **without** —

So that we will not think that this is also a fitting explanation according to *pshat*, Rashi writes, “the word *tnuch* is **unknown** to me” in order to negate this explanation, as mentioned above.

---

<sup>13</sup> *Amos* 7:7.

<sup>14</sup> *Bereishis* 25:3.

<sup>15</sup> *Shemos* 31:3.

<sup>16</sup> *Vayikra* 11:19.

<sup>17</sup> {*Af* connotes anger or temper; thus, Rashi’s explanation, “the hot-tempered *dayah*.”}

## 6.

### SIMILAR SPELLING

Rashi does not accept this explanation, for based on his approach, when a certain word is sometimes written with a *nun* and sometimes without, according to *pshat*, the two words have different meanings.

This is undeniable: On the verse,<sup>18</sup> “with the breath of Your nostrils,” Rashi explains:

Breath that comes out of the two nostrils of the nose. Scripture speaks anthropomorphically about the *Shechinah* as a mortal king, in order to enable people to understand it {to understand Hashem’s anger} as it is experienced {in humans} — when a person becomes angry, breath comes out of his nostrils. Likewise, “Smoke went up from His nostrils,”<sup>19</sup> and similarly, “and from the breath of His nostrils, they will be destroyed.”<sup>20</sup> And this is what Scripture says: “For the sake of My Name, I defer My anger”<sup>21</sup> {lit., I prolong the breath of My nose}. Meaning, when a person’s anger subsides, his breath becomes longer, and when he is angry, his breath becomes shorter... And concerning every expression of אף {*af*} and חרון {*charon*} in Scripture, I say this.<sup>22</sup>

This implies that even though the word “*af*” can be translated as *temper* and *anger*, as in the word *anafah*, it is appropriate to translate it thus in places where it is juxtaposed with “breath” {רוח אף}, “smoke” {עשן אף}, “I will lengthen” (My **breaths**) {אאריך נשימותי}, and the like. But the word “*af*” **on its own** means (not *anger* or *temper*, but) “the nose.”

Therefore, it would be strained, according to *pshat*, to explain “*tnuch*” as connoting “*toch* {inside}.”

---

<sup>18</sup> *Shemos* 15:8.

<sup>19</sup> {*Tehillim* 18:9.}

<sup>20</sup> {*Iyov* 4:9.}

<sup>21</sup> {*Yeshayahu* 48:9.}

<sup>22</sup> See Rashi’s commentary on *Bereishis* 18:23.



Similarly, Rashi cannot explain “*tnuch*” as cognate to the word “*nuch*” — connoting *height* and *top*, as he did “*chomas anach* {a wall made with a plumbline}.” Because aside from the difference between the letters *aleph* and *taf*, as discussed above) the word “*anach*” itself does not mean *height*, but rather {the element of} “lead,” used as the weight of a plumb-line, to ascertain whether a wall is straight.<sup>23</sup> “Lead” is related to the idea “height” and “top” only because the “lead” {of the plumb-line} is placed upon the *top* of a wall.

Therefore, it would not be straightforward to explain “upon the *tnuch*” as meaning, “on the **top**” based on the similarity of the word “*tnuch*” and “*anach*,” since “*anach*” itself does not mean “top.” [In addition, since the letters of “*tnuch*” differ from the letters of “*anach*,” as elucidated above, to draw a comparison between the two words would be especially stained.]

## 7.

### THE INTERPRETERS — SIMILAR PRONUNCIATION

In light of the above, Rashi’s wording here, “the **interpreters** call it *tendros*” (as distinct from his wording in *parshas Tetzaveh*, “called *tenros*”) is understood:

The connotative meaning of the word, “interpreters” is similar to the connotative meaning of the phrase “dream *interpretation*.” As we have learned earlier (in *Sefer Bereishis*), the chief butler beheld “three tendrils” in his dream; Yosef interpreted the three tendrils as symbolizing “three days.”<sup>24</sup> Similarly, regarding Pharaoh’s dream, Yosef interpreted that the “seven cows...” represented “seven years.”<sup>25</sup> Meaning, when it comes to interpretation, although no “days” or “years” were seen in the dreams, Yosef “interpreted” — he revealed the intent of the dream — that the three

---

<sup>23</sup> See the commentaries of Rashi and *Metzudos* (and others) on *Amos* 7:7.

<sup>24</sup> *Bereishis* 40:12.

<sup>25</sup> *Bereishis* 41:26.

tendrils refer to three days, and the three cows refer to three years. That is, “interpreters” find the commonality between two different types of elements.

We can now understand why, after Rashi writes, “the word *tnuch* is unknown to me.” For according to *pshat*, comparing “*tnuch*” to “*toch*” and “*nuch*” is **improper**. Accordingly, Rashi continues, “but the interpreters call it *tendros*”:

These “interpreters” compare {the phonetics of} words to each other. (Thus, in accord with their practice, “the word *tnuch*” can be explained by comparing “*tnuch*” to “*toch*” and “*nuch*.”) As such, they maintain that the reason for the Old French translation of “*tnuch*” as “*tendros*” is {in addition to shared meaning} also because the two words share a similar pronunciation: The word “*tendros*” includes (the sounds) *tav* {T}, *nun* {N}, and *vav* {O or OO} (similar to the word “*tnuch*”). Thus, the “**interpretation**” of the word “*tnuch*” in Old French is “*tendros*.”

## 8.

### SIMILAR ROOTS

Ostensibly, this poses a difficulty: According to *pshat*, it seems implausible for an **Old French** translation from **Rashi’s** era to have had the same grammatical root as a word in the **Chumash** written in the **Holy Tongue!**

However, a more extreme example of this is found in **Rashi’s commentary** (in *parshas Devarim*), On the verse,<sup>26</sup> “Sidonians called {Mount} Chermon ‘Sirion,’ and the Amorites called it ‘Snir,’” Rashi explains: “This means “snow” in the German and Canaanite languages.” Meaning, the name for “snow” in **German** and in **Canaanite** in **Rashi’s**

---

<sup>26</sup> *Devarim* 3:9.

era was the same word used by the Amorites who “would call it ‘Snir’” — wording found in the *Chumash*.<sup>27</sup>

[It is noteworthy that nowadays, too, “snow” in modern German, “Schnee” (and in modern English, “snow”) is also phonetically similar to the word “*snir*.” ]<sup>28</sup>

Likewise, the word “*tendros*” in Rashi’s era was based on the root word “*tnuch*” written in the *Chumash*.

## 9.

### RESTORING THE LIGHT

From the “wine of Torah”<sup>29</sup> in Rashi’s commentary: *Kabbalah* explains<sup>30</sup> that *nega'im*<sup>31</sup> are the result of “the withdrawal of the light of *chochmah*,<sup>32</sup> for a *metzora*<sup>33</sup> is likened to a dead person, and the verse says, ‘They die, and not with wisdom.’”<sup>34</sup> *Chassidus* explains<sup>35</sup> this concept at length in terms of a person’s *avodah*:<sup>36</sup> *Mochin d’ima*,<sup>37</sup> the idea of *binah*,<sup>38</sup> contemplation of the Creator’s greatness, arouses a person’s love for

---

<sup>27</sup> {This example demonstrates that it is reasonable for a word in Old French in Rashi’s era to have the same grammatical root as a word in the *Chumash*.}

<sup>28</sup> Moreover, we can posit that all of these names are derived from the root word “*sheleg*” in the Hebrew, supporting our analysis.

<sup>29</sup> {The deeper teaching of Torah.}

<sup>30</sup> *Eitz Chaim*, *shaar* 38, ch. 7; quoted in *Likkutei Torah*, beg. of *parshas Metzora*. Note: In *Likkutei Torah*, this reference is listed as *shaar* 37 (based on Shklov ed., publ. 1800).

<sup>31</sup> {Lit., “afflictions,” synonymous with *tzaraas*, a spiritual affliction with physical symptoms, affecting the skin.}

<sup>32</sup> {Lit., “wisdom,” the first of the *sefiros*, the highest of the intellectual faculties.}

<sup>33</sup> {A person afflicted with *tzaraas*.}

<sup>34</sup> {*Iyov* 4:21.}

<sup>35</sup> *Likkutei Torah*, beg. of *parshas Metzora*; Tzemach Tzedek’s *Sefer HaMitzvos {Derech Mitzvosecha}*, “*Mitzvas Tum’as HaMetzora*.”

<sup>36</sup> {Divine service.}

<sup>37</sup> {Lit., “intellective faculty of the mother,” also known as the *partzuf of binah*. *Partzufim* are compound structures of the *sefiros*. A *partzuf* is a metaphorical figure of human likeness, used to represent the expansion of an individual *sefira* (or group of *sefiros*) into an independent configuration with ten *sefiros* of its own.}

<sup>38</sup> {Lit., “comprehension,” the second of the ten *sefiros*.}

Hashem. This love is expressed in *ratzo* {lit., “running”}, a person yearning to escape his existence, and (his desire to) be subsumed in G-dliness.

The influence of *mochin d’abba*,<sup>39</sup> *chochmah* on a level loftier than *binah*, brings a person to a state of utter *bittul*<sup>40</sup> to G-dliness. This is expressed by his *shuv* {lit., “return”}, not by the soul’s consuming yearning {Heavenward, out of love for Hashem}, but rather by the *bittul* inherent in Torah study and *mitzvah* observance in this world.

“*Nega’im*” result from “the withdrawal of the *light* of *chochmah*”: When a person lacks the complete *bittul* engendered by *chochmah* (and consequently, his *ratzo* and consuming passion are not channeled down into “*shov*” — into his Torah study and *mitzvah* observance), then (since his contemplation {of G-dliness} derives only from *mochin d’ima*) his *ratzo* can allow the *external forces* to draw nurture.<sup>41</sup> (This phenomenon is similar to what happens when there is **only** ecstasy during prayer. It {the absence of intellectual contemplation during prayer} can lead to a feeling of *yeshus*,<sup>42</sup> etc., in a person, and even to the undesirable sort of excitement.)<sup>43</sup>

Thus, the rectification and healing of *nega’im* are brought about by a *kohen* who draws the *light* of *chochmah* {from Above}. In this way, those afflicted with *nega’im* are purified, and, as a result, nurture is withheld from the *external forces* (as is explained at length in *Chassidus*).

---

<sup>39</sup> {Lit., “intellective faculty of the mother,” also known as the *partzuf* of *chochmah*.}

<sup>40</sup> {*Bittul* connotes self-nullification, humility, and the negation of ego.}

<sup>41</sup> {“External forces” are forces of evil or impurity that conceal their G-dly source, and thus stand in opposition to the side of holiness. A person’s lack of *bittul* enables these forces to nurture from the side of holiness, giving vitality to evil.}

<sup>42</sup> {*Yeshus* connotes an exaggerated sense of self, self-importance, and an over-embellished focus on one’s needs to the exclusion of those of others.}

<sup>43</sup> *Likkutei Torah*, beg. of *parshas Metzora*, regarding the concept of *Pelishtim d’kedushah*. (*Torah Or*, p. 61c ff.; *Toras Chaim*, beg. of *parshas Toldos*, ch. 6.

## 10.

### PURIFICATION

There are two parts to the purification process {of the *metzora*} brought about by the *kohen*:<sup>44</sup> “He **shall be brought** to the *kohen*,”<sup>45</sup> and, “the *kohen* **shall go forth** to the outside of the camp.”<sup>46</sup> In order to rectify *nega'im*, it is insufficient to **only** draw the *light* of *chochmah* {from Above} (“**the *kohen* shall go forth...**”). Rather, the *metzora* must (first) “**be brought** to the *kohen*.” Meaning, first the remediation must be carried out (in the source of the *nega'im*) in a person’s *ratzo* and the consuming passion of his soul {Heavenward} which stem from *mochin d’ima* (*binah*). These should be modulated to the *shov* (conferred by the *kohen* — *chochmah*). Together with (and after) the rectification of the “*ratzo*,” the *kohen* can (then) “go forth...,” and draw down the *light* of *chochmah* into *mochin d’ima*, obviating any possibility of being afflicted by *nega'im*.

The Torah and Rashi’s commentary allude to these two parts of the purification process: “The ***kohen*** shall place it on the ***tnuch*** of the **ear** of the person being purified...”<sup>47</sup> This alludes to drawing the *light* of *chochmah* (“the *kohen* shall place it”) into *mochin d’ima* — “the ear” — “hearing” and contemplation.<sup>48</sup>

Concerning this, Rashi writes: “The word *tnuch* is unknown to me.” Meaning, the purification and rectification of the “***tnuch*** of the **ear**,” of *mochin d’ima*, is “**unknown**.”;<sup>49</sup> by itself {in its present state}, *mochin*

---

<sup>44</sup> *Likkutei Torah*, “*Metzora*,” p. 25a ff.

<sup>45</sup> {*Vayikra* 14:2.}

<sup>46</sup> {*Vayikra* 14:3.}

<sup>47</sup> {*Vayikra* 14:14.}

<sup>48</sup> See *Meorei Or*, index: “The ear is called *binah*...”; See the Tzemach Tzedek’s *Sefer HaMitzvos*, loc. cit., p. 100b (bot.) regarding *mochin d’ima* — *binah* is comprehension and contemplation, similar to hearing, by which a person comprehends.

<sup>49</sup> “Unknown” as in “I did not know my soul” (*Shir HaShirim* 6:12); (See *Mikdash Melech*, beg. of *parshas Tzav*); “we don’t know... the ten *sefiros*” (*Likkutei Torah*, “*Chukas*,” p. 64a; “I do not know which way...” (*Berachos* 28b); “With respect to the inner part of the soul, which is beyond knowledge” (*Or HaTorah*, “*Pinchas*,” p. 1059 ff.; *Maamar* “*Ach BeGoral*,” 5626; *Maamar* “*Ashreinu*,” 5688, 5696; See *Likkutei Torah*, “*Vayikra*,” bot. of p. 50d).

*d'ima* is unable to accomplish this {rectification just} by means of the influence drawn from *mochin d'abba* (under the auspices of the *kohen*).

[Rashi employs the wording, “**unknown**” — the passive voice — to express “knowledge” or action that comes about automatically, rather than employing the wording, “I do not know” {the active voice}, or the like.]

Instead, for this purification process to be effective, the blemish in *mochin d'ima* must be corrected (first), within *binah* itself (just as *teshuvah* must emerge from “that place itself”).<sup>50</sup>

The rectification of *mochin d'ima* is alluded to in the word “interpreters,” as mentioned above with reference to dream interpretation: When two elements appear to be externally dissimilar, *interpretation* reveals and explains their {common} core, thereby binding and uniting the two elements.

Applying this idea to our *avodah*: We should “interpret” *mochin d'ima* — the excitement and yearning that are the outcomes of *binah* — ensuring that they are appropriate, and aligned with their deeper {Divine} purpose.

Afterward, the *light* of *chochmah* is drawn into the person’s *tnuch*, and even “on his thumb... and on his big toe.”<sup>51</sup> This is accomplished by fulfilling *mitzvos* actively with hand and foot.<sup>52</sup> In this manner, *nega'im* cease to exist, “and the *kohen* shall make atonement for him, and he becomes pure.”<sup>53</sup>

Based on a talk delivered on Shabbos *parshas Metzora*, 5730 (1970)

---

<sup>50</sup> *Likkutei Torah*, “*Metzora*,” p. 25a ff., explaining that the deficiencies in *mochin d'ima* must be rectified first.

<sup>51</sup> {*Vayikra* 14:17.}

<sup>52</sup> See *Toras Levi Yizchak*, “*Hearos LeMaseches Negaim*,” p. 359 ff.

<sup>53</sup> *Vayikra* 14:20.