VAYIKRA MARCH 25, 1966

" SWEET, SOUR, OR SALTY?" A Recipe for Religion

Judaism counsels moderation, and rejects extremism. This teaching of moderation in character is raised by Maimonides to a fundamental of the Halakhah, and is elaborately described by him in the first part of his immortal Code of Jewish Law, the Mishnah Torah.

Furthermore, this "Goldean Mean" of abjuring the extremes and choosing the middle of the road in conduct, is identified by Maimonides as nothing less than the \$\cap_73\$, "the way of the Lord." This is what the Torah means, according to Maimonides, when before the destruction of Sodom the Lord says: \(\frac{11}{15} \frac{1

According to this "way of the Lord," a man should develop the kind of character that is distinguished neither by anger and temperemental tantrums nor apathy and indifference; he should be neither a spendthrift who squanders every dollar, nor a miser who cannot

by the "heritage of Abraham", the priceless possession of our people.

bring himself to spend a cent; he must be neither giddy nor gloomy, neither in a state of manic joy nor in a state of somber

depression. One must always try to keep his mood and his quality of conduct moderate, stable, and thoughtful. Of course, there are exceptions, and Maimonides describes them in detail. But the general principle remains; keep away from all extremes in conduct.

This fundamental of Jewish ethics was discovered by a renowned Rabbi in, of all places, today's Sidra on the laws of the sacrifices. Rabbi Joseph Saul Nathanson, the eminent halakhic decisor who was Rabbi of Lwow, thus interprets symbolically the commandment concerning the allow, the meal-offering on the altar: (23 51) //(2) הר הפנו ואוא וחילף אונו; you may offer up on the altar, as part of a gift-offering, neither leaven nor honey. Rabbi Joseph Saul points out that leaven, or sour-sough, and honey represent two extremes of taste: sour and sweet. Neither is permissible on the dive altar. The two extremes of sour and sweet symbolize the extremes of human character, all of which should be rejected. If life is conceived of as 'a law, as a gift offered to God; and if ארף , as incense, as life is to be lived as harmonious and pleasant; then it must be neither apple nor C13, neither sour-dough nor sweet homey. The laws of sacrifices thus offer us a symbolic hint of the Golden Mean.

Yet there is a danger that people will overstate the theory of moderation and reduce it to an absurdity. They might conclude that one must <u>always</u> choose the middle of the road. Hence, if you are faced with the extremes of, on the one hand, Kashruth, and, on

the other, those who are non-kosher, then one might interpret the Golden Mean to recommend being only half-kosher, or to have a kosher home but to be non-kosher outside the home. One might reduce it to the ridiculous conclusion that if some feast on Yom Kippur and some fast, then one should simply eat lightly or just skip breakfast, in an effort to be moderate. It might mean that if some are Orthodox and some are Reform, then the teaching of moderation urges that everyone be Conservative; or that between the extremes of truth and falsehood, one should always tell a half-truth!

What then does it mean to be moderate, and what are its limits?

I believe the answer is this: in matters of character and personality, in developing the traits wherewith one reacts to the world, in teaching oneself personal babits, there must be only the Golden Mean and one must keep a healthy distance away from extremes. But when it comes to principle, to ideals and philosophy and commitments, to a code rather than a mode of conduct -- then only the vision of truth may

guide us. And truth is radical; sometimes it will lead us to a middle position, more often to one extreme or the other. Let us remember that, as one Rabbi pointed out, the Hebrew word for "truth" is _N/c, and these three Hebrew letters allude to a symbolic truth. The first of these letters is the first letter of the Hebrew letter of the alphabet; and the last of the three letters is the last of the Hebrew alphabet. In other words, truth may be found at either extreme or right in the middle -- there is no predicting in advance where it will lead us. In my faith and in my practice of my principles, I must follow only the truth. There is no conflict between moderation in character and truth of ideals. A man may be liberal or conservative in his views; that is a matter of his principles. In his expression of these principles, however, he ought to be moderate. But the principles themselves are beyond any rule of moderation. Whosoever tries to live his life and work out his destiny merely by finding the middle point equidistant from the extremes, and squatting there -- surrenders his critical judgment and yields to a disgraceful, dull, deadly, depressing conformism, which can only kill one's character. Here, only truth must be our guide. To travel automatically in the middle of the road is to excergige neither intelligence nor humanity. The renowned Kotzker Rebbe, reflecting the traffic condition of his society, said that only behemos, animals, walk in the middle of the road -- not human beings. We,

reflecting the traffic conditions of our own society, might say that the middle of the road is the most dangerous place of all; one can be hit from both sides ...

Certainly, if you find yourself in a society of extremes, where some are promiscuous and some highly moral, some honest and some deceitful, some believe in God and some are virulent atheists.—

Judaism's teaching of the Golden Means does not mean to say to you: be half moral, tell half a truth, believe in half a God. You must, of course, be utterly moral, totally truthful, completely devout —

even if that condemns you as an extremist and marks you as off-beat.

Therefore, in questions of Halkhah, a decision may sometimes be extreme; that does not matter, for our only guide is:

Does this mean, however, that in dealing with principles, such as Halakhah, that since I may go to an extreme, therefore my expression of it may be uncivil and even reckless? Certainly not! here is where character is required. For even people with extreme views must express them moderately. In articulating the truth, in living by it, I must always consider others: their conditions and their sensitivities. My opimion may be unpopular, but my presentation of it ought to be non-repulsive.

Perhaps this is the essence of what was meant by the great prophet Malachi, who, in describing the ideal man, the perfect Kohen, uttered the immortal phrases: INDER (13 M) (15 M

that in his mouth, internally, in his own vision of his ultimate commitments, there was only the "Torah of truth" -- no other consideration may be entertained. But when it came to expressing this truth to his fellow men, to bringing forth his vision from his mouth, within, to the words that appeared on his lips, without, then while he never changed this vision, he did not allow it to be expressed with unrighteousness, with ugliness, with contempt for others. The greatness of the Kohen described by the prophet is that his ideals are uncompromising, and yet the character of his expression is so very attractive.

Berhaps this is what the Torah meant, when, in prohibiting ye and (1) sour-dough and honey, symbols of the extremes in conduct, it added affirmatively: (N 217) 1277 & fr, that to every sacrifice that is offered up on the altar, we must add a pinch of salt. What does this mean? In character there must be no extremes, neither sweet nor sour. Ideals must always follow the vision of J1N/l, of But even then, even when we follow truth without compromise, we must keep it flavored, we must season it with a bit of salt. We must see to it that the truth we serve up is neither bland nor harsh. Salt, unlike sweet or sour additives, is not essentially a flavor added from without; rather, it enhances the flavour inherent in the food itself, it brings out the best within it. So the salt of the sacrifice, symbol of the attitude we must bring to Torah: it reveals the inner beauty of Torah itself.

Permit me to give you some examples. The Halakhah, as the Torah of truth, may sometimes decide "forbidden," and sometimes "permitted." This is the _\ \\(\mathbb{()}\), the truth, and should be acknowledged as such. Nevertheless, the decision of Halakhah must always be applied with a pinch of salt. For instance, even when the Torah says "forbidden," and we are required to communicate this prohibition to our fellow שש, הובח תוכיח וות צאיתן Jews -must rebuke our friend who does wrong -- nevertheless, there remain limiting principles, such as Piddle 1018 201N PI 315N (18) (11, that where we know that our rebuke will not be accepted, it is better not to offer it in the first place, so that the fellow Jew who violates the commandments will do so unwittingly and out of ignorance, rather than out of spite and wilfullness. Similarly, the Halakhah may sometimes say: yes, such and such is permitted; nevertheless, do not put this permission into practice! Often the Halakhah will urge a man to refrain from a technical

Often the Halakhah will urge a man to refrain from a technical permission permission on the grounds that \(\int_{\text{NN7}} \) \(\text{NN7} \) \(\text{NN7}

in front of others who are 10/11/2 profile what is permissible in front of others who are 10/11/2 profile, who do not regard this particular act as being permissible. Such conduct is dictated by the "salt" in our religious diet. The correct recipe for religion, therefore, is: "neither sweet nor sour, but salty."

These thoughts are of utmost significance especially this
Sabbath when, from the pulpit of this synagogue, as well as
several neighboring synagogues, we shall read to you a special
announcement concerning the construction of an Eruv in Manhattan.
This Eruv permits carrying in the Island of Manhattan under
certain conditions and with certain restrictions. Within those
limits, it is an unqualified halakhaic descision, very long
in the making. Without question, one may henceforth carry in
Manhattan with the exceptions, as noted, of such tems as are
considered Muktzah.

Nevertheless, in actual practise, we urgently recommend
"salt". Although the ANA , the truth is that carrying is
permitted, yet ANA CICA CICA (AND COMMON SERVENT) (AND CICAL COMMON SERVENT) (AND CICAL COMMON SERVENT) (AND COMMON SERVENT) (A

The recipe for religion requires, in this case, as inevery tasteful other case, that painful discretion and proper understanding that will contribute both to the holiness of the Sabbath and the enjoyment of the Sabbath.

May God grant that our actions be acceptable before Almighty

God as both, asa gift of our a

spiritual endeavors and a pleasant and harmonious contribution to the