

Isaac Selter

Holiness: A Human Endeavor

“The Lord spoke to Moses, saying: Speak to the whole Israelite community and say to them: You shall be holy, for I, the Lord your God, am holy¹.” Such a verse is subject to different interpretations. On the one hand, God is holy, and through His election of the People of Israel and their acceptance of the yoke of heaven at Mount Sinai, the nation attains holiness as well. As Menachem Kellner puts it, “the imposition of the commandments has made Israel intrinsically holy².” Israel attains holiness because God is holy. On the other hand, the verse could be seen as introducing a challenge to the nation to achieve such a holiness. The verse is not ascribing an objective metaphysical quality inherent in the nation of Israel. Which of these options is real holiness?

The notion that sanctity is an objective metaphysical quality inherent in an item or an act is one championed by many *Rishonim*, specifically with regard to the sanctity of the Land of Israel. God promises the Children of Israel that sexual morality will cause the nation to be exiled from its land. Nachmanides explains that the Land of Israel is more sensitive than other lands with regard to sins due to its inherent, metaphysical qualities. He states,

“The Honorable God created everything and placed the power over the ones below in the ones above and placed over each and every people in their lands according to their nations a star and a specific constellation . . . but upon the land of Israel - the center of the [world's] habitation, the inheritance of God [that is] unique to His name - He did not place a captain, officer or ruler from the angels, in His giving it as an

¹ Leviticus 19:1-2

² Maimonides' Confrontation with Mysticism, Menachem Kellner, pg 90

inheritance to his nation that unifies His name - the seed of His beloved one³”.

The Land of Israel is unique in its lack of intermediaries between it and God. God alone rules over this land and, thus, it is endowed with an inherent, superior quality.

Others such as Rabbi Yehuda HaLevi attributed similar *a priori* aspects of sanctity to the Land of Israel. In his poem written about his longing for the Land of Israel, *Tziyon ha-lo tish'ali*, HaLevi “endows [the land] with a spiritual climate.” He claims “the air of [the] land is the breath of life for our souls⁴”. HaLevi also insinuates in his *Kuzari* that “changes in nature . . . are brought about by the indwelling of forms in properly prepared material substrates⁵.” The fundamental nature of a material will determine when a material can achieve holiness or not. Similarly, in a well-known argument with Maimonides, HaLevi was of the opinion that non-Jews cannot prophesy. Only Jews, whose inherent, metaphysical nature was one that could complement *kedusha*, could receive prophecy.

Lastly, Rabbi Hayyim Ben Atar, the *Or HaHayyim*, a 16th century commentary on the Bible, states that the nation of Israel, upon its acceptance of the Torah at Sinai became ontologically distinct from other nations of the world. They now retained a “most high level of holiness” unto which “the spiritually weak crave to cling⁶.” Again, we see an *a priori* attachment of holiness to certain objects that grants them objective, metaphysical superiority over others. “God alone is able to determine works so that the divine order dwells within them⁷.” Humans have no role in the endowment of holiness. *Kedushah* is present or it is not.

³ Nachmanides, Leviticus 18:25 s.v. “*vatitma*”

⁴ *Tziyon Ha-lo tish'ali*, Rabbi Judah HaLevi, In 31

⁵ Kellner, 86

⁶ *Or HaChayim*, Numbers 19:2 s.v “*el sol adat*”

⁷ *Sefer HaKuzari*, Rabbi Judah HaLevi, iii. 53

“You shall be holy⁸” is classically understood as mandating *perishut*, or separateness⁹. Many interpret separateness as synonymous with near-asceticism. Rabbi Moses Hayyim Luzzato, in his *Mesilat Yesharim*, writes that man, to achieve holiness, ideally exerts to “completely [detach] and [remove] himself from the physical, and [cling] always, at all periods and times to his G-d¹⁰.” Despite his concession that this mode of living is impractical and can’t truly be achieved in this world, a state of being such as this is the ideal. Rabbi Hayyim of Volozhin, in his work *Nefesh HaHayyim* remarks that the *kedushah* prayer, said twice daily, is the “elevation of the worlds and connecting each world to the world above it to increase sanctity and shining of their lights¹¹” (*Nefesh HaHayyim* 1:11). To be holy is to quest for the supernal worlds. This world seems to be bereft of sanctity relative to the ones above.

Such a conception of the meaning of holiness had its influences from the Christian world. Christian thought idealized the monk, who, secluded inside his cloister, denies himself any worldly pleasure, or the priest, who remains celibate for the duration of his lifetime. Christianity became an “other-worldly” religion focusing solely on the salvation from above. *Homo Religiosus* would be “yearning to rise from below to above, from earth to heaven, from the images and shadows of reality to the plenitude of a lofty existence, to a pure ontic overflow¹².” Religion was about getting to heaven or being swept off the ground into the arms of the divine up high. Life on Earth was meaningless.

Both perceptions of *kedusha*, that man has no involvement in its endowment, and that the negation of this world is an ideal, bred much animosity towards religion from modern

⁸ Leviticus 19:2

⁹ See Rashi ad loc.

¹⁰ *Mesilat Yesharim*, Rabbi Moshe Hayyim Luzzato, chapter 26

¹¹ *Nefesh HaHayyim*, Rabbi Chaim of Volozhin, 1:11

¹² *Halakhic Man*, Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, pg 44

thinkers. Frederich Nietzsche beseeched the world to “remain faithful to the earth, and [to] not believe those who speak to you of otherworldly hopes¹³!” Christianity, Nietzsche argued, introduced the notion that sexuality was unclean. There was a fundamental resentment towards life. All passions and desires man has are to be utterly destroyed. Religion, as the *holy*, diminishes man’s role in this world. This world is meaningless and only the supernal worlds, the metaphysical, are significant. Nietzsche makes a plea for “spiritualizing the passions,¹⁴” perhaps beautifying it or deifying it. The elevation of engagement with desires should bring man to supreme levels of spirituality.

Rav Soloveitchik, surely with Nietzsche’s comments in mind, seeks to reinterpret *kedushah* and save religion from attacks of modern philosophers. “With all my respect for the *Rishonim*, I must disagree with such an opinion. I do not believe that it is *halakhically* cogent. *Kedushah*, under a *halakhic* aspect, is man-made; more accurately, it is a historical category . . . Nothing should be attributed a priori to dead matter. Objective *kedushah* smacks of fetishism¹⁵.” God, argues the Rav, is not maker of *kedusha*. Rather, “holiness is created by man, by flesh and blood¹⁶.”

The Rav was not alone in viewing holiness in this light. Rabbi Meir Simcha of Dvinsk, in his *Meshekh Hokhmah*, speaks of the incredulity of believing objects on the Earth have inherent *kedushah*¹⁷. In fact, Menachem Kellner argues that Maimonides, long before Rav Soloveitchik, subscribed to such a definition of holiness. Differences and similarities of the two approaches will be discussed.

¹³ *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Frederich Neitzsche, 3

¹⁴ *Twilight of the Idols*, Frederich Nietzsche, V:1, X:4

¹⁵ *Emergence of Ethical Man*, Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, 150

¹⁶ *Halakhic Man*, 47

¹⁷ *Meshekh Hokhmah*, Rabbi Meir Simcha of Dvinsk, Exodus 32:19 s.v “*vayih*”

The principle of *hakdashah*, verbally sanctifying objects for Temple or sacrificial use is the most prominent example of man-made *kedushah*. Human, verbal sanctification alone is what permits the bringing of offerings in the Temple. Rabbi Aharon Lichtenstein, the Rav's son-in-law, related this notion of *kedushah* to a talmudic discussion. In discussion of man sanctifying an ancestral field to the temple treasury, the Talmud discusses the status of a pit in such a field that was sanctified¹⁸. The *Rishonim* discuss the status of an item that falls in said pit. Would the pit—now property of the Temple treasury—acquire such an item through a *Kinyan Hatzet*, a *halakhic* principle that permits the acquisition of items through the means of one's courtyard, without any human involvement? The Tosafists¹⁹ rule that the pit would acquire an item that has fallen into it and said item would now belong to the Temple treasury. Nachmanides²⁰, argues that when it comes to *hakdashah*, sanctification for Temple, while a *Kinyan Hatzet perhaps* would be a valid method for acquisition, the laws of *me'ilah*, misuse of temple property, would not take effect. Rabbi Aryeh Leib Heller, in his landmark work, *Ketzot HaHoshen*, explains that according to Nachmanides, a man-made sanctification is a requisite means for full sanctification to the Temple treasury. Sanctification by way of *Kinyan Hatzet* strips man of his essential role in the institution of *kedushah*²¹.

Festivals' respective *kedushah* are explicitly regarded as linked with sanctification on part of the nation of Israel. The Talmud relates that Festivals are distinct from Sabbath in that they require sanctification via the *beit din*²². It is for this reason that the blessing for the festivals concludes with "Who sanctifies Israel and the Festivals" as opposed to that of the sabbath,

¹⁸ Baba Batra 79a

¹⁹ ad loc. s.v. "v'ein moalin"

²⁰ ad loc. s.v. "v'ha"

²¹ *Ketzot HaHoshen*, Rabbi Aryeh Leib Heller, 200:1

²² Baba Batra 121a

which has no mention of Israel in it. Israel plays a significant role in the sanctification of festival so much so that the dates of festivals fluctuate based on *beit din*'s determination of when the new moon appears.

Nonetheless, there still seem to be many instances of holiness that man has little to do with. The sabbath is described as a holy day from the days of creation when God rested—not man. The Temple Mount and the Land of Israel, colloquially referred to as “the holy land,” seem to be imbued with objective sanctity. The nation of Israel is described as as “a holy nation²³” “consecrated to the Lord²⁴.” Where is man’s role in each of these sanctified concepts, days, and geographical locations? Does Rav Soloveitchik strip these of all ontological inherent *kedusha*? Or can he find a way to have man play a role even in these objective sanctities.

The Sabbath’s *kedushah* manifests itself in the much more stringent punishment for transgressions than those of holidays. A breach in such holiness is considered a *hilul*, or profanation of that very holiness. This holiness stems from God’s endowment of “*Vayikadesh oto*,” “And [God] sanctified [the sabbath]²⁵.” God’s completion of creation is what initiated the holiness of sabbath. However, Menachem Kellner argues that, according to Maimonides, sabbath’s holiness is completely non-ontological in character. “Jews are commanded to exalt the sabbath day, not because of anything intrinsic about it . . . but so that they will not forget important philosophical truths.” Maimonides identifies the sabbath as a day that is to be exalted “in order that the principle of the creation of the world in time be established and universally known in the world through the fact that all people refrain from working on one and the same day²⁶” Joseph Dan²⁷

²³ Exodus 19:6

²⁴ Deuteronomy 7:6

²⁵ Genesis 2:1

²⁶ *Guide of the Perplexed*, Maimonides, *ii*. 31

²⁷ *Nachmanides*, Joseph Dan, 413 (quoted in Kellner, 126)

explains that according to Maimonides “it is not truly important that the sabbath is actually the seventh day after creation.” Sabbath loses its status as an intrinsically holy day and now becomes merely a means to remind Jews of philosophical truths. Through the Jews safeguarding one day of the week, not distinct in nature from other days, the day becomes imbued with holiness.

Rav Soloveitchik, however, suggests a different approach with regards to the sabbath. God does indeed establish a concept of *Kedushat HaYom* without man. Nonetheless, “the *kiddush* said over wine introduces a unique status in the holiness of the sabbath. This status of sanctity is fully developed by way of the *kiddush*. Sabbath unifies with holy times . . . *Kneset Yisrael* partners with the Holy One Blessed be He in the imbuing of the holiness of the day²⁸.” Rav Lichtenstein further notes that Maimonides famously held that the obligations of *kiddush* on the Sabbath was one of “*kiddush b’devarim*,” verbal sanctification²⁹. Through this verbal sanctification, man adds his own element into the holiness of the day³⁰. Perhaps, God’s instantiation of *kedushat haYom* is not the actual sanctity itself but rather the granting of permission to man to fill the day with holiness.

“[*Kedushat hayom*] indicates that there is substance to the day that can be filled with sanctity. Days and hours are endowed or saturated with holiness. The day is a substance of which I can predicate a variety of adjectival designations. The *Ba’alei ha-Kabbalah*, for example, based on the Gemara in Shabbat (119a), said that the Sabbath day is personified by the Sabbath Queen. The day is not just a number. It is a creation in and of itself³¹.

²⁸ *Shiurim l’zecher Avi Mori* part 2, 158

²⁹ *Mishne Torah*, Maimonides, *Hilkhot Shabbat* 29:1

³⁰ *Seeking His Presence*, Haim Sabato, 145

³¹ *The Lord is Righteous in all His Ways*, Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, 201

The Jerusalem Talmud records an opinion that the *kiddush* on the Sabbath should be identical in structure to that of the Festivals—“Who sanctifies Israel and the Sabbath”— a structure that highlights Israel’s involvement in the sanctification of the holy day.³²

As mentioned above, the election of the Land of Israel as the place God’s *Shekhina* resides evokes a notion of objective, *a priori* sanctity. What role does man play in this sanctity if God has chosen the Land from the time of Abraham? Rav Soloveitchik distinguishes here between a “*shem Eretz Yisrael*,” the title of the Land of Israel, and “*kedushat Eretz Yisrael*,” its holiness³³. God’s election of the land certainly gives the land significance and grants it a “*shem*,” which, similar to the explanation regarding sabbath, perhaps creates a void waiting to be filled with sanctity. The sanctity itself comes solely through human hands. Maimonides writes that *kedushah* is granted to the Land of Israel through two means: *kibush*, conquest, or *hazaka*, presence in the land³⁴. The Rav writes, “the term *Kedushat Ha’aretz*, the sanctity of the land, denotes the consequences of a human act, either conquest (heroic deeds) or the mere presence of the people in that land (intimacy of man and nature)³⁵”. The granting of a *shem* permits the human endowment of *kedushah* to the Land of Israel.

Menachem Kellner, however, reads Maimonides with a slight nuance. Maimonides writes that when the sanctity of the land was nullified “it was no longer deemed the land of Israel³⁶.” For Kellner, Maimonides does not distinguish between the “*shem*” and “*kedusha*” of the Land of Israel. A loss of *kedushah* is its very loss of its significant name. “For Maimonides,” writes Kellner, “some other territory could have become the Land of Israel had history worked out different-

³² Rav Baruch Gigi, “*The Relationship Between Sanctification of Shabbat and Sanctification of the Month*,” footnote 6. See also *Seeking His Presence*, 146

³³ *Kedushat Aviv* , Rabbi Aharon Lichtenstein, 264

³⁴ *Hilkhhot Terumot*, 1:5

³⁵ See footnote 15

³⁶ *Hilkhhot Beit HaBehirah* 6:16

ly³⁷.” Again, while Kellner’s Maimonides limits *kedushah* to an exclusively human endeavor, Rav Soloveitchik discovers the partnership between God and man in the imbuing of holiness into sabbath and the Land of Israel.

Kedushah, as we have noted, is introduced by man in some cases exclusively and in others in partnership with God. Thus, for the Rav, “You shall be holy” is not a description of the nation’s spiritual status but rather an imperative to achieve a certain status. Hermann Cohen, a 19th century philosopher and great influence on the Rav’s thought, draws a distinction between two clauses in the verse in Leviticus. “With God it is being: “For I am holy.” With regard to man, however, it says: “Ye shall be holy.” Hence one may translate: “Ye shall become holy.” Holiness thus means for man a task, whereas for God it designates being³⁸.”

But how does man fulfill God’s command to *be* holy, to fulfill *kedushat haHayyim*, the holiness of life? Evidently, the *kedushah* must stem from man himself.

Holiness does not wink at us from ‘beyond’ like some mysterious star that sparkles in the distant heavens, but appears in our actual, very real lives . . . An individual does not become holy through mystical adhesion to the absolute not through mysterious union with the infinite, nor through a boundless, all embracing ecstasy, but, rather, through his whole biological life, through his animal actions, and through actualizing the *Halakhah* in the empirical world³⁹.

Kedushah does not mean the installment of a metaphysical quality. *Kedushah* pertains to natural man and his every day actions. The Earth—this world—is the place when *kedushah* is found. Holiness can only be found where place consciousness—*kedushat hamakom*—and time con-

³⁷ Kellner, 109

³⁸ Hermann Cohen, *Religion of Reason: Out of the Sources of Judaism*, 96

³⁹ *Halakhic Man*, 46.

sciousness—*kedushat hazman*—exist⁴⁰. The Rav supports an elevation of the physical rather than a denigration of it, a healthy encounter with animal desires rather than a suppression of them. “Judaism proclaims the redemption of the body: the deliverance of biological existence from the thick darkness of meaningless, undirected bestial drives⁴¹.” The two foci of such an argument are sexual relations and food—the two most bestial drives man encounters.

The Rav responds directly to Nietzsche’s claims that religion has denigrated human existence. “The purpose of *halakhic* imperatives is not to label man’s sensual body as impure and thus reject it, but to purify it and draw it closer to God⁴².” Maimonides names the section of his Mishneh Torah that deals with forbidden sexual relations and prohibited foods as “*Sefer Kedusha*,” the Book of Holiness.

Before Adam and Eve sinned by eating from the Tree of Knowledge “sexual life was destined to become an ethical act⁴³.” The sin introduced the esthetic gesture of such a natural act. Sin is the alienation from nature. Holiness is the reinstatement of sexual life as “a powerful catalyst which accelerates the realization of an existential community of two individuals with all their separateness and aloofness⁴⁴.” A man and woman who elevate their relationship to such a level are considered holy. Maimonides’ *Hilkhot Isurei Bi’ah*, Laws of Forbidden Sexual Relations, outline the methods to which one achieves such a status. The act of *perishut*, separateness, applied appropriately, leads not to asceticism, but to an elevated physical life. The moral behavior of man is what grants *kedusha*, not any gift from God.

⁴⁰ *Sacred and Profane*, Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, 9

⁴¹ *And From There You Shall Seek*, Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, 114

⁴² *ibid.* 115

⁴³ Emergence of Ethical Man. 114

⁴⁴ *ibid.* 114

The holy man elevates the way he eats, as well. Eating plays a prominent role in *Halakha*. On holidays and the sabbath man is obligated to eat. The mere eating of sacrificial offerings is the fulfillment of a commandment. How does man elevate his bestial consumption of calories? He is charged with inviting in the poor, widow, and orphan. These acts of charity are intrinsic elements of the fulfillment of each command. His meals revolve around discussions of Torah, divine intellectual matters, distinct from the meal-time discussion of Socratic Greek thought, which consists of human intellectual matters and philosophy. “Judaism’s aspiration is not intellectual but moral—revelational . . . If man eats properly, in accordance with the requirements of the *Halakha*, then he is eating before God⁴⁵.” By the same token, *Halakha* abhors *achilah gasah*, overeating, to such an extent that one does not fulfill a commandment through such behavior.

Holiness comes with the engagement with the physical in a way that—to use Nietzsche’s terminology—spiritualizes the world. Sin is when the pleasure and bestial drives are ends in and of themselves rather than means to attaining new spiritual heights. Maimonides explicitly explains that the laws pertaining to forbidden sexual intercourse “are designed to bring about a decrease in sexual intercourse and to diminish the desire for mating as far as possible, *so that it should not be taken as an end*, as done by the ignorant⁴⁶. The heroic act of stepping away from the fulfillment of desire when the *halakha* mandates purifies and refines man’s characteristics.

The discussion in Judaism regarding Rav Soloveitchik’s elevation of the physical and its counterpart, asceticism, is one that appears in talmudic literature. The Talmud relates a dispute regarding the status of the Nazir, who vows away all wine and lives a more ascetic lifestyle for a period of at least 30 days.

⁴⁵ See footnote 40

⁴⁶ *Guide for the Perplexed*, iii. 35

Rabbi Elazar HaKappar the Great says: What is the meaning when the verse states, “And he will atone for him for that he sinned by the soul [nefesh]” (Numbers 6:11). But with what soul did the Nazirite sin? Rather, the Nazirite sinned by the distress he caused himself when he abstained from wine. If one who only refrains from wine is called a “sinner” how much more so if one refrains from all matters? Rabbi Elazar says: The Nazirite is called sacred, as it is stated “He shall be sacred, he shall let the locks of the hair of his head grow long” (Numbers 6:5). And if this Nazirite, who distressed himself by abstaining from only wine is called sacred, how much more if he refrains from all matters⁴⁷?

Is the Nazirite *kadosh*, holy? Or is he a *hotei*, a sinner? The debate ensued to the times of the *Rishonim*. Maimonides strongly advises against taking a Nazirite oath or any oath imposing new restrictions⁴⁸. Nachmanides, however, understands the Nazirite as living in an ideal state⁴⁹. He is “holy” and only called a “sinner” because he concludes his Nazir service and returns to normal life. Is an ascetic lifestyle more of an ideal, as Nachmanides writes? Or is living life without straying to extremes more desirable? According to Maimonides, however, a question still remains. How can the Nazirite simultaneously be called “holy” as well as a “sinner?” Rabbi Moses Isserles, in his *Torat Ha'Olah*, writes, “the essence of the Nazirite’s holiness is after he has completed the days of his vow when he will be in state of moderation, which he does not have during the days of the vow when he was considered a sinner⁵⁰.” According to Isserles, an extreme alcoholic goes through a necessary period of opposite extremes where he sins, complete-

⁴⁷ *Ta'anit* 11a

⁴⁸ *Hilkhot De'ot* 3:11

⁴⁹ Nachmanides, Numbers 6:14 s.v. "v'ta'am"

⁵⁰ *Torat Ha'Olah*, Rabbi Moshe Isserles, chap. 71

ly refraining from any indulgence, in order to reclaim his proper status as a *kadosh*, living life at a healthy medium. The proper usage of physical pleasures is the desirable lifestyle.

Rav Soloveitchik, who states “*halakha* enjoins man to take no less pleasure than the hedonist in the glory and splendor in creation,” unequivocally sides with Maimonides and Rabbi Elazar Ben Kappara⁵¹. Holiness is healthy engagement in this world. For the Nazirite, it is healthy reengagement as Isserles writes.

Rav Soloveitchik’s depiction of holiness is a democratic one. Holiness is completely in the hands of man, scholar and ignoramus alike. Indeed, the Talmud relates that the Torah granted *amei ha’aretz*, or ignoramuses, the power to verbally sanctify items of their own volition, a power that can potentially cause many to falter in laws of *Me’ilah* or misuse of Temple property⁵². Nevertheless, Rav Soloveitchik distinguishes between two types of holiness:

The cry of Korah and his followers, “For all the community are holy, all of them, and the Lord is in their midst, so why do you raise yourselves above the Lord’s congregation?” (Num. 16:3), is partly true and partly false. Its premise is true, but its conclusion is false. It is correct that the external, exoteric holiness of the community of Israel, which obligates all of us to perform the commandments, does not distinguish between great and small. However, internal, esoteric holiness is dependent on the greatness, breadth, and depth of the individual. The greater the person, the greater his holiness. Many Torah portions address the people in the second-person singular. Inner experience is singular. One person’s experience differs from that of his fellow, and the difference in the experience creates a difference in the holiness of individuals⁵³.

⁵¹ *And From There You Shall Seek*, 111

⁵² Shabbat 32b: Rashi s.v. “v’nimseru”

⁵³ *And From There You Shall Seek*, 59

All have a stake in exoteric holiness. Only few can achieve the esoteric holiness. Korah's mistake was his assertion that all holiness is shared equally throughout the nation. "One lives with the community in the basic performance of the commandments . . . yet he concurrently communes with his Creator under the rubric of focused action, in the enclosed realm of his lonely personality which separates itself from the community⁵⁴."

The extent to which man can elevate his physical existence and imbue man-made sanctity into his life is dependent on his ability to be a creator.

The dream of creation finds its resolution in the actualization of the principle of holiness. Creation means the realization of the ideal of holiness . . . If a man wishes to attain the rank of holiness, he must become a creator of worlds. If a man never creates, never brings into being anything new, anything original, then he cannot be holy unto his God⁵⁵. Man is mandated with the mission to create like his Creator. Man, by elevating his existence, creates worlds and fulfills his command to be holy just like God.

Holiness, in contrast to popular conception, does not present man with a life of comfort, ease, and relaxation. A life of *kedushah* presents more hazardous dangers and challenges to the man. "*Kedushah* is not a paradise but a paradox⁵⁶." The power and dignity of man, as well as his acts of creating, which are conveyed by the institution of *kedushah*, can be transformed into the deification of man. The partaking in pleasure by the holy man can transition from a means into an ends. *Kedushah* requires vigilance and diligence in ensuring his lofty status.

It is this very task that is "man's moral aim⁵⁷." The creation of an elevated existence in essence creates man anew. As stated above, man's imbuing of *kedushah*, on the one hand, is a

⁵⁴ *And From There You Shall Seek*, 60

⁵⁵ *Halakhic Man*, 108-9

⁵⁶ *Sacred and Profane*, 8

⁵⁷ *And From There You Shall Seek*, 124

human endeavor, but on the other hand, a partnership with God. The Sabbath and the Land of Israel are endowed with *kedushah* through the integration of man's and God's granting of *kedushah* to them. The great partnership between God and Man is the goal of *kedushah*.

Therein is embodied the entire task of creation and the obligation to participate in the renewal of the cosmos. The most fundamental principle of all is that man must create himself. It is this idea that Judaism introduced into the world⁵⁸.

⁵⁸ *Halakhic Man*, 108-109