

קדושה הבאה מאליה-קדושה הבאה **Divinely gifted holiness vs. Human-made holiness** **Bechorot 19a - בידי אדם**

In the previous shiur we discussed essential and transactional holiness. This week, we add another layer of considering holiness - holiness that comes automatically (such as the holiness of a firstborn animal) and holiness that is human-made (such as consecrating an animal or something else to the Mikdash). How does this additional layer shed light on the concept of holiness?

1. משנה בכורות ג:א

... זה הכלל, כל שידוע שבכרה, אין כאן לכהן כלום. וכל שלא בכרה, הרי זה לכהן. אם ספק, יאכל במומו לבגלים...

...this is the principle: In any case where it is known that the animal had previously given birth, the priest has nothing here. And in any case where it is known that the animal had not previously given birth, that is given to the priest. And if it is uncertain, it may be eaten in its blemished state by the owner...

2. משנה טהרות ד:יב

...ספק נזירות, מתר. ספק בכורות, אחד בכורי אדם ואחד בכורי בהמה, בין טמאה בין טהורה, שהמוציא מחברו עליו הראיה:

..."A condition of doubt concerning a nazirite vow" [in such a condition of doubt one] is permitted [all that is forbidden to a nazirite]. "A condition of doubt concerning first-borns" whether they are human firstborn or firstborn of cattle, whether the firstborn of an unclean beast or a clean one, for the one who wishes to extract from his fellow bears the burden of proof.

3. נדרים יח:-יט.

מתני' סתם נדרים להחמיר, ופירושם להקל...

MISHNA: Unspecified vows are treated stringently, but their specification, if specification is necessary, is treated leniently...

גמ' והתנן: ספק נזירות להקל?

GEMARA: The Gemara raises a problem with the principle stated in the mishna that unspecified vows are treated stringently. But didn't we learn in a mishna (*Taharot* 4:12): Uncertainty with regard to naziriteship is treated leniently? And naziriteship is a type of vow.

אמר רבי זירא, לא קשיא: הא רבי אליעזר, הא רבנן. דתנא: המקדיש חיתו ובהמתו — הקדיש את הכוי.
רבי אליעזר אומר: לא הקדיש את הכוי.

Rabbi Zeira said: This is not difficult. That mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, and this mishna is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, who disagree with him. As it is taught in a *baraita*: One who consecrates his undomesticated animal and his domesticated animal has consecrated the *koy* as well, although it is uncertain whether it is an undomesticated or a domesticated animal. Rabbi Eliezer says: He has not consecrated the *koy*.

מאן דאמר ממונו מעיל לספיקא, גופיה נמי מעיל. ומאן דאמר ממונו לא מעיל לספיקא, גופיה (נמי)
The Rabbis who said that one puts his possessions into a state of uncertainty, and therefore a *koy* is included in the aforementioned vow, hold that one enters himself into a state of uncertainty as well. Therefore, uncertainty with regard to naziriteship is treated stringently. And Rabbi Eliezer, who said that one does not put his possessions into a state of uncertainty, and therefore the phrase: Undomesticated and domesticated animals, refers only to definitely undomesticated and definitely domesticated animals,

כל שכן דלא מעיל לספיקא.

holds that all the more so, one does not enter himself into uncertainty either. Therefore, uncertainty with regard to naziriteship is treated leniently.

אמר ליה אביי: במאי אוקימתא לספק נזירות להקל — רבי אליעזר, אימא סיפא: ספק בכורות, אחד
בכורי אדם ואחד בכורי בהמה, בין טמאה בין טהורה — המוציא מחבירו עליו הראיה.
Abaye said to Rabbi Zeira: In what manner did you establish the mishna that states that uncertainty with regard to naziriteship is treated leniently? You established it in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer. Say the latter clause of that mishna: If there is uncertainty with regard to firstborns, whether human firstborns, or animal firstborns, whether non-kosher firstborns, i.e., the firstborn of a donkey, or the firstborn of kosher animals, the burden of proof rests upon the claimant.

ותני עלה: ואסורים בגיזה ועבודה!

And it is taught in a *baraita* in that regard: But with regard to shearing and working these uncertain animal firstborns, they are forbidden, just like definite firstborns. This indicates a difference between the monetary issue, with regard to which it is ruled that the animal cannot be taken from the owner by the priest, and the prohibition, which applies despite the uncertainty. Evidently, even the *tanna* of this mishna does not hold that all uncertainties with regard to consecration are to be treated leniently.

אמר ליה: אמאי קא מדמית קדושה הבאה מאליה, לקדושה הבאה בידי אדם?

Rabbi Zeira said to Abaye: This is not difficult. Why do you compare sanctity that emerges by itself, i.e., the sanctity of a firstborn, which results from objective reality and not human intent, to sanctity that emerges by the volition of a person and is dependent on his intention? Only with regard to the latter type of sanctity can it be established that a person does not intend to consecrate an item in an uncertain manner.

4. ר"ן שם

אמאי קמדמית קדושה הבאה מאליה לקדושה הבאה בידי אדם - משום דבקדושה הבאה בידי אדם הוא דאיכא למימר דהאי גברא לא גמר לעיולי נפשיה וממוניה לספיקא אבל בקדושה הבאה בידי שמים ליכא למימר הכי דאטו בידיה הוא:

Why do you compare sanctity that emerges by itself to sanctity that emerges by the volition of a person? - Because sanctity that emerges by the volition, about that one may say that a person did not intend to bring themselves and their money into uncertainty, but about sanctity that emerge from Heaven this cannot be said, for is it in his hands?

5. בבא מציעא ו-ו:

אם תמצי לומר תקפה אחד בפנינו מוציאין אותה מידו, הקדישה – אינה מקודשת. אם תמצי לומר תקפה אחד בפנינו אין מוציאין אותה מידו, הקדישה בלא תקפה – מהו?

Rabbi Zeira's dilemma was not resolved, but the Gemara states a related *halakha*: If you say that if one seizes the garment in our presence the court removes it from his possession, then if either of the parties consecrated the entire garment to the Temple treasury, the consecration is not valid, as it is not his. But if you say that if one seizes the garment in our presence the court does not remove it from his possession, then if one of them consecrated the entire garment to the Temple treasury without seizing it, what is the *halakha*?

כיון דאמר מר: אמירתו לגבוה כמסירתו להדיוט דמי. כמאן דתקפה דמי.

The two sides of this dilemma are as follows: Since the Master said a principle with regard to the *halakhot* of transactions that a declaration to the Most High is equivalent to a transfer to an ordinary person, i.e., verbal consecration of an item is equivalent to a formal act of acquisition in a non-sacred transaction, is the one who consecrated the garment therefore considered like one who seized it, and consequently the consecration takes effect?

או דלמא: השתא מיהא הא לא תקפה, וכתבי: "ואיש כי יקדיש את ביתו קדש וגו'", מה ביתו ברשותו – אף כל ברשותו, לאפוקי האי דלא ברשותו.

Or perhaps the consecration does not take effect, as now, in any event, he did not actually seize the garment and it is not his? And it is written: "And when a man shall

sanctify his house to be sacred unto God” (Leviticus 27:14), from which the Sages derive: Just as his house is in his possession, so too, anything that one wishes to consecrate must be in his possession, to the exclusion of this garment, which is not in his possession, as he did not actually seize it, and therefore the consecration does not take effect.

תא שמע: דההיא

Come and hear proof from an incident that transpired, as there was a certain

מסותא דהוו מנצו עליה בי תרי, האי אמר דידי הוא והאי אמר דידי הוא. קם חד מיניהו אקדשה. פרשי מינה רב חנניה ורב אושעיא וכולהו רבנן. ואמר ליה רב אושעיא לרבא: כי אזלת קמיה דרב חסדא לכפרי, בעי מיניה.

bathhouse over which two people were arguing, and of which neither of them were in possession. This one said: It is mine, and that one said: It is mine. One of them arose and consecrated the bathhouse. Rav Hananya and Rav Oshaya and all the Rabbis kept away from the bathhouse and refrained from bathing there lest they transgress the prohibition against misusing consecrated property, as they were uncertain whether this act of consecration took effect. And Rav Oshaya said to Rabba: When you go to study before Rav Hisda in the town of Kafrei, ask him what we should do in this case.

כי אתא לסורא, אמר ליה רב המנונא: מתניתין היא. ספק בכורות, אחד בכור אדם ואחד בכור בהמה, בין טהורים בין טמאים: המוציא מחבירו עליו הראיה. ותני עלה: אסורים בגיזה ובעבודה.

When on his way to Kafrei, Rabba came to the city of Sura and related the incident to the Sages there. Rav Hamnuna said to him: The resolution to your dilemma is found in the following mishna (*Teharot* 4:12): If there is uncertainty with regard to firstborns, whether a human firstborn or an animal firstborn, whether with regard to kosher animals or non-kosher animals, i.e., the firstborn of a donkey, the burden of proof rests upon the claimant. The priest may not take the animal from its owner, or the redemption payment from the child's father. And it is taught in that regard in a *baraita*: One is nevertheless prohibited from shearing and from working such animals, as their status as firstborns is uncertain.

והא הכא דאמר תקפו כהן – אין מוציאין אותו מידו, דקתני המוציא מחבירו עליו הראיה, וכי לא תקפו – אסורין בגיזה ובעבודה.

Rav Hamnuna continued: And here, where the mishna effectively says that if a priest forcefully seized an animal whose status as firstborn is uncertain the court does not remove it from his possession, as it teaches that the burden of proof rests upon the claimant, the *baraita* states that even when the priest did not seize it, one is prohibited from shearing and working it. Evidently, the fact that the priest would remain in possession of the animal were he to seize it suffices to accord consecrated status to the

animal even in a case where the priest did not seize it. The same is true in the case of the bathhouse, that even though the one who consecrated it had not taken possession of it, his consecration takes effect.

אמר ליה רבא: קדושת בכור קאמרית – לעולם אימא לך תקפו כהן מוציאין אותו מידו, ואפילו הכי אסורים בגיזה ובעבודה, דקדושה הבאה מאליה שאני.

Rabba said to him: This is no proof, as the cases are not comparable. You say a ruling concerning the sanctity of a firstborn. Actually, I will say to you with regard to an animal whose status as firstborn is uncertain, if a priest seized it, the court removes it from his possession, as there is no validity to ownership acquired by force. (Accordingly, when the mishna states that the burden of proof rests upon the claimant, it means that the priest must bring proof that the animal is a firstborn.) And nevertheless, one is prohibited from shearing and from working such an animal, as sanctity that emerges by itself is different. The sanctity of a firstborn does not result from an act of consecration; rather, the firstborn is consecrated by itself at birth. Therefore, the uncertainty with regard to its sanctity is intrinsic, and one is prohibited from using the animal as long as the uncertainty exists.

6. רמח"ל מסילת ישרים פרק כו, קדושה Rav Moshe Chaim Luzzatto, 18th c Italy

ענין הקדושה כפול הוא, דהיינו:

The issue of holiness is dual, i.e.,

תחלתו עבודה וסופו גמול.
תחלתו השתדלות וסופו מתנה.

Its beginning is work, and its end is grace. Its beginning is effort, and its end is a gift.

והיינו שתחלתו הוא מה שאדם מקדש עצמו, וסופו מה שמקדשים אותו. והוא מה שאמרו זכרונם לברכה "אדם מקדש עצמו מעט – מקדשים אותו הרבה, מלמטה – מקדשים אותו מלמעלה" (יומא ל"ט א'). That is, that its beginning is that a person consecrates themselves, and its end is that others consecrate the person. That is what they said, of blessed memory, "A person consecrates themselves slightly, and they consecrate the person much; from below - and they consecrate the person from above (Yoma 39a)."

ההשתדלות הוא שיהיה האדם נבדל ונעתיק מן החומריות לגמרי, ומתדבק תמיד בכל עת ובכל שעה בא-להות...

The effort is that a person becomes separated fully from materialism and communes constantly with God...

ואמנם לפי שאי אפשר לאדם שישים הוא את עצמו במצב הזה, כי כבד הוא ממנו, כי סוף סוף חומרי הוא ובשר ודם, על כן אמרתי, שסוף הקדושה מתנה. כי מה שיוכל האדם לעשות, הוא ההשתדלות הראשון ברדיפת הידיעה האמיתית, והתמדת ההשכלה בקדושת המעשה. אך הסוף הוא, **שהקדוש ברוך הוא ידריכהו בדרך הזה שהוא חפץ ללכת בה**, וישרה עליו קדושתו ויקדשהו. ואז יצליח בידו זה הדבר, שיוכל להיות בדביקות הזה עמו יתברך בתמידות....

Yet because it is impossible for a person to put themselves in this state, for it is too heavy, for a person in the end is made of flesh and blood, therefore I said that the end of holiness is a gift. For what a person can do is the first effort in pursuit of true knowledge, and constant intellection in the holiness of action. But the end is that God will guide a person on this path that the person wishes to go on, and will rest Divine Presence upon the person. And thus the person will succeed at this, being able to commune with blessed God constantly...

והנה, האיש המתקדש בקדושת בוראו, אפילו מעשיו הגשמיים חוזרים להיות עניני קדושה ממש. וסימניה אכילת קדשים, שהיא עצמה מצות עשה, ואמרו זכרונם לברכה "כהנים אוכלים ובעלים מתכפרים" (פסחים נ"ט ב').

And behold, one who is sanctified in their Creator's holiness, even their physical deeds become true holiness. And the symbol of this is eating consecrated meat, which is itself a positive commandment. And they, of blessed memory said, "Priests eat, and the owners gain atonement." (Pesachim 59b)

7. רב שניאור זלמן מליאדי (Alter Rebbe, founder of Chabad, 18th c. Eastern Europe), ליקוטי תורה, מאמר "ובחמשה עשר יום לחדש הזה...וספרתם לכם ממחרת השבת"

"ולכן נקרא יום טוב הראשון דפסח בשם שבת, על פי מאמר רז"ל: 'ממחרת השבת – ממחרת יום טוב.' "And therefore, the first day of Passover is called by the name 'Shabbat,' in accordance with the statement of our Sages of blessed memory: 'From the morrow of the Shabbat means from the morrow of the Holiday.'

כי הנה ההפרש שבין שבת ליום טוב הוא, דשבת היא קדשה הבאה מאליה, כי קביעא וקיימא מששת ימי בראשית ואין צריך לקדוש בית דין. אבל יום טוב הוא קדשה הבאה בידי אדם, שישאל מקדשין לזמנים, שהבית דין מקדשין את החדש, וכפי קדוש החדש כך נקבע היום טוב.

For behold, the distinction between Shabbat and a Holiday is that Shabbat is a holiness that comes automatically, because it is fixed and stands from the six days of Creation and does not require the sanctification of a human court. But a Holiday is a holiness brought by human hand, for 'Israel sanctifies the seasons,' meaning that the human court sanctifies the new month, and according to the human sanctification of the month, so is the date of the Holiday established.

וְהִנֵּה הַטַּעַם לָזֶה הוּא מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהַקִּדְּשָׁה הַבָּאָה בְּיַד אָדָם הִיא בְּבַחֲיוֹנָת אֲתֵּעְרוּתָא דְּלִתְתָּא, שְׁעַל יְדֵי מַעֲשֵׂה הָאָדָם וְעִבּוּדָתוֹ מִמְּשִׁיחַ הַקִּדְּשָׁה מְלַמְעֵלָה. אָבֵל שַׁבָּת, מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהִיא קִדְּשָׁה הַבָּאָה מֵאֵלִיָּה, הִיא בְּבַחֲיוֹנָת אֲתֵּעְרוּתָא דְּלֵעִילָא, שֶׁהַקְּדוּשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא מִשְׁפִּיעַ וּמַעִיר הַקִּדְּשָׁה מְלַמְעֵלָה מֵאֵלִיָּה, בְּלֹא אֲתֵּעְרוּתָא דְּלִתְתָּא כָּלֵל.

Now, the deeper reason for this is because holiness brought by human hands corresponds to the level of 'an awakening from below', where through man's actions and his spiritual labor, he draws down the holiness from Above. Shabbat, however, because it is a holiness that comes automatically, corresponds to an 'awakening from above', wherein the Holy Blessed One flows and awakens the holiness from Above on its own, completely without any prior awakening from below.

וּבִיצִיאת מִצְרַיִם הָיְתָה הַקִּדְּשָׁה בָּאָה מֵאֵלִיָּה מְלַמְעֵלָה בְּבַחֲיוֹנָת אֲתֵּעְרוּתָא דְּלֵעִילָא לְבַד, מִפְּנֵי שֶׁיִּשְׂרָאֵל הָיוּ אֵז מְשַׁקְעִים בְּמִ"ט שְׁעָרֵי טְמֵאָה וְלֹא הָיָה בָּהֶם שׁוּם זְכוּת וְאֲתֵּעְרוּתָא דְּלִתְתָּא שֶׁיְהִי רְאוּיָם לְגֻאֲלָהּ. וְלָכֵן נִגְלָה עֲלֵיהֶם מֶלֶךְ מַלְכֵי הַמַּלְכִּים הַקְּדוּשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא וּגְאֹלָם מֵאֵלִיו בְּבַחֲיוֹנָת חֶסֶד חֲנּוּם. וּמִפְּנֵי זֶה נִקְרָא יוֹם טוֹב הָרָאשׁוֹן דְּפֶסַח בְּשֵׁם שַׁבָּת, לְפִי שֶׁהָיְתָה קִדְּשָׁתוֹ מֵאֵלִיָּה כְּקִדְּשַׁת הַשַּׁבָּת.

And during the Exodus from Egypt, the holiness arrived automatically from Above purely as an 'awakening from above.' This was because Israel at that time was completely submerged within the 49 Gates of Impurity, and they possessed no merits or awakening from below that would make them worthy of redemption. Therefore, the Sovereign of sovereigns, the Holy Blessed One was revealed to them and redeemed them automatically as an act of unconditional grace. It is for this reason that the first day of Passover is called 'Shabbat'—because its holiness came automatically, just like the holiness of Shabbat."

...

"וְזֶהוּ עֵינֵן 'וּסְפַרְתֶּם לָכֶם מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת', כִּי הִנֵּה הַקִּדְּשָׁה הַבָּאָה מֵאֵלִיָּה מְלַמְעֵלָה בְּפֶסַח הָיְתָה בְּבַחֲיוֹנָת מַתָּנָה וּמִקִּיף בְּלִבָּד, וְאֵינָה נִקְלָטָה בְּפִנְיָמִיּוֹת הַנֶּפֶשׁ מֵאַחֵר שֶׁלֹּא הָיְתָה עַל יְדֵי עִבּוּדָתָם.

"And this is the inner meaning of 'And you shall count for yourselves from the morrow of the Shabbat.' For behold, the automatic holiness that descended from Above on Passover was given merely as a gift and an 'encompassing light.' It could not be integrated into the internal fabric of the soul, since it was not generated through their own spiritual labor.

וְלָכֵן מִיַּד מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת הִתְחִילָה עֲבוּדַת יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּעֶסֶק סְפִירַת הָעֵמֶר. שְׁעֵנֵן הַסְפִּירָה הוּא מְלִשׁוֹן סְפִירוֹת וּבְהִירוֹת, לְבָרֵר וּלְזַכֵּךְ הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַבְּהִמִית וּמִ"ט מְדוּתֶיהָ, שֶׁזֶהוּ עֵינֵן קִדְּשָׁה הַבָּאָה בְּיַד אָדָם דּוֹקָא.

Therefore, immediately on 'the morrow of the Shabbat' [the day after Passover], the labor of Israel began through the mitzvah of Counting the Omer. The concept of counting (Sefirah) shares a root with 'sapphire' and brilliance—meaning to clarify, refine, and illuminate the animalistic soul and its 49 emotional traits. This is explicitly the definition of holiness built by human hands.

כִּי עֵינֵן הָעֹמֶר הָיָה מִן הַשְּׁעוּרִים, שֶׁהוּא מֵאֵכֶל בְּהֵמָה, לְהוֹרוֹת שְׁעָקֵר הָעֲבוּדָה בְּיָמֵי הַסְּפִירָה הַיָּא לְזַכֵּךְ אֶת הַבְּהֵמִיּוֹת שֶׁבְּאָדָם... וְעַל יְדֵי הַזִּכּוּךְ שֶׁבִּיְדֵי אָדָם בְּמִ"ט יָמֵי הַסְּפִירָה, נַעֲשִׂים כָּלִים רְאוּיִים לְקַבֵּל הַקִּדְשָׁה הָעֲלִיוֹנָה שֶׁל מִתֵּן תּוֹרָה בְּחַג הַשְּׁבָעוֹת, שֶׁהִיא תְּכֵלִית הַשְּׁלֻמוֹת דְּקִדְשָׁה הַבָּאָה מֵאֵלֶיהָ."

For the Omer offering consisted of barley, which is traditionally animal food, teaching us that the primary labor during the days of counting is to refine the animalistic nature within man... And through this human-driven refinement during the 49 days of Sefirah, they become proper vessels capable of receiving the supreme, transcendent holiness of the giving of the Torah on Shavuot—which represents the ultimate, absolute perfection of holiness that comes automatically."

8. רב משה חיים אפרים מסודליקוב, 18th c. Poland, דגל מחנה אפרים, פרשת כי תשא

"כִּי מֹשֶׁה רַבֵּנוּ נֻלַּד צְדִיק גָּמוּר, כְּמֵאֲמַר חֲז"ל 'וַתֵּרָא אֹתוֹ כִּי טוֹב הוּא' – שְׁנוּלַד מֵהוּל וְכָלוּ טוֹב, וְלֹא הָיָה לוֹ שׁוּם רָע וּמְנִיעָה כָּלל מִצַּד תּוֹלְדוֹתָיו וְטָבַע מִזְגוֹ מִלְעֵבֶד אֶת הַשֵּׁם יִתְבָּרַךְ."

"For Moses our teacher was born completely righteous, as our Sages of blessed memory said on the verse, 'And she saw that he was good'—that he was born circumcised and entirely good. He had no evil or spiritual barrier at all from the perspective of his birth or his natural temperament that would hold him back from serving the blessed God.

וְהִנֵּה יֵשׁ עוֹד בְּחִינַת צְדִיק שְׂאִינוּ נֻלַּד כֵּךְ, רַק שֶׁבְּטָבַע תּוֹלְדוֹתוֹ וּמִזְגוֹ הָיוּ לוֹ מְנִיעוֹת רַבּוֹת וְטָבַע רָע, וְהוּא בְּצִדְקָתוֹ וּבְמַעֲשָׂיו הַטּוֹבִים כִּבֵּשׁ אֶת יִצְרוֹ וְשִׁבְרָה כָּל הַמְּנִיעוֹת וְהַקְּלָפוֹת עַד שֶׁבָּא לַמַּדְרַגַּת צְדִיק...
However, behold, there is another category of righteous person who was not born this way. Rather, by natural birth and temperament, this person had many barriers and a difficult nature. Yet, through righteousness and good deeds, this person conquered their inclination and broke all of the barriers and husks until they achieved the status of a righteous person...

וְזֶהוּ שְׂאֵמְרוֹ (בְּכֻרֹת ה', א'): 'מֹשֶׁה רַבְּכֶם קוֹבִיּוּסְטוֹס הוּא' – כְּלוֹמֵר שֶׁהָיוּ תִּמְהִים עָלָיו, מֵאַחֵר שְׁנוּלַד כֵּךְ בְּלֹא שׁוּם יִצְרָה וּמְנִיעוֹת, אִם כֵּן אֵין לוֹ שׁוּם שְׁבִירַת כָּלִי וְיִגִּיעָה וּמִלְחָמָה כָּל כֵּךְ, וְעָקֵר נַחַת רוּחַ לְמַעֲלָה הוּא מִמֵּי שֶׁהָיָה לוֹ מְנִיעוֹת וְיִצְרָה הָרַע וּכְבָּשׁוּ... אֲבָל בְּאַמֶּת, אֵף שֶׁמֹּשֶׁה רַבֵּנוּ עָה"ש נֻלַּד בְּקִדְשָׁה, הַשְׁתַּמֵּשׁ בְּכָל כּוֹחֹתָיו לְשִׁמּוּם מֵאֵלָיו."

And this explains the meaning behind the Talmudic passage where people [cynically] challenged, 'Your teacher Moses is a gambler' Meaning, they wondered about him: since he was born completely pure without any evil inclination or barrier (to goodness), he didn't have to experience the fracturing a vessel, heavy exhaustion, or (spiritual) warfare. And the primary pleasure in Heaven comes precisely from one who possesses a strong evil inclination and barriers, but conquers them! ... But in truth, even though Moses our teacher was born in a state of automatic holiness, he employed every single one of his natural capacities to serve Heaven on his own."