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3rd Lecture by Rabbi J. B. Soloveitchik on “Foundations of Judaism”, ~~Nov~~ Dec. 1, 1948.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(THM) העיקר של תחיית המתים

Postulate constructs underlying THM. Concept of THM is typically Jewish, reflects characteristic of [???] consciousness, manifesting itself in even(?) other than metaphysical spheres. עיקר of Messiah follows from THM; difference is that Messiah is historical hope, in historical cycle of Israel. רמב"ם, פרק אחרון של הלכות מלכים on משיח, connected to historical – political redemption אמר שמואל אין בין וכו' אלא שעבוד מלכויות בלבד. According to Maimonides, throwing off שעבוד מלכויות by משיח is (only) means to sublime life. THM is ~~psychological~~ histological as opposed to historical Escatological hope. THM is divorced from Jewish History, purely personality. Is sequel to reality, which is interjected(?) causalistically, mechanistically, & teleologically. First Liberal Movement (Reform in 1840-60 in Germany, in America, etc) eliminated(?) at first THM. Their movement is surely(?) Theological Judaism, greater than theological, includes Halacha. They identify religious ethos with philosophical ethos, typical religious element is theological – dogmatic(?) – element, with
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[???]. That’s why they clung to idea of Ikarim. With orthodox, not so important, thusרדב"ז and חתם סופר reject idea of עיקרים. It’s too stiff, הלכה urges creativity, חידוש. חידוש is focal point of הלכה. ∴ stiff עיקר unexposed(?) to חידוש and metamorphosis, but בעל הלכה has independent system of research & analysis, while theologian is stuck to certain עיקרים without independent research. בעל הלכה welcomed Jewish Philosophy, not theology, while Reform identified philosophy with theology. Reform thinker limited to inflexible systems. Mendlesohn in ירושלים ~~rejected~~ denied עיקרים because he was raised in home with הלכה spirit. Later leaders of Jewish Reform fought him on this point, supported עיקרים. עיקרים structure is only basis for Reform.

THM, however, was the [???] with Reform. Looked upon as alien to Jewish spirit, very non-Jewish, because נביאים rarely stress THM while they mention משיח, שכר ועונש, etc. Bible critics believe that any mention of THM in נביאים is later edition since they think that THM is later development,
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ישעי' כ"ה ח' – בלה המות לנצח ומחה ד' אלוקים דמעה מעל כל פנים.

ישעי' כ"ו י"ט – יחיו מתיך נבלתי יקומון הקיצו ורננו שכני עפר כי טל אורות טליך וארץ רפאים תפיל

say that טל אורות טליך וכו' וכו' in ישעי' put in in time of חשמונאים as concession(?) to חסידים who fought Wars of Independence as reason to fight. Thus, they believe that THM served as political instrument to cultivate patriotic passions. Thus, if we should accept this premise, all versions(?) (דניאל, איוב, etc.) of THM were later editions. THM has no philosophical or rational place in Modern Judaism.

But, because of that, THM is typically Jewish because it doesn’t coincide with Greek Philosophy. All Jewish philosophers used Greek Philosophy as instrument in effecting harmony bet. Judaism & Hellenistic philosophy. Introduced alien thought. They left THM untouched, unsubjected(?) to philosoph. analysis. Only one who devoted a chapter to THM was Saadia, last chapter. But even he doesn’t philosophize on it. Thus, in his first chapter he’s more interested in philosoph. [???] (Greek(?), than מאמרי חז"ל, but in THM he uses no Philo., simply tries to reconstruct idea of THM from חז"ל and תנ"ך. Rambam once mentions THM in הל' תשובה. [רמב"ן, not
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a philosopher, devoted שער הגמול to THM]. They disregarded THM because not subject to rational or biological(?) (in this case) analysis. Greeks did not know of THM, introduced to occident by early christians who took over from THM from Jews. With christians, THM (Resurrection) plays part in Crucifixion & Salvation. Proof that this was central dogma during בית שני w. Jews: ברכה של בא"י מחי' מתים. Called גבורות (omnipotence). Even Historians admit its one of most ancient ברכות, that ברכת תה"מ precedes ברכת אבות.

Second Proof: from discussions in Talmud (פרק החלק) we see that problem of THM was acute then, moved(?) religious passion. [prepare for next week: central basis of all arguments that THM is just(?) necessary postulation of Judaism – דף ראשון בפ' החלק]. Third proof 🡪 difference bet. צדוקים ופרושים was(?) THM. So much so, that חז"ל that they changed form of ברכת מקדש to מן העולם ועד העולם. [he has the words "כדי להוציא" here but I can’t figure out what they are connected to]. חז"ל’s statement against those who said אין חלק לעוה"ב למי שאמר אין תה"מ מן התורה, even if he believed in THM, as long as he denied it’s מן התורה.

Phraseology of תפילה is prophetic. Prophecy served as model for formulation of ברכות. For THM ברכה
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model (from נבואה) which expressed itself in help to oppressed, etc. & of THM, model was תפילת חנה. etc. כי לא בכח יגבר איש………. Guiding motif of תפילת חנה was ethical order of world, G-d helps suppressed, man’s insecurity & changeability(?), then ממית ומחי' מוריד שאול ויעל, - THM! [can be interpreted as sickness & health, as do modern historians. They interpret so, as to eliminate concept of THM from antiquity. But חז"ל interpret idea of תה"מ] חז"ל called the ברכה – גבורות, referring to main body of תפילת חנה. there, part of ethical performance of G-d is THM, not a miracle (G-d??? not part of cosmic process). Ethical attributes of Divine action, not as part of ~~cosmic process~~ naturalistic, dynamic, cosmic process. This, THM for us, not only metaphysical, but ethical belief.

Ethical basis of THM: from תפילת חנה which is necessarily ethical, from גבורות, ethical. THM accepted, to justify ethical injustices, because of passionate ethical faith מקיים אמונתו לישני עפר, G-d will not disappoint dead, thus not escatological (supernatural).
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What prompted idea of חז"ל to make it central them of בית שני, not Fear of Death (fear of nihility(?)) because they believed in Immortality (השארת הנפש), this no fear of death, and fear of dissolution into nothingness as it was in Christianity. [with Christians, THM ??? ??? ???]. THM is as ancient as Judaism, not political. But, נביאים were prompted by an ethical ideal [Let us free ourselves from Biblical criticism which are disproven ~~daily~~ with every now discovery]. Fact of possibility of THM – אליהו ואלישע did it, nothing absurd or paradoxical; They accepted it as rational [even if not logical]. In מלכים, we see no fear of death, accepted as natural process, no state of horror which [???] modern man This ethical ideal is mainly based in: Creation is good. Central theoretical basis of Judaism [וירא אלוקים כי טוב], no gaps or evil in creation. Later, Bible tells us of deterioration וירא ד' כי רעה רבת האדם וכו' וינחם. But creation perfect כי אלוקים עשה את האדם ישר [from קהלת] only later deteriorated. Then, with THM, NATURE WILL BE PERFECT. Thus, even Nature is not fully perfected.
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even Sun & Moon lost perfection [מאמרי חז"ל]. This prompted ישעי' and other נביאים in belief in אחרית הימים, rehabilitation of Nature. Evil is not necessary parts of Reality, only appended to Reality later. THM is thus based on כי טוב.

Greeks couldn’t accept THM, thought it most absurd part of Judaism; ~~because~~ Plato & Socrates discovered immortality, not THM. ~~[~~ Immortality is Greek idea, THM is Jewish ~~]~~. Thus חז"ל ~~believe~~ emphasize THM although still believing in השארת הנפש. Early Christian Historians [???] that christian blood is THM, not Immortality. Reasons for Greek dichotomy became Matter-Form, Form perfect, Matter is chaotic, thus evil. [???] are perfect for Aristotle, non-evolutionary, whereas THM is evolution-biological and cosmic, progress, change for better. Plato thus promised immortality by duplication of [???] 🡪 by [???] matter-free world, thus evil-free. but Aristotelian idea of immortality, it at all authentically Aristotle’s, is difficult, because he identified matter and Form. Evil was causalistically(?) necessary for Greeks, so duplication of this world to better, evil-free world. But חז"ל, in idea
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of מן העולם ועד העולם does not indicate 2 worlds, but continuation of our world. נביאים actually accepted existence of evil (despite Maimonidean guide) but promised betterment(?) – בלע המות לנצח ומחה ד' דמעה כל כל פנים, i.e. recognition of death as prime evil because it causes spiritual & physical pain – דמעה – suffering, not idea of fear of death itself, but death as causing דמעה, suffering. This פסוק has more than just promise of resurrection of dead, but also elimination of Death for The Living. We postulated a real this world. Halacha: טומאת מת, can’t enter מקדש, eat תרומה etc. בל יטמא for כהן ונזיר who are Holy. Thus, death is negative in Halacha, (not like Maimonides(?) with his מיתת נשיקה, and what we say מן המות - escape - המות היא המנוסה) but Halacha regarded ~~Halacha~~ ~~and~~ Death as evil, one of many evils, not as a wonderful transition, but as imperfection of Reality which is corrected in escatological period of תה"מ.) Main problem of THM is to eliminate suffering in general – not exclusively Death.
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תפילת חנה was on suffering from child-bearing of שמואל [see text of תפילת חנה]. She was helped, by bearing child, no longer עקרה. Sees that every ailment can be cured by G-d, including death; by ethical motivation(?). For us, escatology (אחרית הימים) is full of realization of ethical norm; perfection of Nature. Messianic Hope is point of THM, in that it’s beginning of a certain ethical rehabilitation – political, but still עולם כמנהגו נוהג, Nature is still imperfect [~~but~~ with chance to devote time to ~~the~~ study, etc.]. But other evils, such as Death, still present in ימות המשיח.

Greek approach to G-d was cosmological. Medieval Jew. Philo. Moved in Greek orbit, saw that cosmic dynamics must have basis, this basis is G-d. By approaching G-d cosmologically (i.e. physical, ---logical etc.) we get Prime Principle who is unifying law of all cosmic phenomena, transcendental in Nature, this is G-d. They, however, ended up in a Nirvana, G-d to them was a nothingness, only apex of cosmic hierarchy, a mere principle. Plotinus (a typical homo religiosus, influenced by Judaism through Christianity), even he arrived at nothing special – at a
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Unknown(?) “beyond”, a transcendental motivator(?), because he used cosmological method. Beyond Beauty, Beyond everything that exists yet it itself doesn’t exist. We can’t of course agree with Hermann Cohen who said Jews never used cosmologically (He said Paganism starts from cosmological considerations, crude pagans saw G-d in world – idol(?) – fine(?) pagan sees transcendental G-d, but only cosmological. That’s why he’s [???] at Spinoza, called him philosophical pagan because he saw G-d in all phenomena, but only in our world), ~~only~~ but because of moral imperative, ethical norms of which source is G-d. He is somewhat right (Cohen influenced by Kant, vs.(?) cosmological, with ethical. This Lutheran. Catholic scholasticism – Aquinas – approaches G-d cosmology., Protestant, by way of Man – ethical. Ethically, susceptibility in Man, not ethically natural. ~~)~~ Luther accepts this Man-approach because of renaissance of Bible, prophetic approach). But, we also had some cosmology approach – Story of Creation, many פרקי תנ"ך (ירמי') and פרקי תהילים. Most important contribution of Judaism to understanding of G-d: not only
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principle of ethics, but a personal G-d. While Kant speaks of source & sanction of Ethics as being G-d, this is still causality like cosmology with different terminology. But Judaism – G-d practices the ethical norm, practice (by G-d) precedes norm, this ethical norm is an imitation of G-d’s deeds, His Existence & actions are ethical. Ethical norm is modus vivandi of G-d; from all above, Judaism believes G-d as personal, not only as a “beyond’, a ‘principle’ as Nirvana, not “abyss” (as christians called Him, indicating nothingness). Thus, מה הוא חנון אף אתה חנון, etc. (ethical norm comes from G-d). That’s why call G-d "איש". Thus, to reach this conclusion, we can’t start with causes (we would reach only “principle”), but my man-ethical. From this, insight into G-d’s personality. We can’t discover Man’s personality by comparing to G-d’s personality, which is unknown, but reversed. By studying Man’s personality, we may arrive at some understanding Divine personality, since there is some sort of analogue. THM gives us insight into Man’s personality (philosophic or metaphysical insight), from there we may understand G-d.
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Maimonides reversed order, because he had terrible fear of anthropomorphism, feared analogy of G-d to Man, ∴ wanted to study G-d in vacuo, reaches negative understanding of G-d (i.e. not man) in First Book of Guide.

Judaism not theocentric but anthropocentric. (not quite that strong, said so merely to stress). Thus, subject of Halacha is mainly Man, not G-d. Thus, as we said last lecture, Man-Man autonomous from Man-G-d. Man, not G-d, treated as subject matter by חז"ל. Even חכמי המשנה who lived in era full of speculation as to Divine Nature, were interested only in man and This World, not much (or – not at all) in G-d and other world. Never mentioned מלאכים etc. When mention was ~~mentioned~~ made of metaphysics of G-d, referred to it as negative מעשה מרכבה etc., disregarded or even prohibited its study. Mishna (thus Judaism, Halacha) felt(?) that G-d could be arrived at by study of Man & Personality. Our religion ~~is concrete~~ deals with concrete reality.
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Prepare:

1 – חומש (without מפרשים); study story of Man – creation, first resident(?) in גן עדן, creation of חוה, מבול של נח, till אברהם [???]
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ב"ה

Lecture #4

Personality

Educated christian acquainted w. philosophic anthropology (concerning destiny etc) will define idea of Man in 3-fold way, & by sheer force of associated thinking would refer to 3 metaphysical viewpoints of occident in Man.

1. Judeao-Christian (Biblical) 2) Classical Greek 3) Mod. Scient fic

Would explain as follows: They (first two) are in strict contradiction to naturalistic interpret. of Mod. Scie. Biblical & Greek contrast Man w. Plant & animal by unbridgeable Greek although Man, Plant & animal share in common, organic matter; otherwise distinction is not in degree but in kind. He would say incommensurability of Man w. Plant-animal; Bible Greek agree. Bible: [???] metaphysical autonomy of Man based [???] uniqueness as created in Divine Image whose essence ~~to~~ is determined by his polarity of obedience to a revolt vs. Creator. Polarity is by Satan (vs. Creator) & transcendental spirit (good, w.(?) Creator). Greeks, instead of G-d & polarity of sin saw autonomy of man as he is cognitive-Knowetic man, being able to grasp essence of things & ability to rise(?) over [???] & perception to recognition of eternal conceptual order & stability. i.e.
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for Bible, mystics(?) of Transcendental Spirit, for Greeks – [???] Λόγος (Logos). But both give him autonomy. Mod. Science – see(?) ontic discrepancy bet. Man & animal, no(?) metaphysical autonomy, all built(?) from organic matter organized in living structure & patterns. Difference bet. Man & Pl-anim. is difference in degree (diversity, complexity, structure or(?) organic matter). Life processes [???] a grant from(?) Nature to all three exponents – M, P.A. [Controversy bet. Mechanists & Vitalists or Neo-Vitalists impertinent here. Both agree no dif. bet. M, P and A., same teleology or life-substance in [???] cell & in Man. Just that Vitalists see dif. bet inorg. & org. matter, Mechanists didn’t. ∴ impertinent]. Unity & continuity of life from org. matter of biological sources(?) the most annoying to homo religiosis -problem isn’t genesis of Man (creation <-> Evolution) – but ~~autonomous~~ heteronomy and autonomy of Man. Here antiquity (Bible & Greek) vs. Modern. Problem: is autonomy (metaphysical) of Man a Jewish idea, or assimilated by us in Middle-ages from Christianity via Greek thought?
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Upon reading text of בראשית, one sees that Bible tells of unity of created universe by Word of G-d. order & logical-dynamic sequence(?) – Heaven & Earth, vegetative – animal life then Man. Meaningful pattern of homogenous succession. Let’s [???] on org. matter(?) תדשא הארץ דשא וכו' ~~אשר~~ ועץ עושה פרי – וכו' ישרצו וכו' נעשה אדם בצלמנו וכו' ויהי' אדם לנפש חי'. Reports about all 3 – M,P,A, both before שני and after ויכולו(?), take account common origin of life – עפר, Mother Earth. [“Mother” of “Mother” Earth has origin in idea of Bible]. "אדם" bespeaks his origin – אדמה – when curse of Death, explained as כי עפר אתה ולעפר תשוב. If Torah would speak of Man as Transcendental Being in Divine Image and [???], idea of אדמה & עפר impossible. Naturalistic [???] of Man was, to extent, common knowledge among נביאים & חז"ל, they didn’t resent it but actually accepted it. Christians from Paul 🡪 St. Augustine 🡪 Aquinas 🡪 our age resent naturalistic, at least duality; Natural & Transcendental (other terminologies). Reason is in discrepancy bet. old & New Testament. Old: (נביאים) M = P = A., important(?)
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in Jew. Ethics – helplessness, vulnerability, fluctuating bet. Life & Death, of which Prophets speak, in contrast w. Eternity & omnipotence of G-d. Suggest naturalness & immanence of Man in Nature rather than Spirituality & Transcendence.

אדם להבל דמה וכו' כל הבשר חציר ודבר אלוקינו יקום לעולם

Confluence(?) of Man & Earth make him weak, unstable, contrast omnipotence of pure spirituality of G-d. Not once is Man’s transcendentality mentioned in תנ"ך, but rather his unity w. Nature. Then, cycle of birth & death understood in תנ"ך as cycle of growth & decay in Plant. [i.e. part of biochemical process of Life]. כי כל הבשר חציר – man as flesh & flesh as [???]. ויזכר כי בשר המה, (in whose life, Death is a part of) שוכני בתי חמה? (איוב) בני תמותה [בן אדם suggest irony & sarcasm – “son of Earth”.] “Death” in Hebrew – מיתה - applies equally to Man and Animal, וימת w. משה & כי ימות w. בהמה. נבלה w. both – נבלתי יקומון of ישעי', also always w. animal. Man, according to our version or understanding of Prophets, ~~temporarily when נביא~~
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not as temporal being w. striving for Man for Eternal(?) (christianity) but Man – weakness & his pride wants to convert his weakness to glory but not metaphysical striving. Man = Nature paramount in תנ"ך. christian = Death faces(?) Man as result of original Sin, (in Judaism אם אכלך וכו' מות תמות does not mean “You will become Mortal”,] כי מות תמות not interpreted as Christians by רמב"ם, ראב"ע; רמב"ן has twist on it, but certainly not christian, (although acceptsמות תמות as “You will become mortal”, not strong(?) w. him). Death, ~~for~~ in Judaism, is end of natural process; Death, in Christianity, is metaphysical. Same w. sin. For christian, biological death only consequence of metaphysical death. [“Death is metaphysical” is basis of christian science], thus death not biological or psychosomatic, but primarily metaphysical death. Origin of the idea is in יחזקאל, thus – כי לא אחפוץ במת הרשע כי אם בשובו מדרכו וחי idea of metaphysical death is thus Jewish in [???], we find it only in יחזקאל, but does not quite [???] main force of most נביאים w. naturalistic understanding of Man.
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Isolated(?) Secondary component of Sin = cause of Death found in Judaism (יחזקאל) taken by christians, make center(?) of Christianity. חז"ל also [???] נביאים in beautiful description of Death of משה, his desire for physical immortality, his failure. Biblical description of deaths of Patriarchs, שבע ימים, ואתה תבוא בשלום אל אבותיך, i.e. natural thing, "בשלום" meaning old-age, not prematurely, not accepted as tragedy as it was in New Testament. Old Test. only wanted to solve “mystery” of death, solved it by TH, but not so New Test which saw Death as major tragedy. 🡪 Paul and Augustine spoke of Man as Natural being as corrupt since Nature is corrupt(?), if Man to be worthy of being he must use(?) from Nature to Transcendental existence, thus opened gate to mysticism, asceticism others Middle=age christian [???], where people left families let them starve purposely etc. to show freedom from Nature which was shown(?) in family(?) [???], (not because of religious ecstasy). For Jew, פרנסה was good, asked G-d for it in שמונה עשרה.

Halacha too, like תורה ונביאים develops immanence of Man (in Nature) vs. transcendental of christianity. (That’s why Christianity speaks of Tragedy of Man)

**Page 21**

For us, naturalness of Man is dominant. [???] נשמה, נשמה means רוח; רוח = breath, natural ויפח באפו רוח, thus even soul identified w. Natural phen.(?). ויברא and ויעש apply to all Nature as well as Man.

Immanence of Man (Jewish vs. christian) and his confluence w. Mother Earth & Immediacy vs. Nature: Let’s use division(?) ([???] – Greek) Mineral דומם – Plant צומח – Animal חי – Man מדבר (Man – מדבר. מדבר is Logos, thus thought & logos, not only speech). While medieval philosophers saw no transaction(?) bet. them, Science sees transition bet. Last 3, hopes to see transition bet. 1st and last 3. Let’s leave out Mineral (דומם) , and start w. Plant. Problem: Does יהדות identify naturally, metaphysically, Man with Plant? Answer: yes, especially הלכה (will prove later), places Man in realm of plant-life. Idea of microcosm (Man participant in 1st scene cosmic organic drama(?), i.e. plant). Plant = living structure which displays propensities of change, growth, ~~reproduction~~ regeneration etc – (contrast Minerals); displays, already, behavior in Life, a meaning (that is, behavior) bespeaking “within” and “without”. Even Mechanists who explain Life as atomistic(?) in terms of tissue changes etc, admit tendency of living matter to retain internal structure, & parallelism bet.
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this tendency to behavior to outside (i.e. turning its leaves to green, opening & closing of leaves at AM and PM, show behavior) – phenomenologically (not morphologically) plant ~~retains~~ has adaptibility to environment which bespeaks relation of “within” to “without”. Inner drive of living structure [???] parallel to ~~the~~ its behavior to the outside world, i.e. “organism” & “environment”. This can’t be applied to mineral world. Epistemologically, table is part of environment, not affected by environment as is plant. In plant we can not yet speak of oneness of organism & environment (as we can with mammals(?)). Confluence bet. org. and environment, but still not complete – Source (Science?) far from it, there is polarity of within & without. On one hand, organic(?) parallelism bet. within and without. As for without: confluence of organism <-> environment not only for plant but also Animal, Man etc. Confluence of org – [???] quite different in degree bet. Plant & Man-animal, because [???] is in fixed environment, latter have locomotion, change of environments. Thus, in associative thinking (psychologically) & epistemologically, we can’t dissociate man from any one environment. Another difference, Man-Animal must assimilate org. matter (mostly(?)), while plant assimilates inorg. matter.
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Thus, [???] parallelism:

Plant – outer changes & inner changes neatly(?) attuned. Within: inner existence which behaves to outside in certain fashion (~~whether~~ maybe(?) Mechanistically). Without: plant functionally and phenomenologically flows w. environment, works within & reacts to it.

Now, [Halacha] as to Man-Plant. Biologically, M-P relation, entire biological-physiological-functional system, concerning these functions, M and P act & react similarly, though in different degree, without direct conscience effort and act of Man, just as w. Plant. Same [???] automatic ~~experience~~ function of plant in [???] (let’s say so as [???] to Mechanists). Man-Environment relation. More [???] man is more integrated in one particular environment. [In Philosophy, 1 שיטה sees Man as rising by divorce and independence from natural environment technologically, etc., even in political philosophy of 19th cent. Internationalism was expression of desire to be independent from one particular & fixed environment – Fatherland. 2nd שיטה, return of Man to Nature, corporate(?) state is idea to integrate Man w. fixed environment, Fascists spoke of bond(?) man to particular fixed earth, thus return to animal
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& even plant life]. Attitude of יהדות to Man as organism bounded(?) within (automatic, [???] functionalism alone; or, conscience & ethical imperatives(?), logos) & attitude to confluence of Man w. fixed environment (and implication w. regard to political sphere).

MISSED LECTURES
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ב"ה

LECTURE 6

H = Halacha

M = Man

P = Plant

A = Animal

Last week(?) – definition & application of organism by & in Halacha. Now – Man-Plant in H.

One of most favorite metaphors for Man in נביאים is Tree and other organic life of P. Basic metaphor in Torah (דברים) כי אדם עץ השדה – translation immaterial – whether neg. (אינו עץ השדה) or pos.(הוא הץ השדה) . If(?) [???] this likeness, hence duty-bound to respect Tree as w. M. Like M should not be subjected to war-harm, so עץ השדה is like M not at war w. you, ∴ אסור to cut tree במצור ([???]). If neg. interpret., same meaning – Tree not like M to be besieged by you, but should be respected – don’t destry org. life. ∴ “don’t besiege ‘innocent tree’ and destroy it”. i.e., בל תשחית, that אסור to destroy tree to accelerate surrender of besieged city (such as when fruit tree feeds besieged enemy). ~~[רמב"ם says השחתה אסורה even שלא בשעת מלחמה]~~. Thus, T unwilling to sacrifice org. life as Tree even for purpose of conquest (which in modern life is highest value, everything subservient to it). Thus, T protects still life from onslaught of man; non-belligerent civilian population
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includes Trees. Not economic reason, but metaph. insight(?) of כי אדם עץ השדה. Reason for fruit-trees only, because fruit-bearing quality or propensity is higher degree & criterion of org. life. ~~T~~ ~~Thus~~ This not economic or strategic because if then only prolong siege & lose your own war because of איסור to cut tree.

All proph. full of M-P metaphors – כי עץ שתול על פלגי מים – כארז בלבנון ישגה - כרם הי' לידידי – צדיק כתמר יפרח. M-P one of most central theme in Proph, [???] M-animal. M-P runs both ways: M’s vulnerability etc described by analogue of P & its helplessness (because of its lack of locomotion); on other hand, qualities and propensities to grow & regenerate & [???], showed glorious future of Israel. THM in ישעי' as כעשב (see there). Righteous man like Tree which is formed by growth etc – כעץ שתול על פלגי מים. [others explain M-P metaphor because aridity(?) of Orient(?), org. life ∴ exalted, but this cannot be a sole motivation for all M-P metaphors in תנ"ך]. The group-belonging (family, species, genera) – which Greeks considered as greatest חידוש of Socrates & Plato as metaph. motivation (universal) & which
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they put to all life – inorg. as well as org. (i.e. universal was universal(?)). While mod. scient. cannot accept universal as mechanistic idea, Vitalists come near to it in org. life. T saw group-belonging for inorg. material, but as soon as org. life appears, T shows group-belonging – למינם, למינהם of בראשית. P described in T as having 3 unique properties 1) growth ~~מזריע זרע~~, תדשא… 2) regeneration עץ מזריע זרע 3) heredity ~~which comes over~~ עושה פרי למינו not present in inorg. life. [Biological grouping, not only methodical] carries over from P to A as well – התנינים הגדולים וכו' אשר שרצו המים למיניהם ואת כל עוף כנף למינהם, then חית אץ למינו etc.

With M., group-identity & group-belonging not mentioned. פרו ורבו of P applied to A and M, but not למינהם by M. Reason – unity of man, not separate groupings in Man with resulting ~~discrimination~~ racial diversities, physiognomical(?) & [???]-color discriminations. Men are separated by criterion of ideological consideration – בין ישראל לעמים, not racial. Only ethical & ideological affiliation. Equality of all men. When M separated to groups in דור הפלגה, T looked upon it as curse – [because they [???] ~~in~~ for evil doing]. Messianic ideal also for objective for which
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T gives unity of M. Reproduction(?) of P to A and M.

פרו ורבו to all. With man, natural force of פו"ר translated also to ethical form, but ultimately points to communism(?) w. all org. life.

GI (group-identity) and ~~G~~B (group-belonging) – in H not only euristic(?) principle in org. life, but intrinsic property of org. life, not only as esthetic but dynamic thru(?) heredity. Thus, כלאים (see רמב"ן in קדושים about כלאים and in בראשית on למינהו. But we need to apply Platonic principle as Ramban did). Thus, GI ~~sho~~ of P ~~life sho~~ and A life should not be interfered with by M. T looks askance on interference w. GI in org. life. כלאי זרעים, אילנות, כרמים, בהמות. Thus in A as well as P. חז"ל said w. כלאי אילנות even בן נוח מצוה על הכלאים – all M enjoined(?) from interfering in org. life, and לשמרה of בראשית by גן עדן interpreted by חז"ל as prohibition of abuse of P’s GI. unusual(?) laws of [???] from T are semi-naturalistic – [???] מצות not act as some apocalyptic norm, but as unnatural act. That’s why חז"ל had tough time with כלאים for ב"נ – (בני נח) – and רמב"ם retained(?) it for אילנות. When T speaks of hybrid – כי השחית כל בשר את דרכו על הארץ, רש"י (w. חז"ל) says כי נזקקין לשאינן מינן
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crossbreeding thus called by T as כי השחית – i.e. unnaturalness of act – violation of lex naturalis. No [???] of כלאים by M, because of [??? ???]. Thus, if Negroe(?) should convert to Judaism, absolutely no(?) reason for marrying any white Jewess. Ideological, not racial differences. Philosophically, (not Halachically), bestiality and sodomy (משכב בהמה) similar to כלאים because of transgression of GI of M w. regard to A. [sex-act regarded as unity of separates – והיו לבשר אחד]. Reason is not because of heterogeneity & superiority of M, but because M regarded as separate groups from A, that’s why בהמה should be killed. W. regard to משכב זכר, homosexuality, Halachically not related to כלאים, but philosophically same reason because of unnaturalness – nature demands copulation of 2 different sexes, not same sex. Thus, man in his inter-sexual relationships should behave like flower in its environment – inter-sexual relations is natural, not like Christianity which looked askance at it, had to make marriage as sacrament, wanted to take sex out of natural sphere & put it in methaph., while T thought it pure & good even as animal act, as long as it
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is natural bounds, like flower or animal (no sodomy or homosexuality).

Greeks – M is anyone who is conscious of his existence. Christians explained T idea of M as one [???] to צלם. But M who is not conscious of his existence and completely unethical is not a M according to Greeks and Catholics, not allowed to receive benefits of M. The reason Catholics w. their Love of Man resulted in Inquisition & persecutions was their misinterpretation of Bible – from identification of M w. צלם & misinterpretation of צלם. If M is metaphys. being i.e. צלם, then not birth but baptism makes him a man. And if no baptism, the human body is not a metaph. being or צלם, and not granted immortality, because not privileged to M’s benefits. Baptism is recreation of M to metaph. being. [our טבילה and מילה absolutely unrelated to baptism. M, and Jew, made by his birth, natural being.]. Catholics then had super formula(?) & היתר for persecution, because heretic loses his metaphysical existence & human rights. [In Judaism: רמב"ם ~~says~~ talks of ---iological enemy(?) – מורידין ולא מעלין – T matters(?) when civic(?) becomes ethical norm – T [???] against organized ideological vice(?),
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thus עיר הנדחת]. In Jewish law, M is natural being. Proofs: embryo in womb, it’s רציחה, and even ב"נ נהרג על רציחת עובר and ישראל חייב מיתה בידי שמים; ר' ישמעאל: "באדם" עובר במעי ~~אדם~~ אמו. Thus, חז"ל say embryo = אדם. However, embryo more(?) similar(?) to parasitic plant. Catholics all confused over embryo & immortality, because they say M made by baptism, (they prohibited abortion & even birth-control because the embryo is a potential Catholic). (רמב"ן): Laws of פיקוח נפש applicable to עובר. [אשה המקשה ללדת, עד שלא הוציאה וכו' רמב"ם: if embryo נפש, why sacrifice embryo for mother, says מהני שהוא רודף, embryo is murderer(?) of mother]. As for judicial rights: המזכה ~~ירושת~~ לעובר, קנין עובר etc. עובר has juridic ~~rights~~ prerogatives & is a juridic person, not only a potentiality of man. Thus, H saw in embryos not only potentiality but also as personality. So, too, for dying person, גוסס כחי לכל דבר. The גוסס is like a P, (less than A) no locomotion nor [???] drive – vegetant experience, but still, as long as he exists, H recognizes his personality and juridic rights and prerogatives.
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Said last time, that in [???] of איסורים in H, that all איסורי אכילה והנאה refer exclusively to org. matter. Inorg. matter never prohibited; only inorg. matter outlawed which served as tool for man’s illicit act, as עיר הנדחת. Thus, טריפהת נבילה, שקצים, ערלה, טבל, חדש, נטע רבעי וכו'. H looked at איסורי אכילה והנאה in unique(?) manner – org. life, only inorg.(?) related to org. life. Apparently, T attempted to regulate M’s relation w. organic world, neglected relationship of M to inorg. world - M neutral to inorg. life. ורדו הארץ וכבשוה; רמב"ן says means to exploit nature for himself. Thus, T hints(?) M’s exploitation of org. world, but M completely free in relation to inorg. world. ~~M-A~~

M-A relation: T has certain vegetarianic tendencies, reluctance to allow him to be carnivoric – (animal-eater). A – eater is tolerated, not approved. In beginning, ~~חז"ל~~ T tells us that primordial M prohibited from exploiting A for carnal necessities. See Genesis – T outlaws A-eating for A’s too; all zoological realm (incl. M! enjoined from slaying another A
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for himself. When T says "ויהי כן", we say it applies not only to ~~נעשה אדם~~ ויעשה את האדם [רש"י: כל העולם במאמר אדם בעשי'] because ויהי כן applicable to words(?) as ויאמר, but by ויעש, ויהי כן not necessary. Thus, איסור of eating flesh was not only an ethical norm or imperative, but an intrinsic physiological pattern & [???] (ויהי כן); i.e. primordial M’s [???] drive naturally was regulated to exclude desire from indulgence in A-eating. Thus, איסור of carnivorousness(?) not followed(?) consciously as ethical norm by M, A, norm etc., but as physiological fact. Ethical norm thus became ontic law. Not only expression of cosmic-ethical will but of cosmic-ethical order. From בראשית and נח, Nature degenerated – whether because of original Sin or independent of M – not Jewish problem, impertinent here. Anyway, T did see רע רק כל היום. When T say יוצר מחשבות לבו, not Logos of Greeks (as [???] James(?) [???] i.e. “Imagination & Thought”) but instinctive drive & desires & patterns. Apparently, M. instigator כי רבה רעת האדם, but מאדם עד בהמה וכו' and כי נחמתי כי עשיתים includes all life, thus degradation spread to all life eventually, ~~whether~~ (by M’s instigation – and, curiously, because
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of A’s instigation – נחש – later M causes A to sin כנ"ל). Then וירא ד' את הארץ וכו' כי השחית כל בשר דרכו על הארץ all flesh, deserve to be killed. What corruption?

השחית implies not only ethical corruption (if so, how כל בשר), but cosmic(?) – חז"ל say even ג' טפחים מן הארץ corrupted. Their sin was the acquisition of new desires and drives, going over & over(?) reaching aboriginal natural limits (inspired by Divine Will). Thus – robbery (חמס), going over boundary of jurisdictional & other spheres. חמס is universal act of interfering(?) w. rights and prerogatives(?) not me(?), usurping something not belonging to me, appropriating of not-self for [???]. גזילה is legal term – is חמס limited to concrete economic goods taken from legal owner. But חמס was inclusive(?) – all overreaching, not only economical – thus etc. ויראו בני האלוקים moral wrong also as חמס
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(MISSED LECTURE)
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LECTURE 8

From last lecture: human sacrifice i.e. יהרג ואל יעבר & עקדת יצחק plays important part of general sacrifice in Torah. Highest expression of sacrifice or עבודה is עבודה שבלב, i.e. תפילה. The state also demands human sacrifice under guise of patriotism. Destruction of organic life is, then, absolutely forbidden if not done ~~for~~ as sacrifice to G-d. Murder is חמס, because you rob man of his life. Bible-critics like Robertson Smith were wrong when they interpreted כי בצלם אלוקים עשה את האדם as murder of man being murder of G-d, since Jewish idea & world-formula(?) saw unbridgeable gap between G-d & man; we must interpret it juridically – as חמס. רמב"ם – פ"ד הל' רוצח ה"ח – כי נפשו של הנהרג אינו קנין גואל הדם אלא של הקב"ה. Thus, juridic – all life including human(?) is property of Divine, and ∴ life may be terminated only by Divine Wil, return to owner – which is the permissible end of a natural cycle. א"ר but תניא על ד' מחוסרי כפרה – עבר על חילול השם מיתה מכפרת, or lesser עונות עשה, he says תשובה מכפרת. תשובה is surrender of the self. יום הכיפור is מכפר on עבירות לא תעשה, and here too, יוה"כ is a sacrifice. ~~But~~ And, מיתה is the greatest of all sacrifices. Death itself is מכפר, and this is a great Halachic principle (if with תשובה).
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But while with Man the religious ethos interfered w. the religious cult(?) and raised physical sacrifice to mental sacrifice, the Torah retained animal sacrifice.

[only after conquest of ארץ ישראל did Torah tolerate slaughter of animals for non-sacred purposes. מוטב שיאכלו שחוטות ואל יאכלו נבלות. However, many prohibitions were levied on meat-eating which render it complex and difficult. ~~Even~~ שחיטה was retained from קדשים for בשר תאוה, (thus sanctifying בשר תאוה). But דם is forbidden throughout, the Torah retaining full possession on the דם, כי נפש הבשר בדם הוא – the Torah ~~did~~ does not compromise with man’s carnal desires when it comes to blood.

Is this tendency (prohibition of destruction of life except for G-d) present in M-P relations as in M-A? In sacrificial rites we have flour, wine, oil. (also דם בהמה in rites substitutive for דם אדם). However, not all forms of org. life to be treated same manner. Plant is base of bio-pyramid, man apex. But still, plant is life. We have קרבן עולה ויורד as a מנחה for the poor man - consisting of סולת, שמן ויין. Thus(?) 3 grades of קרבנות – סולת-שמן-יין, עוף, בהמה.
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Torah claims בכורות. Logical consequence – G-d rightful owner of all life. Sacrifice expresses the absolute juridic power that G-d wields over life. Then, first life-manifestation belongs to G-d, - thus man and animal alike. But with בכור אדם and בכור בהמה טמאה, Torah recommends substitution, פדיון. In Halacha, פדיון=כסף, & Halacha learns קנין כסף from פדיון. T then looks upon Man-G-d relations as of juridic nature. בכור in Plant: בכורים. Only difference: בכור בהמה consecrated מאליו, ipso facto, whereas בכורים requires הפרשה. In במדבר, בכורים mentioned w. בכור אדם ובהמה [also חלה is ראשית עריסותיכם, first of a kind, also תרומה]. Thus, P also divine property, so T grants M right to use P only if he offers the first portion to G-d.

ערלה: M not granted privileges of enjoying first portion of tree-life. So too, חדש (of עומר). Halacha extended איסור אכילה of חדש to קצירה, M being enjoined from destruction of life till sacrifice to G-d (which is expressed as a קרבן לה' – Proof: קצירת העומר דוחה שבת). Feudal law of medieval period(?) bad [???] prima noctis.
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(i.e. כל הנישאת תיבעל לטפסר תחילה) also a type of sacrifice - human – but to a Man. Modern State has [???] forms of sacrifice – taxation. Thus, idea that when sovereignty & ownership established, M required to give first & best, is not an outdated idea, but one practiced in our everyday life.

ערלה is applied to M and P alike (not A). Etymologically – denotes(?) something superfluous & alien that doesn’t belong to a certain org system & renders the system weaker than otherwise. ערל לב=סגור לב; כל דבר יתר שראוי להשליכו נקרא ערלה – by רד"ק. Now, ערלה expresses distance – or וערלתים בשרו, see תרגום אונקלוס. יתרחקון וכו' & see רמב"ן on ערלת עץ, distance that M has from the P, must not overreach himself. Permitted only by קרבן – להקריב אל ד', to make nearer to G-d.

4th year fruit is the best, ~~acco~~ (according to agronomists) & that’s why first 3 years M enjoined from three, because P not made permissible by sacrifice; but after 4th year, when best of tree sacrificed, its permissible.
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שמיטה = ושבתה הארץ שבת לד', שש שנים תזרע וכו', שבת שבתון תהיה לארץ שבת לד' וכו'. M’s obligation to earth & her produce. M enjoined from interfering w. P life at all – not with planting, not with destroying. שבת לד' interpreted by Philo as Man’s dedication to G-d (w. respect to יום השבת). Here, שבת indicates belief that world belongs to G-d, M has no right to P-life. So too at יובל we have שמיטת כספים & T says כי לי כל הארץ – showing absolute ownership rights of G-d.

Now, why was H2O included in קרבנות as נסוך המים by חז"ל as הלכה למשה מסיני. Reason: H2O called מיים חיים, therefore since H2O is an absolute necessity for any life, T includes it in קרבנות because of its importance as a dynamic factor in life. Maimonides, however, by describing קרבנות as pedagogical, destroys a great עיקר or principle in Jewish Life. On the contrary(?), we even reduce all worship ~~for~~ of M to G-d to the formula of קרבנות.

Primitive concept of sacrifice was one of trading – exchange of presents w. G-d. However, in Jewish life, קרבנות not a promise for worldly objective; rather duty inherent(?) in relationship bet. M and G-d.
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If M is P basically, what of confluence of M w. his environment? Possible that human dignity finds expression ~~of~~ in confinement of movement rather than freedom of movement, i.e. did T want to make M a “citizen of the universe” or member of his own community, taking root in his soil like a plant. Did T give man power of locomotion to wipe away vegetational restriction(?) of locomotion or vice-versa? Locomotion one of traits of life. Plato, formulating life, says soul is auto-motive principle. Tanach regards dynamic locomotion as ~~added~~ part of character of G-d. ויתגעש ותרעש הארץ וכו' וירכב על כרוב ויעף - ---less movement. Maimonides says that when T refers to movement of G-d, it means activity. G-d is dynamic, ורוח אלוקים מרחפת על פני המים, Divine forces in world are of kinetic nature. ~~Also~~ Idea of omnipotence of G-d not originally Jewish. Is(?) Greek – medieval Jewish philosophy. We believe that G-d can interfere with any universal or individual system at will – but just as גילוי שכינה we have סילוק שכינה. Greeks had omnipresence in metaphysical [???], peaceful and quite G-d. We ~~formulated~~ believed in [???]
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of G-d as having a personality endowed w. locomotion – תנ"ך uses אש and רוח in describing שכינה. Freedom of movement is, thus, Divine attribute.

However, there is attempt by T to “arrest” divinity(?) to one place – בית המקדש – ושכנתי בתוכם. Then; dual aspect: מלא כל הארץ כבודו – an other hand, confinement to certain place. Latter referred to voluntary גלות השכינה, and became most cosmic & grandiose idea of philosophy. גאולה refers to Man and G-d. From Rabbi Akiba: אשר הוֹצאתי אתכם = אשר הוּצאתי אתכם. Modern psychological (Otto(?)) = 2 conflicting emotions of M about G-d: Fascination (merger(?)) & daunting (repulsion). This is idea of proximity & distance of Man from G-d. כל הנוגע בהר מות יומת. Also(?), fascination, desire for proximity to get contact bet. Man and G-d, T did not recommend M to reach transcendental heights, but that G-d confine himself (to condescend to Man). That is why G-d is referred(?) to in Hebrew (uniquely) as מקום. [This confinement in מקדש is symbolic]. Greatest confinement of G-d (שכינתא בגלותא, צמצום), confinement of G-d
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within cosmos. Metaphysically & cabbalistically, G-d is regarded as having freedom of motion, Halachically as confined (Halacha [???] in metaphysics).

שלמה המלך raised this problem כי אמנם יש אלוקים עוד על הארץ כי יכול תוכל על שמים וכו', בנה בניתי בי וכו', as paradox. G-d of philosophers & mystics was “beyond” &(?) unconfinable. This is great accomplishment of Halacha – instead of recommending man to go up, it invited G-d to come down to confinement. Metaphysical philosophy, mysticism & Christianity, not recognizing Halacha’s idea of Man as natural (like P & A) untranscendental(?) being, attempted to raise M to G-d transcendentally. Midrash tells us that משה רבנו ע"ה said יושב בסתר עליון because he was afraid that אהל מועד & confinement of G-d might bring to neo-paganism. But G-d answered him told him not to fear. Maimonides did not see it as we do, **∴** struggled w. פסוקים like וירד ה', ויעל ד' וכו' וכו' וכו'.

If T parallels confinement of M and of G-d, then we have idea of State. Reforms, however, (like
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Hermann Cohen) were always anti-Zionist because they understood M as transcendental; ~~since no~~ it follows, then, that there is no confinement of G-d, hence no confinement of Man, hence no State, hence no Zionism.