

1948-1949

Norman Lamm
Yeshiva University,
N.Y.C.

Prof. Lamm

3rd Lecture by Rabbi J.B. Solovitchik on "Foundations of Judaism", Nov. Dec. 1, 1948.

(THM) PIANO NOSTRUM ESPERO

Postulate constructs underlying THM. concept of THM is typically Jewish, reflects characteristics of our self-consciousness, manifesting itself in ^{our} rather than metaphysical spheres.

idea of Messiah follows from THM, difference is that Messiah is historical hope, in historical cycle of Israel.

THM, PIANO NOSTRUM ESPERO on THM, connected to historical - political redemption ^{PIANO} according to Maimonides, throwing off PIANO by THM is (only) means to more sublime life. THM is psychological historical as opposed to historical.

Escatological hope. THM is divorced from Jewish History, purely personality. Is sequel to reality, which is interpreted causalistically, mechanistically - teleologically. First Liberal Movement (Reform in 1740-60 in Germany, in America, etc) denoted at first THM. This movement is ^{purely} Theological. Judaism greater than theological, includes Halacha. They identify religious ethics with philosophical ethics, typical religious element is theological - agnostic - element, with

them. That's why they cling to idea of Spain
with orthodox, not so important, they 5237 and
1210 RAN reject idea of 1178. It's too stiff, 1210
urges creativity, 1178. 1178 is focal point
of 1210. ∴ stiff 1178 unexposed to 1178 and
metamorphosis, but 1210 has independent
system of research & analysis, while theologian is
stuck to certain 1178 without independent research.

1210 has welcomed Jewish Philosophy, not theology,
while Reform identified philosophy with theology. Reform
therefore limited to inflexible systems. Mendelssohn in
1781 ^{denied} rejected 1178 because he was raised in
home with 1210 spirit. Later leaders of German
Reform fought him on this point, supported 1178.
1178 structure is only basis for Reform.

TTHM, however, was the infatuation with
Reform. Looked upon as alien to Jewish spirit, very
non-Jewish, because 1178 rarely stress TTHM while
they mention 1178, 1178 etc. Bible
critics believe that any mention of TTHM in 1178 is later
edition since they think that TTHM is later development,

ע"פ דברי רמב"ם ורמב"ן ורמב"ם ורמב"ן ורמב"ם ורמב"ן
ע"פ דברי רמב"ם ורמב"ן ורמב"ם ורמב"ן ורמב"ם ורמב"ן

say that TTM is in fact
put in in times of struggle as expression to P. 3108
who fought Wars of Independence as reason to fight.
Thus they believe that TTM served as political instrument
to articulate patriotic passions. Thus, if we should accept
this premise, all meanings (etc. 41%, 1/10) of TTM were
later editions. TTM has no philosophical or rational place
in Modern Judaism.

But, because of that, TTM 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 TTM untouched, unanalyzed to philosoph.
analysis. Only one who devoted a chapter to TTM was
Saadia, last chapter. But even he doesn't
philosophize on it. Thus, in his first chapter he more
interested in philosoph. equipment (Greek) than Judaism
but in TTM he uses no Philo., simply tries to
reconstruct idea of TTM from SIK and JJA. Rambam
never mentions TTM in SEFER HA'AMAROT. [TTM, not

a philosopher, created [idea of + THM]. They disregarded THM because not subject to rational or biological (in this case) analysis. Greeks did not know THM, introduced to occident by early christians who took over from THM from Jews. W.M. christians, THM plan (Resurrection) plays part in Crucifixion/Salvation. Proof that THM was central dogma during year 12 w. Jews: עוֹלָם הַבְּרִיָּתָה 172. called עוֹלָם (omnipotence).

Even historians admit its one of most ancient עוֹלָם, that נִדְּוָה & עוֹלָם precedes עוֹלָם עוֹלָם.

Second Proof: from discussions in Talmud (פְּרָקֵי פֶסַח) 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 portion of Judaism - פְּרָקֵי פֶסַח 12]. Third Proof? [5th] statement against those who said עוֹלָם עוֹלָם עוֹלָם עוֹלָם עוֹלָם עוֹלָם עוֹלָם עוֹלָם, even if he believed in THM, as long as he denied it's עוֹלָם.

Phraseology of עוֹלָם is prophetic, prophecy served as model for foundation of עוֹלָם. For THM,

אף על פי כן פירוש 917113
 מהו THM. שם נראה שזו, פירוש 114
 פירוש הדברי פירוש 114
 פירוש 114
 פירוש 114

model (if from 2000) which can express itself in
help to oppressed, etc. + ~~model~~ of THM, model
was Q/A 1/2. etc. like 2000's.....

guiding motif of Q/A 1/2 was ethical order of world,
g-d helps suppressed, man's insecurity + deviousity,
then ~~the~~ like 2000 in 1911, - THM! [can be

interpreted as sickness + health, as do modern historians.

They interpret so, as to eliminate concept of THM from
antiquity. But ~~is~~ interpret of the 2000] ~~is~~

called the 2000 - 2000, referring to main body

of Q/A 1/2. This part of ethical performance of
g-d is THM, not a miracle (i.e. ^{not part of} cosmic process).

Ethical attributes of divine action, not as part of
cosmic process, naturalistic, dynamic, cosmic process.

Thus, THM for us, not only metaphysical, but ethical
belief.

Ethical basis of THM: from Q/A 1/2 which
is necessarily ethical, from 2000, ethical THM
accepted, to give by ethical injustices; because of passionate
ethical faith - 2000's 1911, g-d will not
disappoint dead, thus not eschatological (supernatural)

What prompted idea of TH to make it central theme
of 'A's', not fear of death (fear of nihilism)
because they believed in immortality (Elysium),
thus no fear of death, i.e. fear of dissolution
into nothingness as it was in Christianity. [with Christian
THM no problem
with nihilism]

THM is as ancient as Judaism, not political.
But, THM was prompted by an ethical ideal,
[let us free ourselves from Biblical criticism which
are disproven daily with way new discovery]. Fact
of possibility of THM - did it, nothing
absurd or paradoxical; they accepted it as rational (even
if not logical). In Bible, we see no fear of
death, accepted as natural process, no state of horror
which dominates modern man. This ethical ideal is
central theoretical basis of Judaism
mainly based on: Creation is good. [Genesis 1:1-5],
no gaps or evil in creation. Later, Bible tells us
of deterioration of creation. But
creation perfect [from A's?]
only later deteriorated. Then, with THM, NATURE WILL
BE PERFECT. Thus, our Nature is not fully perfected

even Sun + Moon but perfection [SUN MOON]. This prompted [SUN MOON] in belief in FINIS UNIVERSE, substitution of Nature. Civil is not necessary parts of reality, only appended to Reality later. THM is thus based on 21010.

Greeks couldn't accept THM, thought it went against part of Judaism; because Plato + Socrates discovered immutability, not THM. { Immutability is Greek idea, THM is Jewish } Thus I'm ~~to~~ emphasize THM although still believing in Copernicus. Early Christian historians indicate that Christian believed in THM, not Immutability. Reasons for Greek dichotomy because Matter-Form, Form perfect, Matter is chaotic, thus evil. ~~genera~~ genera are perfect for Aristotle, so non-evolutionary, whereas THM is evolution - biological and cosmic, progress change for better. Plato thus promised immortality ^{by duplication of mind} but Aristotelian idea of immortality, if at all authentically Aristotle's, is difficult because he identified matter and Form. Civil was constitutionally necessary for Greeks, so duplication of this would be better, evil-free world, Part 150, in idea

My personal conviction - free world, free will - free.

of $\text{פְּלִיטָה וְיִשְׁלִיכֵם מִן הָאָרֶץ}$ ^{does} not indicate 2 worlds,
but continuation of our world - פְּלִיטָה actually accepted
existence of evil (despite Maimonides in guides) but promised
retirement - $\text{פִּיּוּבֵשׁ וְדָמָה עֲבָרֵי אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָ, וְעִנְיָנִי}$, i.e. recognition
of death as prime evil because it causes spiritual
+ physical pain - וְדָמָה - suffering, not idea
of fear of death itself, but death as causing וְדָמָה ,
suffering. This פְּלִיטָה has more than just promise of
resurrection of dead, but also elimination of death for
The Living. We postulated a real this world.
Halacha: אִנְשֵׁי חַיִּים , can't enter עֵדֶן , eat וְחַיֵּי
etc. אִנְשֵׁי חַיִּים for $\text{וְיִשְׁלִיכֵם מִן הָאָרֶץ}$ who are Holy. Thus, death
is negative in Halacha, (not like Maimonides with
 אִנְשֵׁי חַיִּים and what he says $\text{אִנְשֵׁי חַיִּים מִן הָאָרֶץ}$ ^{escape} אִנְשֵׁי חַיִּים).
but Halacha regarded ~~Halacha~~ death as evil,
one of many evils, not as a wonderful transition,
but as imperfection of reality which is corrected in
eschatological period of אֵלֶּיךָ . Main problem of
THM is to eliminate suffering ^{in general} - not exclusively death.

ḲḲḲḲḲ was suffering from child-bearing ḲḲḲḲḲ
[see text of ḲḲḲḲḲ]. she was helped, by bearing
child, in ḲḲḲḲḲ, sees that every ailment can be
cured by ḲḲḲ, including death, by ethical motivation.
In us, eschatology (ḲḲḲḲḲḲ) is full realization of
ethical norm, perfection of Nature. Messianic Hope is
part of THM, in that it's beginning of a certain
ethical rehabilitation - political, but still ḲḲḲḲḲḲ
ḲḲḲ, Nature is still imperfect [but with chance to devote
time to the study, etc.]. But other evils, such as death,
still present in ḲḲḲḲḲḲ.

Greek approach to ḲḲḲ was cosmological. Medieval
Jew-Philo. moved in Greek orbit, saw that cosmic
dynamics must have basis, this basis is ḲḲḲ. By
approaching ḲḲḲ cosmologically (i.e. physical, biological, etc.)
we get Prime Principle who is unifying law of all
cosmic phenomena, transcendent in Nature, this is ḲḲḲ.

They, however, ended up in a Nirvana, god to them was
a nothingness, only apex of cosmic hierarchy, a mere principle.
Plotinus (a typical homo religiosus, influenced by Judaism
through Christianity), even be moved at nothing special - at a

improves "beyond", a transcendent method, because
we need 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 cosmology (He said Paganism
starts from cosmological considerations, crude pagan
see God in world - real - fine pagan no transcendental
God, but only cosmological. That's why his critics at
Spinoza called him philosophical pagan because he
~~so~~ saw God in all phenomena, but only in our world,
not just because of moral imperative, ethical norms of
which source is God. He is somewhat right (Cohen
influenced by Kant, no. cosmological, with ethical. This
Lutheran. Catholic scholasticism - Aquinas - approaches
God cosmology, Protestant "by way of Man - ethical,
ethically, receptivity in Man", not ethically neutrally
Luther accepts this Man-approach because of renaissance
of Bible, prophetic approach.) But, we also had
some cosmology approach - Story of Creation, way
פְּתִיחַ הַיּוֹם (וַיְהִי) and פִּיחַ הַיּוֹם. Most important
contribution of Judaism to understanding of God: not only

principle of ethics, not a personal g-d. While
Kant speaks of source & sanction of ethics as being g-d,
this is still causality like cosmology with a different
terminology. But I reason - g-d practices the
ethical norm, practice (by g-d) precedes norm,
thus ethical norm is an imitation of g-d's deeds,
His Existence & actions are ethical. Ethical norm is
modus vivendi of g-d; from all above, I claim
believes g-d as personal, not only as a "beyond",
a principle in Nirvana, not "abyss" (as Christians
called Him, indicating nothingness). Thus, יהוה or
 יהוה etc. (ethical norm comes from g-d). That's
why call g-d "EIP". Thus, to reach this conclusion,
we can't start w. cosmos (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,
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. TAM
gives us insight into Man's personality (philosophic or
metaphysical insight), from there we may understand g-d.

Maimonides refused only, 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 Rishonim. Even

Rambam who lived in era full of speculations as
to Divine Nature, was interested only in Man and This
World, not much (at all) in G-d and Other
World. ~~He~~ ~~did~~ ~~not~~ ~~even~~ mentioned ~~Eschatology~~ etc. When mention
was mentioned made of metaphysics of G-d, refused
to it as negative ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~study~~ 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~~ ^{deals with} ~~concerns~~ concrete reality.

Prepare:

1. LAD (with ^{story of} edition); study Man - nature,
first incident in 1911, nature of 211, 1st Jan,
Till 1920 measure ~~the~~

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 on Man.

1) Judeo-Christian ^(Biblical) 2) classical Greek ^(first two) 3) Mod. Scientific

Would explain as follows: ~~They are in strict contradiction~~ to naturalistic interpret. of Mod. Scie. Biblical + Greek contrast Man w. plant + animal by unbridgeable gulf although Man, plant + animal share, in common, organic matter; otherw. distinction is not in degree but in kind. He would say immeasurability of Man w. plant-animal; Bible Greek agree. Bible: ^{anti!} metaphysical autonomy of Man based upon his uniqueness as creature in Divine image whose essence ~~is~~ 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-knowledge man, being able to grasp essence of things & ability to rise over senselessness & perception to recognition of ^{eternal} conceptual order & stability. i.e.

for Bible, mystics of Transcendental Spirit, for Greeks -
Twoos Λογος (Logos). But both give him autonomy.
Mod. Science - no 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 (density,
complexity, structure or organic matter.) Life processes
instill 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 of a life-substance in
simplest cell & in Man. Just that Vitalists see dif. bet
inorg. & org. matter, Mechanists don't. ∴ impertinent].
Study & continuity of life from org. matter of biological
sciences to most amazing & how religious - problem
isn't genesis of Man (creation vs evolution) - but
~~autonomy~~ 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?

Upon reading text of 1912, we see that Bible tells of unity of created universe by Word of God. order + logical-dynamic sequence - Heaven, earth, vegetation - animal life from Man. Meaningful pattern of inconspicuous succession. It's overtones in my mind

in early 1912, I saw M.P.A. reports about all 3 - M.P.A., both before and after 1912, take account common origin of life - 707, Mother earth. ["Mother" of "Mother" earth has origin in idea of Bible]. "P 3/c" respects his origin - 1912 - when arose of death, explained as 1912 1912. If Truth would appear of Man as Transcendental Being in Divine ^{and divine} image, idea of 1912 + 1912 impossible. Naturalistic frame of Man was, to extend, common knowledge among 1912 + 1912, they didn't resist it but actually accepted it. Christus from Paul → St. Augustine → Aquinas → our age resist naturalistic, at least duality, Natural + Transcendental (other terminology). Reason is in discrepancy bet. old + New Testament. old: (1912) M=P=A., important

in Jew. Ethos - helplessness, vulnerability,
 functioning bet. life + death, of which Prophets
 speak, in contrast w. eternity & omnipotence of
 G-d. Suggest naturalness + immensity of Man in
 Nature rather than spirituality & transcendence.

פֶּלֶא פִּיפִּי יִגְיִילִילִי כִּי יִבְרָא אֱלֹהִים לִבִּי יִשְׁמַח וְיִשְׂמַח אֲנִי פֶּלֶא
 confluence of Man & earth make him weak,
 instable, contrast omnipotence of pure spirituality
 of G-d. Not once is Man's transcendability
 mentioned in ZM, but rather his unity w.
 Nature. Then, cycle of birth + death understood
 in ZM as cycle of growth + decay in plants.

[i.e. part of biochemical process of life]. לִבִּי
 מִן הָאֲדָמָה אֲנִי וְאֲדָמָה אֲנִי - מִן הָאֲדָמָה אֲנִי
 (in which life, death is a part of) וְאֲנִי מִן הָאֲדָמָה וְהָאֲדָמָה מִן הָאֲדָמָה
 [P311 / 2 suggest irony + sarcasm - "son of earth".]

"Death" in Hebrew - מוֹת - applies equally to Man
 & Animal, אֲנִי מוֹת וְהַבְּהֵמָה מוֹת וְהַצִּבְּרוֹת מוֹת.
 וְהָאֲדָמָה מוֹת - אֲנִי מִן הָאֲדָמָה וְהָאֲדָמָה מִן הָאֲדָמָה,
 always w. animal. Man, according to our version of
 understanding of prophets, temporality which (or)

not as temporal being w. striving for Man for the eternal
(Christianity) but Man = weakness & his pride wants
to convert his weakness to glory, but no metaphysical
striving. Man = Nature perverted in JH.
Christian = Death for Man as result of original sin,
(in Judaism מִיָּמִית אֱנוֹשׁוֹת לְבָרִית אֱלֹהִים does not mean "you
will become mortal"), מִיָּמִית אֱנוֹשׁוֹת not interpreted as
Christian by פְּלוֹסוֹפִים; פְּלוֹסוֹפִים has turned
on it, but certainly not Christian, (although accepts
מִיָּמִית אֱנוֹשׁוֹת as "you will become mortal", not striving w. him).

Death, ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ Judaism, is end of natural process;
" " Christianity, is metaphysical. Same
w. sin. In Christianity, 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 מִיָּמִית אֱנוֹשׁוֹת,
this - מִיָּמִית אֱנוֹשׁוֹת לְבָרִית אֱלֹהִים אֱנוֹשׁוֹת לְבָרִית אֱלֹהִים
idea of metaphysical death is thus Jewish in origin,
we find it only in מִיָּמִית אֱנוֹשׁוֹת, but does not contradict
main force of most פְּלוֹסוֹפִים w. naturalistic ^{understanding} of Man.

isolated secondary component of Sin = cause of death found
 in Judaism (תּוֹמָה) taken by Christians,
 made basis of Christianity. (Sin also like פְּחַד)
 beautiful description of death of Job, his desire for physical
 immortality, his fatigue. Biblical description of deaths
 of Patriarchs, פִּנְיָוֶל, פִּנְיָוֶל אִדְוֶל אִדְוֶל אִדְוֶל,
 i.e. natural thing, "Pide" 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 + Augustine spoke of Man as
 Natural being as corrupt since Nature is corrupt, if Man to
 be worthy of being he must rise from Nature to Transcended
 existence, this opened gate to mysticism, asceticism
 other Middle-age Christian movements, where people
 left families etc. to show freedom from Nature (not
 because of religious ecstasy). In Jew, דּוֹשָׁן was good,
 asked for it in Job.

In contrast, as for
 too, like פִּנְיָוֶל אִדְוֶל אִדְוֶל
 Halakha develops immanence of Man (in Nature) as. Transcended
 of Christianity. (This only Christianity speaks of Tragedy of Man)

In us, rationality of Man is dominant. Avon 1 NCS,
1 NCS means NCS; NCS = breath, natural NCS
NCS 12/12, thus even said identified w. Natural phenomenon.
Avon 12/11 and 12/11 apply to all Nature as well as Man.

Immanence of Man (Jewish vs. Christian) and his
contiguity w. Mother Earth, Immediacy w. Nature:
Jil's use division (emetic - gust) Mineral-Plant-Animal-
Man (Man = $\gamma\gamma N$. $\gamma\gamma N$ is Logos, thus thought +
logos, not only speech). While medieval philosophers saw
no transition bet. them, Science sees transition bet. part
3, hopes to see transition bet. part and last 3. Jil's leaves
out Mineral (P113), and starts w. Plant. Problem:
Does NCS identify Man with Plant? answer: yes,
especially 12/11, ^(with possibility) places Man in realm of plant-life = field
of microcosm (Man participant in cosmic phenomena, i.e. plant).
Plant = living structure which displays properties of decay,
growth, ^{regeneration} reproduction etc. (contrast Minerals); displays, already,
behavior in life ~~for~~, meaning (that is, behavior) bracketing
"within" and "without". Avon Mechanists who explain life as
atomistic in terms of tissue decay etc, admit tendency of living
matter to retain internal structure, + parallelism bet.

The tendency to behavior to outside (i.e. turning its leaves to sun, opening & closing of leaves at AM and PM, show behavior) - phenomenologically (not morphologically) plant ~~relates~~ has adaptability to environment which depicts relation of "within" to "without". Inner drive of living structure runs parallel to the 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 minerals). Confluence bet. org. and environment, but still not complete - Same for form it, there is polarity of within & without. On one hand, again ^{confluence of} within & without. As for without: organism \leftrightarrow environment not only for plant but also for animal, Man etc. Confluence of org-environ. quite different in degree bet. Plant & Man-animal, because former is ⁱⁿ fixed environment, latter have locomotion, change of environment. Thus, in associative thinking, ^(psychologically) epistemologically, we can't dissociate man from any one environment. Another difference, Man-animal must assimilate org. matter (physically), while plant assimilates inorg. matter.

Thos. 23.72 parabola:

Plant - outer changes & inner changes neatly attended
within: inner essence exists which behaves to outside in
certain fashion (^{maybe} ~~whether~~ Mechanistically). without:
plant functionally & phenomenologically flows w.
environment, works within it & reacts to it.

Now [Holbach] 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 conscious effort and act
of Man, just as of w. Plant. Same ~~function~~
nonteleologic automatic ~~function~~ ^{function} of plant in animal
(let's say so as emission to Mechanists). Man-Environment
relation. More primitive man is more integrated in the
particular environment. [In Philosophy, 1761] see 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 ~~the~~ one particular & fixed environment - Fatherland.
2nd 1761, return of Man to Nature, corporate state is idea to
integrate Man w. fixed environment, facets spoke of bond
man to particular fixed earth, thus return to animal

of our plant life]. attitude of XIXth to Man as
organism bounded within (automatic, nonteleological
functionalism alone, or; conscience & ethical imperative, logos)
& attitude to confidence of Man w. fixed environment
(and implication of w. regard to political sphere).

MISSED LECTURES

H = Holoche
 M = Man
 P = plant
 A = animal

Last wk - definition + application of organon by + in Holoche

Now - Man-plant in H.

One of most favorite metaphors for Man in P. is Tree and other organic life of P. Basic metaphor - T. (Tree) (P. 22)

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל כְּצֶמַח אֲדָמָה - translation immaterial - whether neg. (וְיִשְׂרָאֵל כְּצֶמַח אֲדָמָה) or pos. (וְיִשְׂרָאֵל כְּצֶמַח אֲדָמָה). If offering this likeness, hence duty-bound to respect Tree as w. M. Like M should not be subjected to war-harm, so וְיִשְׂרָאֵל כְּצֶמַח אֲדָמָה is like M not it war w. you, ∴ וְיִשְׂרָאֵל כְּצֶמַח אֲדָמָה

to act for וְיִשְׂרָאֵל (וְיִשְׂרָאֵל). If neg. interpret., same meaning - T. not like M to be besieged by you, but should be respected - don't destroy org. life.: "don't besiege 'innocent tree' and destroy it". i.e., וְיִשְׂרָאֵל כְּצֶמַח אֲדָמָה, that וְיִשְׂרָאֵל to destroy tree to accelerate surrender of besieged city (such as when fruit tree feeds besieged enemy).

[P. 22] says וְיִשְׂרָאֵל כְּצֶמַח אֲדָמָה even וְיִשְׂרָאֵל כְּצֶמַח אֲדָמָה. Thus, T. unwilling to sacrifice org. life as Tree even for purpose of conquest (which in modern life is highest value, everything subordinated to it). Thus, T. protects still life from onslaught of man; non-belligerent & civilian population

includes Trees. Not economic reason, but metaph.
insight of $\Delta P \propto P^2$. Reason for fruit-trees only,
because fruit-bearing quality or propensity is higher degree
criteria of org. life. Thus This not economic or
strategic because if then why prolong surge & lose your
own man because of 10% to cut tree.

all prop. fully M-P metaphors - Total Ex. is
 $P \propto M^{1/2}$ & $P \propto M^{1/2}$ - $P \propto M^{1/2}$ - $P \propto M^{1/2}$
 $M \propto P^2$. M-P ^{not} most central theme in Prop, only
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 &
propensities to grow & regenerate & reclamation, showed
oporous future of Israel. THM in ΔP as ΔP
(see there). Reptiles man like Tree which is fanned by
growth etc - $P \propto M^{1/2}$ & $P \propto M^{1/2}$. [Other explain M-P
metaphor because aridity of arid, org. life is exacted,
but this cannot be a sole motivation for all M-P metaphors
in ΔP]. The group-belonging (family, species, genus) -
which Greeks considered as greatest ΔP of sources &
plate as metaph. motivation (universal) ΔP & which

they put to all life - veg. as well as org. (i.e. universal was universal). While mod. scient. can't accept universal as mechanistic idea, Vichets came near to it in org. life. T is group-belonging for veg. material, but as soon as org. life appears, T shows group-belonging - 1) growth, 2) regeneration, 3) heredity

(which comes over not present in veg. life. [biological grouping, not mechanical] comes over from P to A as well - P, M, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, T, U, V, W, X, Y, Z, etc.)

With M., group-identity + group-belonging not maintained. 1) 1) 2) of P applied to A and M, but not equal by M. Reason - unity of man, not separate groupings in man with resulting ~~unwanted~~ racial diversities, phylogenical & skin-color discriminations. Men are separated by criteria of ideological considerations - P, M, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, T, U, V, W, X, Y, Z, etc. Only ethical-ideological affiliation. Equality of all men. When M separated to groups in 1919, T looked upon it as curse. [because they united in for evil doing]. Messianic ideal also for objectives for which

T gives unity of M. Reproduction of P to A and M.
 (25) 170 to all. With man, natural force of 512
 translated also to ethical form, but ultimately points to
 communion w. all org. life.

GI (group-identity) and GB (group-belonging) in H not
 only essential principle in org. life, but intrinsic property of
 org. life, not only as esthetic but dynamic themselves. Thus,
 P1812 (see 1307 in P1817 about P1812 and in addition
 in 131112). But we need to apply Platonic principle as

Ramban did). Thus, GI also of P life also and A
 life should not be interfered with by M. T looks
 advance or influence w. GI in org. life. P1812 1812

11112, P1812, 11112. This in A as well as P. TIA said from

P1812 & 131112 - all M equipped ^{from} intelligently in org.

life, and 131112 of 11112 by 13112 interpreted by 1311

as prohibition of abuse of P's GI. Fundamental laws of 1311

from T are semi-naturalistic - T 13112 not act w.

some apocalyptic way, but as unnatural act. That's why

TIA had sympathy w. P1812 for J2 - (13112) - and

P1812 retained it for 11112. When T speaks of hybrid -

Even 13112 13112 13112 is, w. TIA (w. TIA) say 13112 13112 13112

crossbreeding ^{called} ~~thoroughly~~ $\frac{1}{2}$ as ~~MAAD~~ ~~is~~ ~~not~~.

unnaturalness of act - violation of lex naturalis.

No rule of P/B by M, because of unity of M. Thus, if Negroes should count to Judaism, absolutely no reason for marrying any white Jewess. Biological and racial differences. Philosophically, (not Holotheologically), bestiality + sodomy (same sex) similar to P/B because transgression of QI of M w. regard to A. [sex-act required as unity of separate - ^{heterogeneity} ~~MAAD~~ ~~not~~]. Reason is not because of superiority of M, but because M regarded as separate group from A, that's why ~~MAAD~~ should be killed. w. regard to ~~MAAD~~, homosexuality, Holotheology, not related to P/B, 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 for its environment - inter-sexual relations is natural, not like Christianity which looked at it, had to make Marriage as sacrament, & wanted to take sex out of natural sphere & put it in metaph., which T thought it no pure good sex as animal act, as long as it

is natural bounds, like flowers or animal (no
sodomy or homosexuality).

Greeks - M is anyone who is conscious of his existence.
 Christians explained T ^{idea of M} is one related to P/B. But M
 who is not conscious of himself ^{his existence} & completely unethical is
 not a M according to Greeks & Catholics, not allowed to
 receive benefits of M. The reason "in their favor of Man
 resulted in frequent persecutions was their
 misinterpretation of Bible - from identification of M as P/B
 + misinterpretation of P/B. If M is metaph. being ^{is P/B,}
 then not birth but baptism makes him a man. And if no
 baptism, the human body is not a metaph. being a P/B,
 and not granted immortality, hence not privileged to M's
 benefits. Baptism is recreation of M to metaph. being.
 [Our P/B and P/B absolutely unrelated to baptism.
 M, and Jew, made by his birth, natural being.]

Catholics say they had simple formula + way for
 persecution, because heretic loses his metaphysical
 existence + human rights. [In Judaism: P/B sup talk of
 ideological wrong - P/B (1) P/B (1) - T without when crime becomes
 ethical norm - T without against organized ideological vice,

thus $\text{אדם} \text{ יחיד}$.] for Jewish law, M is material
being. Proofs: embryo in womb, it's אדם , and even
 $\text{אדם} \text{ אדם} \text{ בן} \text{ אדם}$ and $\text{אדם} \text{ אדם} \text{ אדם}$; $\text{אדם} \text{ אדם}$
 $\text{אדם} \text{ אדם} \text{ אדם}$ "אדם". Thus, אדם say embryo \equiv אדם

However, embryo was similar to parasitic plant. Catholics all
embodied over embryo + immortality, because they say M made
by baptism, (they prohibited abortion + even birth-control because
the embryo is a potential catholic). (P.N.): אדם אדם אדם אדם
to אדם . [אדם אדם אדם אדם אדם]

אדם - if embryo אדם , why sacrifice embryo for mother,
say אדם אדם אדם , embryo as murderer of mother].

As for judicial rights: אדם אדם , אדם אדם etc.

אדם has judicial ^{privileges} rights + is a juridic person, not only
a potentiality of man. Thus, H saw in embryo not only
potentiality but also as personality. So, too, for dying

man, אדם אדם אדם . The אדם is like a P (less than H)

no locomotion nor sensory drive - vegetant existence, but
still, as long as he exists, H recognizes his personality and
judicial rights + prerogatives.

Said last time, that in morning of P1301K
in H, that all degraded work was exclusively to
ag. matter. any matter was prohibited; only ing.
matter, ^{allowed} which served as food for man's illicit act,
as AKP11 vs. Thus, AK, P1302, P1303, P1304
P1305, P1306, P1307, P1308. I looked at degraded work in
ing. matter - ag. life, & only ing. related to ag. life.
Apparently, ~~T~~ attempted to regulate M's relation to
ag. world, neglected relationship of M to ing. world -
M neutral to ing. life. AK 201 P1301 1301; AK
says means to exploit Nature for himself. Thus, T
limits M's exploitation of ag. world, but M completely free
in relation to ing. world. ~~AK~~

M-A relation: T has antagonistic tendencies,
reluctance to allow him to be carnivorous -
(animal-eater). A-eater is tolerated, not approved.
In beginning, ~~AK~~ T tells us that provisional M
prohibited from exploiting A for carnal necessities. See
Quasis - T allows A-eating for A's too; all
zoological realm (incl. M) enjoined from slaying another A

to himself. When T says " [13:10:1] ", we say it applies
 not only to [13:10:1] but also to [13:10:2] because [13:10:1] applicable to words as [13:10:1], but
 by [13:10:1], [13:10:1] not necessary. Thus, [13:10:1]
 of eating flesh was an intrinsic physiological pattern + fact
 ([13:10:1]); i.e. primordial M's sensory drive naturally
 was regulated to exclude desire for indulgence in A-
 eating. Thus, [13:10:1] of cannibalism not followed
 consciously as ethical norm by M, A, woman etc.,
 but as physiological fact. Ethical norm thus
 became strict law. Not only expression of cosmic-ethics
 will but of cosmic-ethical order. From [13:10:1]
 and A, Nature degenerated - whether because of
 original sin or independent of M - not Jewish problem,
 impairment her. Anyway, T did see [13:10:1] to [13:10:2].
 When T says [13:10:1], not to [13:10:2] of [13:10:2]
 (as King James Version) but instinctive drive + desire, pattern.
 It apparently, M instigator [13:10:1] to [13:10:2], but
 [13:10:1] and [13:10:2] includes all
 life, thus degeneration spread to all life eventually,
 whether (by M's instigation - and, curiously, because

of A's motivation - CAS - lots of causes A to sin (j's)

Then Q112 Q12 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16 Q17 Q18 Q19 Q20

all flesh, desire to be killed. What corruption?

implies not only ethical corruption, but ^(also, how etc)

comic - for say even Q112 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16 Q17 Q18 Q19 Q20. This sin

was the acquisition of new desires + drives, going over

+ now reaching ^{abridged} natural limits (imposed by Divine will).

This - robbery (ONA), going over boundary of jurisdictional

+ one sphere. ONA is universal act of interfering w. rights

+ preparations not me, usurping something not belonging to

me, appropriating of not-self for self. ^{is legal}

term - is ONA limited to concrete ^{economic} needs taken from

legal owner. But ONA was inclusive - all encompassing,

not only economic - thus etc. Q112 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16 Q17 Q18 Q19 Q20

moral wrong also as ONA

(MISSED LECTURE)

LECTURE 8

From last lecture: - human sacrifice plays important part of general sacrifice in Torah. Highest expression of sacrifice or korban is chatot, i.e. shechita. The state also demands human sacrifice in guise of patriotism. Destruction of organic life is, then, absolutely forbidden if not done for as sacrifice to G-d. Murder is retzach, because you rob man of his life. Philistines like Robespierre were wrong when they interpreted retzach as murder of man being murder of G-d, since Jewish idea + world-formation saw unbridgeable gap between G-d + man; we must interpret it judicially - as retzach. Thus, judicial - all life including human is property of Divine, and \therefore life may be terminated only by Divine will, return to owner - which is the permissible end of a natural cycle.

But, he says we have shechita is murder of the self. shechita is murder on shechita and shechita too, shechita is a sacrifice. But And, shechita is the greatest of all sacrifices. Death itself is shechita, and this is a great holocaust principle (if with shechita).

But while with Man the religious ethos interfered with
 the religious cult and raised physical sacrifice to mental
 sacrifice, the Torah retained animal sacrifice.
 [Only after conquest of Jericho did Torah tolerate slaughter
 of animals for non-sacred purpose. See also, 1 Sam 14:24
 1 Sam 14:31. However, many prohibitions were levied
 on meat-eating which render it complex & difficult.
 Some rules were retained from Egypt for Israelites,
 (thus even sanctifying Israelites). But P3 is forbidden
 throughout, the Torah retaining full possession of
 the P3, 110 P32 783 P3.5 - 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 God)
 present in M-P relations as in M-A? In sacrificial rites
 we have flour, wine, oil. (also 1 Sam 13: P3 in rites substitute
 for P3(P3)). 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 1 Sam 14: P3 as
 a P3 for the poor man - consisting of 1/4 fl, 1/4
 two 3 parts of 1/4 P3 - 1/4 P3, 1/4 P3.

Torah claims $\text{אין אדם זכות על חיי אדם}$. Logical consequence - god
 rightful owner of all life. Sacrifice expresses the absolute
 juridic power that g-d holds over life. Then, first
 life-manifestation belongs to g-d, - the man and
 animal alike. But with אדם זכאי לחייו and אדם זכאי למנוחתו ,
 Torah recommends substitution, אדם זכאי למנוחתו . In Halacha,
 אדם זכאי למנוחתו , + ^{Halacha} Torah leaves אדם זכאי למנוחתו from אדם זכאי למנוחתו . T
 then looks upon Man-g-d relations as of juridic nature.

אדם זכאי למנוחתו in Plant: אדם זכאי למנוחתו . Only difference: אדם זכאי למנוחתו
 understood like, אדם זכאי למנוחתו , whereas אדם זכאי למנוחתו requires
 אדם זכאי למנוחתו . In אדם זכאי למנוחתו , אדם זכאי למנוחתו mentions אדם זכאי למנוחתו
 [see אדם זכאי למנוחתו , first of a kind, also אדם זכאי למנוחתו].

Thus, P also denies property, so T grants M right
 to use P only if he offers the first portion to g-d.

אדם זכאי למנוחתו : M not granted privileged of enjoying first
 portion of free-life. So too, אדם זכאי למנוחתו (of אדם זכאי למנוחתו). Halacha
 extended אדם זכאי למנוחתו of אדם זכאי למנוחתו to אדם זכאי למנוחתו , M being
 enjoined from destruction of life till sacrifice to g-d (which is
 expressed as a אדם זכאי למנוחתו - Proof: אדם זכאי למנוחתו אדם זכאי למנוחתו)
 feudal law of medieval period had אדם זכאי למנוחתו

(i.e. \rightarrow Pna \rightarrow 2026) from 2020 B) also a type of sacrifice - human - that to a Man. Modern State has other forms of sacrifice - taxation. Thus, idea that when sovereignty + ownership established, M required to give first + best, is not an outdated idea, but one practicing in our everyday life.

\rightarrow B is applied to M and P alike (not A).

etymologically - denotes something superfluous + alien that doesn't belong to a certain system + renders the system weaker than otherwise. \rightarrow B is applied to M and P alike.

absolutely - by \rightarrow B. Now, \rightarrow B expressed distance - or \rightarrow B is applied to M and P alike. \rightarrow B is applied to M and P alike. \rightarrow B is applied to M and P alike. \rightarrow B is applied to M and P alike.

1st - \rightarrow B is applied to M and P alike, to make more to \rightarrow B.

4th year fruit is the best, \rightarrow B (according to agronomists) + that's why - fruit 3 years M enjoyed from tree, because fruit made permissible by sacrifice; but after 4th year, when best of tree sacrificed, it's permissible.

some = *shel* *godes*, *tsi* *tsa* *pi* *pe*
M's obligation to earth + her produce.

M enjoined from interfering w. P-life at all - not with planting, and
with destroying. *Shel* interpreted by Philo as Man's dedication
to G-d (w. respect to *tsa* *pi*). Here, *tsa* indicates belief that
world belongs to G-d, M has no right to P-life. So too at *tsi*
we have *tsa* *pi* + T says *tsa* *pi* - showing absolute
ownership right of G-d.

Now, why was H₂O included in *tsi* *pi* as *pi* *pi*
by *tsa* as *tsa* *pi*. Reason: H₂O called *pi* *pi*, therefore
since H₂O is an absolute necessity for any life, T includes it in
tsi *pi* because of its importance as a dynamic factor in life.

Maimonides, however, by describing *tsi* *pi* as pedagogical,
describing a great *tsa* *pi* or principle in Jewish life, in the end,
we can reduce all worship for M to G-d to the formula
of *tsi* *pi*.

Primitive concept of sacrifice was one of trading - exchange of
present w. G-d. However, in Jewish life, *tsi* *pi* not a frame for
worldly objective; rather duty of *tsa* *pi* in relationship bet. M and G-d.

If M is P basically, what of confinement of M w. his environment
Possible that human dignity finds expression in confinement of
movement rather than freedom of movement, i.e., did T
want to make M a "citizen of the universe" a 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. Trench regards dynamic
locomotion as other part of character of g-d. ~~... ..~~
... .. - ceaseless movement. Maimonides
says that when T refers to movement of g-d, it means
activity. g-d is dynamic, ~~... ..~~,
Divine forces in world are of kinetic nature. ~~... ..~~
Idea of omnipresence of g-d not equally Jewish. For
Greek - medieval Jewish philosophy. We believe that g-d
can interfere with any universal or individual system at
will - not just as g-d. We have g-d who, Greeks
had omnipresence in metaphysical sense, peaceful
& quiet g-d. We formulated belief in transcendent

of g-d as ^{having a} personality, endowed w. locomotion -
BTX uses P1C and N17 in describing G-d. Freedom of
movement is, then, Divine attribute.

However, there is attempt by T to "arrest"
divinity to one place - E3, P11, N12 - P2H2, N12.
Then; dual aspect: 1912 Q1A3 B1A - on other hand,
confinement to certain place. Latter referred to ^{voluntary} P1J12, N12,
and became most cosmic + grandiose idea of philosophy. N1A1
referred to Man and g-d. From Rabbi Akiba: P1C
P2A1, N12 = P2A1C, N12, P1C. Modern psychology
(Otto) = 2 conflicting emotions of M about g-d:
Fascination (merger) + daunting (repulsion). This is
idea of proximity + distance of Man from g-d. P2H3 B
N11, N12. 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 P1A. [This
confinement in P1A is symbolic]. greatest confinement
of g-d (P1B3, P1C12, N12), confinement of g-d

within cosmos. Metaphysically & cabalistically,
g-d is regarded as being freedom of nature, Holiness
as confined (Halacha mentioned in metaphysics).

g-d will raise this problem ה' יצאנו ממצרים
 וה' יצאנו ממצרים ; ה' יצאנו ממצרים , as
paradox.

g-d of philosophy & mysticism was "beyond" &
unconfined, 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 transcendently.

Midrash tells us that ה' יצאנו ממצרים said ה' יצאנו ממצרים
because he was afraid that ה' יצאנו ממצרים & 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, i. struggled w. ה' יצאנו ממצרים like

ה' יצאנו ממצרים ה' יצאנו ממצרים .

If T parallels confinement of M as of g-d,
then we have idea of State. ה' יצאנו ממצרים Reformers, however, (like

Hermann Cohen) were always anti-Zionist because they understood M as transcendental; since as it follows then, that there is no confinement of G-d, hence no confinement of Man, hence no state, hence no Zionism