**Suffering and Evil Notes**

Two Problems with Evil

Logical Problem of evil: If God is all powerful and good, and evil exists, Impossible that G-d should exist. (You can answer the question by altering each of the steps)

A1: theodicy - justify God - the world is run well. how did you get here today: I took the subway?

A2: Other possibilities (Car) There are enough opportunities for travel that I could have used any other way to get to class.

Empirical problem: even though it is possible a good God would do terrible things, the amount of evil we actually have goes beyond that, the evidence is overwhelming. The sheer quantity of Evil in the world can’t be justified with any logical answer. When do we say enough is enough? Same can be said for Communism, the suffering necessary is just too much, no longer worth the goal. (Torture is the Egg needed for an omelet) **Witness by Whittaker Chambers –** at some point, enough is enough.

Meaning and Evil – What does that word imply?

Even if you do not believe in G-d, why there is so much suffering in the world is still a question. Still blurry without glasses. Meaning implies an answer to a math question is not enough for this problem. Something just does not feel right, like wearing Ill-fitting shoes. Not a math, although some lose sleep over math.

Tanakh - has philosophically weighty statements – “Source of Jewish Philosophical Reflection” (not pure philosophy) Many different opinions. Should It be synthesized or are their multiple facets of G-d.

-God is good/ הצור תמים פעלו כי כל דרכיו משפט – You get a sense that Gd is a pretty good guy. -The Rav in Worship of the heart - some people experience God as hostile - many people felt this way in the holicaust -they viewed God as the enemy - this should not be contravertial because there are many pesukim like this in tehillim, Eichah, and Iyov and Kohelet.

Q. Why when the Tanach answers a Philisophical question they need to ask again?

2/4 Which question is more urgent - why tzaddikim suffer, or why reshaim prosper?

William C Fields (Dukenfeld) - a comedian- someone saw him reading the Bible - He replied, “Looking for loopholes.” Suffered from Alcohol consumption.

**Rav Yosef Albo** - people do wrong things, and then when they suffer, they forget what they did. People send letters to chassidishe Rebbes that he should intervene - they explain their sins and ask that they should not suffer, but they do not express guilt. Is G-d an easy grader. “Whoever says God gives way, does not collect what is due to Him- let his intestines be opened” - the Yerushalmi is saying rip him open - yet there are sources in favor like כי לא אחפץ במות המת. So, which is it? Is G-d merciful or is he strict.

**Rav Wychgrod** - People say Christianity is a religion of mercy, but Judaism is a religion of judgement. He never heard of a Jew who said on Yom Kippur, God I want my just desert - exactly what I deserve - we ask for mercy.

In the Holocaust - if I could pray that my mother’s family should be saved, or that Hitler should suffer? So that is tzaddik vRah Lo - how much would it bother me that Hitler was having a good time? Not a lot. How important would that actually be to me? So that makes it seem like Tzaddik viRah Lo is a much more difficult problem.

If someone is a tzaddik - do you really know that the person is a tzaddik? But someone who is publicly a Rasha is less likely to be a tzaddik in private - we also naturally tend to think that if something bad happened to someone that person is a Rasha. We want everything to be deserved (smoker gets Cancer) “Just world Phenomenon”.

Q. Do we care that the reshaim are doign well - Maybe knowing the people who are torturing ME will suffer a bad end, but this question is about the question of rasha viTov Lo in general. The way people think instinctively is That person stepped on my toe?! He should burn in hell for eternity - this other person killed a million people who were not related to me? Rishonim and chazzal are more bothered by Rasha ViTov Lo - modern man might be different.

\* Movie: “I’m alright Jack” - factory in England. The time motion guy, makes a big speech that is supposed to be the message - everyone is selfish, I’m alright Jack, how about you? “I’m Ok, what effect does that evil mean to me” - what is evil anyway - it could be people think that God tilts towards chessed Maybe that thinking about vindication is unproductive, (angry, self-righteous)

Maybe the opposite, when tzaddikim suffer there must be something to justify it – A1. people suffer in this world to cleanse the sins they did in this world - indeed, most tzaddikim do NOT look in the mirror and find perfection. A2. Or the Tzadikim will get paid back in Olam Habah.

**Rav Albo** (Ramban)- Q1 What explain tzaddik viRah Lo Q2 Rahsa viTov Lo - assuming there is an answer to these questions, Q3 why do the Neviim keep kvetching about it? If the neviim did not have an answer, then their kvetching make sense.

David Weiss, published very long article in tradition about evolution “but I am a scientist and people ask me to give lectures.” He thought child with leukemia was a more difficult question. Because even good answers aren’t helpful. Even if you have an answer, why accept it.

The Rav was sleeping at Julius Bermans house - the Rav was walking back and forth not sleeping, asked the Rav why, the Rav had been contacted by a couple - woman was not Jewish - man was, but knew very little of what that meant - in course of geirut they started taking Judaism more seriously - realized he could not mary a geir - they asked the Rav is there something that can be done. He said no, there was no loophole in that case - so then why walk back and forth all night? I was thinking, **how am I going to explain it to them? That is a question worth staying up all night for**. Way you answer in a beis medrash different than a hospital.

For Rav Yosef Albo though, there is an answer. It’s given in **Psalm 73** - very important mizmor - Martin Buber thought that in 73 that is where it is really happening - **קרבת א-לקים לי טוב** is the punchline - the real answer is closeness to God- if you are close to God you have no questions like this. Rav Albo assumes it’s an early Asaph by the time of Dovid - so then why is YIrmiyahu still complaining? Maybe it is not a good enough answer. Or it is not philosophical enough.

“When bad books are written with good intentions.” – Gd must have no power.

2/6 Rav Saadiah Gaon - Evil people, “the worms will never abandon them” - if I offend you, I have to do something to make up for it - or suffering will make up for it - how much suffering depends on the offense and who I offended - what if I offend somebody very important? You offend a king, off with your head - perhaps it should be all the more so with God - so the only possible way to pay it back is eternity in hell. That is why suffering is so bad and it actually does corelate with the sin you did.

Rav Saadiah does **not** say that any small sin gives hell for eternity. (Hell is not very popular among the liberal). St. Augustine believed most people go directly to hell. Hans Urs von Balthasar – people do not go to hell, empty. CS Lewis is really the only one who is supportive of the idea of a Christian purgatory – salvation outside Jesus. Clean up for the party (Yirushalmi “Bread of Embarrassment”), as opposed to Anselm who thought Jesus cleared everything. Johnson was worried about being in hell for Eternity. Pope Francis – “Who is to Judge”.

Rav Yosef Albo - if being with God wipes away all קשהs, then why do all later neviim keep bringing it up - they should have their answer! They were more bothered with good happening to bad. A. Hashem is saying that if Yirmiyahu has trouble when things are good imagine when things are bad, he’ll collapse.

**Even if he has an answer it is still like wearing cloudy glasses, something in life seems off.**

2/11

Rav Albo - having an answer does not mean that you stop asking questions - they continue to worry - Rav Carmy: this ties in to the idea of meaning - otherwise it should be that if you have an answer, thats it - if you ask when is Rosh Chodesh, then someone tells you - that’s it. Not so with meaning.

Rav Albo answer two: distinguishes between answering tzaddik viRah Lo That’s 73 - the question is why tzaddikim are afflicted by people lesser than them - on the one hand unjust/evil is unjust/evil - but for some people (including neviim) How you got the broken leg makes a difference - Real life: if someone else gets your job who deserves it more than you do then it is easier to swallow than if it was someone who you felt was not as worthy. A. Yirmiyahu complains that the Rasha is afflicting someone more righteous than he - not just saying why do the wicked prosper. B. Chavakuk says even more openly: The wicked swallow up those more righteous than he - it’s one thing if someone better than me shows me up. A1. Still bothersome. A2. Tehillim is Tzadik Vrah, Others are Rasha Vtov.

**Chazal –** Brachos (7a) Moshe wanted to know about “Tzadik Vrah Loh”. (We live life forward and understand it backward). When he saw G-d’s back he understood the difference between Tzadik Gamur and Tzadik aino gamur.

Shabbos (55a) R’ Ami – “There is no death without sin, there is no suffering without iniquity”. Seems to be saying that suffering is worse than death. (He must have held that Moshe and Ahron did sin at Mei Merivah).

4 Died because of the Nachash. Seemingly saying that there is some death that had no sin attached to it. Seemingly the Sin of Adam tainted the whole physical world to insert the nature of sin into the fabric of the world. Aurbach – These 4 might have avoided sin but they never really became anything. Rambam held of a girsah that this does not actually disprove.

If death is bad and anything bad is a result of sin, then all death is the result of sin - Eitz HaDaat (St. Paul)

Meiri – They actually did sin but it means they did not do any major sins.

Brachos (5a) – Should examine oneself if he comes in contact with Issurin. Rambam Chakirah a. Tshuva If you know your sin. b. Taanis - when a whole group of people finds themselves in times of suffering. Special rule that you should repent as a community without truly knowing what you did.

2/18

Isaiah 53 – Tzadik suffers for those around him. Implies something of a vicarious atonement. Abarbenel: They suffer because they should not see the evil in the world (Avraham). Radak: Morally questionable to believe this.

Kapara vs Teshuva – Washing the dishes vs they forgive your bill. Tefillah – someone else pays.

What are **Yisurin Shel Ahava**?

Sometimes if we think we are hearing Zebras. We think that when we are suffering it is because of Issurin shel ahava. Really it is just Horses that represent punishment because we sinned.

Rav Kook: suffering has to be understood not just **forensically** (has to do with going to trial - like CSI) but **teleological** (having to do with purpose/meaning) as well.

It’s not sin is punished and virtue is rewarded – but rather we expect God to multitask - it should satisfy more than one requirement - If I write a history book, the better the book is, the more the different parts of the book will serve its purpose. Symphony: all instruments have its own part - the more optimistic a Jewish thinker, the more he is likely to insist on that kind of perfection - Rav Kook was like that - so he wouldn’t say this is simply punishment - not just finding what should I do - but the punishment itself should help guide a person to see what should be improved.

That is why Rashi says that they cannot lead to Bitul Torah/Tfillah – because they are supposed to assist in one’s Avodat Hashem.

(Computer: figure out where is there a bug, where did I go wrong - can even find a book with answers at the back - with a human, you can find a solution even if you don’t why there was a problem to begin with - you know you have to do something to fix things, but you are not exactly sure what is wrong and what should be right.

Kierkegaard - we live life forward not backward - Rav Carmy: in life unlike in math there are no answers in the back of the book (so I guess when we see things don’t make sense to us, the lesson is this broader one) - if you want to not waste time with a relationship with the Ribono Shel Olam because they want to focus on making money.) Middle March/Apology Note

**Rashi on Brachot** - because a person suffers, that will lead them to greater commitment to Talmud Torah - Yisurin shel Ahava - you have surplus suffering (which you don’t deserve) which you invest to get more schar in Olam Habah –

**Rav Saadiah Gaon** in Emunos VeDeos interprets it in the same way - gives you a storehouse from whcih you get greater schar. Drashot Haran says similarly

**Drashot Hara and Maharal** - when you consider the body to be in competition with the soul - when one is weaker , the other is stronger - it’s a zero sum game - high spirits you are drinking running jumping, but when youare mroe subdued you think about cheshbon haNefesh and avodat Hashem, it does not have to be that way, but often it is - so this is saying that suffering allows someone to reach a higher potential of spirituality

**Rambam** thought that idea was strange - he took a hard line on the gemara that says there is no suffering without עוון

Rambam: Olam Habbah is a place of intellectual activity - get into the Rav’s shiur: one criterion is can you learn - another is likely who your father is - if there was someone who was a lamdan who also suffered with asthma, that isn’t a criterion! So why is asthma a criterion for Olam Habah?

How do you want your life to look? Most people would probably rather struggle as a young man and then have a respectable peaceful old age. Kal VaChomer for Olam Habbah - rather have a miserable Olam Hazeh and collect your chips in Olam Habbah - it takes a moral quality - holding out - differing gratification.

Gra: person was reading Reishis Chochma and he was so scared of hell from that that he went crazy and got a fever for a while - the Gra said that was a good thing and people should have such fear of hell - Christians are very good at this - Jonathan Etwood (mid 18th century) sinners in the hand of righteous God - James Joyce, raised catholic: Portrait of the artist as a young man - dramatic sermon of what goes on in hell.

All the suffering Olam Hazeh is nothing compared to what goes on in hell - people who get drunk even though they know they will have a hangover: some people will sin even though they are aware of what will happen to them as a result in hell

If it’s just about cleaning the slate like Rambam, then what is the purpose of suffering for a tzaddik?

It almost doesn’t even seem like a moral issue, just I realize that I would rather have suffering now so I can have schar later - it’s a decision perhaps equivalent to deciding to shower in the morning so that you greet the day in a fresh manner.

Rav Addah Bar Ahava - two conditions for Yisurim shel Ahava: You have to accept them and have no bittul Torah - some say bittul Tfillah - some say even without either bittul it can be yissurin shel ahava

Rav Kook: Torah develops you intellectually and Tfillah develops you emotionally. Maharal thought it elevated you because it weakened your physical state.

2/24 What does punishment accomplish?

Intuitive attitude: It’s called retribution – 1. Retributive theory of punishment

Emanuel Kant - (18th century) : if society was to be dissolved tomorrow (everything was over tomorrow) it would still be worth it for the last murderer to be punished - even though there is no danger of the murderer killing anyone else - it would not be fair to the murderer - we don’t blame an animal for killing: that we view in almost superstitious terms - baseball player that strike out and breaks their bat or kicks the water cooler - it’s silly - but we view humans as different - so Kant would say that it is insulting to not punish the criminal - its treating the criminal less than human!

Punishment has a large element of revenge in it, so many do not want to associate God with that - God is merciful, not punitive - many liberal even some frum Christians believe this - God loves us so much that God suffers on our behalf.

2. Another theory: Deterrents: either to deter the criminal or other people

JJR – no one thought of him as a model of morality - wrote in his novel Emile - if every person had outside their window gallows - you know that if you do x you will be hanging there next week - that would do wonders to get rid of crime - that’s deterrent.

Flannery O’Conner: Psychopath takes a nice Christian family hostage - says about the grandmother at the end of the story - you know, she would have been a good person if someone was pointing a gun at her all day.

3. Rehabilitative.

Eved Ivri is rehabilitative - because they thought back then that prison should be rehabilitative - we don’t hold that today.

Combo - Punishment requires a sense of retribution - otherwise it’s not punishment - maybe it would be self-help - but you could still say that punishment *should* never be purely retributive, it should be a deterent as well

Rambam though in Moreh Nevuchim: don’t assume that the heavier penalty means a worse crime because there are other factors that go into it - deterrent is a big part - a heavy penalty for people who lose their temper and beat their wives may not be effective because when people lose their temper they are not thinking about their consequences - whereas selling marijuana maybe should have a heavy punishment

William James - if on judgement day there is one cockaroach suffering the pains of unrequited love - that’s a kasheh

One of the most important novels ever written: Brothers Karamazov by Dostoyevsky - I don’t know what - even if we get Olam Habbah and we meet this child who was ripped apart by hounds and he is smiling and as far as he is concerned everything worked out for the best and he is satisfied – I would return my ticket.

Bialik - על השחיטה - נקמה כזאת נקמת דם ילד קטן - there is no revenge of the blood of a little child - Prime Minister Begin would quote this line after terrorist attacks.

so what about Amalek - and people write about the 7 nations - Christian theologians are troubled - are the knaanim nothing more than just a cheftzah shel mitzvah - no-one wants to be that especially if you are killed in the process - this is a modern issue.

Gemara in Gittin - the decendants of these monstrous people some converted - so Chazzal think that Amalekim can do tshuvah - just because you were born an Amalekim, does not mean you are an Amaleki halakhically - seems to be a makhlokes Rashi/Rambam

Journal “Daat” Published by Bar Ilan - says Rav Kook is not very consistent in these matters - at different times he wrote different things on this matter, bothered about this issue.

someone who is a less harmonious thinker would not be as bothered- not every person is saved.

**Yisurin Shel Ahava**

It is in the Torah - if an eved loses his tooth, he goes free. If you go free for one part of the body, then kal vichomer if someone has isurin, which affects the whole body, then (the benefits are greater)

Rav Kook on this proof from the eved: when he had the tooth or eye, he was still an eved, but now he is a free man and his action s belong to him - a person before yeesoorin was enslaved to desires - even someone who appeared to be involved in Torah and Tfillah…

Ein Yaakov- Rebbe Yochannan - lived in Eretz Yisrael - does not use the term יסורין של אהבה, but he says if you …. and you bury your children, your sins are forgiven - … what happens to one member of the family affects the other - if something happens to children, the parents should take it personally

this means our view of schar ViOnesh and our relationship with God is not purely individualistic - It is said that Americans are more individualistic, but that is not the nature of humans and it is not the Torah’s ideal

**Rashi**: In Bavel you get the benefit of Nega’im, but not the penalty of being expelled from the machaneh - so they are equivalent to יסורין של אהבה - but in Eretz yisrael they are kicked out of the machaneh and once you are separated form am yisrael then it can’t be יסורין של אהבה

Nega’im Bitzin’ah vs. BiFarhesiah - if you don’t lose face before other people then it can still be יסורין של אהבה - assumption: when you are shamed at yourself, that can be spiritually valuable, but otherwise it is not the kind of price tha tcan be compatible with יסורין של אהבה

but this is against Rebbe Yochanan becasue this issayin theat נגעים ובנים is NOT יסורין של אהבה - the difference is between someone who had children and then lost them or not - no because this Rebbe YOchanan is the one who lost many children

**Rashi**: A great person like Rebbe Yochanan only has יסורין של אהבה - adds this premise - such great people can only get יסורין של אהבה

but Rebbe Yochanan did not say his own יסורין were יסורין של אהבה

The fact that rebbe yochanan is displaying the bone is not saying or implying that he has yissurin shel ahava , but at least it is possible - **rash**i is learning it as either or - there may be an ambivalence - we don’t know - but our assumption is that Rebe Yochanan would not be going to peple at shiva and telling them how big of a sinner he is - that is not called for - turning them into a cheftza shel mitzvah- saying this is what happened to me does not imply one interpretation or the other - shows though that there is a possible interpretation that it is not punishment

2/25 If the Nega’im are visible to others than it is not Yissurin shel Ahava

Q. what’s the logic of this? It’s not like Yissurin that prevent Yissurin that prevent talmud Torah and Tfillah - after all, those are religious values

A. The Gemara must be making a statement that shame is so significant/problematic that if one is experiencing shame, it cannot be Yissurin shel Ahava

There is a sense in punishment of having payed one’s debt - he did his time, or got his malkot, even if he didn’t do tshuva. Sometimes people in jail will pretend to be religous so that the Rabbi or priest will try to get them out of jail. Jack Abbit - killed waiter soon after leaving jail

Halkha: if someone was bound to be flogged and then the shaliach was ready to go, but the guy broke free and ran away - he is pattur because he was degraded נקלא אחיך לעיניך - also if the whip breaks in the middle

Reb Chayim - regarding malkot the din is niklah acheecha li’einecha and not the actual pain - it’s the denigration - death penalty is different: there you actually have to die

Gemara: R Yochanan - לא הם ולא שכרן - give me your hand - he helped him get up - R Yochanan could not lift himself up? A person in prison cannot get himself out of prison - I’m crying because your beauty will one day end in dirt - R Yochanan: That’s worth crying about - R Elaza: לא הן ולא שכרן

niether of them use the term יסורין של אהבה - this was particularly a babylonian concept - they devoted much more attention to it (Dr. Elman’s article focuses on this.)

What is the meaning of someone saying I don’t want the Yissurin and I don’t want the schar?

But this is much harder to understand on spiritual terms - people **like Rashi and Rav Saadia Gaon** have this investment perspective (I think) - fast today and you will get reward tomorrow - rather than eat all the cake today, I will leave some for tomorrow - for most people maturity means the ability to defer gratification - like Olam Habah - we will suffer here for Olam Habah.

if the suffering is punishment then it’s easier to say I’ll accept it - I want to go to Olam Habah with a clean state so I accept it willingly. CS Lewis: even someone who believes jesus accepts human’s sins would still rather come to party clean even if it hurts to clean it up. But I don’t know if I would accept it for the future - would you like a headache to get kaparah - no, thank you very much I would rather not if I can get away without it

You come to an exam: You want it to be as easy as possible to get a good grade - but the people in that exam from memorizing Dante looked back upon it favorably many years later because they said we didn’t realize how much I could memorize like that. The Rav’s shiur, but the hours of deliberation gave them a derech halimud - is that Yissurin Shel Ahava

So I could see someone saying - לא הם ולא שכרן - I would love to read the reshimos, but I would prefer not to sit through the hours of shiur - I would prefer to leave the headache and the hundred dollars

Q. Rav Kook: but why would such great Amora’im such as R Yochanan and R Eliezer say לא הן ולא שכרן - someone will get a spiritual level that he would not have gotten on their own - tzaddikim don’t care what spiritual level they achieve - they care about their service of Hashem - they don’t want to be handed this spiritual achievement - they want to get it from their own toil - The Gra said to a Mal’ach, get away from me, I want to learn it on my own - that’s why they said לא הם ולא שכרן - if you just get it through God, then its not really עבודה - its not about achieving the highest level, but the highest commitment

the experienced machine - what if you could get the best experience you could ever hope for without putting in the effort - to make a tuna sandwhich without toasting the bread cutting the vegetables etc. - part of the pleasure people have is the effort - true, if I was really in a hurry, I would rather someone else prepare it for me - Robert Nozick - most people would choose to live life and not just have the experienced machine

ומה שחטאתי לפניך מחק ברחמיך הרבים - but not through Yissurin - as a child Rav Carmy found this odd- GIVE US EVERYTHING, as long as it doesn’t hurt - even on Yom Kippur Jews are honest enough to admit that we want the easy way out - that’s Rav Blau - Rav Kook: That’s not what we want - Yissurin ARE the easy way out

2/27 R Channina ben Dosa - Bat Kol says the whole world exits by his merit - yet he himself was destitiute - he lived on carobs from one end of the week to the other - he got more reward in this world at the request of his wife - then his zechuyot were deminished - different than the earlier Gemara

Q. Machlokes:

1. Tzadik gets financial help – golden leg.
2. Rav Yochanan could not lift himself out of his own Tzarot.
3. If it is about gaining something to fill a loss, that they can accomplish. But in order to stop divine decree, not able to get themselves out of.

Many religious thinkers view the body as a bad thing per say **- Rashi, Rasag** - the more you weaken the body the better it is for the soul - we see this at an existential level: A person who is restless will not get important things done: your supposed to be learning but instead you are eating all the time - the more your body is weakened, the more room there is for the soul.

**Rav Kook** does not view the body as bad - more modern thinker in that way - on  a certain level there is a balance between the two, yet it is not considered a bad thing - for most people we do not care if the body rots away because it is really a means towards something else - you don’t want the  dross, but rather the purified version of the metal.

You can also read this gemara as saying death is tragedy - you die and life is gone - the Rav might have said this if he spoke about this Gemara - whereas Rav Kook was more saying, for R Yochanan, death is tragic, but not necessarily the death of others

**Netzach Yisrael** - a book of the Maharal on Tisha BiAv/ Gallus and Geulah – Chagigah 5a

The word גבה is interpreted as Gaivah – G-d weeps because of Jewish pride

It means the pride of Shamayim that has been demised. What this the meanig of saying that God weeps. isn’t there now Atzvut before God - for God everythign is joyous. We distinugish regardign God between the inner chambers and outer chambers. God obviously weeps in one and not the other - but which is which

1. Maharal - in the internal chambers there is atzvut but not in the outer chambers  - the passuk implies there is mourning everywhere which implies in the external chambers - chuban hamikdash is different - there thereis weeping even in the inner chambers - - assumption: weeping normally in inner chambers - this is girsa of Rashi - inner chambers God weep but not in the outer

* Only weep in the inner, outer when the Beis Hamikdash was destroyed.

1. Rabeinu Channannel had the opposite girsa in the Gemara – Only weeps in the outer chambers but beit hamikdash even in the inner.

Maharal - the whole idea of God weeping is troublesome - tzad hanotein and tzad hamikabel - perspective of the giver and the perspective of the recipient (the human perspective) - at the Yam Suf you experience God and the great savior - at Har SInai as the great Rosh Yeshiva - whatever is fitting for the recipient - Yam Suf you experienced God one way - but on Tisha BiAv we experience God in mourning

Leib Wechnitz - a pseudo intellectual said when you were in Aushwitz where was God - apparently looked her in the eye and said - Where was God? He was with *us*. That is essentially what the Maharal is saying. Outwordly, the world has to go on and nature takes its course, even if G-d is always upset.

Poem by Bialek - hebrw poet went to yeshiva of Volozhin - was the great poet of teh hebrew renosance - we still speak of hism a a national poet - shcolar tries to prove rhat he is the great poet and not Agnon - one of her proofs is that noone sings Agnon but that is not sucha a great proof because people generally dont turn novels into songs - has a poem abourt pogroms - השמש זרחה השיטה פרחה והשוחט שחט - its was a nice beautiful spring day - sun was shining - flower flowering and the slaughterer slaughtered - nature took its course - thats the Maharal - the world has to keep going

there is intimacy to the human soul and there is intimacy to the riboonoshel olam - the sun shone the same way the day after the churban, but you witnessed G-d crying outwardly.

3/6 Bava Kamma 38a - saying “What can you do” to an Avel is an insult to God - because it implies that if you could do something then you would -( what, you are not happy about what God decreed?)

what’s the alternative to saying this? Often people say what can you do because they have nothing else to say - not a deep theological statement - people often say stupid things when they feel they have to say *something*

gam zu liTova - could be presumptuous and offensive - one avel responded to someone saying that God takes people away at the right time when their tafkid is over through a story with the Rav saying, “That’s a funny thing to say about a forty year old woman who died leaving three young children” Rav Carmy responded, “Anyone who knew the Rav knew that he viewed even the death of an elderly individual as a tragedy of infinite proportions

one option is to say nothing - but there is a danger to that - among frum people you can do it - then the Avel might say to you, “Well, what can you say?” Then you are back to square one - but you could say, “What can I say?” A Rabbi whose adult son passed away, Rav Carmy said this to him and he responded אי אפשר לדבר על זה אבל אי אפשר לדבר על משהו אחר

Avot Drabi Natan – Rabbi YbZ lost a child. Returning a Pikadon.

**Moreh Nevuchim** - beginning talks about chet avraham harishon.

Chapter 1 : tzelem elokim - he argues that tzelem here means form - distniction between form and matter: Aristotle - four causes - (cause is a bad word because what we call cause today is Aristotle’s efficient cause - causing the cup to more - so it is easier to present it as four factors)

1) Material cause - the table is metal

2) formal cause - table - material is some sort of metal - if you grind up metal it is the same metal - so what makes the table what it is? Its that the table that is formed a certain wa

3) Efficient cause - a metal worker caused it to come into existence

4) Purpose cause - you can’t understand what a table is without understanding the purpose of the table

You can change form, but not really material - you grind up a dog, the material stays the same, but the form changes

Aristotle: species is a form - they are made up of different matter, but they are of the same form

Rambam: that is tzelem Elokim - humans have teh same form God has - that form is rationality - intellect - at the same time we are material human beings

Seven reasons for contradictions

he utilizes the fifth and seventh

**5)** klal uPrat - write somehting more than once, in one place you include more than you do in another place - when you go through the rules of baseball then you don’t always discuss the infield fly rule - each literary context requires its own explanation

**7)** to confuse fools - philisophical books are meant for people thinking on a high level - so good writers will write in a way in which high thinkers will get what they will get, while others will get something of religous value, but not realize that their missing out on something else - getting into unrelated discussions is part of this strategy

Chapter 2: Eitz Hadaas

Rambam: knowledge of truth and falsehood - that is tzelem elokim - value judgements are what came from teh eitz haddaat - pleasant and unpleasant - desireable and undesirabel - what you want and don’t want - not metaphysics - two options - you can govern your life based on rationality, is this true or false? Or, you can look at the world in terms of what is pleasant and unpleasant

the original sin is the choice to be motivated not just by truth and false, but by pleasant and unpleasant - once you enter that world, you enter the world of sin - it’s not about how many things you know, or how rich your experience is.

If you view experience per say as a value - is he experienced, does he know the world? Well, what does he know? Calculous, advanced algebra, and what it’s like to spend the night in a whore house - what about the person next to him whose experience is much narrower, he has never been to a whore house - the Rambam would say, no, it’s about knowing different forms of knowledge: Not knowing what it’s like to be in a whore house - many people have a similar dispute in education today - the idea that someone in a monastery is missing out on life.

For the Rambam, tasting this food vs. that food is not really valuable - he doesn’t view the experience of pleasure

as far - the world we live in people are bound to both types of thinking - we are born in a world of pleasure and displeasure -what’s controversial is, “were people supposed to be born like that from the beginning.” That God made people ot be purely rational and we messed up, so today humans are believed human beings - or, is perek bet in the rambam in effect figurative - the rambam is nto describing a historical event, but he is saying  this is how humans are - If you look at humans, they should be God like - the Tzura - but what can you do - humans are not even angels - they are material being s - living in a material world - this is a picture of human nature and the rambam just presents it a s a story but it is raeally a metaphysical analysis - form G-d like - matter -material - Analogy: think of an architects plans that he drew everything is mathematical - when you actually build the building there will be stones pieces of wood and so forth - if the plans are made properly, the house will never decay

How did man actually become imperfect? How did he go from one side to the other - with a physical line it is just aobu stepping over - but what does it mean to go from innocent to guilty - if you were innocent, then what motivated you to do the act - if you view the Rambam as a description of human nature then that problem goes away - otherwise it is a paradox

Kirkegaaurd - asleep to awake - sexual ignorance to sexual unawareness - how do you go from one to the other? It is kind of a mystery - The concept of anxiety: very important book for people to read if they are interested to read if you are interested in religion and psychology - not just taking psychology and accepting it, but viewing it through psychological underpinnings

Rav Dessler: what is valuable in human life- the struggle - the arena is not that of metaphysics , but what you do with your life - moving that line of nekudat habechira - life is war - his discription might be reminicent of world war one which he lived through - Rambam would say what is important is intellectual - you have to have some control to raise to great intellectual heights - Netziv: if man had not sinned, there would have been another creation of man that would have been like us

3/13 Chapter 8 in chelek gimmel

Rambam is concerned with the issure of chomer and tzurah - but in a slightly different way than last class - not exactly aristotle (matter is a piece of metal , form is table - mater is a bunch of chemicals - form is a living creature) - an analysis with very little emotional weight to it - you can’t ask, “what do you like better? Chomer or Tzurah?”

Outside of Yahdut - Bishop Berkeley denied the existence of matter - one of the problems then was what was the relationship between matter and mind - he solved it simply by saying that - everything is an idea - then how is it that things persist - meaning if you are only an idea in my mind then when I look away you stop existing - the joke is if a tree falls in a forest and noone is there to see it, does it make a sound? To be is to be perceived - his answer was that God knows everything so you exist as an idea of God

Jewish thought - The Altar Rebbe in Shaar Yichud ViEmunah was mechaven to Berkeley - Nigerian were killing another nation is a civil war Biakrah - Rav Lichtenstein wanted his shiur to protest this - so they had a very early minyan and very early shiur and then they went to protest - bitter cold day - people came to sell them socks - Rav Lichtenstein said there that he thought it wasn’t such a great thing to be mechavein to Berkeley.

What motivated him was likely a sense of matter people replulsive - it was morally valuable to get rid of matter

Rambam did disparage better- an ideal world would nto be a material world - in chapter eight Rambam has lengthy remarks about sex - he is tot to happy about it - doesn’t value it so much - liek how he said about hte guy who does philosophy while he is not eating drinking, or having sex - he says that in lashon HaKodesh there are no words for sexual organs - the words we use are euphamisms

Ramban is upset about this because he thinks it is lashon hakodesh because it is the language of the Torah.

Nafka Mina - in real like you know the difference between someone who uses four letter words and those who don’t - Rav Carmy’s father apparently used those words and got a silver star for it because he used them to command his army to fight when the lead commander was killed- there are times you need to use that language

the Torah does not avoid such language all the time becaus sometimes you need ot use clear language

CS Lewis in his book on Paradise Lost - in english there is no way - either you sound like a sheigitz, a doctor (really technical,) or a baby (because you are trying to use euphamisms)

Rav Hutner will often say if you want to taste the taste of a certain concept - his exposure was to european philosophy so he may have thought that **jewish philosophy was not strictly visual**

**Rav Dovid Cohen** was one of Rav Kook’s editors - The Audio Hebrew Logic - השמעי - that goyish philosophy is visual and Jewish philosophy is about hearing.

**Immanuel Levinas** - important French philosopher. Complicated relationship between his non Jewish writing and his Jewish writing - he represents a similar kind of Jewish inspired philosophy that s different then the classical Greek attitude.

but the Rambam takes the Greek model of Visual is dignified

Tzaddik ViRah Lo - just reading chapter eight - Rambam - a material world is inherintly imperfect - consistent switch chapter 2 - these are בדיעבד accidental factors - these physical things

Midrash - הוא שטן הוא יצר הרע הוא מלאך המות - for the Rambam its all the imperfection of the material world - deviates from ideal order - Yetzer HaRah: physicality leads to sin - Malach HaMavet: an idea doesn’t die.

Rav Carmy has only had to have been maspid people who he had a relationship with - pulpit Rabbis don’t always have that luxury - but even if Rav Carmy had to do that he would but he would never give a hesped for the number four - because ideas don’t die - though you could give hespedim for communism… those would be good ridance hespedim - not admiring like we want most hespedim to be

Why don’t we see absolute justice when we look at the world - we are material peopel living in a material world - if something goes wrong blame it on matter, not God - that’s chapter 8

**Rambam** - if the world is material then it has to be imperfect - **God had a choice**: create and have imperfection, or don’t create at all - we would just be an idea in the mind of God - God chose to create a world and that’s it - God is equally perfect if God creates or does not create

First article in tradition summer 1978 - tzimtzum - God withdraws from the world in order that there should be room for the world - the idea that creation neccesitates limitation appears elsewhere - free will - doesn’t that mean there is a limitation of God’s power - the obvious answer to that is that God chose to creat teh the world with freee will then then if that means that God had to limit Himself - that is what God chose to do

Ohr Sameach - you can’t limit God to not being able to limit Himself

Rav Ahron Soloveitchik - Rav Meir Simcah once met Herman Cohen (sociologically he was the first professor of philosophy in Germany without havign ot convert ot Christianity) The Rav wrote his doctorate on Herman Cohen’s philosophy of science - The Rav said that despite that Cohen is not mishelanu, his writing on Judaism are not totally invalid - He met Rav Meir Simcha and they discussed free will - Herman Cohen was very impressed - what did they have in common - they both knew the Rambam - it is very likely that this point would have come up –

God chose to create the world and that’s it and if that’s what it means then that is what it means - Inner logic of Rambam.

Olam habah - it is wrong that the value produced in this world should go down the drain - rambam would agree - what you built in this world continues - שכל הנקנה - what you built intellectually –

many others though would say olam haah is about justice - people have a tough time in this world - we can say then , so they are suffering here but in olam habah the sacales will balance - **Rasag** - **but not the Rambamb**- Yissurim Shel Ahava means that you even get a dividend - it is more about justice than what is metaphysically right –

The Rambam was really in that first category- he thought that God did not do bad to people and there is schar viOnesh - but that is not the primary goal of Olam Habah - to right the scales. **Rambam** would say don’t bother- you have not built something to make you worthy olam habbah. Yediat Hashem is the height of ethical perfection, Heschel: That is what made Rambam the doctor.

**Rav Chasdi Kresik** - Ahavat Hashem is the most important thing and that is not just intellectual

3/18 Rambam has a series of arguments

Chapter 8 - trzura vs. chomer- we are living in a metraila world - there iwill be imperfection due to chomer

Chapter 9 has one big idea - which is built on the idea of chomer viTzura. Chomer is a curtain- a veil - a screen מסך - it separates between man and understanding G-d. Neviim thus depict God as surrounded by clouds and darkness. If we say this - that explains the fact that people get things wrong - Estakpalia she’einah shel Re’iyah - “Through a glass darkness”. Chomer is not just the source of evil, but of not being able to understand - which is a kind of evil.

Chapter 10 - the character of absence - privation

What is the ontological status of nothing?

Everything God created is good: what about what God did not create?

a lot of the things in the world that are bad are things that don’t exist

people and many animals have eyesight - if you want to make God look good then you can say that eyesight is one of the things God gave us and that has a lot of advantages for us - I can read…

then what about living creatures that don’t have eyesight **- bats** - you could say they are not missing anything - bats can hear very well so it compensates.

If there was as fire and we have to jump out of a window, so we break bones - would we complain that we don’t have wings? No, that’s what being human is about - cat’s can’t do philosophy, concentrate on being a cat, don’t get involved in other thigns -being human means you cna’t go seven days twihtout food - we intuitively feel - thats just what it means to be human

**These are privations**, not positive evils - so you could say, everything God does everything great, but what you are complaining about is just the absence of good things

you could apply the same thing at an individual level - don’t say a person is blind. Rather, if you have eyesight, then you can thank God. Hoever, if you don’t then you just don’t have a benefit that others have. Blind philosopher - I am not preoccupied with being blined - when e up in the orning, I don't think about being blind - I think abo rtuk I have o do - why I am angry etc.

evil vs. privation - is blindness like a disease, or lack of weakness

Chapter 13: Evil is because of human stupidity.

3/25 Rambam: This world is good – three kinds of evil.

1. natural evils

2. social evil - you could view this as humans’ fault as well, but the Rambam assumes that war is inevitable because of God’s design of the world

3. evil people do to themselves - alcohol induced hangover, or attack of gaut

The **Rambam**’s argument is not that the world is perfect, but rather is that it is a very good world, if it is the best of all possible world then all evils are justified.

what if the best of all possible world is a miserable world - this is developed by **Voltaire** (French apikores and Jew hater) wrote novel called Candid - young man studying under Panglas - Panglas thought it is the best of all possible worlds and all the evils are justified - things go from bad to worse - Candid is sold to slavery… - justifying the way the world is is nonesense - thats the message of the book - it is a miserable world, don’t give me the best of all worlds nonsense.

the logical problem of evil is solved, but then maybe you could say, better the world should not be created at all!

The Rambam does think that there is room for things to not be perfect in the world - the Rambam’s response to yah but its a miserable place is, Actually you are not so miserable - some people with hay fever don’t walk around with gloom all the time - Most evil is what people do to themselves and even that does not outweigh the good in the world

A lot of people feel they are right to be miserable - with a sense that the world is a bad place

Rambam does not normally quote earlier Jewish writer and attack them - here without mentioning, he is arguing with **Rav Saadiah Gaon who said that the world is a miserable life, but we have to get through it in order to get Olam Habah**. Rav Saadiah Gaon - Olam habbah is more positive points than Haszeh has negative points

Mashal: someone considers study of Greek grammar to be torture - so a world like that would be hell, but I believe be’emunah shleimah that if I study enough Greek grammar then I can read Homer and the other greats in the original - that pleasure makes up for the misery, but the purpose makes the experience itself a positive journey -some things are not pleasant in themselves, but we think of them very differently when they are part of a larger goal - students who went to public school and were bullied, if they were successful later and attribute that success to school then they view their life in the dormitory positively in retrospect - but others view it as hell.

the third option is not in the Rambam, but it can be found in **Mesilas Yesharim** - viewing our pilgrimage through this world with the perspective of where we want to end up.

Stoic (late greek philosopher) - all that matters to your happiness is if you are doing good or not - you can be tortured day in and day out, but if you are living a good life, then you are happy - you can’t conceive of any misery - most people don’t think this way in the real world

Aristotle - a person who has a miserable life beyond their control, you can't claim they had a good life - Socrates: better to be a victim of evil than a perpetrator - that’s not saying it is impossible to be a victim of evil

I could have said it would have been better if the train arrived exactly when I walked in the station - but in the large scheme of life it does not really matter - ask a talmid chochom if he had a good day - he might say, on the one hand I had a very important chiddush, but that doesn’t matter because when I sat down for lunch, the soup was not properly hot - that would be odd for a talmid chochom to speak that way!

Rambam would say intellectual achievement is what is important in the world - only fools care about the soup being hot - that’s saying that different parts of the Rav’s outlook fit well together.

When I look at people who don’t write and don’t paint - they are not creative in any way- I wonder, how do these people tolerate life - the simple answer is if they were characters in Greenes novels then they would have a miserable life - but in the real world, are people really as miserable as we think they are?

why do so many intellectuals and poets think the world is bad - his answer is in Rav Carmy’s words: **those people are self centered** - if you look at the world from a more general view then it is good - but if you view the world from just your experience, then you can make all sorts of judgements - Can we assume these people that Rambam was attacking were really miserable - people project their feelings so that could be that people are fortunate so they assume the whole world is so they have difficulty empathizing with the disadvantaged - so why does the Rambam emphasize one side more than the other side - so maybe Rambam is identifying these miserable people as those who are self-centered - if you are self-centered then the smallest thing is intolerable -id I expect everything to happen at my conveniece then teh subway train leaving when I enter the subway is intolerable - so their unhappiness is a product of the way they look at things -an intellectual error of **viewing oneself as the center of the world.**

3/27 Rambam - ppl view the world through a self-centered lens when they say its negative Rav Carmy: you can locate pain**, but you can’t locate pleasure** - people who write - it’s easier to write about pain than pleasure.

Tolstoy - unhappy families are all unhappy in their own ways - but happy families are all alike - so it is not particularly interesting to write about happy families - is it really true?

Chapter 13 - Most religous people (or at least **Rav Saadiah Gaon)** believe that the **human being is the purpose of creation** - the highest thing in the world is man - Non Jewish philosophers: great chain of being - in this continuum man is very high - in terms of theodicy one of the implications of this is that one reason there is what we consider evil, the world benefits by having variety!

pshuto shel mikra - man is tzelem Elokim - Chazzal: Man was created at the very end of six days, so man is the crown of creation - or you could say man is a footnote - man is last - there were so much time without man - but  this maamar chazzal implies the opposite - אתה הבדלת אנוש מראש –

**Rambam does not take this position** - he does not hold that man is the purpose of creation - he does believe that man is tzelem elokim and has a very high status - the Rambam did not want to tie the Ribbono Shel Olam’s hands in terms of purpose - he did not want to restrict God to one purpose - he probably thought that humans being the aim of all of creation is an arrogant way of thinking - he did think that Talmidei Chochomim are more of the goal of creation than am aratzim - either they should serve talmidei chochomim - and to **make** life not boring - it would be a desolate world if there were just talmidei chochomim - he says this in hakdama to peirush hamishnah - the question is, is this the view that he held his whole life - Dr. Lamm: Rambam seems to be democratic when he talks about aliyah liregel so he might not have said that when he was young - Rav Carmy: However, in this perek 13 he does seem to be an intellectual elitist

You can ahve a great work of art or literature that has one point and everything else is to support it - but what if you have a piece that every detail is important in itself and they all connect to each other - each scene is done to perfection and in addition to that they are organically connected to each other - that is a masterpiece - Rambam: Putting humans as the one purpose is selling the rest of creation short

if you don’t hold like the Rambam, you can say that God’s wisdom is manifest in the correlation between means and ends - look at a human eye. Were it not for the fact that it serves a human being it would not be quite as impressive - I can imagine someone saying it is a wonderful thing even if it did not serve a purpose - there are scientists who are enraptured by disease mechanisms - its not that they like these diseases - but to see what has to happen in order for each strand to survive - people are impressed by the way a disease mechanism works - nevertheless, part of our impressiveness regarding the biological realm is that not only is it complex, but it helps you see - its useful - then you would be focused on means and ends - holding like the Rambam you end up with a much more voluntaristic - seems weird for the Rambam

maybe disease is just to punish diseases, or is it that they allow people to go out and cure them - this is allied to a very liberal view of halakha: severe halakha: Rabbis with courage will find ways to circumvent this halakha

Julius Berman: Why is it that when rabanim are machmir, it is because they lack the courage, maybe its that they have the courage to resist liberals

we have diseases so we can find the cure to diseases - so for thousands of years people have suffered terrible pain from cancer and other diseases - tb was not fun. Terrible pain. Horrible for their families. Even the misery caused by non-lethal diseases. And you’re telling me that all this is just so a Jewish kid will write a paper about it and get a Nobel prize?? That’s pretty elitist! Rambam, the purpose of everything is that this is God’s will.

Reb Chayim was in the home of a rich person who was chassidic - there was a book on the table - Reb Chayim opened the book and saw the purpose of the world is למען טובו ולמען חסדו - Reb Chayim said no! God created the world **because God wanted to create the world**. Halakhic man and this is very much in consonance with Moreh Nevuchim.

12: this world is a good place - ppl are looking at it in the wrong way

13: if you think you are the purpose of creation, then stubbing your toe is a tragedy

If I view myself (the Rav’s phrase) a hitchhiker on the wagon of time. Might not be the most ethically productive way of thinking - I should think that my life is important - Rambam Hilkhot Tshuva a person looks at the world and sees the world as half chayav and half chayav and what I do in the next five minutes is going to push me and the whole world either to zchut or chayav - the Rambam does not say that is the reality - just that a person should look at him or herself that way - What I do - How I daven, how I eat breakfast, how I write the few hundred words I write to day, that’s important - the worst things for a person to think is what I do doesn’t really matter - there is a real tension  at that point - a person with the correct perspective does not think that GOd owes him to do everything he wants to be done - Ish HaHalakha the Rav juxtoposes ומותר האדם מן האדם אין כי הכל הבל - its not just that we don’t have - and then right after - אתה הבדלת אנוש מראש

It may be easy for the Rambam to say the world is a good place because of the scale of value he puts on these things.

forensic view of theology - “God is in the doc” If I sue God, would I win? Rambam is not viewing things that way.

Chapter 16: Divine foreknowledge and free will - if God knows what is going to happen, how can we have free will - there are probably hundreds of answers. Richard Siragee canvases about a hundred of them from the Greeks through the midevils - Rav Saadiah Gaon, the Rambam, the christians, muslims…

**Rav Saadiah Gaon** - God’s foreknowledge does not force us to act in any way - if I know how a movie is going to come out, that doesn’t mean I am causing the people to produce the movie that way - I am not responsible for the murders committed in that movie - you could argue that perfect knowledge means things are necessary and that …

that might not be adequate for the Rambam, saying that God doesn’t cause you to do something, does not mean that God is off the hook - if God knows you are going to sin, then God should prevent you from sinning - Why didn’t God stop Hitler, if God knew that he would rise to power - some philosophers would argue that human free will is so important that it justifies God not stopping people from sinners (Plantinga) Eliezer Berkowitz also most prominently presented this view.

4/1 Divine forknowledge and free will

A1- Rav Saadiah Gaon: it does not cause one person to act a certain way - liking watching a movie you already know

Even if you like Rav Saadia Gaon’s solution - it doess not cover what Rambam is concerned about - If God knows evil will happen, why does God not intervene and prevent it?!

So the Rambam could not accept Rav Saadiah Gaon’s logic

Rambam: We don’t understand what God’s foreknowledge is about - God is strong: that means it is incorrect to ascribe human weakness to God - really our knowledge of God is a denial of the opposite - Either negative attributes or attributes of action - if we were to describe God in human terms… (Moreh Nevuchim chapter54) So it means God is not limited in knowledge in the way humans are limited in knowledge - not that God would win every jeopardy match (Perek טז)

says similarly in Hilkhot Tshuva - and Perek 23 where he discusses the meaning of the word ידיעה

The general view is that God knows what will happen

one view modifies traditional belief to solve this problem - the Ralbag

מלחמות ה׳ - book of philosophy - **ר׳ לוי בן גרש**ום

limited divine foreknowledge - God knows the future in terms of those things that are necessarily the case - events that occur in the future that are contingent, God does not know - God knows that they are a possibility

Rav Chasdai Kreskes - first midevil philosopher to attack Aristotle’s science

A - **Epicurus**: no hashgacha at all - everything is random - no law about how the world is

Rambam: everyone with sense knows this is not true because nature has laws, so I am not going to go into his view

B - **Rambam**’s view of Aristotle: Prime mover, perfect being beyond the world - the Rambam says he accepts **hashgacha klalit** - there is law and pattern to the world - God has no concern for the individual dog, but makes sure that the species survives as a whole - the world is a good place to be a dog, but not necessarily for every dog - you can make the best building possible, but if it is made out of physical material, it will have flaws - it will eventually decay

Today we know that species evolve - we have tamed dogs because it is  better for us - but in the time of the Rambam people believed in **the great chain of being** - there are a certain number of different kinds of things in the world - you need all of that variety - in the 18th century people said that evil is necessary to have this kind of variety

C - **Ashariah** - emphasized divine power - to extent that they denied causality - if you say 2 +2 = 4 and there is nothing you can do about it, you are limiting God’s power - so Asherites saved God’s power by denying causality - Occasionalism - the patterns we see are all acts of God. There were **Calvanists** who believed in those terms - double election - God chose who gets olam habah and who doesn’t - The ones who God chose end up doing well in this world – so

**Max Weber**: calvanists were instrumental in founding modern science and buisness because in order to prove to themselves that they are chosen, they had to succeed in buisness - opposed to a munk who might say, what do I care if I suffer in this world, since I get Olam Habah

similar views in the **Dead Sea Scrolls** - that God predetermines everything - how could that be that religous people could believe in such determinism.

**Ashurite** outlook is very focused on divine power

D – **Kalam**. Mautasilites (**Rav Saadiah Gaon** falls into this group)

emphasized **divine justice**

what about tzadik viRah Lo - it has to balance out - if we don’t see it balancing out, then we are lacking information - and then olam habbah ends up being about that balance - Nafka Minah - can an animal have Olam Habbah?

Mautasilites: if the dog suffered too much in this world, then they get Olam Habbah to correct it - for the Rambam that would be ridiculous - **Kalam** interpret Yisurim Shel Ahava in a very serious way - Rambam: that’s not a Jewish view, and if someone took this view (Rasag) it is because they were influenced by Islamic thought.

4/3

Throws big monkey into the wrench for Rambam scholarship - Leo Strauss - Rambam wasn’t really frum, and if he sounds frum, that is just what he is throwing out to the hammon am - Dr. Twersky is against - you can’t deny that Rambam is devious - he’s playing with people - the problem when you say the philosopher is not really saying what he seems to be saying, then אין לדבר סוף

14 principles of miyan hamitzvot - Yad Hachazzakah is another 14 - so he was attracted to the number 7, this scholar says that is how you know what his serious chapters

there is no doubt that certain philosophers hid their true views, but it gets very difficult after a while when taking this approach

we do have to figure out, when is the Rambam using this 7th approach of contradiction

so here, the Rambam says I reject one two three four and the fifth is that of chochmei Torateinu: there is hashgacha pratit and people get what’s coming to them - sounds very frum - end **of chapter 17** - in **chapter 18**, if you only read it on its own, then it seems like the Rambam did not really hold this view. he seems to hold that **the extent of your hashgacha pratit is the extent of philosophical wisdom that you know** - you have correct conception of God and ultimate truth - that means your imagination is trained - when I was three I knew that God did not have a body - but to fully *internalize* that conception is not so pashut - it takes work - if you accomplish this, then you have hashgacha pratit - otherwise you don’t

**17**: Aristotle was right about animals, but not about human beings - so in chapter 18 it seems that Rambam’s idea about what a human being is a lot more elitist than simply homosapians - it’s about achieving what humans should - tzelem elokim as he said in chapter one is intellect

E – Personal hasgacha

so now Rav Carmy reads chapter 18 - in 17 he gives you the impression that since that is the view of chochamim so that is his view, but then in 18 he tells us that the view of the average talmid chochom sitting in the beis medrash is not really how he views - so he really held that to get hashgaha pratit you have to have a certain kind of relationship with God.

**Rambam** - there are people who stand around and have no connection to the palace - they are like animals for intents and purposes - lower level goyim is who he says he means - the might be able to do arithmetic and speak a language but they are really like animals

then there are people who walk around and around **the palace** but they never go in - that is your average talmid chochom - they don’t actually encounter teh kind - very elitist kind of outlook –

the **people who are really in the palalce** - whose minds are truly with God - they have the most extraordinary hashgacha - they can walk on fire and it won’t burn them - natural disasters don’t affect them because they and GOd are - Nevuah is experience of lightning - it lights up your way for a moment, but not permanently - its an intermittent perception - Abraham Lincoln told a story - traveler who was traveling at night and it was very unpleasant - lightning and thunder, after struggling for a little bit with lightning he cried out “God, can’t you give me a little more lightning and a little less thunder.” - this is the Avot, Moshe Rabbeinu - intimately connected to God.

**Shmuel Ibn Tibon** wrote the Rambam a letter - isn’t there a contradiction between 18 and 51 - in 18 its a naturalistic phenomenon - if you are on a high enough level then you and nature get along well - nothing miraculous about it - you live the right kind of life, you will have a happy life, you will be exempt from the kind of evils people bring upon themselves - if you eat and drink too much you might have a hangover or attack of gaut - so you will live well in that sense - also, if things don’t go your way, it doesn’t bother you so much because if your interest is studying divine wisdom, then its not goign ot bother you if it is raining or not - Rabmam: worldly things can interfere with wisdom, like if their is a war going on - or one has an attack of hey fever - nevertheless, people whose mind is really on Moreh Nevuchim, hey fever runs down their back like a duck. **18** nothing suggests supernatural hashgacha - but in **51** you are walking through fire - thats not simple - that is not a natural result that we can see comes out of thinking well - Rambam never answered his letter - this is the rayah against people who say that his translation is the best because this indicates that the Rambam did not have such a high opinion of him - we could say that 51 is just about very special people - or that 51 is hyperbolic - he iddn’t **realy mean walking thorugh fire** - or you could say that if a person is really in sync with God then eh is on a different plane than other human beings - Just like planets seem to be scientifically fundametally different, so are tsaddikim.

**Rav Soloveitchik** adds a particularly modern perspective on these issues - on the idea that how much hashgacha you have is dependant on how creative you are - you can’t just be a human - there are two dinim in a human being - a human can be ish hamin - species man - or Godly man - a species man from the point of view of hashgacha is no different than animal - for us, individual dogs mena something. If a neighbor owns two dogs, and generally walks them before the late minyan for maariv - it is very clear that two dogs have different personalities - from your point of view you might use one dog for one purpose and the other for another - but hashgacha: a dog is a dog - even if God is concerned about dogs in general, God is not particularly concerned about ROver or Fito - Navi complains to God that You are treating people like digei hayam - so too if you have humans who are indistinguishable from other humans, T.S Elliot’s Wasteland (important poem) describes the people walking across the bridge to their jobs in London **- its like ghosts** - flowing across the bridge - they are indistinguishable - they are dressed the same way, they look the same way - The Man in the Grey Flannel Suit - not a great novel, but Rav Carmy read it - the title implies that you have this guy who is in advertising on Madison avenue - these people are a dime a dozen - they all are wearing the same suit - all take the train in every morning - Little Boxes: song that describes people living in little boxes that look the same, lawns are the same, children go to the same universities and end up the same as their parents - make the same barbeque every weak on the same patio - that is Ish HaMin - if someone is Ish HaMin, they don’t need hashgacha, they have no unique relationship with God, they are interchangeable

Solves problem that today we do not look at species in the same way - aristotle - a dog is rover, and a member of the species of dogs - postdarwnian world, we do not hold that species are fixed in that way - there is no metaphysical distinction between species and individual - read Ludwig’s great chain of being, this was an important tool for philosophers who wanted to explain a great menu of things - once you get to darwin the whole idea of great chain of being fades away - its not that if you don’t have dogs then you are missing a chain on the great chain of being - there is no platonic idea of a dog which is determined - the Rav get around this problem - developed in a greater length in “The Experience of Suffering” by Rav Carmy which builds on the Rav’s approach - someone who is a Chareidi wrote to Rav Carmy - do you believe that the Rambam really meant what the Rav was saying, or you can just adapt in a certain way which makes sense in a modern context - would the Rambam look at Ish Hahalakha and say Yah! You got it. Hard to give a striaght answer to this question - nafka minah - is the Rambam’s approach to hashgacha lichatchila or bideved - Really the Rambam wanted to hold like aristotle, but he came up with a comprimise that technically works - or that the Rambam’s visions of what hashgacha is about is an interaction between the uniqueness of individuals and individuals being part of a species -

4/8 **Rlbag** takes a view that is different from the mainstream with divine foreknowledge - saying that God does not know future contingencies - one argument is pshuto shel mikra - עתה ידעתי כי ירא א-לקים אתה - God did not know if Avraham would pass the test

another aspect of his arguent - the very nature of divine knowldege does not apply ot contingencies - we experience the world in term of contingencies - - God is more mathematical - like an architect knowing the plans - gGOd knows the general truths, not the smells, tastes, and contingent events -Iyov is saying GOd you are not like people - You don’t know the things that people know in terms of these contingent event type thing - God would know the scientific reality of colors, but not actually experience them as colors. Blind person can know the physics of colors… This is an important point for the Ralbag, but not us - the Question of Merry- someone who has a great knowledge of the world mathematically, but was always in a confined dark room - does this person know more upon leaving the room than this person knew before. We would instinctively say yes

Can God create a stone He can’t lift - if you define God in terms of perfection then the answer is very simple: What makes God perfect? This question is not relevant to perfection –

The **Ralbag** might not be so bad in practice - what is contingent and what is not contingent - the past is not contingent - the question is: Am I going to need an anitacid - will the pizza cause me indigestion - maybe is a mathematical certainty

**Middle Knowledge** - Not knowledge of general things or contingent things - but general knowledge of contingent events - Whether or not I would see the book waiting for me in the shelf of the library is contingent, so for Ralbag, God should not know if it will be there - If I would say that if I would see this book I will take it out - So, someone might not know if I will see the book today, but one can know that if I see the book, I will take it out.

Ralbag; another point - the way the Rambam seems to read is that he first talks about hashgacha pratit and then seem to adopt a more naturalistic read in the next chapter - the Rav’s way of reading this: the issue ins not hteat the rambam held that there is only hasgacha pratit is based on how deep you study philosophy , but how deep your relationship with God is - but dogs and cats don’t have hasgacha pratit because they don’t have individual relationships with God - they may be important, God whanted them to exist in the world - but rover and fido don’t have individual reltaionships wiht gGod - when you are waiting for a bus the people in front of you are not individuals - they are numbers in our focus - how many seats on the bus and how many people in front of you - - do you get a seat in the subway - stnadign in tline in the supermarket - Ish Hamin then there is no Hashgacha - if you have a personal relationship with God then you are one of a species and thus God cares about you individually

If you would ask the rav and certainly if you awould as krRav Carmy then its a sliding scale then it is no longer about being in or out - just reading the Rambam you might get that impression - means it is inot completely a matter of intelletual achievement - but remember the Rambamb doesn not mean - he has a big moral aspect to what he means by intellectual achievement - it would not worldk to be a crude philosopher

What is meant by a personal relationship - what you are as a n indievidual doesn’t matter - but then yo uare defining hashgacha pratit in terms of relationship - but what does it mean - that I am paying attention to you - that is what the  -it cuold be that I give the same lecture whether you are here or not here - but nevertheless when you are here what I am saying is directed directly to you - that requires talent - liek the preacher who people come up to affterward and say he was talkign ot me in his speach - it also requires a listener who is beign receptive to being personally effective - it might then depend not on what GOd wants but on what oyu want - so the outlook that its about psychoanalyzing God, when this happened to you theis is what it meant - who are we to do that and it might involve how you respond

Rav Kook used similar strategy - what is contingent depends on whether or not you have a personal relationship - so this could also be a way of dealing with forknowledge as framed by the Ralbag

**Rambam had conventional views of bechira** -GOd knows everything even though people have freedom - also modified view of personal relationship - Rambam would ignore the Ralbag’s argument that it is not about the Pratim - Ralbag went a step further by limiting divine forknowledge - he was really concerend about yediyah - so once he came to his conclusion about forknowledge, it formed his opinion of hashgacha - but Rambam viewed them as separate sugyas - for Rambam it is the greatest tragedy if someone decides to be Ish HaMin, but that does not limit what God knows about.

Ramban on second perek of kriat shema - a lot about schar viOnesh, but all  of that is formulated by the **plural and not singular** - so he says that by and large, Schar viOnesh is done on a communal manner - there could be extreme cases where someone is sufficiently detached from the klal - but by and large, what happens to the community happens to you - even if one is spared from the empidemic, but one still might lose this person’s entire family - so the Rambam is not the only one who modified hashgacha pratit view - this is also Tanakh KiPshuto - Am Yisrael is judged as a group - there are special individuals, some individuals are picked out for certain reasons - Yeshayah 57 - Yoshiahu was spared so he would not see what would happen - Rav Carmy had a diffcult last years and she died - also her son died prematurely - Rav Carmy’s mother said at the son’s funeral, its a good thing that my sister died, she would not have been able to bear this - Tzaddikim can suffer as a kaparah for the klal - The predominent view of Chazzal is that there is schar vaOnesh - but there is a machloket in Shabbos and it is not clear how we paskin - Yaakov Elman: ocne danger is out there the jews have to put blood on the houses because once the pestilence is out there than it might not distinguish between tzaddik and rasha - thats a gemara - Schar Onecsh behai Almah Lekah - and the notion that what ahappens to am yisrael is more important than what happens to an individual that is pretty clear in Tanakh –

**Kotzker Rebbe** asked  -the gemara says in sotah that if someone is a baal gaivah that he and I cannot exist in the same world - is that not limiting divine power - he answer: its not that GOd can’t coexist with the baal gaaivah its that the **baal gaivah cannot exist with God** - Antoehr formulation - Where is God? Wherever they let him in - profound statements - the way the world is no matter how mant ychances you have there comes a point wher eif you ahve no room for GOd then… a parent can love a child yet never theleess for whtever reasons - there can be no relationship - Milgrit Pierce - without a husband and has to make a living - opens a diner which is no t easy for a women in the 1940s  but she has to make a livign and she has one daughter wh oshe wants the best for - she ends up ecoming a snob and marries a rish man and does not even in vite the woman for the wedding - the child can reject a parent completely - old story abou the jewish mother - SON running after a shiksah - hte shiksah says if you really love me then you have to tear the heart of his mother and he says to his mother, look to make this shidduch I have to do this, so she says ok - then he drops the heart and it says God sh son you fell are you ok

4/10

The Greek rationalist tradition **denied the notion of God loving the world** - Aristotle: to love means that you need something - makes sense for humans to love those who are superior to them - but why should one completely self-sufficient love? Much of secular culture works that way- if you care about b it must be that you have something to gain from b. **Spinoza - Perfect God, so what connection should God have with people** - you may have reason to ingratiate yourself to God, but why would the other way around - אשר מלך בטרם.

The other view: John: For God so loved the world that He gave His son, His only son. God wanted there to be people who serve him with free will - the question is what does that mean - the model one would look at here could be Plato : Love is not a matter of need - but metaphor - overflowing - you have so much that you want ot give to others - create outside yourself - creative impulse - Pashut that Yahdut adopts such a model even though we don’t talk about it so much - We talk about God affirming a world independent of Himself - we could say tzimtzum one notion of it is that G-d made room for something welse by withdrawing - connects with what we sayijd about free will - ralbag and others- saying that evil is a price to pay for free will - that is saying it is importantn that there be an independant people - that is what amounts too - **Augustine** - love is I want you to exist I want you to be - that element is very important - partly because of the selfishness of society we leave it out - we are more business like ot fight against the selfishness of society that is –

fee will defense - if - why cant’ God prevent free will from having bad effects - If I want to kill or torture someone, Q. Why doesn’t God arrange it so that I can act badly and take moral responsibility, but I am not impacted by it - **philosophers say that we need real suffering because otherwise it has no real implications and the free will is just a game**.

Elementary school - one course was agriculture - they planted vegetables which they got to take home – kids messed up, someone fixed it. got older adn rrealized that is not how the world is - they don’t make sure the adults don’t make mistakes - if someone screws up, another person won’t necessarily fix it

would it be possible for God to create free will, but only instantiate the people who will do the right thing so that there is no unnessesary suffering - gets into divine forknowledge question

the language is a little problemativc- not common jewish language to quote Jon chapter three -in general the idea - we don’t talk that way - lord jacobovitz - chief rabbi in britain - spoke about the importance of Rabbanim to speak up abou tTOrah - I was not appointed to the house of Lords because I appeased the culture - he liked to say Christianity is a religion that stresses love and kills people in the name of love - whereas judaism emphasizes justice and engages in chessed - cheap shot - goal - correct point – nowhe

nowhere in Tanakh does God talk about loving an individual who is alive - not appropriate edicate

ties into the Rambmam - Rambam is not interested in absolute Justice - the idea of Olam Habah - ability to know God

Midevil Jewish philosophers want to remove God from our ability to know Him - then you can claim that they are intentiaonlly - in tanakh God cares about humans a great deal and has mercy - Rambam tones it down - that means that God doe s that in the way we  do

20th century Jewish thinkers say that these philosophers are not loyal to Chazzal and Tanakh - Rav Hescehl

beginning of ובקשתם משם attacks it seems Heschel for claiming that Rambam denies God cares about human affairs - so they both claim that it is bad to think that - the only machloket is whether heschel was guilt of that

There are people - how do you view the Rambam over all - Straus and others claimed that moreh nevuchim was satirical and the Yad Chazzakah was for the hamon am and so sounds frum - but if you read moreh nevuchim yo usee the real rambam - Professor Twersky shows that sometimes it is the reverse so not simple

somebody could think that GOd is very grear tbu t not perfect - but then whay should we worship GOd - the n you could respond why sould you worship , well nothing better - I could imagine someone whorshipping a God who is evil but powerful - doesn’t matter if God is good by human standerds or not but God is powerful so don’t cros s hHIm - or else you go to Hell - - imagine that GOd is very great but not quite perfect so someone could say if I am lookign for someone to worship this is the best I can do - in terms of our issues - process theologins the snese is that God is evolving - we don’t have to worry about hte problem of evil because it just is because God is not powerful enough to stop it - maybe influenced to by christianity - the second of the tritnity is divne and could not prevent his chricrusifiction - GOd did not answer me - look, God is trying the best that He can - like your favorite politician - you vote for him anyway 0 Tanakh paints the picture of divine perfection - but Ralbag divine forknowldedge is not necessary for perfection - so you could only do someonehting tlike that - you can redefine perfection like the ohr sameach - could someone read Tanakh like the Ralbag , you could try to do that - if you define God as th most perfect being imaginable ias is our tradition - then you could argue why limit divine perfection if there is no reason to - that is the argument of Richard Swinebern - Christian philosopher  - argument for divine unity - why should I believe God is one - argument is that you go through a gypothesis - akums razor - you don’t multiply entities unnecessarily - why bring in unneeded factors - Occumss - how do you explain where the universe comes from - at least tow things - matter and intention in the universe - you cannot reduce mind to matter is what he argues - if you want to explain them you need to wexplain both factors - is there one explanatin that covers bothe - there should be all thngs being equal - physisists don’t have one set of of rules for sun and antoher for moon - so there should be one set of principle that explains both - so all things beign equal the simplest explanation is that God is really really great why not say He is perfect - one reason to say that not because of evil - it is a way of solvign the problem of evil - does it really solve the problem of evil for everyoen - even if you are athiest you want the world to make sense - so atheists wrote books about theodocy (Susan Neiman) after 9/11 - three great breakdowns in philosophy: 1) earthquake in Lizbon in 1755 - portugal was the frumest country in all of europe - they had a few disasters - tremendous loss of life - Voultare wrote a satire at that time because he was an apikores - that struck a blow in the idea that God is in heaven and everythign else is beign taken care of 2) Halacaust: (frum people have said that the halacaust is reason to doubt man, not God - these athiests might say right that s what we menat by God - eveythign is gettign better and better except…) 3) 9/11 - (gave her the oportunity to write the book) - so you could have this course without belief in God - just say look over history - it would include religions - how do people make sense out of the world - what they are troubled by is not always clear from a logical point of view - so if you don’t believe in God, what is bothering you? Can’t always explain

When you pose an idea: theodocy: explaining the world works to justify God - or something else which is showing that it could be that way - in the real world yo ucould act a strange way and to justify you could say oh he did it for this reasosn or you could say , look he might have done it because of this - that is a defense not a justification - the csae against my clinent is not proven becasue there are alternative explanations - Perry Mason won every case - always gets the guilty person - one case he actually had a guilty client but no t really - the clinet suffered from multiple personalities - it was popular at that time among psychoanalysts to have two totally different people in one - the three faces of eve - today people are less believing in these stories so it is less - one cint was a demured women - she seemed guilty, but he took the case and it turned out her other personality did it - going to jury duty in brooklyn you see a few munites of perry masson first - tell me where were yo u- the wtness says isn’t it a fact that somebody saw you somewhere else at that tiem - isn’t it a fact that you took that gun and you thought that you would frame my client and it says Don’t do this to me - then it says that it is not ohow jury works - there is not going to be one moment when everything beomes clear

difference between theodocy and defense - getting to the truth or preventing a defense - but when you do that you are having implications for real people - not just playing an academic game  - that is why iyov is so troublign - this is real life! you are talkign to a real person! We often think of certain theodocies as obcene not just absurd - Example: cousin dying of cancer and when there was no hope at all - do you know any doctor ,anyone, so Rav Carmy wrote to a former student who was a cancer specialist- he wanted to say something so he said is there anything that he did to damage his health other than smoking - why do people talk that way - because people want to be on the winning side - it is very good for me because I do not smoke - it must be your own fault - theme in sefer Iyov - very often defenses might raise ethical questions that cause pain to people which is not so justified -we did not talk in these terms - one recent example - somebody wrote proposign for theodocy - proposal was - the reaosn inocent peopel have to suffer so much is that we should go out and find remedies for waht ails them - in God’s eyes what is good about it is that it allows  some jewish kid to win the nobel prize - but from the view point of someoen who has cancer that might not be such a great ting - wanted to geat a foundtation to support the writing of this paper - swanted a reconendation - lets just say he got a response that was not a recomendation

one of the issues he raised is that this idea is in chazzal already - gemara is bava basra - asked rebbe akiva - **your God must like you because you are poor** bava batra daf yud - if he liked you He would make you rich - responded that the the good thing about being poor is that people do chessed for each other - people should be poor so people should do chessed for eachother - he thought that was exactly what he was saying - Rav Carmy: if you read the Gemara carefully, the Gemara is a story it is not a halakhic discussion - there are charecters - you got hte goy who wants to put down Jews - the goy is saying whether peopel are successful in worldly matter is indicitive of their status in G-d’s eyes - if you are so smart how come you are not rich - that question implies that what matters is being wealthy - **Marxist Philosopher** - GA Cohen wrote a book called: If your philosophy is right, how come you are rich - Marxist is in favor of equality, so he tries to justify why he tries to make money even in the

**Chagiga:** Poverty fits Jews like the color riegns that fit horses well - does that mean it is a good things for Jews to starve, scury, malnutrition? No, Frulucomfort - you have enough, but you are not rich -not that they are starving - it is not a purely academic discussion - there are real victims here. Not talking about dying of starvation.

**Rav Gussman** - making judgements about people when saying why God does this, why God does that - saying I don’t know why God does this or that - it is all Gezeirot - don’t look for Gezeirot - part of the issue is that there is somethign ethically problematic to look at people who are suffering and say this is an opportunity to look at reasons.

\*

4/15 We are predisposed to find meaning in suffering - we are not predetermined to think of affliction that way - it was much less social and religious value

suffering - people who can appreciate suffering - involves self-consciousness - The Rav: an animal in pain cries out - doesn’t mean it is suffering philosophically - that involves thinking, consciousness, trying to make sense of the suffering - someone who is educated, thoughtful.

Affliction is less clear - people whose lives are so downtrodden with lack of intellectual stimulation - an afflicted person may be a dumb person in the sense that not that they can’t speak, but that they just can’t think - source: Zohar - when the Jews were slaves in Egypt before Moshe came, they were mute. That is clearly not referring to the ability to say that is a brick - but that you can’t’ articulate what you are whom you are - Rav quotes this in 1978 tradition about speak (also talks about animals don’t suffer)

when you explain suffering – this is a social comment - you are talking about people who are actually suffering - so we should be careful what we say in these situations - you can be insensitive even when making scientific statements - like commenting on someone’s smoking after they have been diagnosed with cancer -Chazzal: when someone in the family has been hundg you don’t talk about rope

Meaning of suffering goes a step beyond that - what do those facts mean - personal relationships - there what you say in third person - if alexander the great hadn’t drank so much, no one would take that personally - something else talking to someone directly

Additionally - divine theories tend to end up being cruel to people who are suffering - some people talk about theodicy **without be religious** - people want the world to make sense - they want everything to be ok - if you do that on the backs of people who are suffering there is something callous or even viscous about it - this can be true when talking about an illness.

Same for social and economic gaps - illness commonly is only talking about one person - when rich people are writing theodicy about poor people - something has to come into our discussion here

Rambam does not say that it is always - but he does say that most suffering that occurs is our own fault. We don’t choose to be born in the middle of a war zone?

**Great Chain of Being** - God creates the best of all possible worlds - Rambam did not say that - that if you have exactly the same world with one small improvement - that would be impossible - every imperfection is a necessary imperfection - maybe its not as perfect as it could be becuase of free will

Great chain of being would say, its not perfect **so we could have variety** - true it would be better for the dog to be a human, but then there would be no variety.

Spinoza - there is only one possible world, so by definition it is the greatest possible world- it’s just like 2 and 2 is four and there is no other possibility. Leibnitz - best of all possible worlds meaning it has this ideal balance between all various factors around - any change you would make would be a change for the worse. Rav Carmy, there is no real difference between s and l - for both God really has no choice

**Samuel Johnson** - 1709-1784 or so - Lifted himself from the bolts  - the mud of london to become a person who engaged in gemilus chessed in het dimensions that many of us have difficulty imagining - he also understood what it meant to be poor - left Oxford in his first year, then got honorary doctorate - also was a workman - labored in writing in a similar way that people did bricklaying - did not forget where he came from - Richard Savage - poet, nut, unhappy man - Johnson wrote biography about him - people pointed out, when a man writes about a bum - slept outdoors, when you write a biodgraphy and you know things that nobody knows then you know that he wasnt’ the only one who slept out door -Johnson knew what poverty was about -someone once left boots outside of Johnsons door because he knew he did not have - and that got him very upset made him remember that he was poor to such an extent. Sones Jenene - forgotten except that Johnson attacked him

wrote a book along these lines - GCoB

in **reviewing** ginene, **Johnson** wrote - quotes - if God created all only best class, it would be like coloring the whole world with one color - if there will be superior being then there have to be inferior beings as well - somebody has to have hay fever, you are unhappy you have hay fever, but somebody has to - so man can’t repine that he is not an angel and a horse can’t repine that it is not a man

Johnson argues on logical grounds that there is no real need for every type of being to exist - quotes gene - poverty is generally compensated by greater hope, and greater health - people suffering have greater pleasure from relief - there is pleasure in being mad which not but the madmen knows - the ignorant are not resentful, see everything is perfect - Johns: poverty which is want of necessaries… life must be seen before it can be known” - theodicy which doesn’t deal with what it really means to suffer - ginene: part of the reason for evil: we can get pleasure by watching animals fighting with each other etc. so we can enjoy the suffering of the dog or worms, **so maybe there are higher being who get pleasure out of our torment** - Johnson: In hacha nami - there may be such beings, that take a man and give him the idea that he is a philosopher and get pleasure out of that - Maskana**: If you don’t understand God’s ways, don’t come up with these silly proposals** - Johnson clearly responds with a sense of anger because this is not just a scientific philisophical matter.

4/17

**Rav Soloveitchik** on suffering and divine justice. similar **to Rambam** but with a changed perspective

In Ish Halakha (one of the first hting s the Rav published - about a certain abstract personality type who is devoted to the studey and realization of halakha) - the second part of the essay the Rav speaks about hte rativity of the ish hahalakha - there are creative peop le and ont - Ish Hamin and Ish HaElokim - nothing unique about species man - Ish HaElokim is a unique individual

Beyond Ish HaHalakha: Text which is best known is **Kol Dodi Dofek** - given as a lecture on Yom HaAtzmaut 1956 when Israel was endagered and in war a couple months later - he wanted to create a frame of reference for the Zionists - the opening deals with the Holocaust - the Rav’s basic argument is that **there is no solution to the problem of evil** - we don’t understand a lot of things but evil is particularly conspicuous because we are frustrated by it

Rambam beginning of **Taanit** - when we find ourselves in a time of trouble there is an obligation for tshuva - most people say sin is the mechayev for tshuva which the Rambam says in **HIlkhos Tshuva** - but there is a second mechayev which is a time of trouble - For the Rav this halakha in taanis means that the halakhic approach to evil is tshuva - not explaining God’s motives - It is impossible to give reasons for the Halacaust and that is not the Halakhic approach - the pattern and meaning to the world is like the flip side of a carpet - on one side it makes sense, but the seams on the reverse side of hte carpet only make sense when you see teh other side - we only see one side - but we have a chiyuv of tshuva for oneself - we fail to do enough **- after the state of Israel** we ahve an obligation to our bretherin and we cannot fail them in the same way we failed our bretherin in the Holocaust - people who try to give reasons for why the halaucast happened or why the state of Israel was established are not taking a halkhic approach

This has been a halakhic view - **don’t analyze God, analyze yourself** - but even in a metaphysical sense it is logical because we cannot ascribe motivations to God in the same way we ascribe motivations to ourself

Part of the **Rav’s approach is halakha centered** - but also then you avoid saying silly things about God or things that are open to question - also this person is more likely to think about things regarding themselves that are more pertinent - people can still make mistakes - People used to eat something, then not feel well, they would decide that that food was responsible for the illness - not always logical - could have just been a virus - but peopel are able to think intellegently and sometimes that is the correct decision

The Rav talks about suffering in many other occasions - **Out of the Whirlwind** - contains variety of pieces about the Rav - piece about emotion - others more direct - Very important claim: you should take suffering seriously - one approach to theodicy is not to take suffering seriously - saying that all evils are justified would be doing this (anything that is bad - there is good reason for it) - or that nothing at all is bad - someone has surgery, could wonder, Why is the world the kindof place that… not why did the surgian cut me open - you could ask Why do people need to get that issue in the first place - David Shatz: Don’t you think it’s funny that you spend so much of your intellectual energy on teaching and writing about suffering and you never had heath issues.

So, the **Rav** said you don’t discount suffering because it’s not real or because it had a good reason

one was hungry and then had a good meal - you would not say that hunger in this case was suffering and then the good meal made up for it - its just that **this is part of the experience** - it created much of the pleasure of the meal - but this is not the case when others are suffering and it’s just so you can write an article - A person may say about himself or herself the suffering was ok because it worked out in the end

Why was the Rav intent on saying this- it is a metaphysical argument that does not make sense to us - also, because if people justify evils they are more willing to tolerate evils - not always a terrible thing - I have to put up with bad radio reception - I don’t consider that suffering, so its ok with me - but if everyone thought that way we would never get better radios - that’s fine with me

**Evelyn Waugh** - Catholic man - once had surgery for hemorrhoids - much later he was still in great discomfort and was complaining - Tell me, before you had the operation it didn’t bother you that much - right - so why did you do the surgery - **Man’s unquenchable desire for perfection** - I have certain physical flaws, so what - you live with it - you get old, you are happy that you are functioning at all - at the same time, the Rav is concerned that people think being religious means being silent in the face of evil - if everything is God’s will, then you submit to God’s will - the best shiur in the world happens to be given in a place that is bad for your hay fever, you ask yourself, what is important - you live with it - as one gets older, you dont’…  it s a religous attitude in a way - its a higherarchy of whats important so you will not bother about x y or z - but you could also say it is God’s will, who are you to tamper with it - people were against anesthesia especially in childbirth becasue they thought God ordained that htis person should have pain, so who are we to mess with that - also people were afraid of the side effects on the baby and mother - but Judaism totally dismissed these concerns - what he meant was that Judaism was not concerned with the passuk - they were abou the side effects.

often though, this attitude can be an obstacel ot imorving things - ends up reinforcing haves and have nots - Johnson - that would happen if you said don’t educate the uneducated because they are fine… why should they find out that they are uneducated…

5/1 Rav Soloveitchik - kol dodi dofek is the only one of these pieces that the Rav polished - his position on the holocaust is that when one is faced with evil, **the halakhic approach what does God want from you** - 1)skeptisicm to the idea that we can know why God does this or that (Gemara brachot: Chizkiah was dying, Yeshayah went to visit him - told him you are dying because you didn’t have children. Chizkiah: but I know that my children would be rotten! Yeshaya: בהצי כבשי דרחמנא למה לך - who are we to speculate and talk about these matters - **Philisophically, we don’t know what’s going on, so why speculate**. Rather, “What am I supposed to do.” Tzara precipitates the chiyuv of tshuva - is it that you recognized that you did a chet (hilkhot tshuva,) or that there is distress (hilkhot taanit.) The thesis is a halakhic thesis - the reaction

if you are looking for sins then you are inviting people to be selective - there are so many things you can blame other people for that don’t have to do with you

Lapid vs Lau – Did not see Gd’s hand vs What right do you have to be in EY?

**Out of the Whirlwind**

Both given in late 50s early 60s to mental health people - mixed audience: Not necessarily religous, or orthodox - open to hearing what religous people have to say, but not really aware of what they might say

one difference: by the time the Rav finished, the conferences ended **- the Rav had cancer** - this is the only place he talks about that - in the frum community people are hesitant to use the word cancer - they say “that disease

**Topical vs. Thematic halakha**. Topical = halakha. thematic = aggadah

Perhaps he did not use this language because the audience would not understand this either

**Topical** (topos means place) Halakha in a narrow context- what are you supposed to do - ask a shailah and get an answer

**Thematic** - philosophy, aggaditah - how human beings respond to a certain situation - you can talk about the laws of gerushin without talking about tragedy of divorce, the psychology, the pain. But you can’t do that when encountering the person - when children talk about skeelah, sreifah, its a game, its a comic.

Mental Health - you have to move to the philosphy of suffering - beyond just halakha

One view others hold is that suffering is not really real - **like the Rambam might seem to say -** if one does not take the building block approach that Rav Carmy took. According to the Rav here he seems to disagree with the Rambam, suffering is real and it is all about how we respond to this.

5/6 1) The Rav’s role in these lecture is complicated (Out of the Whirlwind) - Do you say what you think is right, or are you supposed to represent Yahadut - when you are giving a shiur: do you present all possible views? The Rav was more about presenting **what he thought was correct**. The thing is, when dealing with a crowd of little background, is it fair to present your view only?

2) these people (mental health people) may be interested in how to help people more so than what is theologically correct. The Rambam’s “privation vs. evil” is a good approach for things like why don’t we have wings when we have to jump out of a window to escape a fire. But it might be hurtful when saying things like, you are not blind, you just don’t have the blessing of sight (one philosopher actually approached life this way- he said when he wakes up in the morning, he doesn’t think about the fact that he is blind, rather, he thinks about university politics etc.

The people at the Shiva, We have always believed that Judaism holds there is no life after death - this is the prevalent view of liberal Judaism - these ethical atheists said their rabbi spoke about after life at the funeral - people speak what they hope will comfort

The Rav does not speak about sin, he speaks about the approach to evil as that of response by us - but not the response of self-examination - he does not go that far.

one of Rubenstien’s arguments for the “death of God” is Auschwitz. He had a confrontation with a german christian clergyman who had been an anti Nazi - his answer was: sin and punishment - that disgusted Rubenstein - maybe people would have had a similar response to the Rav - even if these mental health professionals accepted it, it would probably not be an effective way to deal with their patients

**So it seems to be the same ideas as in Kol Dodi Dofek, but different things are emphasized here in “Out of the Whirlwind”**

**Levinas**

made German philosophy influential in France in the 1930s. Heidegger - thought he could be to philosophy what Hitler was to politics - supervised the removal of Jewish professors - apparently, he was an anti-Semite based on notebooks, but until then he just seemed egotistical

Levinas noticed that Heiegger became a Nazi - one could argue that much of his philosophy was an attempt to go beyond Hedigger - Heidegger thought the main question was “the question of being” - that is what went wrong in the history of philosophy - that’s what greek philosophy was about and the tradition that came from there - Levinas’s book, “Otherwise than being” - its not about what is, but what aught to be - Ethics opposed to Metaphysics. Yahdut is the opposite of the Greek tradition - Yahdut is about the Aught, about the ideal - about the other - respect for the other - that is the basics of philosophy

Levinas was associated with Jewish institutions mostly - only in his 60s did he get appointed a job in a french university - then younger philosophers started writing about him and he got famous

Levinas became more interested in Yahdut later and shomer mitzvot - apparently he may not have worn tzitzis - but he was shomer mitzvot to a certain extent

**To Love Torah More Than God** - published in Yiddish in Argentina - wrote a story about a chossid whose wife and family were murdered, and writes a letter to God, even though you did all this to me, I will still love you - Levinas thought this was a true story from the Holocaust - Levinas wrote a commentatry on this story

5/8

**Tzvi Kolitz** - European Jew - went to University in Italy - edited and translated in hebrew a selection of speeches of an italian statesman Mussolini - people in right wing zionism admired him at that time - didn’t speak about that later in life

Bunhuffer - “Under today’s conditions, we have to act as if there is no God” - means that we are living in a secular world, we cannot rely on miracles - so that explains why he did things like attempt to assassinate hitler. If we work with the traditional concept of God who operates under reward and punishment, that kind of God would not be able to survive tremendous amount of suffering and evil

Levinas is very different than atheism - **in hebrew: הסתר פנים** - Eliezer Berkowitz uses this term - **Martin Bluber: The Eclipse of God** - an atheist would say there is no God - an atheist would not be bothered by the non existence of God just like i don’t care about unicorns - people who were once religious - some christian writers talk about prayer even though they do not believe in God - it seems they are not able to let go of childhood experience - or they like the ways the word sound, or you like chazzanus - they could have very real nastalgia - some people think of a God, but a God that is absent - like a person who is far away, but still important to another person - like someone who still feels attached to someone who is dead - so the absence of God is not the nonexistence of God.

Rav Lichtenstien’s neighbor Leib Rochman - He looked her in the eye and said, “He was with us.” What does that mean - not that God takeing care of every little thing for them, clearly, he was talking about that God was with them even though God was not intervening - for Levinas, הסתר פנים is an hour when one is totally abandoned and suffering

in the 1960s there were the so called, “Death of God” theologians - two groups. One group was close to analytic philosophers, in a scientific world, God doesn’t makes sense - not particularly deep, noone talks about this today. Second group: as mankind matures, we stand on our own two feet - we used to be children with God as our father, now we are children and on our own - given all our progress, we are now on our own two feet.

Why is God not hands on? Eliezer Berkowitz and others: **free will**

Another answer: God restrains Himself because if God intervened too openly then it would turn humans into toys - **Abarbanel** at the beginning of Bechukotai 7 reasons why the Torah does not mention Olam Habbah: Rambam : because then people would be motivated not לשמה

One could not say gadol, one could not say Norah - Anshei Kneses HaGedolah said that one of the greatness of God is that God can be silent in the face of evil - Rav Lichtenstien: Yimiyahu was living in churban Bayit Rishon, before there was any precedent of destruction and then redemption - now, it is much easier for us because we have lived through Jewish history which is full of destruction and redemption.

when you know it is going to eventually be over, then even the suffering of the present is abated

Rav Soloveitchik: the idea of God being intimately involved with us is not childish - the idea that we can talk with God.

Chazzal: a person can have abandoned God, yet still keep Torah - Eicha Rabba 2 Passuk in Yirmiyahu Torati Lo Shamaru: this is good because eventually the Torah will influence them - there could be value in the same vein for people who pray after they stop believing in God. Yitkhak Cumer in Tilmol Shilshom

Levinas: at the very moment a person feels abandoned by the God of his childhood and what is left is the Torah:

5/9 Rav Shagar - Rosenberg

has been said tath what happened to him t inthe yom kippur war radicalized him - becasue after one almost dies and requires much surgery - if you have ideas then you don’t keep them to yourslef anymore - he said what is on his mind. Yaakov Elman looked at his work once - he could tell what Rav Shaggar read in academics and what he did not

Rav Lichtenstein did not care for his approach in learning - famous confrontation where someone pursuaded them to give shiurim in the same place on the same sugya

Rav Shaggar is identified with postmodernism - but what postmodernism means is up for debate - a lot of people think it is nonsense - but what did he read and what did he know, how much did he fully understand what he was saying - less important how much french philosophy he knows , more importannt is what he is saying

it is an outlook that is skeptical about the meaning of truth - it’s all what people imagine - there is no such thing as truth - in the modern period people want to know what is true - in postmodern…

practically - postmodernism is more tolerant of morality - once upon a time you are a Jew and someone asks if Judaism is true - so you say that yes, but that means everything else is false - so then what right do you have to put your face in a university - in postmodernism, your a jew, a christian, a budist, it is all a way of thinking. There is a certain truth here, an importance in being aware that even if you believe in truth, the awareness that in very important areas you cannot demonstrate proof the same way you can in mathematics is a very important insight - if we have the truth, why can’t we convince everyone - maybe they are stupid, Reshaim - whether or not that is true, the fact is that there can be reasonable people who reach different conclusions - you can’t just hit them over the head till they say amen - this means that you have no right to insist that what one believes is true - a very relativistic outlook - Rav Shaggar says explicitly that he wants his belief to be something he is willing to kill and die for - he doesn’t want to reach the conclusions

in terms of tolerance - **to say it is intolerant to deny someone’s narrative, but you an still kill them. Many would prefer the opposite**. I would rather someone didn’t accept my narrative than kill me - but Rav Shaggar did not want to be a relativist - he wanted to identify as a Shomer Mitzvot and if that means that he has to go out and kill people, then that is what you have to do.

if it is so important to get issues of belief right than why is it so difficult  if yo uphold that getting things wrong means going to hell for eternity ten indeed it is unfair - if yo don’t put stock in hell then someone will lead their lives and die - it is clear tha teen if you dodn’t have hell then the solution can still be painful - C.S Lewiss Great Divorce, in the end God in effect says have it your wayt - you have free will, you win. So Hell means you are separated from God - at theat moment the Rahsa understands what he missed and that is painful

John E Williams - three significant books - one was reprinted 10-15 years ago: “Stoner” - farmers in the midwest, get scholarship to study agriculture, but gets english rpofessor - he is competant, but not brilliant - it is a job like any other job - he marries a daughter of a senior colleague and that is a bad move, she manages to prevent him from printing more scholorship - destroys his relationship with their daughter - reaches retirement age - then he has cancer: Williams describes that at that point in life he realizes that until now she was Mrs. Professor, now she is just a crabby old professor - their lives are ruined from a moral point of view - there is that discovery that it could have been different - we just have one life and that is it and not everyone is zocheh - also even without a knockdown proof, people ought to be able to get out the truth - people who are naive may nuy into somehting and be sorry later - another will pick up right away - maaseh - a brilliant guy who screwed up ethically.

free will defesnse - God allows evil because if not there would be no free will - every time I would do wrong I would get an atticck of guat

Russo - if every person had a gallows outside his window then people would be mjuch ffmore care ful with his crime - God gives people room to encounter their own conciousce - do I realize it is wrong on my own , or do I just not want gaut - to a very loarge etent4 knowing the truth about ceretani ghauman things - whe nthere is no proof there is often judgement and peopel whoe are more honest isn a deeper sense often have taht judgement

**Rav Shaggar** -dangerous answer that has some truth - people should be loyal to their own truth - so he has no problem saying that he is part of the jewish narrative and he would even kill for that - if someon e would say that he is a palastinian terroris and that is who I am - Rav Shaggar would seem to have no defense against him - Sammy Harrowas - right wint theologically - pacifist - staught wnet to graduate school with him - staugh  wrote a kashe - how could hoarro was be so frum and a pacifist - when the bible hass k7 amimim and amalek so how could he be 100 percent pacificst - how could he take it as an axium - Rav Carmy asked Haarrowas how to answer that kashe: he said when people come to me with that questoin i s asy look if god reealv himself to you and said start a war, kill large amount of people - if you believe that is what GOd told you to do then who am iI to talk you out of it **- Rav Shaggar might say similarly - if you think you have to act a different way then who am I to talk you out of it** - We don’t get our ultimate marchign orderes from God, not rationalities - how far can you bbridge that gap - harrowas writes to  people who are not quite his kink of christian like on medical ethics that people take seroiusly - but for him ultimately his belief fundamentally is jesus resurection and that changed the world in christina way -s - yet he can still talk to Rva Carmy

תורת הגמול במבחן השואה - what is your conception of God when dealing with horrific evil - when you reject the immature view that God just hands out schar viOnesh in an obvious 7way to all

despite yisurin shel ahava there are writers like **Rambam who say there is no suffering without sin**

until now we have dealt with non mekubalim and Rav Shaggar represents that world

**Ramchal** distinguishes between haggat hamishpat (schar vaOnesh) and haggat hachessed (messianic) - Free will means that in certain respects the outcome is not just what you want, but what God wants - WIllam James - if play a chess master you know how the game will end, but not in how many moves the game will end - in some way how it all comes out depend on what people do - One extreme is that all humans are puppets - ignores moral responsibility - certain tendecies in Chassidus to say this deals with the problem of how do we deal with all our sins at the end of the day - end of TS elitots four quotets - quoting saint jullian - sin is bahulee (appropriate) - you can’t say sin is good, but somehow it fits the pattern - this is the sense a mystic would have - the world is bitter, but you look back at it and it is all perfect -Kazamarav: 1886 wrote one of the greatest novels ever written in content - to brothers - Ivan is talking about the problem of evil, spoke about how one sent a dog out in the presense of his mother - lays it on, Ivan says at one point, even if you tell me olam habbah  that I see a point that the paritz and the child and the child’s mother are reconciled and they understand why it ahd to be, smiling, even if the mother forgives the sadisdic nobleman, I say that I don’t want to live in a world this way, I want to return my ticket - the mystical approach though says you won’t want to return your ticket - in all matters things shall be well - Rav Shaggar: God is not subservient to moral law either - if you are saying God is not just in this world, then that means God is not bound by morality - what does it mean that two people deserve punishments and only one gets off. When people thought of a president of king the same way as God - then it made more sense - just like a president can commute your sentence - even the queen of england does not have that power anymore - there is a committee - it is no longer the arbitrary will of the sovereign - but if you have the conception of middat harachamim… then God is no longer tied down to this strict calculus of what is just and what is not just - the logic follows that if God can have mercy when people don’t deserve it, then God can punish people who don’t deserve punishments - discusses chassidut: there should be joy in evil as there is in good - Almah diKasiah - world that is concealed - gam zu litova - Rav Shaggar: God is beyond good and evil - Mentions Chazzon Ish’s position - everything we are getting here which goes against the Rambam goes beyond teh sense that there is a world we are supposed to understand which God adheres to - Perceived debate between Lebubicher Rebbe and Rav Shach regarding halacaust - Halacaust was different from other kinds of evil - in hte secular israeli mythology the halacaust plays a very important role - in America there are a few highschool students who think it is a jewish holoday because we are always comemorating it - it is important for them that the halacasut was about ethnicity and not religion - israel was a response - many thought it was the solution to antisemitism - Rav Shach looks at all this and is disgusted, so it his discourses openly goes back to the conventional way of thinking about suffering - All the sins of the Jews for thousands of years and that is why millions of Jews died, now things are good because we have a clear slate - Haskalah, going away from religion is also why these things happen - this is difficult in light of the Chazzal which says that God only punishes people for a few generations worth of sin - On the other hand the Lebuvicher Rebbe is quoted and probably responding to Rav Shach (Rav Shach was against Lebavich) - **Rebbe**: this could not be a punishment because even the Satan could not find sufficient sin to punish this generation so severely. there is no certainty out there, but

5/13 Rav Shaggar: Rav Shach took a traditional schar vaOnesh stance

Rebbe: there are undesirebable things that do not come as a punishment for sin , but rather that is what Hashem decreed - nothing in our own reason to justify nor is there a Torah insight wchich can justify it - The Rebbe is saying that it is not just incomprehensible to noraml human logic, but also that Tamidei CHochomim cannot understand it at all - as Hashem said to moshe in the Gemara כך היא גזירה מלפני

The Gemara could mean that there is a reason but it is disproportionate to the sin

clearly wrong to punish an innocent person - what if you just have punishment that is very severe - steal a loaf of bread, off with your arm - most of us would say that is excessive - Lawyer: that would be the constitutional issue of cruel and unusual punishment - does גזירה mean that - traffic laws that are meant to prevent people from driving through - is that excessive punishment, or גזירה? Open question. in discussing these matters you cannot blame people you don’t like for being responsible for the holocaust

one could blame the victim, while still saying that it is too much - but the Rebbe is saying differently - you can’t blame them at all - he does this because **1)** he thinks Rav Shach is wrong **2)** he thinks its bad hashkafa **3)** if ahavat yisrael is a high priority then whatever virtue there is the more traditional theodicy, then you lose too much - its not worth it - better to reject the more traditional and have more ahavat yisrael - someone rolls around and causes himself to get hay fever then it would be true to say that it was that person’s fault, but there is something cruel about saying “you deserve it” even though I would be right - same with a person who smoked who has lung cancer. Rebbe: don’t even talk to yourself that way - it is a Gezeira.

Is it really about philosophical issues or emotional reactions - Metaphysics or ethics - one could say that perhaps metaphysically Rav Shach is right, but ethically that is not how one should talk - Rav Carmy: Premise may not be appropriate - assumes a divorce between emotion and rationality - rationality tells that one rolls in hay he deserves hayfever - they are asking fo rit - or taoday you know that if one smokes that could lead to lung cancer even if some survive - people smoke and drink.

BACK TO EMOTION- you have two ways to look at it - emotion n and reason are two separate things - in class or laboratory we only think of what causes what - so yah when people encounter a person suffering they don’t have the heart to say the rationsal and they chagne their midnd and soften up - 2) people are righ t ochange their minds - emotions are as muc a reality as siligisms - the person who talks abou tsuffering without thinking about what it means its missing reality no matter how good one can play rational games they are missing an essential part of the equation - davka a religous or moral perosn if they only think about it in abastrant tersms are not thinking about reality - DO emoitions etell us something about reality - if no then tatla divorce between the two - or what emotions tell us about reality is false - like stoics - they think emiootosns are misleading - emotinal responses to things you can’t change anyway is wrong and should be ignore - or you could say no  very often emotions give a window itno reality liek by iyonvs frides who are t o some degree callous towards his suffering are getting something wrong - they don’t understnad want they want to understand - not just that they aren’t being nice - they are wrong in teality

**Holocaus**t is different: you could say this by saying that what happens to 6 million is just different - or you could say it is a reaction of horror - so it operates differently, like our reactoin to hay fever is different than it is to lung cancer - either it is ethically wrong ot point a finger, or it is philisophically wrong because if you react that way, then there is something you don’t appreciate of suffering

we could say this philosophical discurssion has no value - or we could say that the emotinoal ethiacal considerations etell us something about how the world is - what human beings are - ties into larger questions (what about Rambam rationalism?) Historians discuss if the holocaust was really historically unique

**Rebbe: Even the Satan could not justify such a severe punishmen**t (but one could say that the punishment is justified and then it is hard to ask kashehs on severity). It is wrong to use the holocaust as a scare tactic, especially since such hateful words won’t make an impression on people today

Rav Shaggar now turns to **the Aish Kodesh** (Chassidishe Rebbe who ended up being killed, but gave sermons in Warsaw getto and some were written down - htere is an evolution in his presentation from 1940 - 42 - he is at first **more traditional tshuva etc. but then abandons** - Waculdah Pest “The Plague” novel by French writer - moral authority on the left - Rav Lichtenstien when speaking about responsibility of educators to guide readers - they could pick up Carmoon, or on the other hand anne rand - student of Rav Carmy who was drunk on purim - Rav Carmy’s mother said she got a lot out of reading “The Plague.” She also valued Green. “The Plague” was published during WW2 interpreted as a mashal for naziism **- comes to town in nigeria - early on the priest gives people mussar shmooz about sin and punishment- as the plague spreads he changes his sermons, tends to the victims and dies of the plague - at the same time the Rav wrote Ish Hahalakha - both conclude,the important thing in the time of evil is not to give mussar shmoozes but to help the victims**. Some of the aish kodesh ktavim did not appear originally, newer editions are more reliable froma scholarly point of view –

whatever happened to us before 1942, that happened to us before - the argument is Uniqueness - everything until a certain point you can look to Chazzal, to the source to make sense of it - once you go beyond that, it is not an emotional reaction.

The Rebbes point is that we don’t have an implement in the sources for explaining it. Look  through TOrah, there is nothing that you can use - Rav Shggar says: this is not correct Pshat: What the Rebbe is saying is not that some sufferings are more vivid, but that they don’t have an explainable precedant in the sources, but Rav Shaggar interprets it like it is a different kind of concept - that when you talk about it in the abstract, it is one thing, when it happens to you, it is something else - Rav Shaggar is not alway an accurate reader of texts - he seems more interested in his own ideas. Sitting on a cushy arm chair and talk about suffering, we end up distorting reality, true of any suffering (undermines what hte Aish Kodesh is saying who says we could interpret it if it was before 1942.) So Rav Shaggar is saying things that Rav Carmy values, but it is not what the sources he claims to be quoting say.if you are dealing with every day suffering - unrequieted love, hay fever, cancer, things we know, you can use a variety of intellectual means - but if the holocaust creates a gap in which we cannot do this then it may cause us to reevaluate the entire system - i have phenomena 1-n and I have explanantions - if the explanations don’t work for n+1, the entire explanations need ot be reevaluate d - so after the holocaust we cannot look at suffering the same way - or, we culd say things like, well hey fever is still just an annoyance, but I will reevaluate cancer - or not - and either approach could be defended - some say don’t ask me about the holocaust because it is just different htan anything else which means that they will continue to examine everything else in traditional ways - the Rav reexamines everyhting wihtout making the holocaust unique - we have to look at not why GOd did it, we do not psychologize GOd, we distinguish between what we say for ourself and what we say for other people- you have a relationship with God and you should do tshuva, but what other people have to do tshuva for is not my issue, I can only talk about my issues - If I have a mathematical theorem and it works for many examples but then … if we know plutonian physics does not work for microscopic phenomenon, so for what is true in physics we need some other theory to reevaluate everything - scope is important in physics -lamdus: the more the theory explains, the better it is. is there reason to think about the holocaust differently than everything else

Rav Shagar is undermining what the aish kodesh is saying. AK just said that we do not have a mekor to deal with such things. RAv Shagar said it was a whole new entity in itself.

The Rov was able to address what we believed and incorporate the Holocaust while still keeping all tragedy the same. Not just pure Avon like the Rambam says, rather we need to respond.

**Last Class**

Berkowitz – People who were not there have no right to talk. “Ad Sheyagiah Lmikomo”. Fakenheim – built his new Judaism on top of Aushwitz, Do not give Hitler a posthumous victory.

Why did AK not know of the two clear mekoros that show that this is possible? Maybe he did not think they encompassed this.