

- 4 This notion of ma'ale nurtured in J. world war since. (1930s dropped - even reason can explain. 1940s - mostly dropped; unfortunate. 1980s expanded to include 1930s + 1940s. 1950s and 1980s limited to J. So essentially, concept ma'ale (= KOL growth) through we are a-rast here, = $C\ddot{o}$ + 1930s + J.

As the 'ideal' is understood and accepted today in many of the yeshivot, it is an intense inward-looking enterprise, often requiring an almost monastic dedication. This aspiration is

unquestionably a noble one, especially in this narcissistic era of unbridled hedonism and unbuttoned ego display, and hence deserving of the greatest admiration. But is there no place for Mada to be integrated in the goal of shelemut in a substantive manner? Can we not conceive of a shelemut which is outgoing as well as inward looking, one not limited to one's own psyche and moral character, embracing rather than confining, open rather than closed?

I believe that there certainly is and that, indeed, it gives new breadth to the ideal of shelemut.

B)

1. ma'ale - openness can find its place in ma'ale ideal b.c. both $C\ddot{o}$ and J. offer vigils: openness to J. and 1930s. Mostly: conception of penetrating depth vs. that of blanketing breadth.
2. Hence, I prefer to redefine ma'ale (= KOL growth) away from its current constricted conception to a more comprehensive vision
3. Several sources for this redefinition - not all congruent w each other! Range from Contemp. West Coast California to Medieval Cairo to ancient Canaan!
 - a) MOD. CALIF.:... the ethos of self-realization: expression of all latent talents, potencies, aspirations... This really = expression contrary narcissism. hedonism: tasteless dish on menu of banquet of life - merit corrupt / deconstruct / corrupted. ... But virtue: harnessing all life, comprehensive. For this last item - coincide with:

33 etc \Rightarrow 223 if we're vice versa of 123 and v-c, most-likely that this pulling together

be pointed to the overarching goal: Japan
political dimension - ✓

1) ANCIENT CANAAN was a part of Aram

CLIENT CARRIAGE

(P.F.E - (in) P.N.S. 1980)

1. acc Rishi - P.N.S. to fully
soft army at successful passing 7-10/10.
w/le w/plus & sharpening of focus on national challenge

(C.M.I.) = not present and: India side

acc $\bar{r}_2(r_2) = \pi(r_2) (= c(r_2)) \approx$ int pressure $\pi(r_2)$:
 $\pi(r_2) = \pi(r_1)$. so here $\pi(r_2) =$ self-cost of $\pi(r_2)$ factor

2- see 1st - 2nd = substance in republican in C.
P.N.N. → having accepted it, and in everything -
no powers attributable elsewhere (A.D.N. start
demands. etc) as a recent contemporary
children's belief. THUS: reflexive,
all must be for one goal, to "rep."

[illegible][illegible]

4- so: $\omega\omega\omega$ = the assessing of all one's potentials -- intell.,
eth., emotional, esthetic, moral -- and all his experiences --
sacred + profane, superficial + profound, positive or negative --
+ their elevation by directing them to $\omega\omega\omega$;
specifically, everything must be used to be $\omega\omega\omega$.
The $\omega\omega\omega$ in the world, both external + internal.
 $\omega\omega\omega$ means leaving no stone unturned, no talent
untapped. no promise unfulfilled in joining all of
 $\omega\omega\omega$ in $\omega\omega\omega$ to $\omega\omega\omega$. And even if sometimes these
talents or inclinations contradict each other, must use

from all by keeping all in a dynamic ~~balance~~ balance or
 equilibrium. YHWH (using Plato's metaphor) said
 man is like a prince running his kingdom,
 allotted to rule his own & assigning to each his duty.
 Perhaps another analogy: woodworker, using every
 instrument at his command, getting from each the
 best he can do. w. the end of creating a divine
 symphony. Is that possible - not only every
 soul, but the entire soul, every part of it... etc.

5- and openness = an - at great part of reference, both
 individual & universal. w. it - work is far
 narrower, more restricted.

C- Are wide and openness compatible?
 Yes - certainly in an ultimate sense. And if you think
 that from this bec. my (Jewish) sea is showing -
 a few examples from history.

1. Geonic period

In the
 Geonic period, according to the eleventh century R. Joseph
 Ibn Aknin (in his commentary to the Song of Songs), R. Hai
 Gaon did not hesitate to use Arabic sources, including Arabic
 love songs, to prove a Talmudic point, and he quotes the
 Koran and the Hadith (the sayings and doings of Mohammed).
 The same source tells of the famed R. Samuel Hanagid quoting
 Christian exegetes. Moreover, he quotes R. Masliah, a well
 known dayyan (halakhic judge), in Sicily who, in a letter to
 R. Samuel Hanagid, tells of a personal experience with the
 famed R. Hai Gaon who experienced difficulty in understanding
 a verse in Psalms, and directed him, R. Masliah, much to the
 latter's consternation, to approach "the Catholic of the
 Christians and ask him what he knows about the interpretation
 of this verse." Noticing R. Masliah's discomfort, R. Hai
 rebuked him, saying, "our early fathers and righteous men
 never hesitated to inquire from people of different
 religions, even from shepherds, concerning obscure words in
 Scripture."

יוסף
 אבן אקנין
 שכתב
 פירושים
 על ספר
 שיר השירים
 וזכר
 רבי חיי
 גאון
 שהשתמש
 במקורות
 ערביים
 ונצרות
 להוכיח
 נקודות
 תלמודיות

Shelemut requires breadth as well as depth. The dazzling galaxy of Torah Umadda personalities come closer to the ideal of shelemut because of, not despite, their Madda involvements. The knowledge of medicine did not detract from Maimonides' sense of wholeness; indeed, his Hilkhot Deiot, where he discusses the formation of character, benefits enormously from the medical theories he had learned from the Greeks. Don Isaac Abravanel was no less a full personality because of his financial prowess and diplomatic skill; those acquainted with his commentary on the Bible can attest to the life experiences as a man of Madda that he draws upon in his exegesis. Grammar did not impoverish Abraham Ibn Ezra; philosophy did not diminish the stature of Hasdai Crescas; secular poetry did not reduce the wholeness of either Solomon Ibn Gabirol or Yehudah Halevi; literary style and grace did not chip away from the well earned fame of Judah Messer Leone; mathematics did not make the Gaon of Vilna any the less a gaon; and general philosophy has not lessened the greatness of Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik. On the contrary, the Madda development of each contributed not only to their intellectual greatness but also to their shelemut, which would have suffered without the development of these gifts. Wholeness is enhanced by many-sidedness, *and fullness by virtues*.

3. MATERIAL - 0.17% Carbon Steel R31-2N 20 x 25 x 11 mm size

[This means] one should study Torah in order to know how to respond to the heretic, for just as it is a mitzvah for a man to study and acquire Torah which is the "Torah of truth," so is it important to banish false opinions from the world in order that truth be magnified in the world. For if one regularly ignores falsehood, it can ultimately, Heaven forbid, destroy the truth and annihilate it while falsehood gains strength in the world. Therefore [the Mishnah] warns us to deny that which is false by knowing what to answer to a heretic."

ואני חתום עליה מאתו = ז.ל.ל.א.א.י. קובס
 ביום שבת ליל ט"ו = ז.ל.ל.א.א.י. קובס
 המורה שיהיו מותרות כל האוכלים
 ביום הזה מן העולם כולו
 ויש יום הזה מן העולם כולו
 ויש יום הזה מן העולם כולו
 ויש יום הזה מן העולם כולו
 ויש יום הזה מן העולם כולו
 ויש יום הזה מן העולם כולו

u. (Malkah's work)

Let me now present to you a more radical sample of openness - namely, openness to views that we may consider ~~unorthodox~~ ~~anti-halachic~~, provided they are not meant to be provocative but are sincere statements of belief or non-belief. Here too - dialogue is a virtue, a part of openness! In order to avoid misportation, I shall read this proposition almost verbatim:

[Averroes'] words hold true for religion as well... It is not proper that we despise the words [of our adversaries], but rather we must draw them close as we can. [Averroes] wrote there that if one does not do so, and he refuses to accept the words of his opponents with love but rejects them [out of hand], this certainly points to the weakness of his own arguments...

Therefore it is proper, out of love of reason and knowledge, that you not [summarily] reject anything that opposes your own ideas, especially so if the [adversary] does not intend merely to provoke you, but rather to declare his beliefs. And even if such [beliefs] are opposed to your own faith and religion, do not say [to your opponent], "Speak not, close your mouth." If that happens, there will take place no purification of religion. On the contrary, you should, at such times, say, "Speak up as much as you want, say whatever you wish, and do not say later that had you been able to speak you would have replied further." For one who causes his opponent to hold his peace and refrain from speaking, demonstrates [thereby] the weakness of his own religious faith, as we said. This is therefore the opposite of what some people think, namely, that when you prevent someone from speaking about religion, that strengthens religion. That is not so, because curbing the words of an opponent in religious matters is naught but the curbing and enfeebling of religion [itself]...

When our Rishonim found something written against their faith, they did not reject it [out of hand], for it stands to reason that [such opposition]

ought not be a cause for rejecting it and for silencing a man when it comes to religious matters; for religion is given to all. This is especially so with regard to the written word... Should there not have been a reaction against the books of the philosophers who, following their own investigations, repudiated [traditional religious teachings] and asserted the Eternity of the Universe and thus denied the creation altogether? Nevertheless, [the Rishonim] read their books and did not dismiss them. For the proper way in order to attain the truth is to hear [others'] arguments which they sincerely hold, not out of a desire to provoke you. Thus, it is wrong simply to reject an opponent's ideas; instead, draw him close to you and delve deeply into his words...

When a powerful man seeks out an opponent in order to demonstrate his [own] strength, he very much wants his opponent to exercise as much strength as he can, so that if he beats him his own victory will be more pronounced. What strength is there when the opponent is not permitted to fight?... Hence, one should not silence those who speak against religion... for to do so is an expression of weakness.

Now, before anyone goes off calling various vigilantes about my illicit liberalism - be aware that I was NOT giving my opinion. I was quoting a libelous writing in the 1880's. This was almost a literal translation of something of Rabbinic - 112 - 500 years ago! (Hed - att'd)

For I was such a person was not a concession to external pressures. It was a courageous assertion of self-confidence in the Torah, ready to meet all challenges in order to believe right.

From experience: the strength you get from a honest confrontation - w confidence in my TOR, & careful preparation of answers - & got more - an an words for your own Torah. Maybe it's not true for all people - but for me. Torah is the mirror of the spirit: remove them, & they become strong, object to the Torah, & Torah becomes flabby & weak.

