

Dear All,

My apologies for being late and short this week. It is generally my custom to address broadly the issue of commandedness on Parashat Tetzaveh, in memory of Matt Eisenfeld z"l, who was killed by a bomb in Jerusalem in 1996 and in honor of a conversation we once had. That was not feasible this week, so I will simply dedicate the Torah contained herein to his memory, and hope to address the issue in a subsequent week.

This week's brief excerpt from Netziv expresses part of a taxonomy of Talmud Torah that is central to his magnificent introduction to Haamek Sh'eilah and appears often in his Haamek Davar. This week it introduces Parashat Tetzaveh, but the exegetical hook is not crucial; it seems rather an excuse to mention a favorite idea.

What I am interested in specifically here is the distinction he makes between creative and noncreative Torah interpretation, and I encourage readers to send me their formulations of the distinction he makes, and analogies from other discipline that may occur to them. I think the key may be how one understands the concept of analogy, and mention tentatively the Kantian distinction between the analytic a priori, in which the outcome is definitionally contained within the assumptions, and the synthetic a priori, in which something is actually added rather than discovered by the argument.

Shabbat Shalom!

עוד ראוי לדעת דמשה ואהרן היו נחשבים לחברים, כדתניא באבות דרבי נתן פרק כז:
"ומנין שכבוד חברך יהא חביב עליו כשלך? שנאמר: ויאמר אהרן אל משה: 'בי אדני'.
והלא אחיו הקטן ממנו היה! אלא עשאו רבו./
והטעם בזה:

דאף על גב דאהרן היה נצרך לגמרא דמשה מפי ה', מכל מקום אחר ששמע לא היה נצרך לו לסברא, והיה גדול בישראל כמשה, אלא שגדולתם בתורה לא היה באופן אחד, דכח משה היה נעלה בכח הפלפול לחדש דבר שלא שמע בקבלה ע"י ההכרח והפלפול . . . ואהרן היה נעלה בכח הסברא לדמות מילתא למילתא ולכוון האמת . . .
ועיקר ההוראה בשעתה אי אפשר לחדש כל שאלה בפלפול אלא על ידי סברא ולדמות מלתא למלתא

It is also worthwhile to know that Mosheh and Aharon were considered colleagues, as we learn in Avot deRabbi Natan:

"From where in Tanakh do we learn that the honor of your colleague should be as dear to you as your own? As it says: "Aharon said to Mosheh: "Please, my lord",

but was not Moshe Aharon's younger brother! Yes he made him his teacher. (RK: *The argument appears to be that Aharon is choosing Moshe's kavod over his own, but there are clearly many ways to distinguish the case of Moshe and Aharon from general intercourse among social equals, so I don't feel that I have fully understood this.*)

The reason for this is:

Even though Aharon was in need of the fixed content that Moshe received from the mouth of Hashem, nonetheless once he heard he did not need Mosheh for reasoning, and was as great in Israel as Mosheh, except that their greatness in Torah was not in one

fashion, as the strength of Mosheh was exalted with regard to the power of pilpul to originate material that he had not heard from Tradition via demonstration and pilpul . . . whereas Aharon was exalted in the power of reasoning, to analogize one matter to another and line up with the truth . . .

But the core of ruling in live situations – it is not possible to originate (the answer) to every question via pilpul, rather (they must be answered via reasoning and analogizing one matter to another.