

These and These

Eruvin 13b:10-11

Rabbi Abba said in the name of Shmuel, For three years, the House of Hillel and the House of Shammai argued. One said, 'The halakha is like us,' and the other said, 'The halakha is like us.' A heavenly voice spoke: "These and these are the words of the living God, and the halakha is like the House of Hillel." A question was raised: Since the heavenly voice declared: "Both these and those are the words of the Living God," why was the halacha established to follow the opinion of Hillel? It is because the students of Hillel were kind and gracious. They taught their own ideas as well as the ideas from the students of Shammai. Not only for this reason, but they went so far as to teach Shammai's opinions first.

עירובין י"ג ב:כ"ז-ל"ב

א"ר אבא אמר שמואל שלש שנים נחלקו ב"ש וב"ה הללו אומרים הלכה כמותנו והללו אומרים הלכה כמותנו יצאה בת קול ואמרה אלו ואלו דברי אלהים חיים הן והלכה כב"ה וכי מאחר שאלו ואלו דברי אלהים חיים מפני מה זכו ב"ה לקבוע הלכה כמותן מפני שנוחין ועלובין היו ושונין דבריהן ודברי ב"ש ולא עוד אלא שמקדימין דברי ב"ש לדבריהן

From "Argument as Emergence, Rhetoric as Love" by Jim Corder:

Each of us is an argument, evidenced by our narrative. What happens, then, if the narrative of another crushes up against our own -- disruptive, shocking, incomprehensible, threatening, suddenly showing us into a narrative not our own? What happens if a narrative not our own reveals to us that our own narrative was wanting all along, though it is the only evidence of our identity? What happens if the merest glimpse into another narrative sends us lurching, stunned by its differentness, either alarmed that such differentness could exist or astonished to see that our own narrative might have been or might yet be radically otherwise than it is? Do we hold our narratives? Keep telling the story we have been telling? At all costs?

We react, of course, in many different ways. Sometimes we turn away from other narratives. Sometimes we teach ourselves not to know that there are other narratives. Sometimes - probably all too seldom - we encounter another narrative and learn to change our own. Sometimes we lose our plot, and our convictions as well; since our convictions belong to our narratives, any strong interference with our narrative or sapping of its way of being will also interrupt or sap our convictions. Sometimes we go to war. Sometimes we sink into madness, totally unable to manage what our wit or judgment has shown us: a contending narrative that has force to it and charm and appeal and perhaps justice and beauty as well, a narrative compelling us to attention and toward belief that we cannot ultimately give, a contending narrative that shakes and cracks all foundations and promises to alter our identity, a narrative that would educate us to be wholly other than what we are...

How can we take that one chance I mentioned just now and learn to change when change is to be cherished? How can we expect another to change when we are ourselves that other's contending narrative?

Genesis 28:5

(5) Then Isaac sent Jacob off, and he went to

בראשית כ"ח:ה

(ה) וַיִּשְׁלַח יִצְחָק אֶת-יַעֲקֹב בְּגֵלָהּ פָּנָה אַרְבָּם אֶל-לְבָן בְּדָר

Paddan-aram, to Laban the son of Bethuel the Aramean, the brother of Rebekah, mother of Jacob and Esau.

בְּתוּאֵל הָאֲרָמִי אֶתִּי רִבְקָה אִם יַעֲקֹב וְעֵשָׂו:

Rashi on Genesis 28:5:1

(5) מִתּוֹכָם אִם יַעֲקֹב וְעֵשָׂו MOTHER OF JACOB AND ESAU — I do not know what the addition of these words is intended to tell us.

רש"י על בראשית כ"ח:ה':א'

(ה) אם יעקב ועשו איני יודע מה מלמדנו:

Reflection by Rabbi Aaron Alexander on Rashi's commentary on Genesis 28:5

I guess if you just randomly opened up to Genesis 28:5, learning that Rebecca was Jacob and Esau's mother could be useful. But if one has even a cursory knowledge of the story, or has been following along up until this point, this information is totally superfluous.

Enter Rashi. He always has something to offer, an insight that doesn't render the words useless. Once again, he delivers, but not in the way we would expect. "I have no idea what this comes to teach me." Brilliant.

The super commentators are baffled. Siftei Hachamim cannot believe he doesn't actually have an answer. If not, why didn't he just say silent? They posit that in this case there were many reasonable midrashic explanations available but just he couldn't decide which one was closest to the truth.

But I think this could be Rashi's greatest one liner yet. An expression of humility from someone beyond the insecure need to always impress.

Sometimes "I don't know" is as exquisite as intellectual gymnastics. It allows for possibility. Something never before imagined or uttered.

It's the Torah I needed to stumble across today. It seems that so many answers are needed and sometimes it's hard to even know where to start.

*Source Sheet created on Sefaria by Sarra Alpert
Based on a sheet by Zahavit Shalev*