

## Genesis and Literature

R' Carmy

The primary purpose of Tanach is to learn about Hashem.

Intro to Milton:

Milton was an Englishman and a protestant, a very ambitious person. Milton had his eyes on a prize (to become a poet). He was a Puritan and was very outspoken; he was discussing (writing about) the legitimacy of killing the king when people were not talking about it yet. His wife left him and he wrote about the right of divorce. Officially the Church of England allows divorce, but not remarriage (for the woman). Jesus was against divorce (based on Pshat). In Gemorah Gittin there is quite a Sugya on when is it Mutar to divorce. Milton believed that marriage is only meaningful if it is a true meeting of the minds. He was very much attacked for this. Eventually his wife came back to him, probably because they were royalist and the in-laws wanted a relative on the winning team. These are 2 issues Milton was very into – the relation to the king and authority in general as well as his relations to marriage. Late 1640s Milton becomes a high fluent beurocrat in the revolutionary England. At this point he becomes blind. He becomes dependant on others, such as his daughters and his wife died. He had an estranged relationship with his daughters. When the king is restored he is scared that he will be put to death. At this point he works on *Paradise Lost*. The book is about Chet Adam haRishon. It begins in medias res, the beginning of the story. Where the Satan has rebelled against God and already been banished. The devils decide the best way to get back at God is to corrupt mankind. It goes from 10 to 12 books. In book 3 God is talking to Jesus, God knows what is going to happen and Jesus decides to do the atonement later on. We see Adam and Chava at that point. God sends the angel Michael at that point. Book VI is the Star Wars episode, which is the fight between the good and bad angels. Books VII – IX is the actual fall (our most important part). Book X is the incrimination (good dramatization) and XI and XII is the future history of the world. This is Felix Culpa – the happy sin, good coming out of evil. It is a very complex structure and complex poetry. Most important for us is books 4 and 5.

In terms of Hawthorne, there are a lot of people in America who do not believe in traditional religion. This raises a lot of points, like women...

Shiur # 2

The first issue is whether it's appropriate to study בראשית to begin with. רב כרמי has no doubts about this, but he feels it's appropriate to mention this. Bill Moyers put together a television show about בראשית, or kind of revolving around בראשית. Professor Wisotsky (sp) from JTS said things about בראשית that might please Christian listeners because it implied that G-d has a mother, but said it in such a way that it would infuriate them. One episode included a psychology professor from Harvard who compared the רבנו של עולם to Hitler in terms of the Flood, to the discredit of the רבנו של עולם who killed

even more indiscriminately. רב כרמי wrote in by interview that personalizing Genesis has been done already. No Orthodox Rabbis made mention.

A frum series decided to pretty much do the opposite. רב איסינמן wondered whether they should do it at all, because the moment they would start talking about בראשית, they'd be giving in the point to the enemy that בראשית is more of a story. רב כרמי countered that בראשית is considered a separate entity, in that there are five חומשי תורה, separate introductions to the different ספרים, as in the רמב"ן. Beyond that, בראשית is considered as a separate unit altogether.

There is a question of treating Bereishit as a separate entity, from the other 4 Sefarim and from the rest of Torah in general.

The first Rashi is quite famous how he has to deal with why we have Bereishit if we only get Mitzvot until Shemoth. He answers that it is so the Goyim will not call us robbers and we will have to ask if we really need a Matir for every non-Halachik portion in the Torah.

The Rashbam has a problem with the 1<sup>st</sup> Perek of Bereishit, why do we need a piece that deals with a secret idea (Kabalistic possibly, a Sod). He answers that it was needed because of Shabos.

The Ramban said we need Parshat Bereishit to establish God as the creator – which is a very significant part of Hashkafah.

It is very strange that creation and the theological issues are very important and how could Rashi disagree with that. R' Carmy's original intuition was that we could deal with creation out of Chumash, the same way Moshe Rabbeinu wrote Iyov to deal with evil. However, there could be another way to deal with this from a literary point of you. The Torah could have mentioned creation later on when Shabos is mentioned (as the Rashbam seems to propose). The Rashbam often writes how certain things in Chumash are there to set up things that come later on.

Epics often start in the middle (such as Paradise Lost and the Iliad). However, why would you want this in epics and why would you want this in Tanach. It could be by starting in the middle it implies that things have always been going on and the story is starting in the middle (like real life) – this is a good idea to start in the middle in general. It could be that in terms of the Iliad is that the story of the Iliad is about the wrath of Achilles. But this does not help us read Chumash at all.

Someone actually tried to work out a book that does not have Bereishit at the beginning. The book of Jubilees does this. He starts out with Moshe Rabbeinu talking to Hashem at Har Sinai and then you go back to Bereishit. The question is what happens when you have these anthology dramas. For example Alfred Hitchcock Presents. There was an actual calling attention to the fact that what was going on was not real. If Rashi's

question has anything at all, then Rashi would be happy and the Rashbam would be happy and the Ramban couldn't complain.

Take some Goyim who see Torah as literature, they struggle with Vayikra because it is not a regular literature – but it is somewhat of a narrative. Clearly the Torah is not written as a Shulchan Aruch and even the legal portions are narrative.

The Jubilees version of Bereishit is more Halachik then the version of Bereishit on the street. There is some Achronish literature that turns everything into a Halachik issue. But normally people who read Bereishit they see that there is more in Bereishit then just an excuse to give a Gemarah Shiur. The book of Jubilees is constantly ordaining that various actions in Bereishit cause various Halachot to be established (for example Pesach and Shavuot). It could be that putting Moshe Rabbeinu in the story of Bereishit gives credence to the book, (Lehavdil, like Hitchcock introducing an episode).

Another question is what is going on in Jubilees – it could be that it is an attempt to universalize Torah. This is a much more universal and existentialist approach to Torah. If you take a person with a greater philosophical instinct, that means the Torah is the true ethic and we have to ask where the Avot fit into this. We have to explain about these 26 generations that were supported with Chessed. If you are more philosophical – that does not make sense then you have to say if Torah is the good – it should have been around all the time.

Chazal with one approach deal with this by saying that Avraham kept all of the Torah, which is saying that Torah is truth and therefore everyone would have come to it by themselves. The other approach in Chazal is that Hashem tells Avraham Chidushim in what he should do because of this special relationship. Philo would say that all Goyim should keep the Torah Rashi would not. There was a discussion in the Middle Ages to what degree do we think the Goyim will be מגייר לעתיד לבא. A professor at Hebrew U., Avraham Grossman, wrote how the Jews brought the blood libel upon themselves, based on their ideas about the Jewish ideas about Christians and Jews who killed their children during the Crusades. Included in this was the Jewish impression of עתיד לבא.

Moberly says that Bereishit is to Tanach as the Old Testament is to the New Testament. Basically they have the same problem that there was this old period where things were going on back then and it was ok, but now these things are not. Some of this is that Christians may have more interest then us.

The question is not why did Rashi argue with this Jubilees, but why did God disagree with Jubilees. Clearly HKB"Y is less interested in giving credence to his words then a pseudepigraphic work would be. There is another question is how much do Pseudepigraphic authors assume that their works will be taken seriously. There is a guy Metzker who says that these people did not believe that their works would be taken as the works of the attributed author. He brings a proof from a story about a Professor Coleman who published a piece of New Testament, which was clearly a joke, as. However, there still might be a desire to get the best possible PR.

The second option is that it is very important that there be a beginning. Part of what is happening in Bereishit is that there is a beginning. However Bereishit does not emphasize creation ex nihilo as much as we do. There is a debate about this and the fact that the debate exists proves that it is not that clear from the Pesukim. What is more important is the idea of the Ribono Shel Olam being alone in the world. You can do that by saying God created the world. However, experientially that does not work perfectly, because if you read it you were there. When you think of suicide you are not there. The whole enjoyment is assuming you are there (as a foil). This would be a reason that Hashem does not want the appearance of someone there – so that God is acting completely alone.

The עולם של רבונו might have disagreed with Jubilees as a pseudopigraphic work coming later might have more of a need for משה רבינו to present all of the material. Some people will look at a pseudopigraphic book and claim it's dishonest. In the בית שני period, a lot of scholars claim it's not dishonest. Metzker, in the Journal of Jewish Literature, wrote an article about it where he claims that in some cases there is no הו"א that anybody believes it's authentic. It's unclear about the בית שני period. There still might be the desire to create the best possible impression. Perhaps people would believe he was writing ברוך הקודש.

Part of what's happening in בראשית is that G-d is creating people. Apart from the רלב"ג, who has a modified view of יש מאין; if one reads ראב"ע, one doesn't see יש מאין in the פסוקים. What is clear, which perhaps includes יש מאין, is the idea that הקב"ה is alone in the world. One can get the idea across in different ways; experientially, one can do it via a creation story. Just stating it as a truism, makes it as if the person was there. Explaining how the world was created puts the person as someone certainly not being there.

### Shiur # 3

However the reason the narrative should be phrased this way so that no one is else there and this way we are closer to imagining a world where God exists and nothing else there.

If we talk about the 1<sup>st</sup> Perek of Bereishit there is almost nothing there that puts human beings in the picture. Not only do people not exist – but that we do not even think they exist until they come along at the end. You could argue that the Meorot introduces a certain human element – because there is a distinction of day and night – you are bringing Moshe Rabbeinu back in the picture (if you learn like Rashi that day and night is for the Moadim). However, even according to Rashi at the end he points out that Meorot are there to give light. The Eitz Chaim for the Torah points out that the major point of Meorot is for light and darkness – the Pasuk ends up being Torah centered according to Rashi.

Another issue is the phrase נעשה אדם – the Pashut approach is the royal we. However the Meforshim take different approaches to the plural being here. When we talk about the creation of man – it is somehow not based upon God's arbitrary effort it is

a communal effort, the Ramban would say this. Talking about Melachim would see characters as cooperating. When man is a culmination with certain things already in place. This means the use of the  $\aleph$  adds something to the meaning. Man is placed on a pedestal with Tzelem Elokim but we might want to ask if he is just a special person.

An issue is how these points go back to Rashi. R' Carmy says that Rashi's question is why start with this – as opposed to why include it. R' Tzadok has a Klal that the first place something is mentioned in the Torah it is always true to understand that concept. The idea that if the Torah is an Halachik work then it would be odd to start with a different idea than Halacha. Therefore the answer Rashi gives must be that Halacha requires a premise of creation before it begins.

Kugel's new book is a different Kugel. Generally the kind of Kugel we are use to is post-history of Torah. Kugel is pointing out that we can't have Torah without later commentators. This could be there is no Torah shebiksav without Torah Shebaal Peh. However there was a Christian Donahue – who asked if anything could fit into that crack – then what have you done to the original book. The new book goes where the old books would not want to go – what was the biblical world like before all the Parshanut got laid on to it. We certainly bring philosophical assumptions to Tanach. We believe God provides – we know God has no body. There is nothing alien to Tanach about intercordiality. One question is how much was this really aware to people in Tanach. In thought rational orientation comes after intuition. A person who never thought God has a body or not – if he is forced to think about it he will say God has no body. If you know things to be true without thinking about them – you don't think about them. There are things we take for granted without really formulating we take it for granted. Neuman said religious leaders don't make good philosophers because they know what they know and they take things for granted. Additionally Spinoza comes in and says that if the Bible uses physical terms and the Rambam says it doesn't mean it – then the Rambam is wrong. However if you start thinking about things – in Bereishit people seem to see God in a way they don't think about it later on. In Bereishit we see Melachim in an every day – we don't see this later on in Tanach. The problem is that Spinoza throws Tanach out and the Rambam solves everything philosophically very simply. However if you think about it from a literary point of view then there is something to talk about. In Tarbit there was an article that points out how in Bereishit compares man to God and Deuteroisaiah says that God cannot be compared to anyone. In Moreh Necuchim assumes that all language about God is figurative except Tzelem Elokim, which means rationality. Additionally in Isaiah Perek 40 – everyone else gets tired, but God does not get tired. However Bereishit says God gets tired and has to rest. Whatever this means philosophically Weinfeld is making a literary point: Bereishit Perek 1 is not trying to eliminate anthropomorphic language. If the Chumash wanted to work from the Rambam's starting point it could have been doing a slightly better job. The point is literarily not philosophically.

To sum it up there is definitely a difference between the way Bereishit phrases things and the careful way Tanach phrases things later on. The idea is that if there are no literary images used with HKB"V then we run the risk of seeing God as Tapioca pudding.

This way there is some meaningful conception of Hashem and then Devarim and Yishayah comes to tell us not to make any mistakes.

#### Shiur # 4

We can be very safe based on philosophical grounds and textual grounds throughout the rest of Chumash. (לא ראייתם כל תמונה) However:

- 1) Tanach will not discuss this issue the same way the Rambam does
- 2) Literally there will be more anthropomorphism then the rest of Tanach

In Yishayah there is a different emphasis then what is emphasized in Yeshayah.

We spoke last time of a hypothesis that Bereishit is phrased the way it is as a step to get to a better Yedias Hashem (however – the Rambam could not tolerate this).

We have to realize as well that this is targeted at the Dor haMidbar and not people at the time of Bereishit.

It is significant to note that the description of God resting on Shabos is something you wouldn't expect and you have to wonder why it is there. It seems that we could have an idea of Shabat without a need for imetioe deo. One might even think the message would be stronger that humans rest and God does not stop creating.

It would also be significant to raise the question to what point do we use colorful and anthropomorphic images of God and Tanach in our writing and art. Milton holds if this is the way God is depicted in the bible – then that is how we are supposed to think of God with no holds barred. Milton takes Bereishit as a Matir to write what he does. This may have an effect on things we may want to write as well.

We all know about creation II and I and the Rav's insight about man.

There was an article which gave 2 Dinim in God.

Perek 1	Perek 2
Majestic Man	Lonely Man
Elokim Man is a super animal (but another animal) Man is given a job controlling the world Man is controlling Tzelem Elokim	Hashem Man is unique Man is serving God and serving the world Man is lonely

The Torah wants majestic man thrown in your face.

This adds to the Shabos issue as one more way man is aggrandizing himself.

We have to ask why Perek 1 comes before Perek 2.

In Perek 1 man comes at the end because you want God to be alone for a while. Without doing this then creation revolves around man too much.

We might also want to point out that Shem Hashem Elokim is a name in and of itself and it makes Perek 2 more complicated than a simple Shem Havayah.

---

I missed a lot of this Shiur because I was spacing out – therefore here are Zev Nagel's notes from the Shiur:

Even with we hold that God has not body, both on philosophical and within the Bible. Despite that it is not clear that in תנ"ך there would be debates about corporeality, and within the Bible there are going to be some passages that are more explicit than others and we need to pay attention and not bring them down to the same level. We noted in our discussions the Weinfeld thesis – a claim in deutero-Isaiah implies a polemic against Genesis, even among the Bible critics this is not a clear thesis though. There is some difference of what is being emphasized in Genesis and Isaiah. In Genesis there may be more anthropomorphism that we are trying to present the people with a pure conception of God. Maimonides himself would be completely intolerant of anthropomorphism. This is also assuming the Bible's audience is the generation of the Judean desert and about God's relationship with Israel after Sinai. It thus targets them and not the pre-Sinaitic characters of Abraham.

However, Sabbath in Genesis is presented in anthropomorphic terms (a better word would be in the framework of *imitatio deo*) and of course Sabbath could have been presented differently. Later on during the giving of תורה on Sinai, Sabbath observant is justified on account that God himself rested. If we wanted a cleaner philosophical notion we could have done so without the anthropomorphism.

I could argue that God is always creating, but human being is not God so he needs to rest. This way, without an anthropomorphic logic I could find a reason to be resting on Sabbath. It is interesting that the תורה does go out of its way within the covenant of imitating God. How we deal with anthropomorphism also affects the way we write ourselves. The Jew does not depict God physically in art.

Milton holds that if this is the way God is depicted in the Bible, then we are supposed to think about God in these terms. Milton is here in an eerie way, anticipating many of the things Kugel is thinking about.

The images themselves though are also graphic? And why is God masculine in תנ"ך? Beyond that the idea of religion being about ethics makes for a more masculine conception of God. Feminists have taken it in two directions; the anti הלכה feminists see the masculine God as always commanding, and the הלכה feminists agree that the constant command is apropos for a male metaphor and the female metaphor would not work. Certainly in חז"ל, when God is referred to as non masculine images like שכינה it shows

ל"ה moved away from that. How much of the imagery would be crossing the line and the kind of graphic poetry we would object to in Christian writers.

## 2 Adams

Bible critics contend that from the 2 chapters of creation, chapter 1 is ascribed to P and chapter 2 to J. The Rav's own approach in The Lonely Man of Faith was to hold that the two chapters were 2 different views on the creation of man, but it includes a lot of other views on life. Others have interpreted it in 2 views of God, not man. Chapter 1, according to the Rav, uses שם אֱלֹהִים because it is a more natural creation, but chapter 2 is more intimate and uses שם יְהוָה. Chapter 1 man is created together with the animals, a super-animal, given a job to control the world. Chapter 2 places man in the role of serving the world, to preserve the garden. Man is created with woman in chapter 1, in chapter 2 he is lonely created out of the biological world, unique, and commanded. Man is created in chapter one in the image of God, and it would make sense then that we have man portrayed as conquering the universe.

Literary issues: the sequence. Why chapter 1 before chapter 2? In chapter 2 the earth already brought forth the grass, but in affect chapter 1 has a whole creation without any reference to man. And what's the point of having grass without people. This fits with the argument that Genesis 1 man comes in the end because you want God to be alone for a while. You want to understand what it means for God to be alone in the world and that creation is not dependent upon human beings. Having chapter 2 first would come close to describing God creating an angel. There are aspects of the human condition, but it would ignore the impulses from which people start. Man cannot withdraw from the world without knowing what he would be conquering. Thus it would be difficult for chapter 2 to come before chapter 1 in a literary sense.

Man's naming of the animals should belong in chapter 1; language is a mode of dominance, and man's ability to label things shows his dominance over the animal kingdom, though this occurs in chapter 2.

There is one thing that the Rav seems to be misled by Bible critics. Critics say chapter 1 is P, chapter 2 is J. But chapter 2 does not use שם יְהוָה - it says instead שם אֱלֹהִים. Historically among the commentaries, the first to make a big deal of this was the חזקוני. And then a reform rabbi from Cincinnati, who became an apostate. But he asked if you are looking for names of God it is a separate name and not simply another example of God. It is a question on bible critics but even more on the Rav who uses their distinction.

---

Check out Sanhedrin 38.

Another way of understanding the names of Hashem here is Rashi who says that originally Hashem wanted to create the word with Midas haDin and then he had to introduce Midas haRachamim. That is why you go from the Shem Elokim to Shem Hashem Elokim. However this is tough for the Rav. From the Rav's perspective you



would rather be Adam II because he is more spiritual, however the Midas haDin is the ideal from the Rav's perspective.

If we look at the 3 spheres of Kirkegard: the ethical is about human doing what he is supposed to do. The breakdown of the ethical for Kierkegard is Chet. Every person will deviate from the model. Adam I cannot be an individual. If you talk about Adam I as a Mitzvah machine then you get another wife. The whole ideas of human uniqueness but people are not exactly the same. In Perek I you don't get this. We could start discussing what the world would be like without Adam II and it might even be more of what we imagine as ideal – such as a world of *אינו מצווה ועושה*.

There is a discussion in the Rambam in Moreh Nevuchim as to what is the difference between Hashem and Elokim. If you switch between Din and Rachamim you end with Rashi, if you switch between how close the person is with HKB"Y then you end up with the Rav. It could be that both of these ideas are significant but these are two separate ideas that like poetry they must be juxtaposed and not put together because as one piece of prose to give over the desired effect.

If we have pointed out from a literary point of view that Hashem Elokim is a whole stretch of Chumash it is Perek 2 and 3. And Perek 3 is about Chet, if we are looking at these Perakim not just of the creation of man, but the creation overall – 2 leads into 3. Therefore we can see how ideally you only want Perek 1 because there is no Chet and Bidieved we have Perek 2 and 3 in order that we have Chet and how to deal with this.

The next thing to get to is the Gemarah in Sanhedrin:

To put it bluntly the Gemarah completely ignores Perek 1. There is no creation of animals.

We might also want to ask before the Rav and R' Breur – how did people deal with these questions. The gemarah does this and it has to deal with the whole day without animals. The whole idea of a mandate of *Pru uRivu* is missing as well. The Gemarah really separated the 2 and looked at one in isolation of the 2.

The sources in Chazal do this naturally without reading lonely man of faith.

For us we need to look for a larger framework.

Shiur # 7

There is a general question of how you take a narrative.

The Lubavitch Rebba felt that we must take Maaseh Bereishit literally as well – or else what does Shabos mean. The Rambam felt that Maaseh Bereishit must be taken literally as well however the words must be defined in the right way. For example work in the poetic sense is different from work in the physics sense. Do we say that the use of

the word in physics as allegorical or is thinking work in the allegorical sense of the word? The Rambam sees Pshat in Bereishit Perek 1 as science – just we have to use the right definitions like we use it in a physics course. The Abarbanel says this is a Pshat and the Pshat is science. If you come to the Ramban he will say the Pshat is Kabbalah.

If you don't view it the way the Rambam did you will have to ask what does it refer to? If you believe it is in the creation sense – we have to go into other creation stories and how it relates to them. In Bereishit Perek 1 there is a desire to contradict other theological creations. We are silently refuting the views of the pagans who gave the Taninim certain roles. How the Ribono Shel Olam talks about creation is ultimately more important than the science. R' Hertz pointed out that the Maaseh Bereishit is written as a piece of theology and not science. It could be that had the Rambam seen the parallels to paganism then he would have agreed to this approach.

The Midrash had a problem and didn't understand why God needs 6 days – this is theological not scientific.

What the ecologists will say that the view of nature is one to rape nature (in the first Perek). Then when you read the 2<sup>nd</sup> Perek of Bereishit even Al Gore has no problem with it.

When we see Tanach we have to ask what it is really about. If we pick at one theme – we wouldn't have written the way it is.

“The Jewish Mishugas is Halacha and the Christian Mishugas is theology” – the Rav will say this makes religion more practical and he and R' Hirsch will rub this in the face of the Christians. The Rav felt theology was looking at God as an object and was therefore unhappy with it.

The Maharal's treatment of the 12 hours – is that man fills up the whole range of being that he fills up all of Friday. If man were only part of the day then man would not be an integral creature. Absence of being that relates to the night. The Maharal's Shitah in general is that standing on your feet is very important. The Maharal sees man's creation as an elevation in the hierarchy of humans among living organisms. This is strikingly similar to modern evolutionary science. The ability to stand erect really changes a human being. Really what makes a human being human is the ability to stand erect. Wife and family is a higher level. A higher level is to be commanded. Then it gets dark and there is the new aspect of human existence of sin and yet another level of human existence of sin and punishment. This puts sin as part of anthropology.

What the Maharal is doing here he is repeating the Gemarah in his own terminology – however he completely illuminates the aim of the Gemarah. He says over the Gemarah in a way that it is essentially easier to see it. However we still don't know why the Gemarah changed the order.

Shiur # 8

We are left with the question of why the orders of the Pesukim have been switched around in the Gemarah.

Chumash's order	Gemarah's order
Command	Names
Names	Chava
He didn't find a mate	Command

It is probably because the Gemarah is interested in the development of man – if we are working up the order then the command must come after the lower level institutions are in place.

However why is the order as is in Chumash?

It could be that family life is necessary to be put in a spiritual background. We can see Mitzvot are necessary to have before marriage. We can say the whole issue of the names is Tafel – it could be that when it comes to his own loneliness his naming is an emphasis. The names are subsidiary to the naming of Chava. We might want to think about why Chava has 2 names. However we might want to think whether the names might be necessary for the marriage. Adam succeeds in naming her as he names the animals. In Tanach the real issue is to get to Chava.

We might want to comment as well that the story is changed by making these changes regarding the Chet and at what point Chavah shows up on the scene.

Shiur # 9

There is a bible critic, named Hoffman, who claims that Bereishit Perek 1 was written after the rest of Tanach. He points to discrepancies between the way Maaseh Bereishit is described here – and other places in Tanach. He points out that there is no other place in Tanach where there is an idea of an order of Tanach. For example in Iyov – where God speaks about creation, the discussion is not first I created light and then the animals... rather the description is special other then sequential. One could argue that those Perakim do have a sequential order – we do start with heaven and earth and end up with animals – overall the order corresponds with Perek 1. In Mishlei the earth is standing and God is an architect rather then a sequential creator. We would simply say that each Sefer in Tanach is different and therefore different points are made in different points. In Bereishit Rabah the picture is high and low not first and second. In wisdom literature the image is basically coming from physics and in Bereishit the story is coming from natural history. It is very appropriate that in Mishlei you follow a static creation and in the Torah he follows a historical creation. In Tehilim Barchi Nafshi basically follows the story in Torah. We have learned from this Kefirah that there are 2 models for creation. The second beneficial thing he is doing is that in Tanach we don't have a 6-day pattern. In Barchi Nafshi you don't have day 1 and day 2 – but you have the same order. He will say that it was written to explain Yitro and Shabos. This will emphasize the

Rashbam that Shabos places a crucial role in the first Perek.<sup>1</sup> The fact that this leads up to Shabos is very significant – especially with the anthropomorphism that Bleinfeld points out. This is interesting that the Rav sees Shabos as a day for Adam 2 – surrender.

There is also an article by Michael Fischbane that claimed strong parallels between Bereishit 1 and Iyov as well as some Pesukim in Yirmiyahu. If Fischbane is write then there is more evidence against Hoffman as well.

Our next short story is from Agnon from his collection אלו ואלו. It is called בינער ובעיר. There is a page where one of the characters tells the other character the story of Kayin and Hevel.

A couple additional comments on Perek 1 and 2 – there is a question of how feminists and other type of ideologists read this Perek. There is a book מבראשית. It is a bunch of articles by woman on Bereishit. It is mostly Conservadox groupings – some real Chilonim as well. Some of the book is more literary. Some of the readings was I am Hagar, etc. What you get from some of the chapters is one version of the anti-Bible approach, which is pro-Perek 1 and anti-Perek 2. They are complaining that in Perek 1 man and woman are equivalent, however Perek 2 woman is made out of the rib and the Mitzvot are given and feminists don't like Mitzvot. One of the women there basically repeats this kind of ideology. However she says if you read the lonely man of faith you take the obnoxiousness out of the Perek. Clearly we don't hold like real egalitarianism – are we going to reject that as any kind of value. There are notions of some kind of fairness. Part of the difficulty with rigid egalitarians is they don't hold as rigid a position as they would like to hold. They hold that Rebetzin and Blau and Bleich are not really women. At the Orthodox forum, some guy was quoting how we need complete equality and without it isn't fair – this then goes down and breaks down the whole family structure. In Perek 2 and 3 to what extent are they characters that happen to be male and female and to what degree do we have to separate and make sexual identification. The Rav's idea of community could work with 2 people of the same sex (in family redeemed you cannot do this with his conception of family). There is another side of this though – one of this is an American vs. Israeli divide. On the American side people have been so habituated to the Rav's way of thinking we do not have the problems the Israelis think about. Many people of this ideology would dislike Perek 1 more than Perek 2 because they don't like domination either. That idea of dominating nature is in Perek 1 – we have the ecologists attacking Perek 1 and the feminists attacking Perek 2. All the modern writers – they use Perek 1 to justify a hard-handed approach to the natural world. The Rav says we gain in dignity when we can go from one point on Earth to another in a few hours not days. For Western people the idea of Kivshuha was there. If God created the world then nature is not enchanted. One wonders if one can have the serious point of ecology without the Avodah Zarah.

Were finished with that we can go through R' Kook.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Christians call this (taking ideas from heretics) spoiling the Egyptians. However it has also been called taken the gates of the Beit Hamikdash as tribute to the king of Syria.

R' Kook was asked about the new Bible studies against the Torah. It is wrong. However we are not obligated to go to war against these views because the Ikar of Torah is not to tell us what happens. However this is good because it makes us understand real things. He says there is no N'M if the creation had been literally the way it was written in Bereishit. R' Kook is challenging the kind of approach a figurative approach Gan Eden would have to received as well. Even if the order was the opposite – that we started with people as they are (no pre-sin) then we can live with that also. Of course this way then we have a lot less to explain. R' Kook is undertaking a more difficult job then one would say there was some perfection and some sin. He says we only have to know – is that if a person becomes perfected then he can still sin and lose everything. This lesson almost instills a sense of Teshuvah and original sin then the original way. R' Kook says that even if everything is wonderful there is always that issue that if you screw up there all these terrible ramifications later on. Walk back a step how do you define original sin? It could be that it was numerically the first sin or that man has a tendency towards sin. R' Lichtenstien says that any sensible person believes in original sin that you can pretty much trust people to do the wrong thing. Gary Anderson said that there are 2 stories of original sin in the Torah – here and Chet haEgel. By chet haegel everything is fine until Nadav and Avihu. The idea is no matter how good things are people will mess it up. So the idea will be that nothing remains in perfection for long. There maybe 2 different model one wants to work with. The notion that not so much you can trust people to do the wrong thing but the tendency of sin is deeply rooted in the person. The notion no matter how deeply you cut – you always have this issue. That is one kind of model. Because in learning Perek 3 we want to know how sin comes about. Whatever your model of sin is – sin has tremendous repercussions. Because of Adam's sin we all have to die - or because of Adam's sin we are all guilty. Kant made a crack about the tapeworm theory of original sin - assuming tape worms need humans to exist - because Adam had sin then we got a tape worm. At a certain level R' Kook is saying the things someone does have these tremendous repercussions. We are already getting into major issues.

#### Shiur # 11

Agnon was born in 1888 makes Aliyah in 1908-9. A yeshiva Bachur leaves Yeshiva and goes into the forest at the same time as the murderer. He meets a serf and meets the murderer. The serf repeats the story of Kayin and Hevel. The serf gets parts wrong.

“The secret sharer” is about a sailor. A man goes from one ship to another ship and the captain hides him.

#### Back to Bereishis

We noted the vagueness of where the 2 trees are. In Perek 2 they are both some where in the middle of the garden. In Perek 3 Chavah calls the עץ הדעת the tree God has forbidden and God is worried if they find the Eitz Chaim.

---

<sup>2</sup> The most interesting letters R' Kook wrote were to Moshe Zeidel.

The Chizkuni has a Pshat that they are part of one organism (Eitz Chaim in the tree of knowledge). This is very Rappaccini like – the life and death in one organism – in one gift (gift in German means poison).

The Rambam in Perek 1 of Moreh Nevuchim finds Shem Elokim in trans-reasoning. A guy asked the Rambam a question don't Adam and Chavah gain from the Chet - The Rambam rips him apart. He says that this is a judgment of pleasant and unpleasant as opposed to being true or false – you are now swayed by the issue of pleasant and unpleasant.

We have to wonder how one can be prohibited from an Eitz haDaas Tov veRah – what did they think about it – what did they think it would be?

There is a gap between the Rambam and everyone who sees it as an inner experience.

The Orach Chaim held that Chavah tricked Adam and he is completely innocent from the whole thing. Then the question is why is God angry with him.

The Ramban by the Mabul uses the Mabul as a proof for creation. Creation had no human witnesses.

There is the general question of the nakedness business.

We also will want to worry if there is a sexual element in this story and ask the question according to each Peirush.

There is a notion in Chazal that the Nachash is driven by a sexual desire.

Shiur # 12

We are left with a problem why Rashi puts the personality into the snake.

They do receive clothing at the end – one could speculate that there might be a need for clothing even if they are not embarrassed for each other.

You might say that the Ribono Shel Olam should have given them clothing earlier. Other than the theological problem that this interpretation assumes God dropped the ball – it takes some amount of psychology on the Nachash wondering what it will take to turn him on. You could say that there is a Chet of Adam and Chavah that they jumped the gun and had sex before they had clothing letting the Nachash in.

Another question to ask is whether they knew the Nachash was clever.

However there is another possibility – part of the shame comes from some else being there. The issue is what an observer would say about you – being the object of the

gaze of another person. If there are no other people then there is no shame. If Adam and Chavah are one person then there is no shame. Once they become 2 separate people then there is shame. After the Chet he is looking at her in terms of her relationship to the rest of the world. You might say the very nature of sin alienates. From the pesukim the discovery of shame is something they do together – it maybe the element of shame enters through the joint awareness of where they are.

There is a difference from saying I am a sinner and I am naked – it could be that when he confronts God he realizes he is diminished in front of God. It could be that Adam is trying to communicate that he is feeling embarrassed. And then God says the issue is disobedience.

R' Carmy is trying to say that the shame comes from their relationship – they now have this gap and are therefore no longer willing to be seen naked by the other. That notion is very much tied to the child.

Another question is there a real difference between the punishment of Adam and Chavah – or is it just that this is the same punishment from the male and female perspective?

Until now we have been looking at this from the perspective of the Rambam that it is preferring the aesthetic over the ethical.

There are 2 other approaches to rise.

One is what Kierkegaard state. There is an idea of objective angst – that once there is Sin the world changes – certain institutions are no longer innocent. An example of this maybe politics – it could be had people not sinned then it would be an innocent kind of activity – but now it is an ugly one. The other one is the question of sexuality – there is no reason that for a pure person sex should be repulsive – however now with our society it becomes ugly. This is what he calls the objective aspect. The subjective aspect is more interesting – that objective dread is tied to anxiety, which is attached to freedom. The fact that freedom is open that is connected to society. If your self-interest is to do x – you do x, if not, not. If you have freedom – then the very fact you have that freedom generates a certain type of anxiety. Sartre<sup>3</sup> says that dizziness – if you have the possibility to jump on to the subway tracks – that freedom gives you anxiety and that is why people feel freedom – that gives you dizziness, the fact that you can do things that have absolutely no rational basis. If you are free you are capable of doing the wrong thing. One possible interpretation of original sin is that no matter how you cut into the human being there is no way to get rid of the possibility for sin. (There is a Gemarah and Sanhedrin where the body and the soul are blaming the other one for sin and Hashem says that they are both equally good). That outlook doesn't work.

Shiur # 13

---

<sup>3</sup> A French philosopher

The Rambam says that sin is a matter of the unintelligent choice – choosing the appealing over the true. Then the problem becomes inevitable – because humans are bodily and material beings. The Rav called this the aesthetic over the ethical. Although we could say it is inevitable in retrospect – but not in prospect.

Kierkegaard said the issue is about free will. That can be connected with anxiety. Fear is the future – it is a biological reaction (animals experience fear and it is fight or flight). Anxiety is fear of your self. According to Kierkegaard this is a story about anxiety and freedom - and once anxiety comes in – then it is inevitable that someone will break. Once you have already sinned then nothing (such as sex) is innocent. There is a specific fascination with something that can lead to something wrong. Once you have sinned then not eating Chazer is no longer innocent – eating becomes an area where the forbidden food exercises its own attraction after crossing that line. However sex has more of an attraction than anything else. Once sin occurs already then the sexual realm becomes a loaded issue.

It could be that the same person, Augustine, influences both Kierkegaard and the Ramban. It comes out a sexual act is a particular humiliating act – because we don't control it. However what Augustine means is not that you become aroused when you don't want to – but some people want to be aroused and fail. Augustine gives an interesting analogy – there are people who are able to break wind at will, he says before the Chet that is how sex was. That idea of sexuality being free – is very likely that the Ramban was exposed to that. The idea being that there are certain things we still have control of after the Chet.

Auden has a book about Limestone where he describes these human forms in limestone. He says that in Olam Habah people will not experience shame – and the shape will not matter. The question is we are basic nudists – why do we bother wearing clothing? Over all there are 2 types of Frum people – there are Frum people who like it that people should wear a lot of clothing and there are people who don't care that people wear a lot of clothing. Many religious Zionists take this attitude why do we have to wear all that clothing. According to Augustine we have an answer that there is a part of a body we do not have control of. Auden once said the difference between women and men is that women can fake it – but men can't. Of course we can ask about Chavah as well.

In T.S. Elliot's poem "Love Song of Alfred Prufrock" there is the line, "Do I dare to eat a peach" this shows that the act of eating can be anxious as well.

One further step is the Ibn Ezra who says that for Ibn Ezra that Daat Tov vRah means sex – the tree of sexual knowledge.

According to the Ramban before the Chet people would be free without the anxiety. The other way of reading the Ramban is that you are describing human nature and sin is inevitable. Freedom is connected with sin – if you have that kind of freedom inevitably there is sin and at the other end you give up free will. The Ramban in Ki Tavo says there will no longer be Yetzer Hara in the end of days. In R' Carmy's way you will



have freedom – but you will not abuse your freedom – the more extreme way is that you will give up freedom. The idea of free will as such a great value might not be true.

For Ibn Ezra – Daat Tov viRa really does mean sex. It simply means that you are no longer in the Parsha of these sorts of things – it is a euphemism for that sort of desire. The question is what kind of general psychology comes out of this. The Rambam, Ramban and Kierkegaard use this to explain human psychology. If you want to understand the human being this is where you go. For the Rambam you say lets go back – the choice between the pleasant and true. To say it is all about sex – then from a Freudian point of view it is about sex as well. If you don't want the imagery – there is the nakedness. From that point of view you are making the story of the Chet a story about sex – from that level you really are blaming the body of what is really the work of the whole person and R' Carmy does not like it. We don't like to blame the body in Judaism. Dualists blame the body for everything – however the body not the mind demands one to drink too many martinis – the Rayah is that tigers do not drink too many martinis. Lashon Harah is the strongest proof against this.

The Nachash again – what does the Nachash actually do? According to the Rambam and the Ramban – the Nachash is a projection of what people thought. What does the Nachash do from an existential point of view and how important is it?

We made the assumption that this Parsha is about why people sin? The question of the origin of sin as the key to human psychology - is that what this Parsha is about? There are a few alternatives.

Shiur # 14  
10/23/2003

We were talking about sex (Ibn Ezra) and how this works really well from a Freudian point of view.

We have 2 questions if the snake is only the Yetzer Hara – then why is the snake getting punished? If it is a real snake, why is the snake responsible for its actions? Sadya Gaon says that this is somewhat allegorical. The Ibn Ezra quotes an opinion that the snake is clever. We get out of the Ibn Ezra that there is a literal snake. He may want this literal snake because the tree has certain properties and the snake has real properties.

We will have to ask what is being communicated and is the Nachash honest?

In Bryant's poem "Cain" Cain is talking to the devil and he says you promised enlightenment – we didn't get it – it is all a lie.

They will get something God has and they don't have them. If that is what the Nachash is offering it makes some sense. We can now solve the problem in the Ibn Ezra – if the Eitz HaDaat is about sex, then what does the Nachash mean you will be like God? As the Ibn Ezra looks at things you can't be like the Ribono Shel Olam and have sex.

They make think they are like angels. It could be that he thinks he is like God – but he isn't. This would then explain the Ibn Ezra to a general discussion of sin.

It is interesting that the Nachash does not tell them to be jealous of God rather that God is jealous of them.

We might say that the snake is really offering a religious experience.

One thing we have developed is the question of jealousy as something that is going on. We are also talking about the ambiguity, which is very useful for the Ibn Ezra.

We spoke about the personification of the Nachash. Why isn't it more like Milton and why according to Rashi is the sexual side of the Nachash not in the text.

The Abarbanel ends up being very much like the Ibn Ezra, he introduces a sexual theme as well. He turns the whole speech of the Nachash as a fantasy on the part of Chavah.

The Nefesh haChaim has an opinion on the matter as well. For the Nefesh haChaim free will is very important. He says that the Yetzer Hara had to be outside the person to convince him to do an Aveirah. He says today we do the wrong thing because we want to do it. Many times we say "the devil made me to do it." People do have the sense that there is some other force. At the same time there is some sense of differentiation. You are saying whoever did that is me – but it is not the personality I want to be.

Shiur # 15

Do they want to become closer to God?

Is this Parsha really about Chet?

To quote Milton this is "Man's first disobedience." Reasons to think in those terms, Milton thought that way and the discussions of the Rishonim tilt in that direction. Kierkegaard focuses on the Chet and that is why he learns the Parsha. We care that this is about Chet.

Another theme that is possible is how death came about. According to Freud everyone has this feeling of expulsion from Eden. The most noteworthy issue is death and we have to ask how death relates to this whole issue. If you are looking for life death comes out. It is also implied that they would have lived forever had they not eaten from it – not necessarily. What does it mean that on the day they will eat from it you will die?

Working from the Pesukim what are the possibilities of the human being before the Chet?

- 1) The human being is immortal

This is problematic – why do we need the Eitz haChaim? An antihistamine when no one is sick.

- a. You could say that man was mortal before the sin but the Eitz haChaim will prevent this. However this is already much different than the first approach. This is a different philosophical position.
- b. One could also say that the Eitz haChaim had another purpose not for humans – but that is very counterintuitive.
- c. One might say that the only way there can be anything bad in the world is because of sin. This is a theodacy position – everything was good and then there was sin.

[Maybe the whole purpose of the Parsha is to explain why there is work. (There was death or we don't care). But that doesn't seem to be the theme of the Parsha.]

- 2) The Ramchal says that it would be embarrassing for us if God gave us everything – נהמא דיכיסופא. This could be a reason why you would have to eat from the Eitz haChaim to become immortal.
  - a. It could be that Adam is like the dean who never gave himself tenure.
  - b. Also God never told Adam about the Eitz haChaim. It could be that God would have introduced him to the Eitz haChaim had he passed the first.
- 3) There is a 3<sup>rd</sup> option that might be implied by the Ibn Ezra. People are mortal – but the Eitz haChaim extends life, everlasting and not eternal life. This eliminates a lot of problems.

The Netziv says that Chaim in Tanach means life and it can also mean being healthy – having a good life.

Another issue we should touch upon is man really immortal – it sounds like this is what almost everyone holds. However there are lines in Chazal that imply death is good and existed before eating from the tree.

Additionally does Adam haRishon know about death at all? Pashtus is they have some idea of what death is about – but where would they experience it. There is a Midrash that when Hevel was killed – Adam and Chavah didn't know what to do with him and the Ribono Shel Olam had to illustrate with a bunch of ravens burying a dead raven. On the other hand how can someone who is fully human have no understanding of what death is about?

That prepares us for the Radvaz. The Radvaz was asked how did Adam sin? The Radvaz says that anyone who lives in a material world realizes that things fade away. The real issue for the Radvaz is dying in your time and not in your time.

Shiur # 16

Most people take it for granted that you are immortal until you sin on theodacy grounds. There might be another way of looking at it – if the human soul is indestructible, in order for people to die something must have happened. If you really

hold the soul is immortal you don't die you just move on. This would be another to take the common position you wouldn't really die originally.

The other position is that from a common sense point of view is that we mortality makes sense and we only believe in immortality because God promised it to us. This is the Frummer approach historically. So much so that many 20<sup>th</sup> century Christians have an aversion to believe in immortality. If you take this approach you may reject resurrection of the body, which is a problem for religious people but not new age people. There was a book that was titled immortality of the soul of resurrection. This is because we don't want to kick God out, Biblical religion is more into resurrection of the body and Frum people (in all religions) in contrast to new age religion is very into the body. They care about wafers for Christians and Kashrus by Jews.

For the Radvaz the idea that people are basically mortal – is a real issue that comes in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Even if the Radvaz holds people by nature know that they die people get rid of their body like an old suit. However the Radvaz uses the analogy of a stone – stone's disappear it isn't a stone anymore. We might want to ask how important are these things.

The Radvaz says that there was an Eitz haChaim that he could have achieved immortality with – but he didn't know where it was. According to the Radvaz Elokim is you will be like God who is eternal. The Radvaz is somehow intertwining the 2 trees. One could say the Parsha is really about immortality but the Nachash tempted them with something else. Adam saw Chavah on a higher spiritual level after eating from the Eitz haDaas and he sees Chavah – realizes he would rather be on a higher spiritual level. He says there would be one moment of sin and then he would return to Hashem (do Teshuvah) and then everything would be wonderful and he will be able to find the Eitz haChaim and live-forever. The bottom line of the Radvaz is Adam thought he would come out on top. According to the Radvaz that when the time came the Eitz haChaim might become available. He was anxious and he got it quicker then he should have.

We have to bring this back to the Eitz haDaas.

The Radvaz is making a lot of assumptions – if we like this we have to make it work with less cleverness, more lumudus and make it work.

Shiur # 17

We basically concluded that even with the Radvaz the central theme of this story is Chet. However we can use the Radvaz to show how the central idea is Chet but immortality is very significant.

We can now address the Giglamesh epic.

A general question is about which ancient near east source to use. Why should biblical text to one over another, why should that comparison be significant? This is the

Bibel Babel problem. If you look at medieval documents we can trace this much easier. If you assume people are familiar with other legal codes then we might want to compare them. What evidence is there that everyone in the Midbar knew the Hamurabi code? The Ancient Near East is geographically very big. From a historical point of view we know much to be sloppy about this.

However, the Gilgamesh Epic is different because it was so widespread in the Ancient Near East – everyone was aware of this. The Gilgamesh Epic is a story about Gilgamesh who is looking for eternal life. Among other things he meets this guy Upnapishitn – the guy who was saved from the flood. There is a long digression of the flood story. Right after that story they get a plant that gives you life. It is clear in this story there is some plant that gives life. And man dies because of the serpent. This is close enough at a literary level to create some sort of echo. It is clear that death is an important issue.

Because death is an important issue here doesn't mean it is necessary important in Bereishit. James Barr held differently. Barr almost always uses common sense in his contributions. One thing he generally uses are attacks on people to use their own theology as a way to understand Pshat.

Lipking claims that to be a great poet you have to produce an epic. It is definitely true biographically many poets feel that the Ikar is to produce that really great work. Whatever you are going to say about this theory in general – agreed with this. If you produce a great poem – everything must get into it. James Joyce had the largest view like this in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This would mean whatever else Milton is trying to do – he is trying to get you to cram his mind into this great poem. So Adam gets astronomy and physics lessons. And finally he is interested in the grandeur of man because if man is not great then the poem isn't that important.

There is this fellow in the command that talks about 2 voices in paradise lost. There is more of an evolution in paradise lost – early on in the poem grandeur is defined in aesthetic terms. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the poem there is a much more focus on the moral side.

We can have a whole course in literature of people dieing. One people who die and it is biological and there is a bit of a cringe. And a different dieing where people had a sense of death (and human beings) as being important.

For anyone who takes Tanach seriously we have to think of death that you are dieing for something you have to see the human as being important. We have to see Avraham as knowing the significance of what he is doing.

If you listen to R' Lichtenstien talk about various characters in Bereishit – to dramatize what it is like to walk through the situation on one hand you are a human being in another way you are walking through life. Bringing this out and dramatizing it is a

very important issue. And with Milton as well it is important to notice the grand scale of what is going on.

The last thing to think about the way that is working with what is happening here. Take the Radvaz and put it together with James Barr. What would happen if Adam haRishon thought what was important was immortality. From his point of view the important thing is are you fulfilling yourself. However the Hashem holds that Adam is not Gilgamesh. Finally the important thing is the Chet but that is not what Adam is thinking about.

Shiur # 18

- We can ask furthermore what is the relationship between Adam and Chavah?
- 1) We treat them as one unit, this is what the Radvaz does by ignoring her
  - 2) We see Adam as the prototypical man and Chavah as the prototypical woman
  - 3) There are 2 separate individual characters here, one happens to be a male and one happens to be a female, and we have to ask if there are differences are because he is the man and she is the woman or that they are just different people.

Milton clearly sees man as the Ikar – “he for God only – she for God through him.” The Malach teaches Adam and Adam teaches her. This is the way Milton sees the husband wife relationship. They both don’t go to philosophy class together. Is there something adherent in the notion that Adam hears it from God and Chavah hears it from God. You might want to ask what would happen if God tells her before Adam – would the story be flipped around?<sup>4</sup> Are we talking about male nature and female nature or where the spin comes around? The Nisayon to her might have been how binding does she see a Tzivui coming from her husband.<sup>5</sup>

Where did she get the Mitzvah? Do we assume the Mitzvah comes from Adam and he gives it over to her and she is Chayiv because of this or is she Chayiv because Adam was commanded? Another issue is where does the problem of touching the tree come from? And then is this a male/female question or just a question of 2 different people?

What do Chazal have to say about this?

We raised the question of why the Satan went to her (He could have gone to Adam, Chavah or both of them together). Bereishis Rabah asks where was Adam? Presumably she is easier to tempt – but where was he. R’ Abah Bar Kuriah says that he was sleepy after sex. This is odd that usually woman complain about this. Taking that for granted. A book that was written about psychology – male dreams achieve a climax, but women don’t have the climax in dreams. This is somewhat parallel to modes of sexual behavior and life as well. Men desire to reach the climax in life (win the world

---

<sup>4</sup> This is similar to how Kierkegaard wrote 7 different ways the Akedah could have taken place.

<sup>5</sup> Someone was listening to tapes directed towards woman and this is what happens when you ignore Daas Torah.

series). Women think of accomplishment in more repetitive turns. The Rabanan say that Hashem was showing him around (this is what the angel does in Milton). R' Chiyah says not to make a Geder more important than the Ikar – she is being blamed for the Hosafah (she said don't touch it). The Nachash pushes her upon the tree the same way you didn't die when you touched it you won't die when you eat it. And she eats it.

The Gemarah in Sanhedrin quotes R' Shmuel who says that the Dayanim normally look for extenuating Taanos for acquittal. And we use this as a Mekor that temptation is not a Taanah. They then learn from this Pasuk if you add you subtract. It is ambiguous to whom this is referring to – but it is possible that it is Adam. Rashi writes here that Hashem did not warn them on Negiah and because of the addition they fell. Rashi knew about Bereishit Rabah – but he doesn't blame her. Rashi goes out of his way not to read anything into the Gemarah.

Lets take a look at what Rashi says in Chumash. Rashi in Chumash is much more loyal to the Midrash. Rashi in the Gemarah says הוזהירם. We might want to ask if she made the Chumrah – how could the Nachas fool her?

If we take Avot dRabi Natan and we have no evidence Rashi had it.<sup>6</sup>

On the nature of Syag – Avot dRabi Natan says the person who made the change was Adam haRishon. It seems to be a good thing (the Mishnah says to make a Syag). John Ellster has a discussion where he goes from book to book – that there is a strange fact that we have dueling proverbs. He discusses why this is useful. We have here to counter proverbs עשו סייג לתורה and כל המוסיף גורע. There is something else going on – he knows no chance with Adam – he tries for Chavah. Interesting the story is different here – he gets himself involved he touches the tree himself and then she touches it.

If you have something like that there is a very natural idea that you want to run away from something that is dangerous. It is interesting – it could be the whole reason that he entices Chavah from this perspective is because he knows he cannot fool Adam – because Adam knows he is not Metzuvah and therefore he goes after Chavah. This underscores the point that there is a difference between Bereishis Rabah and Avot dRabi Natan – if he tempts her by pushing her or he tempts her by touching it himself. The real contrast if he makes her due it or if he does it himself. According to Bereishit Rabah part of what he convinces her is the action rather than the motivation. He says don't think in terms of Tzivui think in terms of results. Practically every steps counts even if he doesn't have significance.

It could be that Avot dRabi Natan is more of a gradual process than Bereishit Rabah. Additionally Bereishit Rabah is more of an emphasis on the communal level of the sin. (Everyone has this with Adam). In Avot dRabi Natan the Nachash is a much cooler guy. In Bereishit Rabah he is more or less that way – the racetrack driver. In Avot dRabi Natan this is like the drug pusher who gives him a little marijuana to begin

---

<sup>6</sup> There is a recent book about Avot dRabi Natan

with – look how cool I am – want to be like me. This might tie into how does this work with Avot dRabi Natan is in a crowd and is there a social dimension of sin.

There is a story in Saint Augustine's confessions where he and his friends were going through an orchard and stole some pears the importance was not the pears but the fact that they were stolen. This is only possible if there is a social element. We are adding that externalization is also socialization. The Abarbanel says that Nachash didn't talk to her – she imagined the Nachash talking to her. This isn't the Nefesh haChaim but it expands the Nefesh haChaim.

Shiur # 19

We will join *Paradise Lost* in book IV. The Satan has made it into Gan Eden and is going to tempt Eve – there is a description of the Garden of Eden. The sentences are long, although they all work out in the end. We have the tree of life near the tree of death. There is knowledge of good that can only be attained through the knowing of ill. For Milton knowledge is a very important issue. The question is there any justification for any limitation on knowledge. Milton wrote a pamphlet explaining how one should not censor a book before it has been published. Virtue is not achieved by sheltering oneself. Liberals like that passage very much.

Milton explains the differences between man and woman – Satan sees the Tzelem Elokim, even though they are equal they are not quite equal. She is good for soft things and he has the intellectual qualities. What Milton does here is to try to introduce sexuality without making it shameful as it is after the sin. They have to work but only enough to work up an appetite. The Satan watches all of this – his reaction is 'oh Hell' – he admires them.

Later in book 4 Adam speaks to Eve. The subject here is the power that made us – raised us from the dust. He requires us no other charge other than to taste the tree of knowledge planted by the tree of life. He makes another point how death and life are very close to each other. The question Milton is trying to answer – how they can deal with death – which they don't really know about. The Radvaz assumed everyone knows about death – the Radvaz maybe right in Pshat in Pesukim. Milton is working in a more traditional mode – that there is no death without the Chet. He heard the word death – he knows it is not good but he does not know anything beyond it.

There is one issue, particularly with people who are not religious read Milton – is Milton successful in conveying authority. One anti-Milton position is that you have a man against the king, how can he tolerate God – if the issue is freedom – whose side is Milton really on? What is the balance between human freedom and divine authority? Most people think that if God is God and man is man then one prohibition isn't too bad. The Satan is clearly bothered by these issues. At some points it seems that subservience to God is the problem, however at other times the problem seems to be Jesus – that he is not God's right hand man. In Othello one can ask if Iago is jealous of Othello or Casio. The idea that the Satan is free like man and breaks away on his own is there already. In



terms of theodacy this makes it a little easier – in the words of C.S. Lewis – if there is a lot of evil in the world – we can blame a lot on man and we can blame the rest out of rebel angels. This can also kick some mysteries upstairs as well. However Milton treats Satan the way you would treat a human being, he gives Satan a psychology.

Milton gives a psychology to the Satan. Even if Milton is sincerely religious there are issues here. It is clear with Milton that... Most people have a problem with theodacy and if they don't it is because they kicked the Ribono Shel Olam upstairs.

Eve makes a comment about her creation. Eve has a recollection of coming to consciousness. She first sees herself in a reflection in a lake. It is a powerful scene. It is very important to realize that something other than you exists. We don't know about God and we don't know other human beings exist. There is a voice that warns her that there is someone else and that through him she will achieve motherhood. She doesn't want to look at Adam at first and then she does. We only see Eve's version of things – but not Adam's. He has it worked out already – he tells her you are supposed to be with me. Clearly Milton does not want to present marriage as a GZH"K. Milton has this notion that man and woman should belong to each other. We can have more non-material situations – but that is not Gan Eden. She is being told not to be narcissistic. A self-centered person can be married by being a larger selfish unit of 2. There is this tension between her looking in the mirror and this voice saying that the real issue maybe action other than image. What distinguishes your kids is they act more independently. There are very sick people who want other people to look like them.

There are things here that annoy feminists.

Then the angels – who are policing Gan Eden to protect Eve, discover Satan. He makes some comments that earlier I was much higher than you. The angel replies that you don't look like you did before.

In book 5 she tells Adam haRishon about her bad dream. There is the whole narrative about the revolt in heaven. Book 6 is the Star Wars book with the description of the war in heaven.

At the opening of book 7 it is more about Milton than the narrow Tanach issues. There are 4 points where the poet addresses the reader. The most famous is where he describes what he is going to do. He invokes the heavenly muse to sing the heavenly song. He is pretty full of himself – he is doing things no one has ever done before. Then he gets into what he will do.

At the beginning of book 3 he has the next apostrophe and he addresses blindness. So much the rather celestial light shine inward. Leaving aside the discussion of blindness has more power – he says I am blind and I will see things invisible to seeing people.

At the beginning of book 7 he has the 3<sup>rd</sup> of these speeches. He is invoking the meaning and not the name. I am using these words because poets talk this way – but not

about the meaning. There is a movement from the poetic attitude from invoking muses to invoking the Ribono Shel Olam. In the previous six books he has described a lot. He is scared if he stays up there he will fall down. He says let me get on the ground. He says half yet remains unsung. He says that he is safer – he is on the ground. He is not alone because poetic inspiration comes. Say Goddess what... technically he is telling the truth however it could be argued that there is not just an evolution of Adam and Eve there is an evolution of the poet. The poet is a fictional character like any other character in the poem. One of the themes is Torah uChachmah. There is an underlying theme of what is the role of a poet who is Christian, into religious matters.

Shiur # 20  
11/18/2003

We discussed the idea of the 2 bars – Milton and the fictional poet. In book 8 – the author continues to make these various speeches. The issues that

It is interesting how Eve described her first consciousness and now it is Adam's turn. He immediately infers that somebody made him and he wants to know him. They both here this voice that tells them Pru uRivu. He is informed about the Issur of the Eitz haDaat.

He has the ability to name and having the ability to name makes him ask about God. However later on the ability to name is connected with Kivshuah. Earlier poetry was much less embarrassed to say things that could have been said in prose. Therefore Milton has no problem describing the fish coming out to be named.

One major issue with Milton is the idea of submission. It could be that this is why we have the image of the fish here – so that we know that the fish can't come to man to be named the same way man can't go to God. This is seen throughout the epic – man to God, Satan to God, woman to man. What is the nature of submission?

Man then talks to God realizing that he is in charge of the earth.

It is interesting that Adam himself is the speaker of Al Kein Yazov Ish. How do you handle when you want some element of Tznius. Some intimacy in front of changed people. Milton is in trouble he wants sex without shame but also he doesn't want them to be animals. R' Carmy says there is a difference from shame in front of the other people and shame in front of the other people. If you go through Milton he uses the image of blushing. He gives an innocent blushing like the sunrise. He explains why if he is so powerful he is overcome in her presence. He mentions that she is less of a Tzelem Elokim than others – he does the Kivush not her. There is a question in the Rishonim if woman is made bTzelem Elokim. It seems the Tzelem Elokim applies to him before it applies to her. There was an article written in Daat – first of all the differences between Perek 1 and 2 and she didn't realize the Abarnbanel was quoting the Ran not saying something on his own.

Most people think Telem Elokim period – for all humans. We can say differently as copying God in a literal sense. We then become a Xerox of R' Lichtenstien's Mareh Mekomos. One can talk about the 2<sup>nd</sup> copy not being as bright as the first copy.

There is a sense that they are together in this.

Milton says that blushing is the color of love.

In the issue of theodacy we can ask with regards to theodacy that he is being misled.

In this book God his happy with his confession and this is sort of argument.

The angel replies to Milton that you must know that you are superior to her and don't listen to her. This is very similar to the Rambam making the distinction between truth and falsehood and pleasant and unpleasant.

It is interesting that Adam asks the theodacy issue after the Chet. Milton develops the idea of this peculiar type of relationship. In terms of theodacy issues – all are after the fact. When you work philosophically from the bottom up – then we say everything is just right – then we have the problem that things went wrong but that is the way it had to be. Milton is doing a very tough job. At the very end the angels come back and they failed and the Ribono Shel Olam tells the angels don't worry it was supposed to be this way. If you are just writing Peirushim then you can get away – but he is taking a lot of risks.

In book 9 we have the Satan infiltrating Gan Eden in the form of a snake. There is a powerful passage on line 100 where the Satan is almost ready to do Teshuvah. However he says he is not aiming to help himself rather to hurt others – because only there he can feel less badly off. I have to slink around like a snake.

He finds Adam haRishon working – enough to make things meaningful. At that point Chavah decides to separate from him. And Adam doesn't want to separate because of the Satan who is on the loose. (Milton read Rashi). She is worried that how can Adam doubt she will stand up to the Satan. He says I am sure you can stand up to him but I want to keep him away – even to be tempted is dishonorable. He wants to make sure the Satan is even afraid to start up. Adam says don't make light of Satan's malice. Eve was not that happy with this if we are always worried about Satan. She says why should we run away from temptation.

Shiur # 21  
(Missed Class) ...

Shiur # 22  
11/25/2003

This point after the Chet begs the question of why death – why does man have to die? Why mortality?

From the point of the Radvaz and Giglamesh (and a little Ibn Ezra as well) death is the norm and that is just the way the world works.

This is not the natural way of viewing things and is definitely not the Saint Augustine view.

From the point of Milton death becomes a Tikun.

A question here brought up by Milton is why not commit suicide?  
Even after Chet there is a future.

Death in this case is not necessarily a curse. It is terrible to live forever. Death becomes a Tikun of what happened before. The fear of him eating from the Eitz haChaim is that he is truly lost. Another question is what makes God – God?

In terms of the death issue there is another piece in the Nefesh haChaim. He quotes a Gemarah that when Chavah ate from the Eitz haDaas a Zuhamah entered man kind and when Har Sinai came it left and then returned with the Chet haEigel.

Kant compares the concept of original sin to the tapeworm – Adam haRishon gives the sin the way he gives over the tapeworm. This idea is seen in the Gemarah and some how Har Sinai stopped this and then it came back.

R' Chaskai Kreskes was one of the first Jewish philosophers relating this Gemarah about the Zuhamah to the idea of original sin.

According to the Nefesh haChaim – death is necessary to be Mechaper. There is a requirement of death. He says explicitly the problem of living forever is a problem of a lack of Kaparah.

The Nefesh haChaim is saying the same thing as Milton. However when you hear the Nefesh haChaim it sounds Kabalistic – when you hear Milton then it becomes much more dramatic.

If you go back to the other point is that the idea of death gives people a hope for a useful life then we can look at the end of book 11 and book 12. The angel explains to Adam what will happen in the future. We have this feel there is a comfort in sin – that through sin – Jesus comes to save you. There is a question of how much Milton bought into that notion. His discussion is the most famous of this idea. Danielson doubts whether Milton is an extreme formulation. There is a question of making sin Lechatchila or Bediavad. The extreme form of this is Auden's character who says that "I like to sin and God likes to forgive sin." One can say this about sin in general – the more you sin the more grace there is. This is not what Milton is talking about – you hear this in certain

modern preachers. If you want to understand Clinton this is where it comes from. At the same time the notion the fall leads to Jesus coming – if you really believe that God is in control then anything in history as being a complete Bediavad is tough. This is the idea of Felix Culpa – the happy sin.

Adam doesn't know whether to do Teshuvah or to rejoice because it is such a wonderful thing.

There is a question about how much of a parallel to Jewish sources. The more you deal with Kabbalah the more you have it, definitely with someone like R' Tzadok. The Netziv in one of his Harchiv Davar's has this idea that if Adam had not fallen then he would be immortal – but God would have to have created another being who would have fallen. Lovejoy wrote this book how there is an importance of variety in the world and everyone has to fill his or her role. The Netziv might be thinking along these lines that someone has to fill this role in the world.

The angel then tells him you have enough go and get knowledge.

The last scene here could be a child going off to college. Is this sense that there is still a future – a sense of adventure.

## Kierkegaard

He had a bunch of life issues that may have effected his essay, broken engagement – father...

2 questions:

- 1) Does he handle the philosophical issues well?
- 2) Is this Pshat and is this the only pshat in the Akedah?

The prelude is a set of 4 alternate scenarios of the Akedah.

The figures in Tanach are not characters like in a novel we don't really no much about them.

Shiur # 23

(I missed the beginning of class) ...

## Cain and Abel

It is interesting to question what is bothering Cain. It seems on a Pshat level Cain has a real complaint. He thinks about giving a Karbon and Hevel tries to out do him.

If you are reading Bereishit is impossible not to think of the parallel between the 2 stories – Cain and Hevel and Yosef and his brothers. What Cain does is to move from a shepherding economy to a grain based economy. We might want to wonder what the different types of economies. Is there something significant about these 2 types of economy? Being a farmer is much harder work then being a nomad. Yosef might also be someone thinking about the bottom line. There does seem to be something the brothers complain about. The focus here is really on Cain and not on Hevel. At a certain level it is a luxury too we are not eating them – they are vegetarians.

The materialist as opposed to someone less driven. Lets take a walk together and find out. There is nothing simpler then say lets go to the field – the Targum fills in this line to make things explicit. He was looking for... He told him whatever happened in Pasuk 7.

One question is about the Karbon, why God did what he did and finally what happened about the murder, the background, the dialogue and the murder itself? Another issue is the family relationship – it keeps saying Achicha – is this another murder or is it emphasized because it is fratricide. And we might ask in general what is so bad about murder to begin with – because we are both human beings, because humans are special? We might want to ask as well what happened to the parents. Does caring about having children mean that you are Metasek in the children? In Yahdut there is a concern for children. If you don't have that then how important is caring about your children, the idea to educate your children only shows up in the Western world in the late middle ages. A French historian (Aryeh) had a thesis that there were no (special status) children up until the modern age. There is also the question of attachment to the children – if there is high infant mortality there is a question about how much attachment there is. It is a very controversial thesis. From the Jewish aspect is there is a Chiuv of T"t and what Aryeh describes in the Christian world is not true for the Jewish world. Chazal there is the story in the Midrash about Adam and Chavah trying to know what to do with Hevel until they see the Ravens bury each other. The question of what Cain says to his parents does not play a role.

There is a Hebrew poem by Dan Pagis – who was a child Holocaust survivor. Chavah is on the transport with Hevel and she calls out to her son Cain. It is clear that Cain is the murder. It could be she is trying to put human thoughts into Cain. She may not know Cain is the murder. It seems that Cain is on the Nazi side. The story ends abruptly – you don't know what she wants to tell Cain. The fact that we know in the end what Cain does – does not communicate what Chavah knows. Is she giving him Mussar?

An interesting question is whether the rhyme improves the poem.

Shiur # 24

We were wondering why God favors Hevel? What Cain said to Hevel?  
We noted the parallel between Chet Adam and Chet Cain.

In Bereishit there is very little conflict between the parents and children.

Terach dies after Avram leaves. It is so dramatic that it fooled two people – the Septuigent translator killed Terach at 140 to get Avram out of there, Saint Paul also killed off Terach before Avrahm leaves. Ramban says this is the Minhag of the Pesukim. Rashi says that this is so people won't say that Avram left his father. This is the first place in Chumash where you have to do math to get the real story. However in Parshat Bereishit everything is right in front of you.

There is a real confrontation of a father and a son is Noach and Cham. Even there it is a shift in language to Canaan.

Later on with Yaakov and his children you can talk about a tension. As you reach a stage of Klal Yisroel being well formed you don't have it anymore. In Greek myths there you have the father's and children after each other all the time. Oedipus kills his father and his father wanted to kill him. Saturn ate his own children – nothing like that in Tanach.

This is a certain type of reaction you normally don't get. There isn't so much about the parents' reaction to the story. There is a Midrash that Adam meets Cain and Cain says I did Teshuvah. But we don't have a reaction of what did you do. It could be that we were inspired to think about it because of the poem.

The word אָחִיךָ shows up a lot here and this implies the idea that everything is around the theme of killing your brother.

R' Lichtenstien made the comment in print that you have to see a Goy as a Tzelem Elokim. There must be a middle ground between Adam as a colossus and man as a piece of dirt.

Going back to the question of what Cain did wrong to begin with. One of the original proposals was that being a farmer is more materialistic then being a shepherd.

Or one can view Cain as a hard working Joe and he gets messed over.

We have the poem of Abel & Cain by ... this vilifies Abel and victimizes Cain.

Shiur # 25

Byron has a poem where Cain is the outcast – somewhat the righteous outcast. Cain is the victim. Cain works hard and Abel has the easy life. Cain is morally superior to Abel but his problem is that he can't withstand the Nisayon of not being noticed by God. This is pointed out in Chazal by the Netziv, Cain's H'A is that he will work in the field all day and support his brother. He then sees he is doing all the work and his brother is getting all the fun. Cain covered the necessities and Hevel dealt with the luxuries.

Cain did not have the capacity for enjoyment. The Ribono Shel Olam tells Cain if you are doing this because it is right then you are uplifted by it – but if not the Yetzer Hara will go after you. According to this Pshat then Cain is superior to Hevel and you can rule him. There are 2 different ways to read the Pasuk either the Yetzer Hara or Hevel. Then Cain didn't go out to kill Hevel rather he tried to make him work and in the end it ended up he died. The problem is only a problem because he is his brother and then Cain's response actually makes sense (am I my brother's keeper). The Netziv is running into Drush here. This is very similar to the 19<sup>th</sup> century poem where Hevel gets the girl and here he gets the Ribono Shel Olam.

There is another point that no one raises – but it is significant. One that stands out is that Cain gets off pretty easy – he goes into Galut. Most Parshanut deals with this by minimizing Cain's guilt, such as the Netziv. They will say he is somewhat bShogeg and then he gets Galut. Some say he did Teshuvah (there is the Midrash with Cain meeting Adam). The Gemarah in Sanhedrin implies that Cain did a minute Teshuvah.

The Gemarah in Sanhedrin implies that on some level the earth itself is being punished for receiving the blood of Hevel. Retzicha actually destroys the Earth. The Maharal says that the earth had to swallow Hevel's blood because if it didn't the world could not have existed. The earth cooperated with Cain to cover up the sin – because Cain was a farmer the earth cooperated to help him out. The earth never opened its mouth for good after that – it only did it because of the family relationship. There are 2 points:

- 1) There were only 2 young men on earth (that would destroy the world to kill Cain)
- 2) There was this relationship between Cain and the earth

Then a 3<sup>rd</sup> idea is added that in a sense Cain deserved to die. You have to cover up the other reasons. You get rid of Hevel because you don't want him there. This has 2 real elements:

- 1) Cain has more of a practical contribution to the world. (Like the poem by Uno)
- 2) Killing Cain will be genocide

The Maharal does not say what the Netziv says. It seems to be because at the bottom line Cain is a Rotzeach. According to the Netziv Cain becomes a murderer when he commits the act. The Maharal is more a mystic and therefore you have a sense that Cain is Cain from the beginning and Hevel is Hevel from the beginning. The Netziv is focusing on tragedy of character and the Netziv is focusing on tragedy of plot. Forester makes a distinction of a novel that revolves around a character or a plot. James was about plot, because he thought about plot before he thought about the character. If the issue is the meaning of the plot then character has less free will. Maharal will follow the logic of the story (his Diuk is from the word Hevel) and therefore he doesn't have an important role. The allegory of the brother that is dismissed early is the drama if Cain will meet the challenge or not and the earth has its role to play in the drama – either that the plot of the novel is the earth must exist or that Hevel is really unimportant. At this point you have made Hevel a major character. Auden writes a poem that you need an innocent victim to have a western world. The idea of the victim of the innocent victim is



not that really important. If this was the view point of Cain then the Maharal will move towards the Netziv.

There is another aspect that we have in Pshat that Cain gets away without a real punishment. Some people talk about Cain getting off easy. For most people the issue is Retzicha. If you read Chumash straight you notice that Cain's progeny disappear.

Beowulf discusses the descendants of Cain (clearly the other didn't know Pshat).

If we look at Agnon and Conrad and what they are doing with this, are they doing something that is not in the typical read of the story? With Chet Adam haRishon many of the writers we are looking at are trying to get down to what is happening on the basic level. With Cain and Hevel the question is what is Pshat in the Karbon being accepted and not accepted.

#### Shiur # 26

Steinbeck wrote a book East of Eden – it's basic allegorical structure is a family where generation after generation – kids whose name's begin with C are aggressive and with A are victim.

Pshat in the Akedah is not Kierkegaard's conflict between the religious and the ethical. This is because the first readers of the Akedah didn't think this way – no one thought about the conflict between religion and morality.

The Rambam in the Moreh tells us that the Navi has no doubts about the Akedah and when God speaks is the end of the story. The Chidush of Kierkegaard is that we don't really cancel out the ethical. There is one Midrash that hints to Kierkegaard about the Satan telling Abraham that God will ask you tomorrow about lo tirtzach. This is because no one thought about this.

#### Shiur # 27

We were discussing the poem by Owen about war – which has become an anti-war poem, *The Parable of the Old Man and the Young*. The Mashal and the Nimshal are pretty clear. It is pretty transparent. What he believed about Avraham in Tanach is not the issue here.

The Reform said the point of the Akedah is that you shouldn't do this, we are Kantian and we don't sacrifice.

We can ask the question of Mesirut Nefesh by Avraham as well as the pride here. There is the Midrash that Avraham wanted to make a nick on Yitzchak. This could be so that there is the whole idea of showing Yishmael and the world that he didn't hesitate – rather he passed the test. One can say that this was to express the idea of Karbon. It can

be also as the Chasidim write that with regards to Mesirat Nefesh the thought is as good as the action.

It is possible that he is taking Kierkegaard on his head and saying that he should be doing the ethical and forgetting about the religious.

What is missing in this poem Avraham's answer is missing. What is added here that is not in Tanach, he leaves Yishmael out and calls Yitzchak the first born. There is one word however that you expect to have it in Tanach. The other thing is the iron. Avraham does not take the iron. R' Kook pointed out the knife is not an essential part in the whole thing. In terms of the actual idea of Kadshim the Shechitah might not be that essential.

In his Sefer on Zevachim, RAL says that it could be that the Shechitah of Kadshim is very similar to the Shechita of Chullin or there is some significance to the Zar being able to do it.

Lincoln is taken seriously because we don't know God is on our side. This poem could be as a Shtuch to the British and German preachers equating nationalism with Biblical religion.

When we talk about a father killing his son does that have anything to do with animosity between the father and the son. One logic about human sacrifice could be that if it is better to sacrifice a sheep then a carrot then your son, who is most precious is the best sacrifice. On the other hand one could devalue the son. Avraham does not devalue his son when he does the Akedah. Sometimes when someone is dieing you treat him as if he is already dead. When you say "I have no son" that is a way of dealing with the pain by getting rid of the son. Then there is a question of how you get back to things if he doesn't die. The issue of what is behind Oedipus' father trying to kill him you don't like someone supplanting you. The Greek Gods hate their kids because they look at things in terms of power and the kids are a threat. From the Christian framework the idea of Chinuch does not exist. It is a very important point that Christians are not obligated to marry. From the Christian point of view if I am a stranger to cheese and crackers or my son is what is the difference – a Jew would not think like that. The family concept is uniquely Jewish. Given the way we feel about our parents we don't like to think in those terms. Whatever we like – if we really have a father or mother who are really not good people there is a question how we deal with that. To that extent when we look at abusive people how we see this. Anti-war people use that type of language that the old people make the wars and the young people die. There is the question of why war costs so much. You get the view that the old people resent the young. Literary discussions of fathers and sons have to take this into consideration. Does this happen in the Akedah?

Shiur # 28

Yehudah Amichai ended up becoming a secular poet and a great poet. There isn't much religion in his poetry but there is a lot of biblical poetry. He takes metaphors from

different realms and mixes it. He describes his thoughts about his comrades lying in the rain in the battlefield. He does a lot of battlefield imagery.

Amichai says the true Gibor of the Akedah was the Ayal. The striking part of the poem is who cares about the ram – it's an animal. At the end of the day the Ayal is a Karbon. In a certain way Amichai could be saying the real action is not the people making the noise – but the solder. An argument could be that the boys on the battlefield are rams – the Ayal is there and the Ayal has a role to play. It makes fun of everyone who are glorifying the death as the sacrifice of Isaac or those who condemn – they are just rams. We know the end of the stories of Tanach and the story of the Akedah. We look at the story as a kind of ritual where the same thing happens.

In so far as Judaism contains ritual – we become cyclical. Even though RAL said the difference between Judaism and Hellenism that we believe in Hitchadshut – ritual makes things conservative. If you don't treat it as being cynical he is turning the story into a ritual. This could be what Kierkegaard is fighting against. Even if we are not Staam liberals we get this sense. By using the word Kenuiah you are pointing to the tipping point where you don't realize whether you are dealing with a narrative or a ritual. If the Ayal was there from 6 days of creation this is what the world is there for. There is a poetically interesting word of Kemo – this is just enough to keep the reader from turning the realistic reader away. Part of what he is thinking about is the artwork of the Akedah – there has been a lot said on it. If we ignore the visual images then we are suppressing a certain aspect of the way our minds work.

A picture freezes the dramatic, which is a moral aspect of what is going on. A narrative takes place in time a picture takes place in space not time.

In the end he gives an interesting statement about Avraham and God leaving.