

איוב

I'm up to Shiur #10 in the editing
Total 14 shiurim were given

I DO NOT PLAN ON LISTENING TO THE LAST TWO SHIURIM BEFORE THE FINAL

LINK TO THE RECORDINGS:

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1JZo91iTq9dH5F-h4dvQVJ-3me29-oQgf?usp=sharing>

Shiur #1 1/25/18

Approach to תנ"ך - Literary Theological

What is איוב about?

What do you do with the middle פרקים?

How our approach slightly differs from that of the ראשונים

Schedule

Reading materials

Authorship

משה - written by בבא בתרא in גמרא

When did איוב live?

What else do we know about איוב?

יחזקאל

Apocryphal "The Testament of איוב"

The Epistle of Saint James

Was איוב Jewish?

Back to when איוב was written

When did איוב live (or not live)?

Translations of איוב

Starting the ספר

Nature of his צדקות - is it אהבה or יראה?

Shiur #2 2/1/18

Rambam - Iyov was not called a Chacham

Rambam - Iyov was not a חכם

Is it a valid דיוק in the פסוק?

Iyov and his Children - suspicion

Parenting

Child-rearing Iyov versus Avraham

Communal versus Individual

Was he a Tzadik or not?

שטן and בני אלקים

What are בני אלקים?

בראשית - ויראו בני האלקים

Angels - The imagery of the Royal Court

בני אלקים as humans

The שטן

What is the שטן?

רמב"ם

Shiur #3 2/8/18

Iyov's reaction

Second meeting with G-d

Iyov's Friends

The idea of Nisayon

The רס"ג and רמב"ם - meant to display the צדיק to others

The רמב"ן - actualizing potential

רמב"ן שער הגמול - A person is in a rough spot and may fail

Shiur #4 2/15/18

Is this a נסיון?

If yes, why doesn't it use the word נסיון?

Do people in תנ"ך know that they're being tested?

Iyov's Korbanos

Philosophy

רמב"ם

רלב"ג

מלבי"ם

Personalities

רמב"ן

Shiur #5 2/22/18

פרק ג

ויען

Day versus date:

גאל versus גאל

כמריר יום

ליתן

Sea monster

עתה ילוח אישי אלי

Funeral

[Sum up](#)

[The Poetic Styles of איוב - Bicola and Tricola](#)

[Parallel to ירמיהו](#)

[איוב's ambiguity when referring to G-d](#)

[איוב's parents](#)

[איוב's anxiety](#)

[Sum up:](#)

[Shiur #6 3/8/18](#)

[פרק ד](#)

[נסיון](#)

[כסל](#)

[צדיקים not being destroyed](#)

[רשעים being destroyed](#)

[אליפז - self-absorbed](#)

[Philosophical thesis for the opening section](#)

[אליפז's vision](#)

[ק"ו The](#)

[Rashi](#)

[רלב"ג](#)

[Difference between Rashi and Ralbag](#)

[Synthesizing Rashi and Ralbag - interpreting an experience](#)

[ק"ו Meir Weiss - explaining the illogical](#)

[Sum up](#)

[Shiur #7 3/15/18](#)

[איוב פרק ה](#)

[כעס](#)

[Biblical Foolishness](#)

[אליפז's curse](#)

[אדם לעמל יולד](#)

[השגחה כללית](#)

[דרישה](#)

[שם השם בספר איוב](#)

[Rain](#)

[The downtrodden](#)

[אבני השדה](#)

[Shiur #8 3/22/18](#)

[פרק ו](#)

[אליפז's response to](#)

[I'm suffering](#)

[You didn't say anything of value](#)

[I wish that G-d would just kill me already \(רחמנא לצלן\)](#)

[I'm out of strength](#)

[Iyov's accusation of his Friends](#)

[What brought on this accusation?](#)

[Understanding other people's suffering](#)

[פרק ז](#)

[Depression](#)

[I don't have any good waiting for me](#)

[Change in איוב - G-d is in the picture](#)

[Review: Iyov's responses, what he ignores, what is new](#)

[תחיית המתים](#)

[תחיית המתים in כופר is איוב](#)

[Not such a big deal because he's a גוי](#)

[אבל is not a solution for problems in general עולם הזה](#)

[Shiur #9 3/26/18](#)

[Iyov's responses:](#)

[Summary of פרק ו](#)

[פרק ז](#)

[Rashi - why am I still alive?](#)

[Dream - possible response to אליפז](#)

[Parallel to תהילים - who is man that you should pay attention to him?](#)

[Even if I sinned I don't deserve punishment](#)

[burden unto myself - תיקון סופרים](#)

[Response to אליפז's visions](#)

[Iyov's change in attitude](#)

[How does the רמב"ם deal with this?](#)

[איוב פרק ח](#)

[philosophy of בלדד](#)

[איוב towards חוצפא More](#)

[\(מלבי"ם\) Tradition](#)

[משלים The](#)

[The reed](#)

[The spider web](#)

[Plant clutching stones](#)

[Ending with assurances](#)

[Shiur #10](#)

[Does בלדד think that איוב was a צדיק?](#)

[משלים](#)

[How convincing is the philosophical approach to בלדד?](#)

[Things work out in the end - differences between אליפז and בלדד](#)

[Review](#)

[איוב פרק ט](#)

[Shiur #11](#)

[Shiur #12](#)

[פרק יב](#)

[Shiur #13](#)

Shiur #1 1/25/18

Approach to תנ"ך - Literary Theological

Theological -

1. Our primary purposes in studying תנ"ך is to understand דבר השם. As opposed to grammar and ancient near-east history.
2. We are approaching תנ"ך from a Jewish point of view. Meaning that even when מדרשים / מפורשים are not helpful for פשט we're still interested in them. We're not going to run away from them because they don't help us with פשט. Jewish tradition is part of what we're doing there.

Literary - how something is written is an integral part of what is being said. We don't only look for the conclusion. What's between the lines and what is explicit? What is being said louder? Where is indirect language used.

There are academic works on תנ"ך dealing with linguistic and historical issues. To the extent that we could get insight from there we certainly want to use it. Western culture - like it or not, we have grown up in intercourse with western culture, sometimes that could give us valuable insights, and sometimes it could be a challenge. Sometimes it may be the case that we have ways of thinking about religious issues and life issues and תנ"ך that you would not necessarily get if you were just reading תורה sources. Sometimes that adds, sometimes you have to get away from that. If you want to get away from that you have to understand that.

Rav Lichtenstein - "In every גן עדן (i.e. every person), and if you want to deal with that serpent you may have to read a book on serpentine psychology." You have to understand what you are dealing with.

What is איוב about?

The story:

A man named איוב who is a צדיק. G-d had this get-together, and at this get-together someone called the שטן shows up. Hashem says that איוב is a wonderful guy, the שטן says make him miserable and he'll curse you. So Hashem says okay let's try it, he loses his children and possessions and doesn't curse. And then at the second get-together he says "you (שטן) tempted me to destroy him for no reason!". This is a very strange idea, that anyone could play around with the הקב"ה like that. חגיגה in גמרא - when רבי יוחנן would get to this פסוק he would cry. Boggled his mind, couldn't deal with it. So the שטן does it again, Hashem takes away his health, he has a skin disease, and it seems that איוב still is not cursing G-d. His wife says why don't you curse, he says no.

איוב is sitting there suffering and his friends come to see him. He sits there for seven days, and afterwards he curses the day that he was born. Seems to be a change of manner here. The first of איוב's friends, אליפז, tells him to stop kvetching. Takes him two פרקים. And then it takes איוב two פרקים to tell him that he's going to continue to kvetch. Same thing with בילדד, and it takes איוב three פרקים to answer him, same with the third friend, and this time it takes איוב three פרקים.

Another round with the three. Then the third round. אליפז speaks איוב answers בילדד speaks very briefly (pashtus is that they're running out of things to say) and he answers. צופר does not speak. איוב continues to speak, goes on and on, until the end of פרק לא. Then there's a fourth person, אליהו, turns up, apparently not one of his friends just a spectator. He sees that no one else is speaking so I'm going to talk a little also. He speaks for six פרקים. At that point הקדוש ברוך speaks. For some readers it would be relief, you would think that there would be an answer. הקדוש ברוך speaks for two פרקים, then איוב speaks, הקדוש ברוך is not satisfied and speaks again, and then איוב speaks again then apparently everything is okay and איוב gets everything back double and everyone lives happily ever after.

What do you do with the middle פרקים?

The story is difficult enough. A problem for someone reading or teaching it is: what do you do with all of those פרקים in the middle?

Between פרק ג and the end of the book is not kvetching. You're dealing with significant things that are going on here. You can't just waive your hand at it.

How our approach slightly differs from that of the ראשונים

How is this different than what the ראשונים did? The ראשונים tended to view איוב and his friends purely as philosophers. I'm accepting a lot of that, but I'm also proposing that in addition to being philosophers we're dealing with people. In a real world there are people who have

philosophical ideas and sometimes there are philosophers that are human beings. And in real life you get a combination of the two. Since תנ"ך is not a philosophy book, but rather a book about the relationship between man and G-d (of which philosophy may play a part but not necessarily the entire story), that desire to integrate the two, it is very much what I call the literary theological method but here it may be more indispensable that it may be in other areas of תנ"ך.

Schedule

We're going to start with the general stuff about who wrote איוב. Some discussion of what it means for הקדוש ברוך הוא to put someone in this kind of position.

Then the first two פרקים.

Then before we get to the poetry I'm going to give you an idea of what the major שיטות in ראשונים and אחרונים are. You could either say let's just learn and then figure out the ראשונים and אחרונים from there, but I think that it is simpler to know already what they are doing, know what their agenda is, and then see how much what they're doing actually helps us work out פשט. Which means that we're going to get a kind of quick survey of the רמב"ם רלב"ג מלבי"ם. The רמב"ן is also interested in philosophical ideas but he is less doctrinarian about some of these things. If you hold like me you would say that he understood some of the things that I'm thinking about that we're dealing with people and not just philosophy. He read מורה נבוכים already but he uses it the way that he wants to use it.

Then we go through the first round, to פרק יד. There I expect to do well. We'll see what each one of איוב's friends are about and how they are arguing with each other. Character development and philosophical correlates.

By the time that we get to the second and third rounds the semester will be coming to the end already. So we'll have to move much more quickly because time is short and the language gets much more difficult as you go on so I don't have things worked out as well.

Then איוב's last speech, הקדוש ברוך הוא quickly, then the epilogue.

Here in order to do what we want to do we really have to end up at the end of the book.

Reading materials

מקראות גדולות and תנ"ך A

רס"ג

רמב"ן

רבנו בחי"ן בן אשר - תלמיד רשב"א - כד הקמח ערך השגחה

מלבי"ם

Other sources as needed or desired.

Should also look at רמב"ם מורה נבוכים, two פרקים devoted in איוב. Not really understandable unless you understand ג יז-ח. I will be discussing those very briefly.

See syllabus.

Kierkegaard -

1. Repetition - a novel, main character spends most of his time reading איוב
2. Edifying Discourses- sermons, two of them about איוב.

Authorship

תלמוד בבלי מסכת בבא בתרא דף יד עמוד ב
ומי כתב? משה כתב ספרו ופרשת בלעם ואיוב; יהושע כתב...

משה written by - בבא בתרא in גמרא

איוב, and ספרו, פרשת בלעם wrote משה. בבא בתרא in ברייתא Famous.

Assuming that we're not dealing with a hard-wired מסורה, why would חז"ל attribute איוב to משה? One reason might be that if you think that צדיק ורע לו is a very important matter, an ultimate theological issue, then it makes sense that משה who is the source for Torah practice should be the source of this issue. More frumly - the גמרא in ברכות says that משה is הראני נא את כבודך. צדיק ורע לו asking about. So it makes sense that he would be the repository of work that would be the official work on this question.

When did איוב live?

Later on, the גמרא asks when איוב lived.

תלמוד בבלי מסכת בבא בתרא דף יד עמוד ב
משה כתב ספרו ופרשת בלעם ואיוב. מסייעא ליה לר' לוי בר לחמא, דא"ר לוי בר לחמא: איוב בימי משה היה, כתיב הכא: מי יתן אפוא ויכתבון מלי, וכתביב התם: ובמה יודע אפוא. ואימא: בימי יצחק, דכתיב: מי אפוא הוא הצד ציד! ואימא: בימי יעקב: דכתיב: אם כן אפוא זאת עשו! ואימא: בימי יוסף, דכתיב: איפה הם רועים! לא ס"ד, דכתיב: מי יתן בספר ויוחקו, ומשה הוא דאיקרי מחוקק, דכתיב: וירא ראשית לו כי שם חלקת מחוקק ספון. **רבא אמר: איוב בימי מרגלים היה**, כתיב הכא: איש היה בארץ עוץ איוב שמו, וכתביב התם: איש בה עץ. מי דמי? הכא עוץ, התם עץ! הכי קאמר להו משה לישראל: ישנו לאותו אדם, ששנותיו ארוכות כעץ ומגין על דורו כעץ. **יתביב ההוא מרבנן קמיה דר' שמואל בר נחמני, ויתיב וקאמר: איוב לא היה ולא נברא אלא משל היה**. א"ל, עליך אמר קרא: איש היה בארץ עוץ איוב שמו. אלא מעתה, ולרש אין כל כי אם כבשה אחת קטנה אשר קנה ויחיה וגו', מי הוה? אלא משל בעלמא, הכא נמי משל בעלמא. א"כ, שמו ושם עירו למה? **רבי יוחנן ורבי אלעזר דאמרי תרוייהו: איוב מעולי גולה היה, ובית מדרשו בטבריא היה**. מיתיבי: ימי שנותיו של איוב, משעה שנכנסו ישראל למצרים ועד שיצאו!

תלמוד בבלי מסכת בבא בתרא דף טו עמוד ב

אימא: כמשעה שנכנסו ישראל למצרים ועד [שעה] שיצאו. מיתבי: שבעה נביאים נתנבאו לאומות העולם, ואלו הן: בלעם ואביו, ואיוב, אליפז התימני, ובלדד השוחי, וצופר הנעמתי, ואליהוא בן ברכאל הבוזי! (א"ל) וליטעמך, אליהוא בן ברכאל לאו מישאל הוה? והא כתי' ממשפחת רם! אלא אינבוי אינבי לאומות העולם, ה"נ איוב אינבוי אינבי [לאומות העולם]. אטו כולהו נביאי מי לא אינבוי לאומות העולם? התם עיקר נביאותיהו לישאל, הכא עיקר נביאותיהו לאומות העולם. מיתבי: חסיד היה באומות העולם ואיוב שמו, ולא בא לעולם אלא כדי לקבל שכרו, הביא הקדוש ברוך הוא עליו יסורין התחיל מחרף ומגדף, כפל לו הקדוש ברוך הוא שכרו בעוה"ז [כדי] לטרדו מן העולם הבא! תנאי היא; דתניא, **רבי אלעזר אומר: איוב בימי שפוט השופטים היה**, שנאמר: הן אתם כולכם חזיתם ולמה זה הבל תהבלו, איזה דור שכולו הבל? הוי אומר: זה דורו של שפוט השופטים. **רבי יהושע בן קרחה אומר: איוב בימי אחשורוש היה**, שנאמר: ולא נמצא נשים יפות כבנות איוב בכל הארץ, איזהו דור שנתבקשו בו נשים יפות? הוי אומר: זה דורו של אחשורוש. ואימא: בימי דוד, דכתיב: ויבקשו נערה יפה! התם בכל גבול ישראל, הכא בכל הארץ. **רבי נתן אומר: איוב בימי מלכות שבא היה**, שנאמר: ותפל שבא ותקחם. **וחכ"א: איוב בימי כשדים היה**, שנאמר: כשדים שמו שלשה ראשים. **ויש אומרים: איוב בימי יעקב היה**, ודינה בת יעקב נשא, כתיב הכא: כדבר אחת הנבלות תדברי, וכתיב התם: כי נבלה עשה בישראל. וכולהו תנאי סבירא להו דאיוב מישאל הוה, לבר מיש אומרים, דאי ס"ד מאומות העולם הוה, בתר דשכיב משה מי שריא שכינה על עובדי כוכבים? והא אמר מר: בקש משה שלא תשרה שכינה על עובדי כוכבים ונתן לו, שנאמר: ונפלינו אני ועמך.

Continue in the גמרא in בבא בתרא, there are several different views.

1. Time of אברהם
2. Time of משה
 - a. View that you get in two גמרות in סוטה
3. Time of שופטים
4. Time of בית שני
 - a. טבריה was in בית מדרש holds this and tells us that his רבי יוחנן Why would רבי יוחנן say such a thing? When there's so much מחלוקת clearly we're not dealing with a מורה.

Some generations are more sensitive, to ask the questions of לו צדיק ורע. He's being put in the context of what happened to כלל ישראל in the time of the חורבן. And רס"ג makes איוב emblematic of כלל ישראל. I don't think that it's necessary to say that but רס"ג thought that.

I could very well imagine that people are trouble by this question in every generation, and what happens to individuals is just as important as what happens to the nation. So רבי יוחנן is making this national.

But why should he be in טבריה? At that time the Jews were mostly in יהודה. Why? טבריה was from רבי יוחנן. He's making a joke. A serious joke. There's a גמרא in שבת that discusses people using medication on שבת. The גמרא says that a certain אמורא has a heaviness in his heart. If you look at Soncino גמרא, it translates דלבא as asthma, unsure what basis. When we got to this גמרא in שיעור, The Rav said that he had a back-ache. When The Rav wanted to he could read historical scholarship. This was a period where the Rav had a lot of problems with his back. He meant let's move on.

Then you read the גמרא in that ברכות דף ה' where רבי יוחנן lost all of his children. The יסורין של סוגיא of אהבה. Leads me to my next comment. If you look at these as views of אמוראים then there are six views. If you look at this as a product of the editor, the גמרא was not written by an אמורא, it was put together. The final stages of putting something together are shaping the book. You read it as you would read the product of an editor, what you're reading is that he lived in the time of אברהם, of שופטים, time of גלות בבל, טבריה, he lived during the Crusades (quoting The Rav now), he lived during the Spanish inquisition (he didn't *expect* the Spanish inquisition, but he was there), he lived during the time of the Holocaust. All of these opinions add up, and it really means that the question of איוב is a perennial question.

5. There's one more view in the גמרא, that רב נחמני בר שמואל says that איוב never existed. I can read that view two different ways, one the גמרא really meant, the other is בראשית רבה quoted in תוספות in בבא בתרא.
 - a. איוב is a purely fictional character.
 - b. There was a man named איוב, for whatever reason there is a story about him.

תוספות מסכת בבא בתרא דף טו עמוד א

איוב לא היה ולא נברא - האי לא סבר כריש לקיש דאמר בב"ר איוב לא היה שבאו עליו יסורין ולא אמר הכתוב שבאו עליו להודיעך כחו של איוב שאילו באו עליו היה יכול לעמוד בהן דאי סבר האי אמורא דאיוב היה בעולם א"כ מאי קאמר שמו ושם עירו למה טובא איצטריך לאשמועין מי הוא אותו צדיק שהיה יכול לעמוד באותן יסורין.

When תנ"ך takes a person and makes a ספר dealing with certain issues and chooses that person, what we know about איוב before could be important to understanding this.

What else do we know about איוב?

יחזקאל

יחזקאל פרק יד פסוק יד

וְהָיוּ שְׁלֹשֶׁת הָאֲנָשִׁים הָאֵלֶּה בְּתוֹכָהּ נָח דָּנָאֵל וְדָנְיָאֵל וְאִיּוֹב הַמָּה בְּצִדְקָתָם יִנְצְלוּ נַפְשָׁם וְנָאֵם אֲדָנִי יְקֹוֹק:

So do we know anything about איוב from any other source? In יחזקאל פרק יד G-d tells the נביא there as follows: if there is a land, and I bring a sword upon that land, and these three people are there, נח, דנאל, and איוב (that's דנאל without a יוד), those three people would save themselves, but not any of your sons or daughters. What we see from here is three things:

1. They're צדיקים
2. They're well-known
3. They suffered in some way. They fit in such a scene. נח lost the whole world, איוב from the ספר lost his children. The universal view amongst scholars this דנאל is not the same

as דניאל. In Ugaritic literature there's a king and דנאל who has trouble with not having children and so on and so forth.

Meaning whether or not the story of איוב is historical or is a novel, the image of איוב which people expected would be something like we see in יחזקאל. A צדיק who suffers. What about all of the kvetching? Based on איוב in יחזקאל we wouldn't know that he is a kvetcher.

- אגב

The **אבן עזרא** concluded based on יחזקאל that רבי יהושע בר נחמני in the גמרא is wrong. I don't think that this is such an issue. You could have a fictional character that is mentioned because he's part of the public consciousness and they will get the message. Rav Henkin used such an example in an article where he compared certain zionists to Don Quixote. That doesn't mean that he believed that he was a historical character, that means that he assumed that anyone reading a yiddish newspaper would know what a Don Quixote type of person is.

Apocryphal "The Testament of איוב"

What else do we know about איוב? There is an apocryphal book (to in the apocrypha, but an apocryphal book) from the בית שני period called "The Testament of Job". There you really get more of a stomach turning picture of his suffering. There איוב is very frum and it's his friends that are complaining. As I would see it I would say that the popular איוב was this very patient uncomplaining person. Meaning that what we have in תנ"ך deviates from the popular איוב. When תנ"ך uses איוב as a character representing a very complicated view of שכר ועונש, that is against this shallow conception of איוב.

The Epistle of Saint James

Another writer that treats איוב as being very patient: The Epistle of Saint James. James is the brother of אותו האיש. There when he discusses things in תנ"ך he refers to איוב as the model of patience. The patience of Job. But if you read the ספר he doesn't seem to be that patient. I think that the פשטות is that the author of the new testament is working with the popular conception, meaning that the view of תנ"ך didn't soak into the public. Even serious christian literature makes איוב more frum than we have it.

Was איוב Jewish?

Is איוב a Jew or not? Pashtus not. There is nothing of a Jewish nature that comes up there. And there are good reasons for him not to be a Jew, we don't have time for that right now.

Back to when איוב was written

Academics will say בית שני. We'll see later whether there is good evidence for it.

When did איוב live (or not live)?

At the time of the אבות. Even if it's fictional, the framework belongs at the time of the אבות. Not giving you arguments for this right now.

Two more גמרות about the dating of איוב. Two סוטה in גמרות.

Shorter one later in סוטה. The גמרא interpreted as placing the מרגלים at the time of the funeral of איוב. If you're saying that then he was at the time of משה.

תלמוד בבלי מסכת סוטה דף לה עמוד א

ארץ אוכלת יושביה היא - דרש רבא, אמר הקדוש ברוך הוא: אני חשבתיה לטובה והם חשבו לרעה, אני חשבתיה לטובה - דכל היכא דמטו, מת חשיבא דידהו, כי היכי דניטרדו ולא לשאלו אבתרייהו, ואיכא דאמרי: איוב נח נפשיה, ואטרידו כולי עלמא בהספידא, הם חשבו לרעה - ארץ אוכלת יושביה היא.

The other one says that איוב was part of פרעה's cabinet and was silent about what פרעה was going to do to the Jews so said "You're silent when other people are suffering, let's see how you do on your own".

תלמוד בבלי מסכת סוטה דף יא עמוד א

א"ר חייא בר אבא א"ר סימאי, שלשה היו באותה עצה: בלעם, ואיוב, ויתרו, בלעם שיעץ - נהרג, איוב ששתק - נידון ביסורין, יתרו שברח - זכו מבני בניו שישבו בלשכת הגזית, שנאמר: ומשפחות סופרים יושבי יעבץ תרעתים שמעתים סוכתים המה הקננים הבאים מחמת אבי בית רכב, וכתוב: ובני קיני חתן משה וגו'.

Translations of איוב

There was no authoritative translation of כתובים as we know from מגילה.

תלמוד בבלי מסכת מגילה דף ג עמוד א

ואמר רבי ירמיה ואיתימא רבי חייא בר אבא: תרגום של תורה - אונקלוס הגר אמרו מפי רבי אליעזר ורבי יהושע. תרגום של נביאים - יונתן בן עוזיאל אמרו מפי חגי זכריה ומלאכי, ונזדעזעה ארץ ישראל ארבע מאות פרסה על ארבע מאות פרסה. יצתה בת קול ואמרה: מי הוא זה שגילה סתריי לבני אדם? עמד יונתן בן עוזיאל על רגליו ואמר: אני הוא שגיליתי סתריך לבני אדם; גלוי וידוע לפניך שלא לכבודי עשיתי, ולא לכבוד בית אבא, אלא לכבודך עשיתי שלא ירבו מחלוקת בישראל. ועוד ביקש לגלות תרגום של כתובים, יצתה בת קול ואמרה לו: דיך! מאי טעמא - משום דאית ביה קץ משיח.

In מקראות גדולות there is a translation, don't know who wrote it.

There is the Greek Septuagint. Much of איוב is missing. One sixth. Why? Because the language is very different and they're kvetching and yelling at each other so if you leave out a little especially if the language is difficult it's not a big deal.

An aramaic translation probably existed. In dead sea scrolls we have an aramaic translation of איוב. Of all of the ספרים this is probably the one that survived because the language is difficult.

The גמרא in שבת says that רבן גמליאל had a תרגום of איוב, and someone told him that his grandfather was גונג it. So it was around. Professor Lyman asked that how do you know that it was an aramaic translation, maybe it was a Greek translation? Whatever it is, there was a desire to translate probably because the language was very difficult.

תלמוד בבלי מסכת שבת דף קטו עמוד א

אמר רבי יוסי: מעשה באבא חלפתא שהלך אצל רבן גמליאל בריבי לטבריא, ומצאו שהיה יושב על שלחנו של (יוחנן הנזוף) +מסורת הש"ס: [ר' יוחנן בן ניזוף] + ובידו ספר איוב תרגום והוא קורא בו. אמר לו: זכור אני ברבן גמליאל אבי אביך שהיה עומד על גב מעלה בהר הבית, והביאו לפניו ספר איוב תרגום, ואמר לבנאי: שקעהו תחת הנדבך! אף הוא צוה עליו וגנזו.

So for whatever historical value this has we should be aware of this.

Starting the ספר

איוב פרק א

(א) אִישׁ הָיָה בְּאַרְצ־עֵזְרָא אִיּוֹב שְׁמוֹ וְהָיָה הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה וְאֵת תָּם וְיִשָּׁר וִירָא אֱלֹהִים וְסָר מִרָע:

In a word איוב was a צדיק.

Anything wrong with this פסוק? There is a גמרא that says that whenever it says that he's a פלוני ושמו he's a צדיק. But the **עזרא אבן** points out that there are a lot of exceptions.

אבן עזרא איוב פרק א

... ואל תתמה על מלת איוב שמו כי איננו רשע כלל והנה כתוב ה' איש מלחמה ה' שמו והפך הדבר ויהי איש אחד מהר אפרים ושמו מיכיהו אולי בעל הדרש על הרוב הנמצא דבר מקום איוב סמוך לחרן מטעם וילך ארצ' בני קדם:

are phrases that fit בראשית ספר. Works well with my notion that he belongs during the time of the אבות.

What is the nature of his צדקות?

Nature of his צדקות - is it אהבה or יראה?

משנה מסכת סוטה פרק ה משנה ה

בו ביום דרש ר' יהושע בן הורקנוס לא עבד איוב את הקדוש ברוך הוא אלא מאהבה שנאמר (איוב י"ג) הן יקטלני לו איחל ועדיין הדבר שקול לו אני מצפה או איני מצפה תלמוד לומר (שם כ"ו /כז/) עד אגוע לא אסיר תומתי ממני מלמד שמאהבה עשה אמר רבי יהושע מי יגלה עפר מעיניך רבן יוחנן בן זכאי שהיית דורש כל ימיך שלא עבד איוב את המקום אלא מיראה שנאמר (שם א') איש תם וישר ירא אלהים וסר מרע והלא יהושע תלמידך תלמידך למד שמאהבה עשה:

The view that he was מיראה is based on this פסוק of מרע וסר אלקים. He only served out of fear. The problem is that this may be good דרוש but it's not פשט. We don't have the same distinction between אהבה and יראה in תנ"ך as we have in חז"ל. The highest thing that the תורה says about אברהם is ירא אלקים. There's nothing better than that.

The תפארת ישראל noticed my question and said that the דיוק was not from ירא אלקים but rather from וסר מרע. That implies that it's a person who avoided evil but not someone who sought out good.

תפארת ישראל - יכין מסכת סוטה פרק ה משנה ה

כא) ירא אלהים ולא כתיב אוהב אלדים, ואף על גב דגבי אברהם נמי כתיב כי ירא אלדים אתה, נ"ל דהכא שאני דסמיך ליה וסר מרע, משמע דהיה סר מרע רק מיראת אלדים, מה שאין כן סתם יראת אלדים היינו יראת הכבוד, [ערהפורכט] בל"א:

איוב פרק א

(ב) וַיִּלְדוּ לוֹ שִׁבְעָה בָנִים וְשְׁלוֹשׁ בָּנוֹת:

(ג) וַיְהִי מִקְנֵהוּ שִׁבְעַת אֲלִפִּי-צֹאן וְשִׁלְשַׁת אֲלִפִּי גַמְלִיִּים וְחֲמִשׁ מֵאוֹת צֶמֶד-בָּקָר וְחֲמִשׁ מֵאוֹת אֲתוֹנוֹת וְעֶבְדָּה רַבָּה מֵאֵד וַיְהִי הָאִישׁ הַהוּא גָדוֹל מְכַל-בְּנֵי-קֶדֶם:

Shiur #2 2/1/18

The idea of someone being an אוהב השם is very very rare, and never used for a living individual.

איוב פרק א

(א) אִישׁ הָיָה בְּאַרְצ־עֹזַי אִיּוֹב שְׁמוֹ וְהָיָה הָאִישׁ הַהוּא תָם וְיָשָׁר וִירָא אֱלֹהִים וְסָר מִרָע:

(ב) וַיִּלְדוּ לוֹ שִׁבְעָה בָנִים וְשְׁלוֹשׁ בָּנוֹת:

(ג) וַיְהִי מִקְנֵהוּ שִׁבְעַת אֲלִפִּי-צֹאן וְשִׁלְשַׁת אֲלִפִּי גַמְלִיִּים וְחֲמִשׁ מֵאוֹת צֶמֶד-בָּקָר וְחֲמִשׁ מֵאוֹת אֲתוֹנוֹת וְעֶבְדָּה רַבָּה מֵאֵד וַיְהִי הָאִישׁ הַהוּא גָדוֹל מְכַל-בְּנֵי-קֶדֶם:

Rambam - Iyov was not *called* a Chacham

Rambam - Iyov *was not* a חכם

The Rambam's view. The Rambam held that Iyov here is not called חכם. And the Rambam enjoys making that point, because he holds that Iyov is not a Chacham. Bluntly - the רמב"ם's interpretation of איוב's position is not the same as the Rambam's position. If you read the Moreh Nevuchim you come out with the idea that הקדוש ברוך הוא holds like the Rambam and Iyov does not, so by definition he can't be a Chacham.

Is it a valid דיוק in the פסוק?

On a פשוט level - Is such a diyuk justified or not? If I describe the doorman to my building but I don't say that he's a philosopher, does that imply that he is not a philosopher? Where do we find that someone is called a Tzadik *and* intellectual? Certain things we talk about and certain things we don't talk about. Maybe the רמב"ם thinks that for a book like this it should have been

mentioned. But at the beginning of the book there is no way of knowing that it is going to be a book about philosophy.

It says that he was richer than בני קדם. Elsewhere in תנ"ך בני קדם are identified as repositories of wisdom.

מלכים א פרק ה פסוק י

וַתֵּרֶב חֲכָמַת שְׁלֹמֹה מִחֲכָמַת כָּל־בְּנֵי־קֶדֶם וּמִכָּל חֲכָמַת מִצְרָיִם:

It says that Shlomo was smarter than בני קדם.

The בני קדם sometimes sarcastically refer to אדום as a place of חכמים. And אדום is בני קדם. And there are views that אדום is ארץ עוץ,

איכה פרק ד

(כא) שִׁישִׁי וְשִׁמְחִי בֵּת־אֲדֹמִים יוֹשְׁבֵתִי יוֹשֶׁבֶת בְּאֶרֶץ עֹוֶץ גַּם־עָלֶיךָ תַעֲבֹר־כּוֹס תִּשְׁכַּרְי וְתִתְעָרִי:

Others say that ארץ עוץ is ארם because one of the descendants of ארם is בכורו.

So they're associated with wisdom. So when the רמב"ם says that he was richer that implies that he was richer but not particularly wise. If I say that someone is the richest person in Princeton New Jersey, generally we talk about people in Princeton having a high intellect.

Used to be a reconstructionist rabbi in LA named Harold Schulweis (not a particularly good name for a Rabbi) -, had a way with words. He said "If I were to ask you what do you want for your children, you would say that I want him to be a good person, but if I were to ask you to tell me something about your child and you would say that they are a good person that would mean that if he's a boy he's not so smart and if she's a girl then she's not so pretty."

I don't know if this is a good דיוק, but if I would want to defend the רמב"ם on a פשוט level that is how I would do it.

Since here we're talking about how many sheep and camels he had, therefore it is implied that גדול means in terms of possessions.

The reason that the Rambam said this (and I would say this to the Rambam's face assuming that i wasn't just trembling and afraid of the Rambam) is because he had a view of the nature of ספר איוב. And within a framework he wants to make it clear that Iyov was a nice guy, but he didn't fully understand מורה נבוכים. He may have been a nice man, but he was not really deserving of extra-special פרטית השגחה. We'll get back to this point later today.

Iyov and his Children - suspicion

(ד) וְהָלְכוּ בָנָיו וַעֲשֹׂו מִשְׁתֵּה בֵּית אִישׁ יוֹמוֹ וְשָׁלַח וַיִּקְרָאוּ לְשִׁלְשֶׁת אַחֵיהֶם לֶאֱכֹל וּלְשִׁתּוֹת עִמָּהֶם:
(ה) וַיְהִי כִי הִקִּיפוּ יְמֵי הַמִּשְׁתֵּה וַיִּשְׁלַח אִיּוֹב וַיְקַדֵּשׁם וְהַשְׁכִּים בִּבְקֹר וְהָעֵלָה עֲלוֹת מִסְפָּר כָּל־כִּי אָמַר אִיּוֹב אוֹלִי חֲטָאוּ בָנִי וַיִּבְרְכוּ אֱלֹהִים בְּלִבָּבָם כָּכָה יַעֲשֶׂה אִיּוֹב כָּל־הַיָּמִים: פ

His children made parties on a fairly regular basis and would take turns hosting and would invite their sisters as well. This is important so that they're all under the same roof when it collapses. But it's also important for the culture of the Iyov household.

When the cycle would come around Iyov would be מקדש them. What does that mean? תוספות it could mean in the marriage sense, to designate.

תוספות מסכת קידושין דף ב עמוד ב

דאסר לה אכ"ע כהקדש - והרי את מקודשת לי כלומר להיות לי מקודשת לעולם בשבילי כמו (נדרים ד' מח.) הרי הן מקודשין לשמים להיות לשמים ופשטא דמילתא מקודשת לי מיוחדת לי ומזומנת לי ומיהו אם היה אומר טלית זו מקודש לי אין נראה שיועיל דגבי אשה במה דמתיחדת להיות לו היא נאסרת לכל אבל בכר וטלית לא שייך למימר הכי.

Or if you're more romantic you could think that he sanctified them.

Both readings are linguistically possible

You could say that he prepared them. משה prepared the people.

פרשת יתרו

(י) וַיֹּאמֶר יְקֹנֶק אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵךְ אֶל־הָעָם וְקִדְשָׁתָם הַיּוֹם וּמָחָר וְכַבְּסוּ שְׂמֹלֵתָם:

Get up early in the morning, put on nice clothing.

He would get up in the morning and bring עולות for each of them because maybe they cursed (רחמנא לצלן) in their hearts. He was not חושש that they cursed out loud, but in their hearts you never know. So I'll bring קרבנות for them. This is how he conducted himself all of the time.

What do we make of this practice, this concern?

Parenting

You could say that you never know. Or you could say that he is being very suspicious. Why would you suspect?

Sometimes parents can be very deluded - saw a documentary about an entertainer Julius Marks (Groucho) - being interviewed and asked about how in Hollywood all of the kids are overdosing and he says that he's so close to his daughter that if anything were bothering her she would tell him. Twenty years later her daughter said that at that time she was drunk every night and he knew nothing about it.

Maybe it was more of a prayer. Maybe he didn't really suspect them.

The way that people intuitively react to this may depend on what you think about child-rearing in general. If you take the view that you should always worry about the worst possible thing and be prepared. So what do we make of this?

Cursing is something that Iyov himself struggles with, maybe this is him projecting?

In Iyov the question of cursing or not becomes the central definition of piety. It's an appealing idea.

Camus - French writer - The only real problem with philosophy is suicide, everything else boils down to do you want to live or do you not want to live. Similarly, maybe we could say that the ultimate religious question is: are you in sync with **הקדוש ברוך הוא** or not, all of the other things are derivatives of that. The barebones of a religious outlook is whether you bless G-d or curse.

Here it's natural that he should think about cursing G-d because he's not ready to think that he would do anything public so he has to focus on something private. On the one hand it's extreme because it's a rejection of G-d or it's minimal because it's a private thought.

If you want to take the pro-Iyov side you could point to the way that this פסוק functions in הלכה - we learn בה"ב from here. This מנהג apparently begins in אשכנז at some point or another. For our purposes it's sufficient to say that it's quoted by the טור.

טור אורח חיים הלכות פסח סימן תכט

הלכות פסח:

א) א[תניא שואלין ודורשין בהלכות פסח קודם הפסח שלשים יום הלכך שלשים יום קודם הפסח חל עליו חובת ביעור כאשר אבאר:

מצאתי כתוב מר"ח ניסן עד אחרי אסרו חג אין נופלין על פניהם לא ביום ולא בלילה ואין אומרים צדקתך צדק במנחה בשבת ואין מתעניין ב[ואין מספידין והכי איתא בפ"ק דמסכת סופרים ג'] מפני מה אין מתעניין בניסן ב[מפני שבאחד בניסן הוקם המשכן וי"ב נשיאים הקריבו קרבנם בי"ב יום וכל אחד עשה ביומו יום טוב ד] ואין מתעניין בו עד שיעבור ניסן והבכורות ה[מתעניין בערב פסח ג'] ו[ותלמידים מתעניין בו שני וחמישי ושני מפני חילול השם ג' ימים ונ"ל דהנך ג' ימים אחר הפסח קאמר כמו שרגילין באשכנז להתענות ג' ימים אחר הפסח וכן אחר הסוכות ז] מפני שהם ימי משתה ושמחה ושמא מתוך כך באו לידי עבירה וסמכו אותם אקרא דאיוב ויהי כי הקיפו ימי המשתה וגו' ח[והעלה עולות מספר כולם כי אמר איוב אולי חטאו בני וגו']:

טור אורח חיים הלכות פסח סימן תצב

נוהגים באשכנז ובצרפת להתענות שני וחמישי ושני אחר הפסח והחג וממתינין עד שיעבור כל חודש ניסן ותשרי ואז מתעניין לפי שאין רוצין להתענות בניסן ותשרי וסמכו אותם על מקרא דאיוב ויהי כי הקיפו ימי המשתה וגו' אולי חטאו בני וגו' ובשביל שימי המועד הם ימי משתה ושמחה אולי חטאו ועושים אותם כמו ת"צ לקרות ויחל:

One view of this מנהג is that over יו"ט people eat and drink and live it up so the concern is that over that time people may have frivolous thoughts. So after the יו"ט you buckle down and fast as a way of responding to that danger. Why we don't have this מנהג for שבועות is not our business right now.

So we see that they took this פסוק straight.

Child-rearing Iyov versus Avraham

Could you imagine אברהם אבינו doing the same thing? הוא says that הקדוש ברוך הוא

פרשת וירא

(יט) כִּי יִדְעֵתִי יוֹ לִמְעַן אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא אֶת־בְּנָיו וְאֶת־בֵּיתוֹ אַחֲרָיו וְשָׁמְרוּ דֶּרֶךְ יִקְוֶה לַעֲשׂוֹת צְדָקָה וּמִשְׁפָּט לִמְעַן הָבִיא יִקְוֶה
עַל־אַבְרָהָם אֶת אֲשֶׁר־דִּבֶּר עָלָיו:

The relationship between אברהם and יצחק the תורה describes as one of education. The idea that Avraham would be concerned for Yitzchok in quite that way just doesn't sound right.

On the other hand, we don't see Iyov teaching his children. His children in effect borrow his car keys and his booze and his concern is that who knows what they're going to do with it, so you make sure that they're ensured.

If you compare Iyov and Avraham - this is kind of invited, the משנה in סוטה contrasts איוב and אברהם. The pashtus is that this story is set during the time of the אבות.

So we could look at certain מדרשים, the ספורנו, where איוב is viewed in a slightly critical perspective. And views bringing קרבנות as an anxiety that is open to question.

Communal versus Individual

One more negative thing about these פסוקים. He brings individual קרבנות for each one of his children. Most readers would not make much out of that. One reader used this פסוק as an whenever excuse to say another negative thing about Iyov - The Rav. it's in קול דודי דופק. In כתבי הרב whenever איוב comes up he always ends up making this point. His argument is that there is an outlook of a relationship with G-d that requires a level of solidarity. I don't exist alone, I am part of the community. And there is another approach of a narrow individualism where I am interested as myself as an individual and I don't see myself as being part of the larger community. And The Rav based on the פסוק that we have here and the פסוק in פרק מב that contrasts with that, his claim is that Iyov in the beginning of the book is a narrow individualist. Like I said before - his concern is having insurance for his children. So this is a self-centered view in The Rav's opinion, and The Rav sees that as a weakness in Iyov's character.

What we're doing now makes Iyov's children important. Some read the book and look at the children as just props for the plot, but I'm opening up the possibility that they are significant.

In the זורה it says that if Iyov would have brought שלמים and not עולות this would not have happened to him. I think that what the זורה meant is that the עולה is offered completely to G-d and the שטן has no part of it. But the שלמים you're throwing the bone to the שטן so he wouldn't have started up. The idea behind this - if I interpret the זורה in more psychological terms: If you have a form of השם עבודת where G-d is alien to you (the עולה) then you go your way and G-d

goes his way, whereas a more peaceable (literally שלמים) the kind of קרבן where you and the עולם של רבונו are eating together, there is a חלק in הזה עולם, you're not driving a sharp wedge between what's religious and what's worldly, there there's a more harmonious kind of existence. That could be similar to what The Rav is saying. I know that you could ask me that פי הלכה that גוים can't bring שלמים, the גמרא in מנחות. I would say אה"נ that's what we're getting here.

Was he a Tzadik or not?

Without getting involved with whether he had another option, the overall idea of all of these points that we made - even the רמב"ם, it all ends up showing flaws in Iyov. This is what comes out of this analysis. To which, I can ask a very basic question: the עולם של רבונו says that he's a צדיק, and we are smarter than the עולם של רבונו and are looking for all kinds of ways of blaming איוב. We're going against the grain of the book!

The answer has to be that he is a צדיק even though he is עובד מיראה, even though there are things that we look at that are open to criticism. If we want to read correctly there has to be a ballance. We can't reach the point that because of something that The Rav said a couple of times in his writings, that becomes bigger than what the פסוק says literally. Part of reading is distinguishing between what is said openly and what is said between the lines.

איוב פרק א

(ו) וַיְהִי הַיּוֹם וַיָּבֹאוּ בְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים לְהִתִּיצֵב עַל־יְקֹנָק וַיָּבֹא גַם־הַשָּׁטָן בְּתוֹכָם:

שטן and בני אלקים

What are בני אלקים?

What are benei Elokim? Some sort of supernatural beings probably, that's how most people would interpret.

בראשית - ויראו בני האלקים

What's the alternative reading? Big shots, powerful people. Like the פסוק in בראשית:

פרשת בראשית

(ב) וַיֵּרְאוּ בְנֵי־הָאֱלֹהִים אֶת־בְּנוֹת הָאָדָם כִּי טֹבֹת הֵנָּה וַיִּקְחוּ לָהֶם נָשִׁים מִכָּל אֲשֶׁר בָּחָרוּ:
on this פסוק in בראשית interpret it to be powerful people. and חז"ל

תרגום אונקלוס בראשית פרק ו פסוק ב

(ב) וחזו בני רברביא...

One reason to interpret it this way is because if you don't say this then it's a very strange story, mythological. So they avoided the idea of angels engaging in these activities.

In there are views that בני אלקים are angelic. There is a notion in ל"ר of fallen angels, angels that turn away from what they should be. That's one view in ל"ר. You have it very much outside of ל"ר in the books of Enoch and Chanoch. There you have stories of angels that rebel against G-d (רחמנא לזלן). You have it in the christian bible ימח שמו. Paradise Lost.

So in bereishis the more mainstream view is that it's natural beings. In Iyov the consensus is that you're dealing with supernatural beings. Then where does the Satan fit in?

Angels - The imagery of the Royal Court

It's like a royal court. They're having a cabinet meeting, G-d is on the royal throne and the heavenly beings are before him negotiating. The earliest example is מלכים א פרק כב. The צבא השמים are standing around Hashem and he asks who is going to mislead אחאב? There you have this image.

מלכים א פרק כב

(יט) וַיֹּאמֶר לָכֵן שָׁמַע דְּבַר-יְהוָה רְאִיתִי אֶת-יְהוָה יֹשֵׁב עַל-כִּסֵּאוֹ וְכָל-צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם עֹמְדִים עָלָיו מִיְמִינוֹ וּמִשְׁמָאלוֹ:
(כ) וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה מִי יִפְתֹּה אֶת-אַחָאָב וַיַּעַל וַיִּפֹּל בְּרַמֹּת גִּלְעָד וַיֹּאמֶר זֶה בָּכָה וְזֶה אָמַר בָּכָה:
(כא) וַיֵּצֵא הָרוּחַ וַיַּעֲמֵד לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וַיֹּאמֶר אֲנִי אֶפְתָּנּוּ וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלָיו בְּמָה:
(כב) וַיֹּאמֶר אֵצֶל וְהִיִּיתִי רוּחַ שָׁקֶר בְּפִי כָל-נְבִיאָיו וַיֹּאמֶר תִּפְתֹּה וְגַם-תֹּאכַל צָא וַעֲשֵׂה-כֵן:
(כג) וַעֲתָה הִנֵּה נָתַן יְהוָה רוּחַ שָׁקֶר בְּפִי כָל-נְבִיאָיִךְ אֵלֶּה וְיְהוָה דִּבֶּר עֲלֶיךָ כִּדְבָרֵהָ:

ישעיהו פרק ו

(א) בְּשַׁנְת־מוֹת הַמֶּלֶךְ עָזְיָהוּ וְאַרְאָה אֶת-אֲדָנִי יֹשֵׁב עַל-כִּסֵּא רָם וְנָשָׂא וְשׁוּלְיוֹ מַלְאִים אֶת-הַהִיכָל:
(ב) שְׂרָפִים עֹמְדִים מִמַּעַל לוֹ נֶשֶׁשׁ כְּנָפִים נֶשֶׁשׁ כְּנָפִים לְאַחַד בְּשָׁתַיִם וְכִסֵּה פָנָיו וּבְשָׁתַיִם וְכִסֵּה רַגְלָיו וּבְשָׁתַיִם יַעֲוֹפֶף:
(ג) וְקָרָא זֶה אֶל-זֶה וַאֲמַר קְדוֹשׁ קְדוֹשׁ יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת מֶלֶךְ כָּל-הָאָרֶץ כְּבוֹדוֹ:

The image here is that G-d is on the throne and the מלאכים surround him.

יחזקאל פרק א

(כו) וּמִמֵּעַל לָרִקְעַי אֲשֶׁר עַל-רֹאשִׁי כְּמֶרְאָה אֲבֹן-סַפִּיר דְּמוּת כֶּסֶף וְעַל דְּמוּת הַכֶּסֶף דְּמוּת כְּמֶרְאָה אָדָם עָלָיו מְלָמְעָה:

You have the divine chariot and these angelic figures are there.

What does it mean in concrete terms? The Rambam מורה ב"מ the word מלאך means a messenger, agent of G-d, and he says that sometimes we use it in נבואה that he sees an image that he has a human face and wings and he explains why that is, that is part of the imagery of nevuah.

Another function is that they are agents of G-d. The forces of nature can be looked at as מלאכים because they are agents of G-d.

So here these beings are being presented as being subservient to G-d. it's a cabinet, there are different voices. At the end הוא הקדוש ברוך decides because it's a monarchy.

So what is the Satan doing there? Is he part of the array of malachim? Is he serving G-d or serving himself? For the Rambam that is anathema, the idea that there is a spiritual creature that is opposed to G-d. Can't talk about that. That's כפירה for him. So what does he do here? We'll come back to it.

as humans בני אלקים

The alternative view is to treat the benei Elokim as Ravrevaya, human beings. Now Satan makes sense. The שטן is also a human being. He's a nasty person. That view is רס"ג. But then how are they coming in the presence of G-d? The imagery doesn't sound as impressive. So for him G-d somehow has a Q and A with some important people and there is this nasty guy who got in there.

איוב פרק א

(ז) וַיֹּאמֶר יְקֹנָק אֶל־הַשָּׁטָן מֵאֵין תָּבֹא וַיַּעַן הַשָּׁטָן אֶת־יְקֹנָק וַיֹּאמֶר מְשׁוּט בָּאָרֶץ וּמִהֲתֵהֵלךְ בָּהּ:

Where have you been? I have been walking around on earth. There is a pun, שטן and שוט. What does that mean? According to the רמב"ם it would mean that whoever this is he has been looking around on earth. For רס"ג not so sure, it means that he has been walking around.

The שטן

Where else does he turn up? By בלעם and by מלכים the word שטן means adversary. Where do you have it as a noun? The haftorah for Chanukah (זכריה), with Rabbi Yehoshua Kohen Gadol and the menorah,

זכריה פרק ג

(א) וַיֵּרָא יְיָ אֶת־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל עֹמֵד לִפְנֵי מֶלֶאךָ יְקֹנָק וְהַשָּׁטָן עֹמֵד עַל־יְמִינוֹ לְשַׁטְנוֹ:

You could interpret this like the mainstream or Rav Saadya gaon.

Where else? In Shmuel Beis perek 24 G-d seduced David into counting Yisroel. This is philosophically a little bit annoying, how could he be setting a trap? If you're a commentator you would say that he didn't seduce him ממש but rather that he arranged the circumstances such that he will be misled into making this mistake.

שמואל ב פרק כד

(א) וַיִּסָּף אֶף־יְקֹנָק לַחֲרוֹת בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וַיָּסֶת אֶת־דָּוִד בָּהֶם לֵאמֹר יֵלֶךְ מִנָּה אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֶת־יְהוּדָה:

In Divrei Hayamim Alef perek 21 it isn't G-d tempting David, it is him setting up the Satan and he is doing the work.

דברי הימים א פרק כא

(א) וַיַּעֲמֵד שָׁטָן עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּסֶת אֶת־דָּוִיד לַמָּנוֹת אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל:

I could interpret the mainstream view that it is some kind of agent, that since it is philosophically abhorrent to speak of G-d doing that so דברי הימים changes the language, or it was a person all along and it's saying peshat in Shmuel.

The word Satan as a noun appears three times: Zechariya (בית שני) Divrei Hayamim (בית שני), and this is בית שני squared because דברי הימים is really a rewriting of שמואל so there's a change of style between דברי הימים and שמואל, where שמואל doesn't use that word but דברי הימים apparently has that word available.) and Iyov (as I stated last time is בית שני).

The Yerushalmi in Rosh Hashanah says that none of the Malachim have names until the time of Galus Bavel. Didn't need the ירושלמי to tell me that but it rubs it in. Before that they just have functions. In the בית שני period, after גלות בבל, you have this machinery where the מלאכים have names and functions, a whole array. You could be an expert on angels during the בית שני period. In בית ראשון you don't have any of that. The way that the ירושלמי presents it is that it was something that was picked up in בבל. Theologically it gives you a much more structured image of what's going on in the עולמות האליונים which if you're learning דניאל is important to think about.

Pashtus is that the שטן is a kind of supernatural being. But is he one of the מלאכים or a side-character?

I'm adding to the ירושלמי that there is a shift in worldview from just G-d and the world to a whole network in between G-d and the world.

I don't think that we need that for what we're doing here. What's going on in דניאל? Why is it in כתובים not נביאים? There is a logic to it, which may be connected to it being a different way of looking at the world.

The ירושלמי implies that the terminology came from Bavel. Not necessarily the network.

Professor at Hebrew U - Tur Sinai - well known bible critic and apikoros. He was famous for amending texts. This is not about amending texts, but he says that if this is a בית שני book then maybe the Satan is a member of the cabinet that is meant to cause commotion. Like they had in France, the police would hire someone to provoke the masses so that they could flush out the rebels and kill them all. So maybe that is what the Satan is doing.

איוב פרק א

(ח) וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־הַשָּׁטָן הֲשִׁמָּת לְבָרְךָ עַל־עַבְדִּי אִיּוֹב כִּי אֵין כְּמֹהוּ בָּאָרֶץ אִישׁ תָּם וְיָשָׁר יָרָא אֱלֹהִים וְסָר מִכָּעַ:
(ט) וַיַּעַן הַשָּׁטָן אֶת־יְהוָה וַיֹּאמֶר הֲחִנָּם יָרָא אִיּוֹב אֱלֹהִים:

The word חנם is an important word in איוב.

(י) הלא את אֶתָּה שָׁכַתְּ בַּעֲדוֹ וּבַעֲד־בֵּיתוֹ וּבַעֲד כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ מִסָּבִיב מַעֲשֵׂה יָדָיו בִּרְכָתָהּ וּמִקְנָהּוּ פָּרָץ בְּאֶרֶץ:
 (יא) וְאוֹלָם שְׁלַח־נָא יָדְךָ וְגַע בְּכָל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ אִם־לֹא עַל־פָּנֶיךָ יִבְרַכְךָ:
 (יב) וַיֹּאמֶר יְקֹנֶק אֶל־הַשֹּׁטָן הִנֵּה כָל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ בְּיָדְךָ נֶקֶד אֵלָיו אֶל־תִּשְׁלַח יָדְךָ וַיֵּצֵא הַשֹּׁטָן מֵעַם פָּנֵי יְקֹנֶק:
 If you treat him as a מלאך then he has these powers, if he is a human being then G-d will do it for him.

איוב פרק א

(יג) וַיְהִי הַיּוֹם וּבָנָיו וּבָנֹתָיו אֹכְלִים וְשׂוֹתִים יַיִן בְּבֵית אַחֵיהֶם הַבְּכוֹר:
 They have started a new cycle of partying. That means that איוב brought the קרבנות for them. So the insurance has been paid.

(יד) וּמִלֶּאךָ בָּא אֶל־אִיּוֹב וַיֹּאמֶר הִבֵּקֶר הֵיוּ חֲרָשׁוֹת וְהָאֲתָנוֹת רַעוֹת עַל־יָדֵיהֶם:
 (טו) וַתִּפֹּל שִׁבְאָה וַתִּקְחֶם וְאֶת־הַנְּעָרִים הָכֵן לְפִי־חֶרֶב וְאִמְלָטָה רַק־אֲנִי לְבִדִּי לְהַגִּיד לָךְ:
 (טז) עוֹדוּ זֶה מְדַבֵּר וְזֶה בָּא וַיֹּאמֶר אֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים נָפְלָה מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם וַתִּבְעַר בְּצִאֵן וּבְנִעָרִים וַתֹּאכְלֶם וְאִמְלָטָה רַק־אֲנִי לְבִדִּי לְהַגִּיד לָךְ:
 Switch from a human attack to act of G-d.

(יז) עוֹדוּ זֶה מְדַבֵּר וְזֶה בָּא וַיֹּאמֶר כְּשִׁדִּים שָׁמָּה שְׁלֹשָׁה רָאשִׁים וַיִּפְשְׁטוּ עַל־הַגְּמָלִים וַיִּקְחוּם וְאֶת־הַנְּעָרִים הָכֵן לְפִי־חֶרֶב וְאִמְלָטָה רַק־אֲנִי לְבִדִּי לְהַגִּיד לָךְ:
 Go again to a human attack.

(יח) עַד זֶה מְדַבֵּר וְזֶה בָּא וַיֹּאמֶר בְּנִיךָ וּבָנוֹתֶיךָ אֹכְלִים וְשׂוֹתִים יַיִן בְּבֵית אַחֵיהֶם הַבְּכוֹר:
 (יט) וְהִנֵּה רוּחַ גְּדוֹלָה בָּאָהּ מֵעֵבֶר הַמִּדְבָּר וַיִּגַע בְּאַרְבַּע פְּנוֹת הַבַּיִת וַיִּפֹּל עַל־הַנְּעָרִים וַיָּמּוּתוּ וְאִמְלָטָה רַק־אֲנִי לְבִדִּי לְהַגִּיד לָךְ:
 (כ) וַיָּקָם אִיּוֹב וַיִּקְרַע אֶת־מַעְלֹו וַיַּגֵּז אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ וַיִּפֹּל אַרְצָה וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה:
 (כא) וַיֹּאמֶר עֲרֹם יָצִיתִי מִבֶּטֶן אִמִּי וְעֲרֹם אָשׁוּב שָׁמָּה יְקֹנֶק נָתַן וַיִּקְנֶה לֶקַח יְהִי שֵׁם יְקֹנֶק מְבָרָךְ:
 Powerful statement. It is unusual since איוב is a גוי that he is using שם הוייה.

(כב) בְּכָל־זֹאת לֹא־חָטָא אִיּוֹב וְלֹא־נָתַן תִּפְלָה לְאֱלֹהִים: פ
 He did not sin or say anything tasteless about or to G-d.

What is the שטן?

We have some more work to do about the שטן.

Philosophically רס"ג works better. You have a nasty guy. He's envious of איוב. Why did G-d get talked into it? It makes some kind of sense, G-d is saying "I'll show *you*."

What about the other view? Dealing with a certain supernatural presence. They are not independent agents. So what does it mean that one of them talked G-d into this? Makes no sense.

So what is שטן according to רמב"ם and according to רלב"ג? Nine-tenths of רלב"ג is רמב"ם.

רמב"ם

I think that this presupposes the Rambam's view of hashgacha. You think of מלאכים as G-d's agents in the universe. The cabinet, the court, agents of G-d. offhand, they are not independent. G-d created the world, and everything in the world is completely subservient to G-d. What's

essential to the רמב"ם's view is that a perfect blueprint does not entail a perfect world. The image that I'm using is deliberate. The blueprint is eternal. If you take that blueprint the building will go on and on forever. The problem is that the house exists in the real world. That is a world in which there is matter. We are living in a material world. For the רמב"ם this means that it is a world of inherent imperfection. The house is made of bricks which will crumble sooner or later. The ideal human being lives forever. The real human being of flesh and blood, a mutation here and there, eventually everyone stops functioning when they die.

So with all of the perfection in the conception, between the ideal and the reality falls the shadow of imperfection. What is that shadow of imperfection? Nothingness. Nothingness does not exist? Nevertheless nothing is a factor in the world. If you want to see this go on and on in a funny way, the old encyclopedia of philosophy from 1967, look at the article about nothingness. It's a very funny article. People are afraid of nothing, know nothing, etc. Where do you put that nothing? Is that part of G-d's world? Yes. is that part of his plan? No. the way that the רמב"ם puts it in the מורה גיב (which is a big שטן chapter), that's exactly why it is unclear whether the שטן is part of the heavenly host or not. All of the reputable מלאכים came, but in the real world the שטן, meaning that which deviates from the blueprint, he is also there. Not among them, he didn't get the same invitation that the others got, but he's there. He doesn't quite exist, but he's there.

If I learn this way, what is this dialogue between G-d and the שטן? According to the רמב"ם - the world is a good world, איוב is a צדיק and all things being equal he should live a good life. Even if he is just a צדיק not a חכם, by and large if you lead a good life then things should work out well. That's the way that it should be, it doesn't have to work out that way.

Not everybody has intimate פרטית השגחה. מורה נא. In, which, unlike many people, I am taking serious, he talks about אברהם יצחק and יעקב, people who are in synch with הקדוש ברוך הוא, and there the רמב"ם quotes חפזים פסוקים of תהלים ופתן תדרוך על שחל that you step on poisonous snakes and they don't harm you and nothing can touch you. But in the real world, not for great צדיקים, and איוב is not in that category, things happen. Accidents happen. A brick falls loose and hits him on the head.

So what's really going on in פרק א for the רמב"ם is not that there is this nasty human being that talks G-d into doing crazy things, it's rather that G-d is not intervening on איוב's behalf. He is allowing nature to take its course, and what is happening is nature taking its course. In a real world it is uncommon for a person to be hit on so many sides at once. But that wouldn't make an interesting course. A one in a million situation. Everything piles up and hits him all at once. For the רמב"ם it's an experiment, the book is fictional, what happens when things unfold in this way? So the שטן is not a rebellious figure, it represents something that could happen in the world.

I don't mean that the average person reading איוב knows the פשט in the מורה. If you come to איוב knowing the רמב"ם then the shock of this book is diminished. If you are reading it without already plugging in the רמב"ם, you'll be much more puzzled about it and much more confused,

which is what you're supposed to be. read the פסוקים about the שטן and started crying. He was responding to the raw poetic power of it.

Shiur #3 2/8/18

Iyov's reaction

איוב פרק א

(כ) וַיָּקָם אִיּוֹב וַיִּקְרַע אֶת־מְעָלוֹ וַיַּגֵּז אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ וַיִּפֹּל אַרְצָה וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה:

He shaves his head. Makes more sense if he's not Jewish. Tears his clothing which makes sense no matter what.

(כא) וַיֹּאמֶר עָרֹם יצתי וְצָאתִי מִבֶּטֶן אִמִּי וְעָרֹם אָשׁוּב שָׁמָּה יִקְוָה נָתַן וַיִּקְוָה לֵקַח יְהִי שֵׁם יְקֻוֹק מְבָרָךְ:

Famous line. Interesting is, especially if he's not Jewish, he's using השם שם.

Sounds like a very frum פסוק. If you read it in a shallow way then you don't have much to say about it.

There's a question that can be raised - we know what he's saying. What else could he have said?

1. The one that the שטן is thinking about is to start cursing. But that's not what we're expecting here.
תפלה means tasteless. It has two meanings in English. It has no taste, or it's disgusting. The Hebrew word תפל in my opinion has the same ambiguity.
2. Could have said "I must have done something wrong. Do תשובה. Of course if he has nothing to do תשובה for then this is dishonest. We're used to the idea that if you look closely enough you can find, if you don't find then be תולה on תורה if you don't find that then it's אהבה של יסורין. Important גמרא. In the suffering course this whole sugia takes up more than one meeting. But the גמרא takes for granted that a person could examine himself and not find anything wrong. So Iyov doesn't find anything wrong. He doesn't even pretend to.
3. He could have said "I just have bad luck."

In the modern world those are two options. What did you do to bring this on yourself?

If you read the sermon by Kierkegaard in what used to be called Edifying discourses and is now called upbuilding discourses. The sermon that he gave on איוב, this is the point that he makes. He does not adopt either of these alternatives, neither of which would have been honest. Either deny השגחה or to plead guilty to some vague transgression that he does not see.

"Sometimes a virtue of a more philosophical interpreter, something that Kierkegaard in particular was very good at this, is not so much saying the pshetl, saying some pshetl that we didn't think of, but realizing what a statement fully implies." -Rabbi Carmy

(כב) בְּכָל־זֹאת לֹא־חָטָא אִיּוֹב וְלֹא־נָתַן תַּפְּלָה לְאֱלֹהִים: פ

איוב פרק ב

(א) וַיְהִי הַיּוֹם וַיָּבֹאוּ בְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים לְהִתִּיצֵב עַל־יְקֹוֹק וַיָּבֹא גַם־הַשָּׁטָן בְּתוֹכָם לְהִתִּיצֵב עַל־יְקֹוֹק:

How does this differ from the first time?

Second meeting with G-d

First perek:

(ו) וַיְהִי הַיּוֹם וַיָּבֹאוּ בְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים לְהִתִּיצֵב עַל־יְקֹוֹק וַיָּבֹא גַם־הַשָּׁטָן בְּתוֹכָם:

Second perek:

(א) וַיְהִי הַיּוֹם וַיָּבֹאוּ בְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים לְהִתִּיצֵב עַל־יְקֹוֹק וַיָּבֹא גַם־הַשָּׁטָן בְּתוֹכָם לְהִתִּיצֵב עַל־יְקֹוֹק:

He seems more integrated in פרק ב. In פרק א they come, somehow he manages to get in. In פרק ב he's there with everyone else. A small difference.

How do we explain this difference?

1. Simple explanation - the רמב"ם - when we look at the שטן, it's unclear where he really fits into the picture. Is he one of the מלאכים or not? So one פסוק presents him as more integrated and one presents him as less integrated. That's the way that he learns. This variation tells you something about how he has this ambiguous position among the figures that stand in attendance of G-d. Why one is in פרק א and one is in פרק ב, he could just say that it doesn't matter. He doesn't address it.
2. The רלב"ג did try to explain why the more integrated one was in פרק ב and the less integrated one is in פרק א. We'll get to that when we get to it.

איוב פרק ב

(ב) וַיֹּאמֶר יְקֹוֹק אֶל־הַשָּׁטָן אִי מִזֶּה תָּבֹא וַיַּעַן הַשָּׁטָן אֶת־יְקֹוֹק וַיֹּאמֶר מַשָּׁט בְּאַרְץ וּמִהֲתֵלֵךְ בָּהּ:

The same answer.

(ג) וַיֹּאמֶר יְקֹוֹק אֶל־הַשָּׁטָן הֲשִׁמְתָּ לְבָרְךָ אֶל־עַבְדִּי אִיזָבָה כִּי אֵין כְּמֹהוּ בְּאֶרֶץ אִישׁ תָּם וְיֹשֵׁר יִגְרָא אֱלֹהִים וְסָר מִרָע וְעֵדֵנֹו מִחֲזִיק בְּתַמָּתֹו וּתְסִיתֵנִי בֹו לְבַלְעֹו חֲנָם:

Same as פרק א except that at the end he says "you see that he did very well, and you tempted me to destroy him for no reason." The wof חנם is interested, in פרק א "Is G-d fearing for no reason?".

The language itself is somewhat shocking. רבי יוחנן wept when he got to this פסוק. G-d being toyed with לצלן.

(ד) וַיַּעַן הַשָּׁטָן אֶת־יְקֹוֹק וַיֹּאמֶר עֹור בְּעֵד־עֹור וְכָל אֲשֶׁר לְאִישׁ יִתֵּן בְּעֵד נַפְשֹׁו:

Skin for skin. Either literally people would give up other people in order to save themselves. Or a person would give up part of his body to save other parts of his body. You're willing to suffer a lot in order to save what's really essential. He was frum until now in order to stay safe.

(ה) אוֹלָם שְׁלֹחַ נָא יָדְךָ וְגַע אֶל־עַצְמוֹ וְאֶל־בָּשָׂרוֹ אִם־לֹא אֶל־פָּנֶיךָ יִבְרַכְךָ:

Touch his body and then he'll sing a different tune. People often are willing to let their family die as long as they survive. Break an arm to save the head. If you really want to see who he is then up the ante.

The רלב"ג is more subtle about this. The way that he reads (as for the רמב"ם) the שטן represents disorder. The world is orderly, the blueprint is perfect, but we live in a material world, matter decays and things go off. There's an element of disorder even in a perfectly arranged world. But now the רלב"ג says that there are two ways to talk about disorder.

1. There could be disorder that is totally accidental. Brick falls and breaks someone's skull. Bad news, but does not reflect anything about him. The world operates the way that it operates.
2. Then there is a kind of disorder that has purpose and meaning to it. Think physiological processes. If a person has malaria. The way that malaria works: mosquito bite injects the agent. There are different kinds. It reproduces in the bloodstream with a certain cycle. At that point the body fights back and kills the parasites until the next cycle. If it's a four day cycle then every four days you run a very high fever and then the parasite is knocked out and then four days later you have it again. Very high fever, 105 106. So high that one could die from it. But the point is that it's so high that the parasites die of it as well. The point is that it's meaningful the way that being hit on the head is not. An attack of malaria is meaningful in a way because you have all of these mechanisms that are working for a purpose - to destroy the parasite.

So in פרק א the שטן is not really integrated has nothing to do with the order in the world. Get hit in the head by a rock. But in פרק ב when he's going to be afflicted in his body then the illness is closer to being part of the meaningful purposeful world. That's why in פרק ב he has a nametag. Interesting idea.

(ו) וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־הַשָּׁטָן הֲנִי בִידְךָ אֶךְ אֶת־נַפְשׁוֹ שְׁמֹר:

If you read like רס"ג this means that he could ask for whatever he wants and G-d will acquiesce.

(ז) וַיֵּצֵא הַשָּׁטָן מֵאֶת פְּנֵי יְהוָה וַיֵּךְ אֶת־אִיּוֹב בְּשֹׁחִין רֶעַם מִכָּף רִגְלוֹ עַד וְעַד קִדְקֵדָיו:

There are other problems as well but the major issue is the skin disease.

(ח) וַיִּקְחֵהוּ הָרָשׁ לְהִתְגַּדֵּד בּוֹ וְהוּא יֹשֵׁב בְּתוֹךְ־הָאֶפֶר:

Why pottery to scratch itself? It's cooler than his finger, less chance of infection.

Sitting in the dirt. Either he's humbled. Or it may be cooler to sit down there.

(ט) וַתֹּאמֶר לוֹ אִשְׁתּוֹ עֲדָךְ מִחַזִּיק בְּתַמְתְּךָ בְּרֹךְ אֱלֹהִים וּמָת:

You could translate ברך as to bless. Keep on blessing and you'll die, you saw what happened in פרק א. Being sarcastic.

Or she's saying to curse and the worst that could happen is that he'll kill you.

(י) וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיָה כְּדִבְרֵי אַחַת הַנְּבִילוֹת וַתְּדַבְּרִי גַם אֶת־הַטּוֹב נִקְבַּל מֵאֶת הָאֱלֹהִים וְאֶת־הָרָע לֹא נִקְבַּל בְּכָל־זֹאת לֹא־חָטָא אִיּוֹב בְּשִׁפְתָיו: פ

How could you speak in this way?

One question. He lost everything. His wife survived. Why? Two פשטים that I'm familiar with.

1. To tempt him to curse. Closest to פשוטו של מקרא. To my knowledge it first appears in saint augustine. And he held that his wife is part of the difficulty. She's tempting him to curse and that's one more burden that he has to bear.

2. A maskil wrote a three-volume work called *ספר הבדיחה והחידוד*. It's a great maskilish joke book. Some are jokes that you have to be a maskil to understand. G-d knew that eventually he would get everything back double, and he had mercy on איוב, so he didn't take his wife because he knew that then he would have to give him double and he had רחמנות.

He responds angrily. How could you say something like this?

... אֶת־הַטּוֹב נִקְבַּל מֵאֵת הָאֱלֹהִים וְאֶת־הָרָע לֹא נִקְבַּל...

How does this compare to what he said in the first פרק?

1. Sounds frum, but there's something wrong.
2. Shifts from הוי"ה to אלקים.

You have to roll with the punches. You took what's good so you have to take what's bad. That's not really acceptance, that's putting up with things בדיעבד.

So there is a change in איוב from א פרק to ב פרק. The ספר itself says בְּשִׁפְתָּיו אִיּוֹב לֹא־חָטָא but in his thoughts Rashi says that איוב חטא.

So א פרק is not a carbon copy of ב פרק.

Out there there are scholars (I will end up rejecting what they have to say, but for now I'm going to treat them seriously) really איוב is two different books, there's the folk story in the beginning and end, and there's the poetry in the middle. In the folk story he's as frum as a summer day is long. He's the איוב that יחזקאל refers to, the pseudepigraphical Iyov. and then in the poetic section he suddenly gets a mouth and starts screaming. A folk tale, and then an author who uses the folk tale to mount an important philosophical argument.

If you want to say that there was a folk tale I don't see that as being כפירה, we've seen based on יחזקאל and other things that there was this folk tale in the background. The question is: how much is the folk tale and the poetry integrated with each other? If you're dealing with a mediocre writer so you take the folk tale and poetry in the middle and read them separately. If you're dealing with great literature which תנ"ך is then we should really expect the ספר to read unified. So there should be some connection between the prologue, epilogue, and the poetry.

What I'm pointing out now is that if you look at ב פרק it's not like he's very patient until the end of ב פרק and then a new author comes in and suddenly he is like another person, I'm showing you that in ב פרק he is already edging towards a less happy position. In the פסוקים. Whether we'll see more in other פרקים, I suspect we will, but right now we don't know that.

Iyov's Friends

(יא) וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ שְׁלֹשָׁתוֹ רֵעֵי אִיּוֹב אֶת כָּל־הָרָעָה הַזֹּאת הַבָּאָה עָלָיו וַיָּבֹאוּ אִישׁ מִמְּקוֹמוֹ אֶל־יֹפֶז הַתִּימָנִי וּבִלְדַד הַשּׁוּחִי וְצוּפָר הַנַּעֲמָתִי וַיַּעֲדוּ יַחְדָּו לָבוֹא לְנוֹד־לוֹ וּלְנַחֲמוֹ:

His friends come on their own:

1. אליפז התומני
2. בלדד השוחי
3. צופר הנעמתי

Do the names mean anything to us?

There is an אליפז who is a son of עשו. And תימן literally means south. In תנ"ך it is a place in אדום. The word עוץ could be associated with אדום, or it could be associated with ארם.

One of the בני קטורא is שוח.

יחזקאל in איוב here must be the same איוב as in איוב אבן עזרא. But if you hold that איוב is fictional, that cannot be possible because it must be the same one as in יחזקאל, and if the one in יחזקאל is real then this one must be real also. We said that the one in יחזקאל could be fictional. But he refused to go that way. Then if you look in פרק א he says that you *could* say that there were two איוב, but it's not מסתבר. They seem like the same person. The example that he gives is שמואל. There are several people in תנ"ך named שמואל, but anyone reading about the שמואל in הימים realizes that this must be the same person as שמואל הנביא even though there are other people in תנ"ך named שמואל.

(יב) וַיִּשְׁאַל אֶת־עֵינֵיהֶם מִרְחוֹק וְלֹא הִכִּירוּהוּ וַיִּשְׁאַל קוֹלָם וַיִּבְכוּ וַיִּקְרְעוּ אִישׁ מַעְלֹו וַיִּזְרְקוּ עֹפֶר עַל־רִאשֵׁיהֶם הַשָּׁמַיְמָה:
(יג) וַיֵּשְׁבוּ אֹתוֹ לְאַרְץ שְׁבַעַת יָמִים וְשִׁבְעַת לַיְלֹת וַאֲיֵן־דָּבָר אֵלָיו דָּבָר כִּי רָאוּ כִּי־גָדַל הַכָּאֵב מְאֹד:

We learn from here that is someone is an אבל that you don't start the conversation, you wait for them to.

The idea of Nisayon

Several places in Tanach that speaks about Hashem testing people.

1. Most famous - עקידה in אברהם
2. למען אנסנו הילך בתורתי אם לא - מן

So what does it mean?

There's one trap that we could fall into. You could say that everything that happen to a person is a נסיון. I woke up, and there is a נסיון whether I would get up or go back to sleep. In תנ"ך the word is not used for everything that happens, it refers to a special event. There is specialized usage.

There is a problem that many people have philosophically - what is the purpose of G-d testing someone. A person tests another person because he doesn't know what the outcome would be. But G-d knows what's going to happen. That makes this whole question complicated.

Among Jewish thinkers there is a view that divine foreknowledge is limited. To put it the way that the philosophers put it "does not have knowledge of future contingents". "Future contingent events do not have a truth value".

This view is associated with the רלב"ג. It's a view that is not popular among Jewish thinkers. So according to the רלב"ג this issue would not come up. But according to everyone else it would come up.

The רמב"ם and רס"ג - meant to display the צדיק to others

Among mainstream ראשונים there are two views that are commonly spoken about. And a third view that we should be aware of as well. One view, if you ask people in the street they will associate it with the רמב"ם, but רס"ג also holds this way. According to them, the word נסיון is to be interpreted as a display. In Hebrew you have the word נס, meaning a banner. Holding something up. So a נסיון means a display. Almost related to נשא, to list something up. So the purpose of a נסיון is to display to other people. So אברהם נסה את האלקים means that he wanted to show the world who אברהם was.

Q - But this implies that whenever a person goes through a נסיון he's never going to fail.

A - You are forcing me to quote a מדרש that I was going to quote in ten minutes, now. A מדרש says that השם צדיק יבחן. Often the מדרש will begin with a פסוק that we are not discussing right now, and then the מדרש unfolds and shows you how that is relevant to what we are discussing now. G-d tests a צדיק. There is no point testing someone who is going to fail.

Questions against the רמב"ם regarding the עקידה - he was alone with יצחק! The נערים were left behind. The רמב"ם says from the עקידה that we learn two things. First of all, someone who is committed to G-d is totally committed. You don't make excuses or hold back. And when a נביא has a נבואה he doesn't doubt the נבואה because if he would have then he wouldn't have done this. This is something that had to be demonstrated to the world. So maybe because it's written in the תורה this way.

The other question that you could ask is the פסוק in the עקידה of כי עתה ידעתי. Here the רמב"ם would say that ידעתי means הודעתי.

The Book of Jubilees - pseudepigrapha. Retelling of בראשית. When it tells over the story of the עקידה it is explicit that "Now I have made known."

Does this fit איוב at all? The פסוק does not call איוב a נסיון. It could be that if you want to read the רמב"ם that way that you could do it. Kierkegaard calls it a נסיון. The רמב"ם doesn't make the connection. But רס"ג had to make the connection because for him the שטן is a human being! For him the whole story is almost written to illustrate his idea of נסיון. So for him there is no doubt that this should come under the category of נסיון. So why doesn't the פסוק use the word נסיון? He has an answer to that that we are not ready to discuss right now. But the רמב"ם maybe yes maybe no.

The רמב"ן - actualizing potential

The רמב"ן on the עקידה. His idea of נסיון is that a test is something that actualizes the potential of a person. It's not that G-d doesn't know what אברהם is going to do, rather he does it to bring out his potential.

I could read this in two ways.

1. I could say (and I think that this seems to be the dominant element in the רמב"ן, it is certainly the dominant way that people read the רמב"ן) that the point of נסיון is to show אברהם who he is. Someone who potentially be a great weight-lifter, and he never lifts weights.
2. A more abstract way of reading it. More explicitly in the ספורנו. A more metaphysical statement. What's better, potential or actual? Actual!

Q - Is this like he רמב"ם that says that תשובה גמורה is when you are in the position to do the עבירה and don't do it?

A - What you are saying makes sense, but what always bothered me about that רמב"ם is what happens if you don't have that opportunity?

רמב"ן שער הגמול - A person is in a rough spot and may fail

<I DIDN'T REALLY UNDERSTAND THIS שיטה SO WELL>

Not that well known. רמב"ן שער הגמול. In the back of תורת האדם. It's an essay about שכר ועונש. He raises the question of נסיון and gives two explanations. The first is just what he says on חומש. The other is that you could have a נסיון where the person being tested doesn't necessarily do well. Against what we said before, against the מדרש that we said before. He gives two examples. In שופטים the jews failed to conquer the land and therefore G-d stopped helping there, the גוים were left there בני ישראל. The implication being that they had temptation to ע"ז because these nations were together with them, and this is some kind of punishment. And if you read שופטים you see that they didn't do that well.

דברי הימים ב:לב it says that G-d tested חזקיה with regards to the Babylonian ambassadors. He didn't respond properly. G-d put him to the test and you see that he did not respond properly.

So you see that there is a נסיון that they didn't do so well. You have a situation sometimes where people who are in the course don't do work until the last minute. And then a student comes two weeks before the end and asks "What do I have to do to get an A?" Sometimes the answer is that if you do a perfect final exam and you do an extraordinary paper then you'll get an A. But you also know that the type of person that got himself into this situation wouldn't do this kind of extraordinary work at the end.

His point is that in effect he is testing because there is no alternative. You put yourself into a corner and there is no way out except to expect some sort of extraordinary exertion.

Coming back to בראשית רבה. It says ה' צדיק יבחן יבן. The מדרש has three משלים:

1. Compares G-d testing the צדיק to a person selling pottery. If you sell pottery you want to convince the buyer that it's strong. So you bang it against things. Like the commercial for the indestructible watch.
2. Take a piece of flax. You want to improve it. So you beat the flax. You beat a rug to get all of the dust out of it. Which type of flax would you beat? A1 flax. You beat it and beat it and it just gets better. Not the kind of flax that if you beat it it will deteriorate.
3. You have a donkey and you want to carry a heavy load. Which donkey do you overload? The ace or the bad one? Obviously you overload the best donkey that you have.

The רמב"ן and רמב"ם claim that the first two משלים reflect the נצי"ב.

1. Hitting the pottery is to show someone else. You're not making it a better watch. You're showing people that they should pay a lot of money for the watch
2. The flax is the רמב"ן. The more that you hit it the better it is.

I would go further and say that the third משל fits the רמב"ן. שער הגמול in רמב"ן. What is the situation with the donkey? There is no guarantee that it will be good for the donkey or achieve what you want it to. You do it because you have to get your load from one place to the other. If you have to do that then you go with your ace. Like using the same pitcher game after game. Even if you're not sure that your donkey is going to perform, but your back is to the wall, you ask "How do I do what I'm supposed to do? How do I deal with the situation in ארץ ישראל after they failed to do what they're supposed to do and the גוים are left behind?" You have to overcome it.

These are the שיטות? Do they fit איוב or not?

For רס"ג fits like a glove.

For the רמב"ן and רמב"ם we don't know.

Shiur #4 2/15/18

Is this a נסיון?

We had these various שיטות of נסיון and asked whether or not they were relevant to איוב, and according to almost all of the ראשונים the answer was no. According to רס"ג the answer was yes because according to רס"ג a נסיון is in order to prove something to other people, which fits the story of איוב as רס"ג interprets it. It fits so well that it's impossible not to make that connection.

If yes, why doesn't it use the word נסיון?

I raised the point last time that ספר איוב doesn't use the word נסיון. If it is a נסיון then why is the word נסיון not mentioned? Why not just say so, that would help us a great deal.

Do people in תנ"ך know that they're being tested?

Do people in תנ"ך actually know that they're being tested? אברהם doesn't know that he's being tested. We know because we read the first פסוק. The people with the מן. Moshe knows. But the people don't know.

Why is this point important? If you know that you're being tested, then that doesn't really prove anything. So if people are aware that they're being tested or not will have an impact on what your understanding of נסיון should be. On the one hand, the more genuine the test is the more likely it is that you don't know that you're being tested. Conceivably it is possible that a person knows that he's being tested but he's so hungry that he just can't do it. That is an extreme kind of situation.

In Jewish thought, in תנ"ך you never have people being tested who know that they're being tested. The first time that you have it is in the Apocrypha. The book of Judith. The storyline isn't important, it ends in יהודית cutting off the head of a general, it was a great ישועה. According to יונוס in תוספות this has something to do with why we eat milchigs in חנוכה. The רמב"ן had it in an aramaic translation and only quotes it for issues of דקדוק.

He's besieging the city. They call a fast day and are ready to give up. She says "Let's not give up, G-d is testing us." This is the first time someone invokes נסיון to explain their situation. This is not shocking, once you have the idea of נסיון, if תנ"ך is talking about it long enough sooner or later people will start applying it to their situation. But in תנ"ך we don't have it.

The more the idea is put in your face the more tempted you are to apply it and therefore the more tempted you are to solve the problem of the book by invoking the problem of נסיון.

Assuming it is a נסיון, and if תנ"ך would say upfront את איוב, then the reader will say "I know what's going on, it's a test." If you think that it's a test you won't work as hard when reading the book. You're going to get an overly simplistic answer. If part of the purpose of the book is that people should labor through it, you should make all of that effort and not get a quick answer-.

Kierkegaard - the difference between math and actually living is that in life there are no answers in the back of the book. Here the answer would be in the front of the book.

According to רס"ג that is why ספר איוב doesn't use the word נסיון. According to other ראשונים you could either say that or ignore the whole issue. רס"ג should deal with that, and he does. He says that it would oversimplify the situation. It would be harder for us to live through the book together with איוב which is part of what makes איוב important.

Iyov's Korbanos

Going back to the discussion of יצוב's children. I could have made the point a little bit sharper. No connection to this course - I was studying something else. How does the תורה look at נדרים? Is it a good thing that people have נדרים or is it a bad thing? The גמרא in ט נדרים דף ט, a חוטא or not a חוטא, and the פסוק of תדור לא טוב אשר לא תדור פסוק. It just so happens that this issue happens to come up in חולין דף ב. And I happen to be looking at the רמב"ן there, and the רמב"ן in חולין is more attracted by the anti-נדר position. There he says that people who bring קרבנות all the time, very often they become smug because they feel that after all if they're עובר since they bring קרבנות, they're not as careful as they should be because they bring קרבנות. The רשב"א says the same thing.

So here we have ראשונים who say that being overly anxious to cover your back with קרבנות may not be a sign of spiritual health, but may rather be a sign of smugness etc. I had never realized. So that is an interesting footnote to our discussion in א פרק.

Up to about 1:10:00 left ← IGNORE THIS

Philosophy

Many ראשונים and אחרונים who held that Iyov and his three friends had very specific philosophical positions. We're first going to learn the שיטות and then see if it helps in terms of פשט.

רמב"ם

רמב"ם - Moreh 3:17-18. His two פרקים on Iyov are 22 and 23, 23 is applying 17-18 to Iyov.

Five different views on Hashgacha (השגחה for the רמב"ם means order):

1. So unacceptable that he doesn't want to spend time on it. The view of Epicurus that denies השגחה completely, there is no order in the world at all. Clearly not true because there are rules of nature.
2. Aristotle. Order in the world, but that order only affects general things, not individual things. השגחה כללית. Laws of physics. Perpetuation of species. The צדיק suffers, the world is a good place, is perfect, but individuals are hostage to accident. Not clearly false.
3. Asharites (אשעריה) - G-d is all powerful, he means business and is in control, everything that happens is how G-d wills it. So on a certain level they will say that there is no such thing as nature because anything that happens is G-d's will. (Occasionalism). So we are in no position to judge צדיק ורע לו at all because G-d decides what he likes and what he doesn't like.
 - a. Free-will? A קשיא. In the history of human beings and history of religion there have been views that were highly deterministic and emphasize

divine power, in all of those views the question is where does free-will fit in?

4. Kalam (Arabic: talkers. Dialectical philosophers). Very much in favor of divine justice. Therefore if you show me that a צדיק is suffering then it must be made up. If people suffer then עולם הבא has to make up for it. A dog who has a bad life he gets עולם הבא. The רמב"ם has two criticisms about this view:
 - a. It turns עולם הבא into a place where justice has to be done. This is not the way that the רמב"ם viewed עולם הבא. He viewed it as a place to develop the intellect. The רמב"ם says that this is not a Jewish view. He thinks that people may read this idea into יסורין של אהבה. He says that there are some Jews that were influenced by the Kalam (he means רס"ג but doesn't really like to mention people by name). [Clarification: you are suffering here *for no reason* in order that you should be made up for it in עולם הבא. Not that you deserve punishment and for getting it now you have a clean record for עולם הבא].
5. The view of חכמי תורתנו. They hold that there is השגחה פרטית but only for human beings. You would think that this is the רמב"ם's view. But then he's devious. Read perek 18. You get the impression that human beings do not have השגחה פרטית unless they have reached a very high intellectual level. I would say that in 18 he's explaining what he said in 17.

The Rambam claims that Iyov himself held like Aristotle.

1. Elifaz - חכמי תורתנו (that's 17 without 18)
2. Bildad - Kalam
3. Tzofar - Asharites

רלב"ג

Pashtus in the רמב"ם is that there are five views about השגחה in twelfth century muslim thought and there are four views in biblical thought. They line up (possibly with the exception of Apikoros). The רמב"ם held that things don't change in historical thought.

The רלב"ג disagreed with that and said that if certain characters don't say things that line up with the positions that you say that they do, especially when they are ridiculous. When did בילדד say anything about animals having השגחה פרטית?

For the רלב"ג they have to represent a certain kind of logic that we infer on our own.

איוב - same Iyov that the רמב"ם had. General Providence, not for individuals.

Elifaz - a person who believes that even though צדיקים may suffer, they are justified.

Bildad - sort of like the Kalam without the animals, the idea being that if there are unjustified sufferings it will all work out in the end.

Tzofar - like the Rambam's tzofar, he believes that we can't determine who is a צדיק and who is a רשע. He has another philosophical constraint - we just don't know who is who. Not that he is an Asharite.

(There are other Rishonim who work out the same kind of thing but we can't do everyone).

מלבי"ם

Very close to the רלב"ג in the general system. The one significant difference - Tzofar - we are unable to know for metaphysical reasons - we can't know whether he is a צדיק or a רשע unless we know what his potential might have been.

Personalities

The Malbim also ascribes personalities to these people. Iyov is not just about the positions, but it's also about the entire way that a person thinks. Not only what you hold, it's why you hold that position, where you are coming from. So he ascribes these people personalities.

Elifaz - a man of revelation.

Bildad - a man of tradition.

Tzofar - a man of philosophy. ← But he seems to be someone who is very skeptical about what people could know about. He's thinking about Kant. For Kant philosophy is about showing the limits of human speculation.

One other thing in the Malbim. He also wanted to give guidance in reading the book in its entirety. How is it structured?

1. First round - צדיק ורע לו.
2. Round two - רשע וטוב לו.
3. Round three - leftover business which Elifaz and Bildad are still persuing

I could say that the shift between צדיק ורע לו and רשע וטוב לו is psychologically. His friends are getting exasperated with him.

רמב"ן

Read the Moreh. When you read the רמב"ן he is very quick and not willing to follow it all the way. Where the views are convincing okay if not don't bother me with it. Same school with much less anxiety with turning everything into philosophy.

Iyov is cursing the day that he is born. Look at ירמיהו פרק כ

(ד) הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה יִהְיֶה חֲשֹׁךְ אֶל-יִדְרָשׁוּהוּ אֱלֹהִים מִמֶּעַל וְאֶל-תּוֹפֵעַ עָלָיו נִהְרָה:

The day should be dark. There shall be no light on that day.

The nature of biblical poetry is that it's parallel. You say one thing, and then you say sort of the same thing, a contrasting thing to second it in the next phrase.

גאל versus געל

(ה) יִגְאֹלֶהוּ חֹשֶׁךְ וְצִלְמוֹת תִּשְׁכַּן-עָלָיו עֲנָנָה יִבְעֹתָהּ כְּמִרְרֵי יוֹם:

גאל means to be redeemed. This could fit here. The only redemption for that day is that it should be dark. But it could also be that גאל has the same meaning as געל. In modern hebrew געל means to be repelled or rejected. גועל נפש. And ולא יגעל נפשי אתכם. In modern hebrew we make the distinction, in תנ"ך sometimes גאל is used even though the meaning is meant to be געל. The words sounds the like. The words are similar enough that in conversation one could shift from one to the other. And when you spell it you might spell it the variable way. As language moves on, when you have two words that are spelled the same way that conflict with each other, one of them are going to die. That is the nature of language. You want to be clear. So געל becomes the only word used negatively and גאל to be the positive one. But in our פסוק here it very well could be that גאל means to be tarnished, to be darkened, and תנ"ך is using this because it has a double meaning.

כמריר יום

פשטים two - כמריר יום.

1. If the כ is a prefix then it means that it should be rejected in the way that those who are bitter reject their day.
2. The alternative is that כמר would be "dross". It would imply a dross drizzly kind of day. ישעיה פרק מ

ישעיהו פרק מ

(טו) הֵן גֹּיִם כְּמֶר מִדְּלִי וְכִשְׁחָק מֵאֲזִנִּים נִחְשְׁבוּ הֵן אֲיִים כְּדֶק יִטּוּל:

Like dross in a bucket.

(ו) הַלֵּילָה הַהוּא יִקְרָהוּ אֶפֶל אֶל-יַחַד בִּימֵי שָׁנָה בְּמִסְפָּר יָרֵחַ יָמִים אֶל-יָבֵא:

The light should be dark.

יחד like יתרו - אל יחד, it should not rejoice among the days of the year.

Or you could translate it as "be one of." אל יהיה אחד. To be counted. There are a lot of these double meanings here. It's probably meant as a pun. It's poetic that way.

(ז) הִנֵּה הַלֵּילָה הַהוּא יִהְיֶה גִלְמוּד אֶל-תֵּבָא רִנָּה בּוֹ:

גלמוד does not appear anywhere else in תנ"ך. But there is such a word in Arabic. It means to be isolated, to be alone. That night should be alone, there should be no rejoicing or singing in that night.

(ח) יִקְבְּהוּ אֲרִי־יָוִם הָעֵתִידִים עֹרֵר לִוְיָתָן:

It should be cursed by those who curse their day.

לִוְיָתָן

Sea monster

Who is לִוְיָתָן? A big fish. What is he doing in this פסוק? King fish. That would either give people associations with Louisiana politics or with a sitcom during the 1950s. There was a governor of Louisiana who was called Kingfish. He was assassinated, but that's not our business right now.

What's the story with the לִוְיָתָן. Here you have to know something about ancient near-eastern myths. Many of the myths there's a conflict between the sea/ocean/water and the more civilized deities. In Mesopotamia there is a deity whose name comes from "תהום" who threatens to engulf the world. In Ugaritic (much closer to ארץ ישראל) there is בעל who is the deity of heaven, and there is ים who is of the sea. This kind of construct people have, that the sea is disorderly and threatens.

In תנ"ך you have imagery that echoes these myths. You don't have two deities fighting, you have one G-d, and he is depicted as taming or overcoming the disorderly forces of nature.

Very explicitly in ישעיה כו. In תהילים עז, and קד. That's ברכי נפשי. And here.

תהלים פרק קד

(ו) תְּהוֹם כְּלָבוּשׁ כִּסְיֹתוֹ עַל־הָרִים יַעֲמְדוּ־מַיִם:

(ז) מִן־גַּעֲרַתְךָ יִנוּסוּן מִן־קוֹל־ךָ עַמְּךָ יִחַפְּזוּ:

The water recedes because the G-d orders the water to recede.

(ט) גְּבוּל־שֹׁמֵת בַּל־יַעֲבֹרֵן בַּל־יָשׁוּבוּן לִכְסוֹת הָאָרֶץ:

The magnificence of creation is that G-d sets the limits and the water comes up to here and it doesn't go further.

That is using the kind of imagery that people would be familiar with from Canaanite and mesopotamian mythology.

When you think of the sea as being threatening, it's not just the sea, there are also sea monsters. In Ugaritic epics there's לִוְיָתָן (Lawton). In תנ"ך there will be references to לִוְיָתָן.

תהלים פרק קד

(כו) שָׁם אֲנִיּוֹת יִהְיֶינָה לִוְיָתָן זֶה־יִצְרֶתָ לְשֹׁחַק־בּוֹ:

There are references to snakes in ישעיה כז.

ישעיהו פרק כז

(א) בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יִפְקֹד יִקְוֶה בְּחַרְבּוֹ הַקָּשָׁה וְהַגְדֹּלָה וְהַחֲזָקָה עַל לִוְיָתָן נָחַשׁ בָּרָח וְעַל לִוְיָתָן נָחַשׁ עָקְלָתוֹן וְהָרַג אֶת־הַתַּנִּין אֲשֶׁר בַּיָּם: ס

These are poetic images that are used here.

If you read the פסוק that way, he is saying that it should be cursed by those who curse their day, and by those who are somehow provoked or endangered by לִוְיָתָן.

Q: Maybe it's a pun, יום and ים.

A: Is every possible pun really an intended pun? You could go overboard. If you start looking for puns then אין לדבר סוף. And then the question is: is it really legitimate? When you first discover these possibilities they are really attractive? Then at a certain point you ask yourself: is there really no end to it? And then you have to look for criteria.

Another area: very often פסוקים in תנ"ך refer to other פסוקים. In ישעיה you have שמעו שמים שמועו שמים. I have no doubt that ישעיה expects the listener to remember the פסוק דבר כי השם דבר. The question is that if you take any two words you could have someone who makes everything relate to everything else and then people spend their entire careers trying to set up criteria for when a play on words is really a play on words and what is an accident?

Q: So what do the two halves of the פסוק have to do with each other?

A: So the question is: why is the לִוְיָתָן jumping in here? The other פסוקים don't say anything about mythology, why is this jumping in here? It would be interesting if לִוְיָתָן would show up later in איוב in strategic places, that would alleviate your question.

עַתָּה יְלוּהוּ אִישִׁי אֵלַי

The alternative is that לִוְיָתָן is an ordinary hebrew word, either meaning sexual congress, עַתָּה יְלוּהוּ, אישי אלי.

פֶּרֶשׁת וַיֵּצֵא

(לד) וַתֵּהָר עוֹד וַתֵּלֶד בֶּן וַתֵּאֱמַר עַתָּה הִפְעַם יְלוּהוּ אִישִׁי אֵלַי כִּי־יֵלְדֵתִי לוֹ שְׁלֹשָׁה בָנִים עַל־כֵּן קָרָא־שְׁמוֹ לְיוֹ:

It means those who are going to do that on that night. That relates to what we had before. But then what is the וַתֵּלֶד doing here? It should be לוֹ! The biblical grammar rules aren't set in stone, there are exceptions. Especially in the בית שני period they are aramaic speakers as well, so they would use the aramaic form which would end in a ו.

Those people should curse that day because if they do this then the consequence will be bad. Everything connected to that day will be cursed.

Funeral

It could mean funeral. In תנ"ך you never have that term. Except possibly here. But in חל"ל it's a common term. So those who are going to raise their voice in mourning at funerals. What's the ן doing here? And there may be a play on words. It might be לוייה but the ן is hinting at the mythological term as well.

Those who have funerals on that day, it's a day to curse. But people may curse on a funeral regardless of what day it was, even if it's a happy day. I once was at a funeral and a Rabbi got up and said "The day that Charlie Greenbaum died was the happiest day of the year." He died on שמחת תורה. That's what he meant. But the way that it sounded. I heard this and started looking around, no one reacted. No one thought that there was anything peculiar about it. I was "Did you realize what he just said?". But people have that experience, if you have a funeral on a rainy day people say "it's such a gloomy day."

(ט) יְחַשְׁכוּ כֹּכְבֵי נֶשֶׁפּוֹ יְקוֹל־לְאֹר וְאֵין וְאֵל־יִרְאֶה בְּעַפְעַפ־שָׁחַר:

The stars should be dark, the day should be yearning for light and no light comes, and it should not see the eyebrows of the dawn. Very unusual image, the eyebrows of the dawn. Appears only one other place in תנ"ך, in איוב, but I don't know the rest of איוב yet.

Sum up

That's the opening section. He's cursing the day, then he explains why he's cursing the day because he's unhappy that he was born on that day.

Offhand, if you read this casually, he's cursing the day that he was born and the night that he was conceived, and takes a few פסוקים to do it. If we didn't have interesting words to talk about you would tell me that he's just kvetching for a few פסוקים and if you've heard one פסוק you've heard them all. Let's see if we can do better.

The Poetic Styles of איוב - Bicola and Tricola

From a purely poetic point of view: do you notice anything? Is there any sense that he's talking about more than one thing, some kind of variation?

We know already that biblical poetry works on the principle of parallelism. After you say something you either say the opposite or the same thing in a slightly different way. Like this:

פרשת האזינו

(א) הָאֲזִינוּ הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֲדַבְּרָה

וְתִשְׁמַע הָאָרֶץ אֲמַר־פִּי:

(ב) יַעֲרֹף כְּמָטָר לִקְחִי

תִּזְלַל כְּטַל אִמְרָתִי
כְּשֶׁעִירָם עַל־דָּשָׁא
וְכִרְבִּיבִים עַל־עֶשֶׂב:

What's happening here? How does the poetry work?

(ד) הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וְהָיָה חֹשֶׁךְ
אֶל־יִדְרָשׁוּהוּ אֱלֹהֵי מַמְעַל
וְאֶל־תּוֹפֵעַ עָלָיו נִהְרָה:
(ה) יִגְאָלֶהוּ חֹשֶׁךְ וְצִלְמוֹת
תִּשְׁכַּן־עָלָיו עֲנָנָה
יִבְעֹת־הוּא כְּמִרְיֵי יוֹם:
(ו) הַלֵּילָה הַזֶּה וְיִקְחֶהוּ אֶפֶל
אֶל־יַחַד בִּימֵי שָׁנָה
בְּמִסְפַּר יָרַח יָמִים אֶל־יָבֵא:

In most of these פסוקים there are three instead of two. If you want fancy terms you could talk about bicola and tricola. A cola would be a small unit, bicola is two, tri is three. That's the language that I want to use here, there are other languages used by scholars but I think that this one will be less confusing.

This is tricola. Nothing wrong with that. Saying it three ways is more poetic. Three is more poetic than two all things being equal. It's more creative to say that same thing three different ways. All things being equal, a tricola would be more elegant.

In the real world, no one speaks this way. If you fall down you say whatever you say. If you wall down and start speaking poetry, unless you have someone who is an experienced actor who has all of the פסוקים in shakespeare that he could just roll out.

I'm reminded that there is an old story about a maskil. He had a son and he went to the big city, and then he stops getting letters from his son. So he writes a letter to another maskil in the same town and asks about his son. He gets a letter back from his friend and he's reading the letter and in the middle he jumps up and takes a book off the shelf and starts checking it. His wife asks "what's happening with our son?" And he's taking the books, the רד"ק, she says "stop reading and tell me what's happening with our son!" He says "I don't know what's happening with our son, my friend wrote to me that our son got into trouble with the government, and that it's important that I should contact anyone with connection to the government to try to help him out of it, but exactly what his problem with the government is I don't know, because my friend wrote to me that he was put אל הצינוק ואל המהפכת. And I started looking in ירמיהו where those words appear and it's a רד"ק exactly what those words mean. Why did the government had to do something to my son that involves a מפורשים?

So maskilim might say אל הצינוק ואל המהפכת and start asking what does this mean what does that mean, but if it weren't a joke then the maskil would have said במקום נתנו את בנך במלך אסורים, מחלוקת ראשונים, no שאסירי המלך אסורים.

So in real life people don't talk that way. This is poetry. But then there's more elegant poetry and less elegant poetry. There are passages in Shakespeare written more or less in prose, and others that are in iambic pentameter. Those more are eloquent. Sometimes it rhymes.

So perhaps these פסוקים are more elevated than they would be in bicola. In איוב almost all of the פסוקים are bicola. So if you just look at איוב the presence of bicola is unusual.

Q; Wasn't איוב composing this for like a week?

A: We shouldn't assume that these were actually the words that were said, rather this is the language that the תנ"ך gives him. And that expresses, perhaps more eloquently than he would express himself, about his character.

So we have three tricola. What's next:

(ז) הִנֵּה הַלֵּילָה הַהוּא יְהִי גִלְמוּד
אֶל־תֵּבָא רִנָּה בּוֹ:
(ח) יִקְבְּהוּ אֲרָרִי־יוֹם
הָעֵתִיד יִים עֶגְר לִוְיָתָן:

That's biocla. Then we shift back:

(ט) יַחֲשֹׁכוּ כּוֹכָבֵי נֶשֶׁפָּן
יִקּוּ־לְאֹר וְאֵין
וְאֶל־יִרְאֶה בְּעַפְעִפ־שַׁחַר:

So there's a shifting back and forth.

Sum up: variation between bicola and tricola, and we're not quite sure why this variation occurs.

Q: The writer probably wasn't sitting down and thinking about the style that the poetry was going to be in!

A: There are conventions, meaning that if you want to present something in elevated language then you're supposed to sound a certain way, which involves parallelism, and the מסורה is that certain parts of תנ"ך are written differently than others like האזינו and שירת הים, which means that there was a recognition that these פרשיות are somehow linguistically different than other פרשיות.

Let's look at ירמיהו.

Parallel to ירמיהו

Let's look at ירמיהו.

ירמיהו also curses the day that he was born. He had a very ____ life, he was persecuted, people didn't like his נבואות. So he says:

ירמיהו פרק כ
(יד) אָרוּר הַיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר יָלַדְתִּי בּוֹ
יּוֹם אֲשֶׁר-יָלַדְתָּנִי אִמִּי אֱלֹהֵי בְרוּךְ:
(טו) אָרוּר הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר בָּשָׂר אֶת-אָבִי לְאִמִּי יָלַד-לִי בֶן זָכָר שִׁמְחָה שִׁמְחָה:
Cursed is the man that gave my father a mazel-tov
(טז) וְהָיָה הָאִישׁ הַהוּא כְּעָרִים אֲשֶׁר-הִפֵּךְ יִלְוֶק וְלֹא נָחַם וְשָׁמַע זַעֲקָהּ בִּבְקָר וּתְרוּעָה בְּעֵת צָהָרִים:
(יז) אֲשֶׁר לֹא-מוֹתָנִי מִרְחֹם וְתִהְיֶה-לִּי אִמִּי קִבְרִי וְרַחֲמָה הָרַת עוֹלָם:
Why should he be cursed? Because he should have killed me.
(יח) לָמָּה זֶה מִרְחֹם יִצְאָתִי לְרֵאוֹת עֹמֵל וְגִזּוֹן וַיְכַלּוּ בְּבִשְׁתִּי יָמַי: פ

Are there differences between ירמיהו and איוב, in content and in style?

ירמיהו is talking about other people. Which is understandable because he was persecuted. But it does sound very strange that he's cursing that man. What did he do? So Rashi says that it was somebody who was ירמיהו's enemy. We know that there was a man named פשחור who was his enemy, so Rashi says that he happens to be the man that notified his father. What's bothering Rashi here? Because to curse a man who gave a mazel tov doesn't make sense.

But if we fill it in like Rashi does then it is clear to us that he expresses real anger at *people*. איוב is expressing anger at the stars, the date, the calendar. Which kind of curse is more robust, sticks to your ribs? ירמיהו.

So I'm saying that if you compare ירמיהו and איוב. I don't know whether the way that איוב is written that we are supposed to make the comparison, but I'm making the comparison because the comparison is there.

In ירמיהו it's a very straightforward curse. Poetically it's not as sophisticated as איוב. Even take the first פסוק:

(יד) אָרוּר הַיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר יָלַדְתִּי בּוֹ
יּוֹם אֲשֶׁר-יָלַדְתָּנִי אִמִּי אֱלֹהֵי בְרוּךְ:

Is that a good line? I'm assuming that if it doesn't sound to us like good poetry there is a reason. The reason is not just that if you hold like the אברבנאל that he didn't get a good grade in poetry writing class. What bothers me about this פסוק is that they use the same verb twice. You could distinguish and say that יולדתי means the night that I was conceived, and אמי יולדתי means the day that he was actually born. You could do that. But ארוור versus ברוך אל יהי ברוך? That's weak. If you want to contrast ארוור and ברוך אל יהי ברוך you could do it. The משלי in פסוק does it well.

משלי פרק ל

(יא) דֹּר אָבִיו יִקְלָל וְאֶת־אִמּוֹ לֹא יְבָרֵךְ:

That sounds like good poetry. Because it's a generation that will curse it's father, and there's no blessing for the mother either. You might have a הו"א of saying that even a rotten son would curse his father but at least will give his mother some נחת. So no, no blessing for the mother either. But over here it extends the פסוק. The second half ends up being a lot longer than the first half.

Rather, ירמיהו is meant to sound like an angry man, a man who really means it. It is meant not to be eloquent. Whereas איוב *does* sound like poetry.

Another point. We saw that in ירמיהו it's directed towards people, but not in איוב. Let's look at איוב again:

איוב פרק ג

(ד) הַיּוֹם הָהוּא יְהִי חֹשֶׁךְ
אֶל־יִדְרָשׁוּהוּ אֱלֹהִים מִמֶּעַל
וְאֶל־תּוֹפֵעַ עָלָיו נִהְרָה:

(ה) יִגְאֻלֵּהוּ חֹשֶׁךְ וְצִלְמוֹת
תִּשְׁכַּן־עָלָיו עֲנָנָה
יִבֶעֱתֶהּ הוּא כְּמִרְיֵי יוֹם:

(ו) הַלֵּילָה הַהוּא יִקְחֵהוּ אֶפֶל
אֶל־יַחַד בִּימֵי שָׁנָה
בְּמִסְפָּר יָרַח יָם אֶל־יָבֵא:

Now we shift to the bicola:

(ז) הִנֵּה הַלֵּילָה הַהוּא יְהִי גִלְמוּד
אֶל־תֵּבֵא רִנָּה בּוֹ:

(ח) יִקְבְּהוּ אֲרָרֵי־יוֹם
הָעֵתִיד יָם עָרָר לִוְיָתָן:

Is this devoid of people? No. it just so happens that the tricola, which we decided is more eloquent, omits human beings. The two פסוקים in the middle that are bicola include human beings. So if I reread everything now - as far as we have gotten he admits human beings, it's a world devoid of human beings to a large extent, in the tricola. The moment that he allows human beings in there he is already using the bicola instead of tricola. So the two פסוקים in the middle are meant to be more prose-like than the פסוקים around.

So I would say that איוב in these פסוקים does *not* curse G-d (רחמנא לצלן). In פרק ג this is a man who is deeply unhappy, and who is almost avoiding a confrontation with G-d. He does not say "Why did G-d do this to me?"

There was an atheist philosopher in Columbia. Didn't publish that much. His reputation was that he had great students and a great sense of humor. Also happened to have been a conservative Rabbi. When he was dying, he had a difficult death, and he said to a visitor "why is G-d punishing me this way for not believing in him?" Iyov is not doing that. He's reflecting his anger at the date, the stars.

Come back to the רמב"ם. Last week the רמב"ם and כוותיה, they say that איוב is aristotelian, only the השגחה כללית. What about השם נתן לקח? I admitted that he doesn't work as well with those פסוקים. So far in these פסוקים the רמב"ם works very well. Not necessarily because he studied philosophy and thought that the aristotelians were correct, what I am saying is that איוב's philosophy here is indeed the one that the רמב"ם ascribes to him, but it may be a product of his own psychological state. What's bothering איוב at this point is that he's angry, he is not ready to turn against G-d, and therefore the philosophy that suits his state of mind at this point is one where G-d is not directly involved. It's a world where there's a certain distancing between his suffering and that which he is complaining about. In the two פסוקים bicola that mask drops a little bit, and not that he curses the day that he was born, but that there are other people out there who curse the day that he is born. He wishes that the day would perish but doesn't use the magic word "curse." ירמיהו doesn't. Iyov says that these other people are cursing. Language counts.

The narrator is the one that says that he cursed his day, not איוב himself.

The more that you contrast with ירמיהו the more that you see these things.

Going ahead:

איוב's ambiguity when referring to G-d

(י) כִּי לֹא סָגַר דְּלִתִּי בִטְנִי וַיִּסְתֵּר עָמִי לַמַּעֲיָנִי:

The reason that he is cursing that day is because he did not close the gates of my בטן. Who is "he?" it doesn't say. Both Rashi and the עזרא אבן note that there is no noun here. He doesn't want to be specific. ירמיהו cursed that man, for not killing him. איוב asks not to be killed but rather not to have been born. ירמיהו is more violent.

איוב's parents

(יא) לָמָּה לֹא מִרְחַם אֲמוֹתַי מִבֶּטֶן יִצְאָתִי וְאֶגְוֶה:

(יב) מְדוּעַ קִדְמוּנֵי בְרָכִים וּמֵה־שֹׁד יִים כִּי אֵינָק:

He was greeted by knees and breasts. Whose? For all that I known it could have been a nursemaid. Later in איוב we know that there are slaves. But ירמיהו has a mother and he has a father. איוב we don't see it.

If we discussed in א פרק that he seemed to have a certain distance between him and his children.

(יג) כִּי־עֲתָה שָׁכַבְתִּי וְאֶשְׁקוּט יֵשׁ־נָתִי אֲזוּ יָנוּחַ לִי:

If I had died it would be quiet.

(יד) עִם־מַלְכִּים וְיַעֲצִי אֶרֶץ הַבְּנִים חֲרָבוֹת לָמוֹ:

His image of the grave is a very egalitarian place. Everybody is there. The kings are there. Rich people, stillborn baby. democratic.

(טו) אִו עִם־שָׂרִים זָהָב לָהֶם הַמַּמְלָאִים בְּתִיהֶם כָּסֶף:
(טז) אִו כְּנָפֶל טָמוּן לֹא אֶהְיָ כְּעַלְלִיִּים לֹא־רָאוּ אֹר:
(יז) שָׁם רָשָׁעִים חִדְלוּ רָגַז וְשָׁם יְנוּחוּ יִגְיעֵי כֹחַ:

I hope that knowing where this פסוק comes from doesn't ruin the זמירות.

(יח) יַחַד אֲסִירִים שְׂאֲנָנוּ לֹא שָׁמַע יוֹ קוֹל נִגָּשׁ:

The prisoners are free there too.

(יט) קִטְן וְגָדוֹל שָׁם הוּא וְעַד חִפְשֵׁי מַאֲדָנִיו:

(כ) לָמָּה יִתֵּן לַעֲמֵל אֹר וְחַיִּים לַמָּרִי נָפֶשׁ:

Who is he complaining about now? Who is giving troubled people light and life to bitter people? Who is the subject? One obvious candidate. But again, he allows Rashi to fill that in, he doesn't say it. G-d is outside the picture here.

(כא) הַמַּחֲכִים לַמָּוֶת וְאֵינָנוּ וְיַחֲפֹרֶה מִמַּטְמוֹנִים:

The bitter people are waiting for death, they dig it more than people dig for treasure.

(כב) הַשְּׂמִחִים אֱלִי־גִיל יֵשׁ־יֵשׁוּ כִּי יִמְצְאוּ־קָבֶר:

גיל could have two meanings here:

1. Those who have the highest joy, the greatest joy for them would be to die.
2. Or you could say that it means to live a long life, גיל meaning age, those who are happy to live a long life will be even happier when they get to the end point.

(כג) לַגִּבֹּר אֲשֶׁר־דִּרְכּוֹ נִסְתָּרָה וַיִּסָּךְ אֱלֹהִים בְּעֵדּוֹ:

A man whose way is hidden and G-d has closed in on him.

The verb ויסך appears by the שטן. That אתה סכת בעדו. You protected him. Now איוב is turning it around, it doesn't mean to protect, it means that you'll put a barrier. Like in איכה:

איכה פרק ג

(מד) סָכַתָּה בְּעֵנֶן לֶךְ מַעְבֹּר תִּפְלָה:

You put a curtain, and תפלה can't get through.

He's complaining now. He's unknown to G-d.

(כד) כִּי־לִפְנֵי לֶחְמִי אֲנַחְתִּי תָבֹא וַיִּתְּכּוּ כַּמֵּי יָם שְׂאֲגֹתַי:

He sits down to eat, groans to eat. Either he has no will to eat, or he is in so much pain and is screaming and you can't scream and eat at the same time.

My roaring is flowing like water.

(כה) כִּי פָחַד פָּחַדְתִּי וַיֵּאֲתֵינִי וְאֲשֶׁר יִגְרֹתִי יָבֹא לִי:

I was afraid, and what I was afraid of occurred to me.

(כו) לֹא שָׁלוֹתַי וְלֹא שְׁקֻטַּי וְלֹא־נִי חֲתִי וַיָּבֹא רָגְזִי פ

I never rested, and disturbance happened to me.

איוב's anxiety

What is happening here? If you take it כפשוטו then he never really had peace. Or maybe he's upset now so he's painting his whole life as bad.

Two גמרות are relevant. It's really one that is directly relevant, and the other one we just need to fill out the background. חז"ל had discussions as to whether it's good to be anxious or bad to be anxious. גמרא in ברכות one, פסוק says בציון חטאים which implies that the sinners were anxious. And the other פסוק says אדם מפחד תמיד. The גמרא answers תורה כתיב. הוא בדברי תורה and the other was not in דברי תורה. If the anxiety is about דברי תורה that's a good thing, if it's about other things then it's a bad thing.

תלמוד בבלי מסכת ברכות דף ס עמוד א

ההוא תלמידא דהוה קא אזיל בתריה דרבי ישמעאל ברבי יוסי בשוקא דציון. חזייה דקא מפחיד, אמר ליה: חטאה את דכתיב פחדו בציון חטאים. אמר ליה: והכתיב אשרי אדם מפחד תמיד! - אמר ליה: ההוא בדברי תורה כתיב.

Another גמרא in ברכות:

תלמוד בבלי מסכת ברכות דף ס עמוד א

יהודה בר נתן הוה שקיל ואזיל בתריה דרב המנונא, אתנח. אמר ליה: יסורים בעי ההוא גברא לאתויי אנפשיה? דכתיב כי פחד פחדתי ויאתיני ואשר יגרת יבא לי. - והא כתיב: אשרי אדם מפחד תמיד! - ההוא בדברי תורה כתיב.

Same answer.

Which implies that whatever his anxiety is about in פרק ג it's not about תורה. Now we come to Rashi, and Rashi says that it was about his children!

רש"י איוב פרק ג פסוק כה

(כה) פחד פחדתי - כל ימי עמדתי בפחד על זה כמו שאמרנו (לעיל /איוב/ א) ויהי כי הקיפו וגו':

The מהרש"א was a good reader of Rashi. He paid attention to Rashi on נ"ך. He's a good resource. He noticed what we're noticing now, this גמרא contradicts Rashi! Rashi says that the anxiety was about the children, the גמרא says that it was not about תורה. He leaves it as a צ"ע. According to what we learned earlier we have an answer.

The answer is אין הכי נמי. It was דברי תורה, but there's something about this anxiety which is not ideal and healthy. Then the point that Rashi is making here works out well.

If you don't hold like Rashi then what will you say? There is a kind of anxiety that is not hinted to in the פסוקים at all? If you are reading איוב as a literary production, then you would think that in a matter of this sort, if this information is important to understanding who איוב was then the פסוק should have hinted at it and prepared us for it. According to Rashi it does. First he's anxious, then he's upset when he recalls his earlier anxiety.

Sum up:

The kind of approach that we outlined in רמב"ם רלב"ג מלבי"ם in פרק ג is a valuable approach. The difference between what you get from the מורה and what you get from me is that i'm also looking at this in psychological terms. So if איוב in א and ב is different than ג that doesn't bother me, and if he is different later that doesn't bother me either. He's not interested in publishing in philosophical journals. He's interested in an experiential philosophy that reflects his experience of life.. At this point that experience of life is one of G-d abandoning him, and he doesn't want to directly confront G-d. And we see in the large things and in the small things how he is working this out. The atmosphere that kicks השגחה over to the callander and the stars, which is why people like to believe in astrology, something powerful and impersonal, you could blame everything on the stars. We see it even in the small aspects of his style, where he includes

human beings or not. He drops his parents out of the story of his birth. And lastly, the issue of anxiety coming up at the end of the פרק.

Next time אליפז, who is two פרקים.

Shiur #6 3/8/18

פרק ד

איוב פרק ד

(א) וַיַּעַן אֱלִיפַז הַתִּימְנִי וַיֹּאמֶר:

(ב) הֲנֹסָה דְבַר אֵלֶיךָ תִּלְאַה וְעָצַר בְּמַלְיִין מִי יוֹכֵל:

נסיון

The נסה of שורש is נסה. What person is this in?

1. If you read it as third person then the subject of the sentence is דבר. Has something happened to you? Have you been whatever נסה means? Has a דבר happened to you, now you are demoralized, exhausted, etc.
2. How else could we read נסה grammatically. First person plural. May we try to speak to you? Do you refuse to speak to anybody?

Both readings are possible here.

What's interesting about this word? The first word that we hear from any of איוב's friends is the word נסה. The word נסה is a word that we talked about a lot.

If you hold like רס"ג that this is exactly what is happening to איוב then why doesn't the שטן say it? Even if you don't hold like רס"ג, in our minds we were thinking that it sounds like a test. רס"ג said that if it were used it would give away the book from the beginning, and would allow the reader to not really get involved in the sugia properly. Now this sort of confirms what we said before. The first word that we see is נסיון. Many readers would be forgiven for saying "Ah! Just as suspected, it was a test." And the reader who is not fully aware that there are 38 פרקים to come will say that now אליפז will straighten everything out. You would think that you would be getting a quick knockout. So I think that the word נסה here is very strategic. It has multiple meanings, ambiguous.

Bonus question on exam : Movie: Horsefeathers. Set at a secular college. President of the college was called Professor Quincy Wagstat. He's played by Groucho Marks. Speaking to some important academic person who was very exasperated and Groucho wasn't treating the whole thing seriously. At a certain point he says "The dean is waxing roth," and Groucho says "Roth is out there too, why don't you ask him to wax the dean for a while," then this guy says "Sir, you try my patience," and he says "Why thank you, and I shall try some of yours."

What's the ambiguity here? Try could either mean have experience. Or it could mean to put it to the test. It's an ambiguity that you have in English as well. So this is the ambiguity here.

We readers are thinking of this other option, which is a kind of tease. You think that he's going to explain things and we're going to be home free, but we're not.

(ב) הַנֶּסֶה דָּבַר אֵלַיךְ תִּלְאָה וְעָצַר בְּמַלְיִין מִי יוֹכֵל:

He's either saying that it's hard for us to keep quiet so we would like to speak to you, or he's saying that you are going through such a rough time how could I be quiet?

(ג) הִנֵּה יִסְרֶת רַבִּים וְיָדַים רַפּוֹת תַּחֲזִיק:

You have given mussar to many people, when other people were sitting shiva you were the center of all eyes. You were the start מנחם-אבל I'm just making this language up now, but as we read the rest of איוב it may become relevant again.

(ד) כֹּזֵשׁל יְקִימוּן מְלִיךְ וּבִרְכִּים כְּרַעוֹת תִּאֲמָץ:

You helped the stumbling people

(ה) כִּי עָתֵהּ תָּבֹא אֵלַיךְ וְתִלָּא תִּגַּע עַד יֶיךָ וְתִבְהֵל:

Now that it's happening to you you are weary, confused, upset.
This is fairly understandable.

(ו) הֲלֹא יִרְאֶתְךָ כְּסִלְתְּךָ תִּקְוֹתְךָ וְתָם דְּרָכֶיךָ:

כסל

Two ways of reading this:

1. Your fear of G-d is what you relied upon. Elsewhere in תנ"ך the word כסל means fat, חלב, in על הכסלים ויקרא. The fat is what you rely on. When you fall down then you have some fat underneath you hit the ground easily. כסלתך would be a synonym for בטחון.
2. It also means folly. I believe that that word doesn't exist in איוב. Except in this case, all other uses of the word are not the foolish usage. Though Rashi did interpret it as foolishness it turns out that if this is how you are reacting now then your יראת שמים is all for show. His אליפז is more pugnacious than mine.

Sometimes the same thing that could be a very polite thing could also be a jab. So he could be trying to give him חיוזוק but it's a double edged sword. On the one hand it could be complimenting his אמונה, on the other hand where is your אמונה now.

(ז) זָכַרְנָא מִי הוּא נָקִי אֲבָד וְאִפֹּה יִשְׁרִים נִכְחָדוּ:

צדיקים not being destroyed

Remember, when have the innocent perished? When have the righteous been wiped out? What does that mean?

One way of reading is to say that since the righteous do not perish, G-d is in the heavens all is right in the world and what are you kvetching about? If he is saying that then he is being very hard on איוב at this point?

There is another way of reading. The righteous may suffer but they don't perish. They may have their ups and down, but it all works out for them. Everything is just, and a truly righteous person does not perish completely, is not wiped out. You bounce back.

What would that imply about איוב? It would be encouraging. In my reading, at this stage he is not telling איוב that he is a רשע.

But he is implying that those who do perish are *not* innocent. So he is in effect dismissing איוב's children. If איוב really is affected by the loss of his children and you tell him איפה ישרים נכחדו, a person may be more offended than if you tell him that he deserves it. But he doesn't say this openly, I am just noticing this.

What does he say? He gives you an anecdote.

רשעים being destroyed

(ח) כַּאֲשֶׁר רָאִיתִי חֲרָשִׁי אֶן וְזָרְעִי עֵמֶל יִקְצְרֶהוּ:

When I saw people planting iniquity they reaped it.

(ט) מִנִּשְׁמַת אֱלֹהִים יֵאָבְדוּ וּמְרוֹחַ אֶפֶס יִכְלוּ:

They were wiped out. This doesn't tell you anything that happens to צדיקים, but it does tell you about his experience with רשעים.

(י) שִׁאֲגַת אַרְיָה וְקוֹל שֹׁחַל וְשִׁנֵּי כְּפִירִים נִתְעוּ:

The roaring of a lion, the voice of a synonym for lion, the teeth of a lion were pulled out.

(יא) לֵישׁ אֲבָד מִבְּלִי-טָרֶף וּבְנֵי לֵבִיָּא יִתְפָּרְדּוּ:

A lion dies without prey, and the children of a lion are separated.

Five synonyms for lion. Why do we need so many synonyms?

After all, we're supposed to be talking about צדיקים who are suffering. He is talking about רשעים who come to a bad end, which is not quite the same thing. You come to me and you're asking "what's the justice in the world? I have gout" so you tell him "Mussolini has problems with digestion."

It's easier for אליפז to talk about רשעים coming to a bad end than צדיקים coming to a good end. It's much more dramatic. If a describe to you scenes where a צדיק is in a good mood it's not as dramatic.

אליפז - self-absorbed

The מלבי"ם says that אליפז is a person who likes to rely on revelation, as we'll see later. I would like to say that אליפז is a person who likes to rely on his own experience. When I saw. He likes to be dramatic.

There was a comedy on BBC forty years ago. There was a character who was the boss who would start every sentence with "I would not have gotten to where I am today without ___." except for the lines that began "Neither my wife nor I get to where we are today..." So this is like אליפז. I saw this I saw that. I saw the world. He gets very excited about the story that he tells. He's so excited that he goes through the whole thesaurus for lion. He's very into it.

Where else in איוב did we see שאגת אריה? In the end of פרק ג. There are those that say that he subconsciously picks up that image which really portrays איוב as a רשע even though that's not what he's saying, but those connotations are coming out there.

Philosophical thesis for the opening section

A philosophical thesis for this opening section: not that anybody who suffers must be a רשע, rather anybody who is wiped out is not innocent, and that leaves open what G-d has in store for איוב. This is consistent with the אליפז's רמב"ם, An average חכם תורתנו, a non-philosophical Rabbi. Believes that there is שכר ועונש, things work out, but not committed that everything is precisely proportional, but rather that overall people get what they deserve. Not everything is perfectly balanced.

אליפז's vision

(יב) וְאֵלֵי דָבָר יִגְנֹב וַתִּקַּח אֶזְנִי שִׁמְץ מִנֶּהוּ:

Now onto the next section. The truth was smuggled out to me. I had נבואה. I'm telling you now, it's not just what I saw, it's what I know from up there.

He makes having נבואה very dramatic. If you're writing a book about נבואה in the biblical period, and you want to give a sense of the experience of נבואה, the trembling in front of the presence of

G-d, these פסוקים are very important. I have heard scholars say that it's ironic that the fullest description of this experience is not in נביאים but in כתובים. I don't see it as so surprising. For the regular נביאים (and they do talk about some of the phenomena) these experiences are subsidiary to the נבואה itself. The important thing is what G-d says to you, and if you read lines you get a sense of what the experience was right. In ישעיה, he says נדמיתי, by אברהם a shadow falls over him. But if you want a long description you get it here. And the reason that you get it here instead of elsewhere is because he *wants* to impress you with the imagery. The emotional aspect.

(יג) בְּשֵׁעָפִים מִחֲזִינֹת לַיְלָה בְּנֶפֶל תִּרְדָּמָה עַל־אֲנָשִׁים:

I had the visions late at night when people are asleep. I am not asleep. I am having great experiences.

(יד) פָּחַד קָרָאֵנִי וּרְעָדָה וְרַב עֲצֻמוֹתַי הִפְחִיד:

A great fear, and the multitude of my bones shakes. The word רוב here doesn't mean the majority of the bones, it means my *many* bones. Similarly in מגילת אסתר, that רצוי לרוב אחיו, that does not mean that he was acceptable to 51% of the Jews, it means the multitude of the Jews, at least פי פשט.

(טו) וְרוּחַ עַל־פָּנַי יַחֲלֹף תִּסְמָר שַׁעֲרַת בְּשָׂרִי:

Wind over flesh, goosebumps all over.

(טז) יַעֲמֵדוּ וְלֹא־אֶפִּיר מֵרֹאֵהוּ תְמוּנָה לִנְגִיד עֵינַי דְּמָמָה וְקוֹל אֲשָׁמַע:

There's this image before his eyes which is unrecognizable. I see a mixture of silence and sound.

So this experience is overwhelming, very frightening. Then he presents an argument. This could be an argument that he received from this angelic being, or it could be that he somehow infers from the experience itself this kind of message. The message is:

(יז) הֲאֵנוֹשׁ מֵאֱלֹהִים יִצְדָּק אִם מֵעֵשִׂי הוּא יִטְהַר־גִּבּוֹר:

Can a man be more righteous than G-d, can he be more pure than his creator?

The ק"ו

(יח) הֵן בְּעֵבְדָיו לֹא יֵאֱמִין וּבְמַלְאָכָיו יֵשִׁים תְּהִלָּה:

There's a ק"ו here, however that works I don't know yet, we have real work to do to figure out what the possibilities are. He does not something or other vis a vis ועבדיו מלאכיו, so ק"ו that he does not something or other vis a vis regular people who dwell in tenements of clay, frail fallible human beings. These people will be crushed before the moth. They'll be wiped out in one day. Our job is to figure out the ק"ו. What are these two פסוקים about?

The normal reading is that תהלה means הוללות. Frivolity. He does not even trust the עבדים. And the מלאכים he treats as if they were frivolous. The other פשט is רס"ג, that תהלה has a more positive meaning of light and illumination, elsewhere in איוב "the light around my head" :

איוב פרק כט
(ג) בְּהִלּוֹ גָּרוּ עָלַי רֹאשֵׁי לְאוּרוֹ אֶלְךָ חֹשֶׁךְ:

תהלה is a good thing.

The פשט is that the word לא is missing. It should say "ובמלאכיו לא ישים תהלה." in biblical poetry this happens. A word that is in the first half of the פסוק is carried into the second half of the פסוק even though it's not repeated in the second half of the פסוק. In conversation that happens, the way that you structure the sentence. The עזרא אבן describes this phenomenon as מושך עצמו ואחר. It speaks for itself and drags along the second half of the פסוק.

Q: Do מלאכים and עבדים refer to the same beings?

A: I was trying to avoid that question. Now we at least understand what the other words are.

Who are we referring to here? מלאכיו most would say mean angels. Does עבדיו mean the same thing? It also mean angelic beings. Or I could say that עבדיו means righteous people and מלאכיו could be messengers of G-d or angels.

Generally if someone is referred to as a מלאך you have a question as to whether he is a human or not. When you have the word מלאך without any human function it makes more sense to say that we're dealing with supernatural beings. A human who is a מלאך has a message, there is no message here.

(יט) אֶפֶן שִׁכְנִי בְּתֵיחַ מֶרֶץ אֲשֶׁר־בְּעֶפְרַיִם יִסְדָּם יִדְכָּא וְאֵם לִפְנֵי־עֵשׂ:

G-d does not trust them, therefore... he does not trust someone else. But this doesn't seem to work that way. He doesn't trust them, therefore these are crushed before the moth. What does that have to do with anything?

Something's being smuggled in here. If I don't even recommend my best students for a Nobel prize, ק"ו the average students I kick in the stomach and punch in the jaw. I'm sure that there are many ways that you could wiggle out of that problem. We'll look at Rashi and the רלב"ג.

Rashi

Rashi: עבדיו means צדיקים. And לא יאמין that they won't sin. So it's a moral judgement. Then he adds: because he doesn't trust them, therefore he takes them from the world prematurely. The model for this (from חז"ל) is חנוך. He was shakey, so הקדוש ברוך הוא had mercy and took him at a good point.

Why does Rashi say that? He is presupposing that kind of approach overall. That's a way that we think about divine providence, some people die younger so that they shouldn't sin. But what's really pushing Rashi is that he's aware of the next פסוק. What does trust have to do with being broken up and smashed and so forth? So he smuggles into the פסוק the idea of death. He doesn't trust them therefore he takes their lives. Those who dwell in clay who are not צדיקים, so the way that this ק"ו works is that they should die young. But that doesn't really work because how do you preserve them from sin if they're not צדיקים? Unless not have them at all. I have read about people who murdered all of their children under the assumption that in our society today when they grow up they will all become רשעים.

They're crushed. Regular people need a constant measure of misfortune to keep them humble, in their places. The overall idea is that human beings are morally fallible, leave something to be desired, and therefore it is appropriate that they don't have things too easy. That's the way that he learns.

You could say that he likes to be really dramatic. He really turns them on in the second and third פסוקים of the ק"ו.

(כ) מִבְּקֶרֶךְ לְעֶרֶב יִכְתּוּ מִבְּלִי מִשְׁיִים לְנֹצֵחַ יֵאָבְדוּ:
(כא) הֲלֹא־נִסֶּע יִתְּרָם בָּם יִמְּוֹתוּ וְלֹא בְּחֻכְמָה:

<Missed whole Q and A discussion here about why אליפז is saying what he's saying, אונאת דברים, whether there was an alternative of what he could have said, and whether at the end of the day איוב's friends were good therapists. I think that this was בערך between 40 - 35 minutes left>

רלב"ג

רבדיו means angels. לא יאמין means that G-d doesn't really confide in מלאכים. They are inferior. ק"ו that human beings are going to be crushed. Here it's not a moral issue. For Rashi it was an issue of moral worthiness. If you're morally fragile then you deserve premature death or to be debilitated. But moral inadequacy is what is driving the פסוקים. The lesson would be, you're a human being, don't complain, you have nothing to complain about. That's Rashi.

For רלב"ג the issue is intellectual. Even מלאכים don't understand G-d's ways. ק"ו to human beings. They are crushed before the moth.

Q: So why is there so much about being smashed?

A: It's that human beings are nothing.

There are other combinations that you could make here, but we can't go through every possible פשוט in the פסוקים.

Difference between Rashi and Rabbag

The large issue between Rashi and the Rabbag is whether you view human inadequacy in moral terms or in ontological terms. The whole being of human beings is not much to write home about. Offhand, אליפז is either hearing the speech from the angelic being. Or he's drawing an inference from the experience. He had this overwhelming experience, when he reflected upon it it led him to think about the unworthiness of human beings. Can work for either Rashi or רלב"ג.

Synthesizing Rashi and Rabbag - interpreting an experience

I want to suggest that there is no contradiction between these two ways of reading. Part of human religious experience is that we confront G-d and become very much aware of our moral failings. איש טמא שפתים אנכי. Who am I to be in the presence of G-d. Or you could have it from your ontological standing, G-d is infinite, and even if I have no faults, who am I? אין ואפס לנגדך in the language of the מזור. What do we understand of the world? What is our worthiness? What חוצפא is it for us to understand G-d.

These are both experiences which could be expressed here. And I don't see why there has to be a contradiction. It could very well be that for religious people one experience feeds the other. If you feel that G-d is infinite and who am I, it will sharpen your sense of being morally inadequate. If you are aware of your moral inadequacy it makes more drastic your sense of being unworthy. Who am I do try to understand G-d.

What I'm doing now is not just the typical thing of taking two ראשונים and trying to justify both. I see nothing wrong in doing that if it's done properly. If there's something attractive in both, wouldn't it be nice to create a שיטה that works for both. Here though, especially since we're dealing with words that are distilled from an experience, he sees this strange apparition. I may say that אליפז isn't sure how he learns פשוט here. The experience has implications, either in terms of moral inadequacy or that humans are foolish so how could they attempt to challenge G-d, or it could be that on some level if he were sitting here in class he would try to support both.

What comes out of this is that if these ideas turn up elsewhere in the book, how you learn פשוט here doesn't necessarily determine how you learn פשוט later on. Because the experience itself

could be open to either interpretation. Which one we adopt right now does not determine which one will look better at some other stage of the discussion.

Meir Weiss - explaining the illogical ק"ו

What I'm saying is partly based on a scholar named Meir Weiss. Originally taught bible at Bar Ilan, there was a whole political shootout in Bar Ilan and he ended up in Hebrew U. Nechama Leibowitz was friends with him and she left at the same time. They said that she left in sympathy, when they asked her later in life she said that there were other factors as well. Again, we're not here to discuss this.

In Meir Weiss's reading, he stops at the words שְׁכַנֵּי בְּתֵי חוֹמֶר (He's also the one that said that בְּנֵי לֵבִיא is a *shtuch* to איוב's children). Strange image to refer to people as tenements of clay. In modern English it may not be so unusual but that's because they're influenced by the King James Bible and got it from here. But in תנ"ך it's unusual. An interesting image. A house of clay, inferior substance. Where else do we see houses in איוב? His children had houses. And they collapsed. We've seen already that you come in meaning one thing, and what you say and what you get across is not always the same thing. So once אליפז stumbles across the image of בְּתֵי חוֹמֶר and compares inferior fragile man to a house of clay, the image of a house collapsing begins to push him, and by sheer association, instead of continuing the ק"ו properly (maybe according to the רלב"ג it should be "they have no understanding of G-d.") he says that the ק"ו breaks down because אליפז gets distracted. Once the words בְּתֵי חוֹמֶר comes in, he sees collapsing houses.

(כ) מִבְּקֶרֶךְ לַעֲרֹב יִכְתּוּ מִבְּלֵי מִשְׁׁיִם לְנֹצֶחַ יֵאָבְדוּ:
(כא) הֲלֹא־נֹסַע יִתְּנֶם בָּם יָמֵי יוֹתוֹ וְלֹא בְּחֻכְמָה:

The word נֹסַע means to travel. So whatever makes a person human travels away. Their human dignity goes away. נֹסַע meaning to travel. They die בְּחֻכְמָה. ולא According to רלב"ג they die in ignorance, according to Rashi their ignorance comes to nothing.

There's an alternative way of reading the פסוק. Take the word נֹסַע literally as travelling. The first way was metaphorical. And the word יִתְּרֵם. We said that that means the advantage, greatness of man. The word יִתֵּר has another meaning - the cord of the tent. כְּלֵי מִיתֵר are string instruments. יִתֵּר is a word in תנ"ך referring to the cords that tie the tent down. So instead of this being an abstract statement, if you take the image much more literally, you think of the human as a tent, the cords are pulled out, and the tent collapses. When you are about to travel that is what you do with the tent. Then the image in the last פסוק is much more this image of the house collapsing. This supports Meir Weiss's idea.

Sum up

רמב"ם ends up giving him מוסר, which is complicated but he didn't intend it that way. Then we get to what happens to those who are not צדיקים. And צדיקים should not perish completely. We saw the vision and the ק"ו. The focus would either be on the sense of human moral inadequacy, or the more intellectual or ontological outlook of what do humans understand anyway. The last two points that we made was on a literary level Weiss's attempt to show why it doesn't work well for psychological reasons, and my argument that you could tie things together, and a philosopher or a student of comparative religion might want to learn from multiple ways to read.

Next we have פרק ה where he keeps on speaking.

Shiur #7 3/15/18

1. The opening few פסוקים were basically saying "Why don't you have a better attitude."
2. Then there's מי נקי אבד, which we interpreted as saying that those people who are צדיקים, bad things happen to them but they don't perish, and illustrated this from his own experience.
3. Then we spent a lot of time on the vision. In terms of his self-image this is important. The מלבי"ם would say that he's the spokesperson for נבואה, I would say he's the spokesperson of his own experience. The vision entails some kind of message, the ק"ו, whether he heard this or intuited it from the experience. We approached the ק"ו in two ways,
 - a. Rashi - who are human beings to criticize G-d, moral inadequacy.
 - b. Rambam - intellectual inadequacy

We had difficulty with how the ק"ו actually works out.

The likelihood is that it doesn't work out. We discussed the possibility that his emotions take over so it doesn't come out the way that it would have had he been purely logical.

And I emphasized that the two approaches of Rashi and Rambam are not mutually exclusive. The experience could have two faces, and they could enforce each other.

That sums up what we have done last time.

איוב פרק ה

(א) קרא נא ה' עֹנֶךָ וְאֶל־מִי מְקַדְּשִׁים תִּפְנֶה:

Cry out, does anyone answer you.

קדושים we'll translate as angels. What supernatural beings are there that you can call in there?

Implicitly he's saying that I do have that kind of access but you don't.

Now we have some kind of argument:

(ב) כִּי־לֹאֵיִל יִהְרַג־כַּעַשׂ וּפְתִיחַ תַּמִּית קִנְאָה:

כעס

The לֹאֵיִל is destroyed by כעס, and the פְתִיחַ is destroyed by zeal/envy.

How to translate כעס? In תנ"ך a lot of these emotion words are not as clearly defined. If I wanted to be more safe I would translate כעס as agitation. חרון אף is definitely anger. Your face is inflamed.

Depending on that there could be two very different פסוקים in the פסוק:

1. Agitation: why would the fool be destroyed by agitation? Foolish people get upset for no good reason. A foolish person goes into the subway and just missed the train and gets all upset. Many people wouldn't respond at all, some would say that G-d is sending me a message. There's a foolish attitude where you didn't pay attention to what stop it was and then you get annoyed with it. This is more or less the רלב"ג. There are people out there that thinks that the world owes them a living, and when they don't get what they wanted they get all upset.

Biblical Foolishness

2. **Rashi** - Anger. And his לֹאֵיִל is not as much of a fool as he is a morally deficient person. In תנ"ך, fools are not simply people who have low SAT scores or Forrest Gump. Read משלי. He's not just a person who is not very bright. There is blending of foolishness with morality. His way of looking at the world is wrong, his values are wrong. So if you take a range of words, כסיל, אויל, רשע, כסיל, אויל. There is a certain moral opprobrium attached as well. So Rashi learns that this is anger, and this is religious foolishness. When he is faced with misfortune he complains, the way that איוב complains.

רש"י איוב פרק ה פסוק ב

(ב) כי לאויל וגו' - לאויל כמותך יהרג כעסו שאלו היית שותק שמ' תשוב מדת הרחמים עליך:

An אויל like you, you are killed by your anger. Keep your mouth shut. Your shouting may be making things a lot worse for you.

When you pronounce and write the ש and o the same way, you end up changing them all to o.

When you think of שלמה as a חכם what do we mean? שלמה hired an outside person to build the בית המקדש. If he was so smart why didn't he do it himself? Or does wisdom mean that he knew whom to hire? That he had good judgement about who to get to do things for you.

Q: What kind of חכמה does the רמב"ם refer to in his position on השגחה in the מורה?

For Rashi אליפז is harsher, your complaining is a kind of foolishness bordering on חופצה.

For the רלב"ג he's just a fool, not a bad person.

קנאה could mean zeal or excitement. Rashi here treats this as a synonym for כעס.

אליפז has another experience:

(ג) אָנִי־רָאִיתִי אוֹיִל מִשְׁרִישׁ וְאָקוּב נִהוּ פְתָאָם:

I saw an אויל who was taking root (looking good) and I cursed his abode suddenly.

(ד) יִרְחֲקוּ בָנָיו מִיָּשָׁע וְיִדְכָּאוּ בֶּשֶׁר וְאִין מִצִּיל:

(ה) אֲשֶׁר קִצְרוּ רָעַב יֹאכֵל וְאֶל־מִצְנֵים יִקְחֶהוּ וְשָׂאף צָמִים חֵילָם:

His children were in trouble. Whatever he had worded was eaten by hungry people, people who take things from the thorns. Should be צמאים. The thirsty inhaled all of his plenty.

(ו) כִּי לֹא־יֵצֵא מִעֶפֶר אָוֶן וּמִאֲדָמָה לֹא־יִצְמַח עֵמֶל:

I'm not sure what this means yet.

(ז) כִּי־אָדָם לְעֵמֶל יוֹלֵד וּבְנֵי־רֶשֶׁף יִגְבִּיהוּ עוֹף:

Man is born for עמל like the sparks fly up high.

אליפז's curse

Why did אליפז curse him? If I were to show that an אויל comes to a bad end, I would not curse him. It would be more appropriate to say that G-d struck him dead. Why should he do that?

He is very into his own authority and experience. "I did not get to where I am today without seeing an אויל משריש, and I gave it to him."

רס"ג was more disturbed by the issue. He says that אקוב doesn't mean that he cursed him, rather it means "I said." In איוב and other places as well he tends to take things that seem over the top and tone them down.

Also - a grammatically unnecessary word - אני ראיתי. Just say ראיתי! Why did he include אני? You don't need that in Hebrew!

Dan Amos - an American tourist donated blood and announced "אני תרמתי דם היום" That means that "I am loose in the head." The point is that he shouldn't have said the word אני . If he wanted to say that he should have said תרמתי דם without saying אני

Let me show you a פסוק in תהילים there are multiple פרקים that deal with לו.

תהלים פרק לז

(א) לִדְּוֹד אֶל־תִּתְחַר בַּמַּרְעִים אֶל־תִּקְנֵה אֶבְעָשִׁי עוֹלָה:

Don't envy the wicked. The הו"א is that the person envies the wicked who does well. The rest of the מזמור tells him not to envy the wicked.

Go to לה.

(לה) רָאִיתִי רָשָׁע עָרִיץ וּמִתְעַרֵּה כְּאֶזְרַח רֹעֵן:

I was an impressive רשע taking root like a flourishing date tree.

Notice that the פסוק clearly resembles the פסוק over here. The reader would have in his mind the echo of this פסוק in תהילים. Differences:

1. Here it says אני
2. In איוב it says אויל, in תהילים it is a רשע.
3. In איוב it's taking root, in תהילים he's already a stable part of the landscape.
4. What happens? In תהילים he doesn't intervene. That would undermine the whole point of the מזמור. Don't worry about them. Don't be concerned about them.
5. In תהילים all of a sudden he disappears.

Very different than what you have in אליפז.

If you look at פסוקים that are similar it can give you better insight into what going on. It gives you more insight into what the מזמור in תהילים is doing - it's specifically about a speaker who is tempted to be preoccupied with that, and is told don't think about. Where in איוב he's very much behaving according to character.

אדם לעמל יולד

What about that פסוק that we skipped:

איוב פרק ה

(ו) כִּי לֹא־יֵצֵא מֵעֵפֶר אָנוֹן וּמִאֲדָמָה לֹא־יֵצֵמַח עֵמֶל:

(ז) כִּי־אָדָם לְעֵמֶל יוֹלֵד וּבְנֵי־רֶשֶׁף יִגְבִּיהוּ עוֹף:

Literally that means that out of dust iniquity does not grow and out of earth toil does not grow.

The way that **Rashi** would interpret it is that if a person suffers there must be a reason for it. Because mankind is set up for travail the same way that the sparks fly up. That's the nature of the world. People are not perfect, they are sinners, so when they suffer don't complain about it.

According to the רלב"ג, the fool is really much more of a fool, and according to his reading he's talking about the fool who may not be a bad person, but he expects the world to cater to him. A person who would not be a חכם in the רמב"ם's sense of the world, who thinks that if you're a nice person then you shouldn't have to work. Nice people shouldn't have to suffer. Out of dust,

without hard work, nothing will grow. For man was created to work. Not like Rashi, that people are imperfect.

I don't know whether logically the שיטות have to align this way. But the approaches happen to go together. If there are those that don't combine it this way it doesn't mean that they're wrong.

השגחה כללית

What do we have so far:

1. If you are really a צדיק you won't perish.
2. Whatever אליפז got out of that vision.
3. Whatever we did today, either (Rashi) don't kvetch, or (Ralbag) nice people can have misfortunes and if they think that the world owes them a living then their wrong.

Now we go to something that appear to be entirely different. He starts speaking about the way that the world runs in general. What we would call השגחה כללית.

(ח) אֵלִים אֲנִי אֶדְרֹשׁ אֶל־אֵל וְאֶל־אֱלֹהִים אֲשִׁים דְּבַרְתִּי:

דרישה

As for me I turn to G-d. Whether the word אדרוש means תפלה or philosophical inquiry is open. does this mean that רבקה went for נבואה or תפלה? For יתרו - similar question.

שם השם בספר איוב

The name of G-d appears here. Generally speaking, הוי"ה does not appear at all in the poetic parts of איוב. Not surprising. השגחה פרטית we don't have so the שם disappears. The רמב"ן makes this point.

I would go further and say that even the שם אלקים is very rare in איוב. I suspect that this is a similar phenomenon. It is a more traditional name of G-d, אליפז uses it the very first speech. Many readers would think that he's speaking so this should be the answer. The use of שם אלקים reinforces the sense that this should be the answer. The more that you are using unconventional language the more up in the air you are. The more that you are using terms that are familiar to people through from frum discourse the more that your sense is that you're listening to a ראש ישיבה and he's explaining things the way that they are. As the ספר becomes darker and darker these more conventional signposts disappear.

He discusses what seems to be two things:

- (ט) עֲשֵׂה גְדֻלּוֹת וְאֵין חֶקֶר נִפְלְאוֹת עַד־אֵין מִסְפָּר:
(י) הִנֵּנִי מְטַר עַל־פְּנֵי־אֶרֶץ וְשִׁלַּח מַיִם עַל־פְּנֵי חוּצוֹת:
(יא) לְשׁוּם שְׂפָלִים לְמָרוֹם וְקִדְרִים שָׁגְבוּ יֵשַׁע:

G-d does wonderul things. G-d sends rain. Through rain people who are downtrodden rise up. Without rain people starve. So rain is what enables people to survive.

(יב) מִפֶּן מַחֲשָׁבוֹת עָרוּמִים וְלֹא־תַעֲשֶׂינָהּ יְדִיהֶם תּוֹשִׁיָהּ:

G-d confounds the plans of the crafty.

(יג) לִכְדּ חֲכָמִים בְּעֶרְמָם וְעֹצֵת נְפֹתָלִים נִמְהָרָה:

Traps clever people בערמם.

(יד) יוֹמָם יִפְגְּשׁוּ־חֹשֶׁךְ וְכָל־יֵלֶה יִמְשְׁשׁוּ בַצֹּהָרִים:

Smart people grope in the dark,

(טו) וַיִּשָּׁע מִחֶרֶב מִפִּיהֶם וּמִיַּד חִזַּק אֲבִיוֹן:

(טז) וַתְּהִי לַדָּל תִּקְוָה וְעַל־תָּה קִפְצָה פִּיהּ:

Saves the poor people from the wicked/powerful people.

Why these two examples?

Rain

Rain is a great example of השגחה כללית. It is a special kind of השגחה כללית.

When you talk about השגחה כללית you could be talking about something as general as how the universe works. A comment from intro by אבן Ibn Janach about how the land juts up from the water, and how this is השגחה.

There is a book that I'm reading about the history of taking temperature. Part of the discussion is that in order for science to progress, common sense opinions have to be close enough to the way that things really are. If reality was totally alien to common sense then scientists would not have any grip on phenomena to be able to extract data. I'm reading this and saying, this is השגחה. The reality is such that if you just guess a scientific truth you'll be close enough that if you would start finding more you would be able to get somewhere.

Rain is השגחה כללית in that it doesn't require divine intervention like the עשר מכות. But it's more fine-tuned than the average השגחה כללית. You could have it fall on one field but not the one next to it.

עמוס פרק ד

(ז) וגם אנכי מנעתי מכם את-הגשם בעוד שלשה חדשים לקציר והמטרתי על-עיר אחת ועל-עיר אחת לא אמטיר חלקה אחת תמטר וחלקה אשר-לא תמטיר עליה תיבש:

That is one of the reasons that if you read the beginning of תענית it talks about the מפתח של גשמים. A special key that you have to open up. It involves metaphysical intervention. Funny kind of thing.

So rain in good, it's evidence that the world as a whole is being well run.

The downtrodden

What's the deal with the poor people and the downtrodden? According to **Rashi**, the poor people being saved from the גשמים is the same story as the rain. There's one scenario. The powerful people, for them the famine is good, they have stores of grain, so if it's a bad year they clean up. Like יוסף. So when there *is* rain, that confounds their plans.

The **Ralbag** held that these are two separate stories. What about the poor people being oppressed? If you're looking for השגחה כללית in a dramatic way, the kind that really gets to you, rain is one example, the other is the way that the רשעים are always poised to take over and they never really succeed. You always expect them to win. And somehow they never quite close the deal. For the רלב"ג that is a basic law of the universe - they are always close to winning but never quite manage.

He says this here and says this in his philosophical work מלחמות השם.

Decameron - Plague is raging, people run away and hang out in this villa, and there are ten people there so if they each tell one story a day it will pass the time will. Story about a Jew and a גוי who are business partners. Like each other, and the christian is bothered the the Jew would not go to עולם הבא (Chas Veshalom). He bugs him for a while and then the Jew says "I'll go to Rome and then rethink your ideas." Rome was very corrupt. If you find a priest who doesn't have children it's because he's gay. And the corruption with money. And then the Jew says that when he goes to be baptised (נ"ח) he would like the גוי to be his sponsor. The גוי doesn't understand why he still wants to convert, and the Jew says "If a church is this corrupt and still survives, G-d must be with them." Sounds like the רלב"ג.

If I wanted to pull together the various strands of אליפז's argument:

1. the צדיק is not destroyed completely, therefore איוב should be more hopeful

2. End of פרק ד little bit of פרק ה - it's either חוצפא or foolishness for us to try to judge G-d and expect that everything will be smooth
3. The description of השגחה כללית. Someone mentioned that לכאורה this doesn't matter for the ספר. But אליפז is talking about this anyway what does it hurt? To add that the world is a good place. If I'm trying to console someone in misfortune, the fact that the world as a whole is good is one more reason to be positive about the world. It may not directly relate to his suffering, but still adds something.

next:

(יז) הִנֵּה אֲשֶׁרִי אָנוּשׁ יוֹכְחֵנוּ אֱלֹהִים וּמוֹסֵר שְׁדֵי יְיָ אֶל־תִּמְאָס׃

Fortunate is the man who G-d reproves and therefore do not reject whatever G-d is to give him.

(יח) כִּי הוּא יִכְאִיב וַיַּחֲבֹשׁ יִמְחֹץ וַיְדוּ וַיִּדְּיוּ תִרְפִּינָה׃

He may smite you but he will heal you. This is consistent with זכור מי הוא נקי אבד. The assumption is that איוב is not perfect, so you have your bad days and your good days.

(יט) בָּשָׁשׁ צָרוֹת יִצִּילְךָ וּבִשְׁבָּעוּ לֹא־יָגַע בְּךָ רָע׃
(כ) בָּרָעַב פָּדַךְ מִמָּוֶת וּבְמִלְחָמָה מִיָּדִי חָרַב׃
(כא) בְּשׁוֹט לָשׁוֹן תִּחַבֵּא וְלֹא תִירָא מִשֵּׁד כִּי יָבוֹא׃

שטן is an interesting word. When the tongue wips against you. I think that it echoes the שטן in פרק א.

(כב) לִשְׁדֹּד וּלְכַפֵּן תִּשְׁחַק וּמַחֲנִית הָאָרֶץ אֶל־תִּירָא׃

You can smile at robbery and famine.

(כג) כִּי עַם־אֲבֹנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה בְּרִיתְךָ וַחֲנִית הַשָּׂדֶה הַשְּׁלֵמָה־לָּךְ׃

אבני השדה

You will have a covenant with the stones of the field.

There is another פסוק with the phrase of אבני השדה. The משנה in כלאים speaks about אדני which is a being that is half human half plant. Looks like a plant, but if you pull it out of the earth it will scream. The term used in latin is mandrake.

משנה מסכת כלאים פרק ח משנה ה

[*] הפרוטיות אסורות והרמך מותר ואדני השדה חיה רבי יוסי אומר מטמאות באהל כאדם הקופד וחולדת הסניים חיה חולדת הסניים רבי יוסי אומר בית שמאי אומרים מטמא כזית במשא וכעדשה במגע:

(כד) וַיֵּדַעַת כִּי־שְׁלוֹם אָהֳלְךָ וּפְקֻדָּתְךָ נֹכַח וְלֹא תַחֲטָא:

You know that your tent will be at peace. This is a pun. You will count up your family and there will be no one missing. The other meaning is that you will visit your tent and you will not sin. He is not saying that he is a sinner, but there is a play on words here.

(כה) וַיֵּדַעַת כִּי־רַב זֶרַעְךָ וְצִאצָּאֶיִךָ כַּעֲשָׂב הָאָרֶץ:

You know that your seed will be great. The assumption is that everyone dies. But there's death and death. The right kind of death is that you're old and your family is around you, and you see your magnificent legacy. And he is describing this. You will be restored, your children as many as the grass of the earth.

(כו) תִּבּוֹא בְּכָלֹחַ אֱלֹהֵי־קֶבֶר כַּעֲלוֹת גִּדִּישׁ בְּעֵתוֹ:

you will go to the grave at a good time, like mature grain.

(כז) הִנֵּה־זֹאת חֻקְרָנוּיָהּ כִּן־הִיא שְׁמַעֲנָה וְאַתָּה דַּעֲלֶךָ: פ

We have investigated this. Either the royal we, or he is speaking on behalf of all of them. Listen, and digest our words of wisdom.

Does Iyov respond to אליפז? What parts does he respond to? The book will start to get more complicated because this is איוב responding to אליפז responding to איוב.

Shiur #8 3/22/18

פרק ו

אליפז is responding to איוב.

Recap: what did אליפז say?

1. Don't kvetch
2. The people who are truly innocent are not wiped out, even though they might suffer
3. The vision of אליפז where he sees this figure, overpowering kind of revelation, either what this figure said to him or what he inferred from the experience ____
4. In פרק ה we opened with the משריש. According to Rashi it meant a person who is resentful when something bad happens to him. According to the Rambam he expects the world to owe him a living.
5. The השגחה כללית section in which אליפז says that, apart from what G-d does to individuals the world is run well. You turn to G-d. Doxology = hymn of praise. A Doxology about how G-d does wonderful things in the world.

6. You should accept whatever G-d has given you because ultimately (I'm adding: if) you are a צדיק you will survive everything and you'll have a wonderful old age and death.

אליפז's response to Iyov

So

1. Is אליפז responding to איוב?
2. If he is, how?
3. If he is ignoring, why?

I'm suffering

א ויען איוב, ויאמר.
ב לו--שקול יִשְׁקָל כְּעָשִׂי; וְהִיטִי (וְהִיטִי), בְּמֵאֲזָנִים יִשְׂאוּ-יָחִיד.
ג כִּי-עֲתָה--מִחֹל יָמִים יִכָּבֵד; עַל-כֵּן, דִּבְרִי לְעוֹ.

If you would weigh my agitation on a scale it would be as heavy as the seashore which is why my words have been heavy. This is a response to אליפז. I'm suffering much more than they are. He may be doing more than that, but at the minimum this is a response to אליפז.

ד כִּי חֲצִי שְׁקִי, עֲמִיד--אֲשֶׁר חֲמַתָּם, שְׁתֵּה רוּחִי; בְּעוֹתִי אֶלּוֹק יַעֲרֹכֵנִי.

The arrows of G-d are with me. I don't know if איוב here is really blaming things on G-d. It's a way of speaking. Using G-d's name is very extreme. If this were the only פסוק that I had I would say that this is just a figure of speech.

You didn't say anything of value

ה הִיזְנֶה-קַּרְא עָלֵי-דָשָׁא; אִם יִגְעָה-שׁוֹר, עַל-בְּלִילוֹ.

Will the wild donkey groan over grass? Will an ox bellow on his swill? The implication is that if an animal is properly fed he does not groan. He makes noise when something is bothering them. The implication is that if he is kvetching he has a reason to kvetch.

What does he mean by not being properly cared for? Maybe he is saying that he is really really suffering. But he could be complaining about something else. What does it mean to be properly fed in this context? To be fed is that someone is talking sense to you.

Milton - what happens when the sheep look up and the shepherds don't feed them? The נמשל is that the shepherds are incompetent stupid teachers. Rav Lichtenstein likes this quote. The sheep look up when they are not being fed.

He saying that what you said to me is nonsense. Do you think that I would be kvetching so much if something reasonable has been given to me?

ו הַיֹּאכֵל תִּפְּל, מִבְּלִי-מֶלַח; אִם-יֵשׁ-טַעַם, בְּרִיר חֲלָמוֹת.

Can you eat something tasteless without salt?

What does tasteless mean?

1. No taste
2. Repulsive taste.

No salt

1. For some people food has no taste unless you salt it
2. If you don't salt it it will spoil quickly without refrigeration

Is there taste in חלמות? What is בריר חלמות? Many מפורשים. A פשט is what oozes out of plants. חלמות is the name of a plant.

Cute פשט - saliva of a healthy person.

Or it could mean egg whites. חלמון.

[אבן עזרא see](#)

The implication is that what you're saying is not appealing to me.

ז מֵאֲנָה לִנְגוּעַ נִפְשִׁי; הִמָּה, כְּדוֹי לֶחֱמִי.

Like a depressed person does not have an appetite, whatever food that you give them doesn't have a taste. But also implying that the words of אליפז don't have value.

חמי - flesh. דוי - sick. Your words are as disgusting as my skin.

I wish that G-d would just kill me already (רחמנא לצלן)

ח מִי-יִתֵּן, תָּבוֹא שְׁאֲלָתִי; וְתִקְוֹתִי, יִתֵּן אֱלֹקִי.

I wish that G-d would grant my request. In פרק ג G-d was very much absent. Here he is already mentioned.

ט וַיֵּאל אֱלֹקִי, וַיִּדְכָּאֵנִי; יֵתֵר יְדוֹ, וַיִּבְצַעֵנִי.

I wish that he would crush me. I wish that I would be dead.

י וַתְּהִי-עוֹד, נִחְמָתִי-- וַאֲסִלְדָּה בְּחִילָה, לֹא יִחְמוּל:

כִּי-לֹא כְחַדְתִּי, אֲמַרִי קְדוֹשׁ.

אסלדה בחילה.

קפ - to jump

חילה - fear.

What the פסוק would mean is that if G-d were to crush איוב he would jump in fear. Even if you want to die people have certain reflexes. Even if I jump it's still better for me that way.

The other way of reading is that חילה is to rejoice. I would jump for joy if he would crush me.

I did not deny the words of קדוש. I would die with a clean context. Alternatively קדוש generally means מלאך. It could be that איוב is making fun of אליפז. He spoke in the name of this angelic being. He is saying that if I were to die now I did not act wrongly.

I'm out of strength

יֵא מֵה-כֹּחִי כִי-אֵיחָל; וּמֵה-קִּצִּי, כִּי-אֲאָרִיךְ נַפְשִׁי.

What strength do I have to tolerate or hope? What is my end that I should be patient, that I should be long-winded?

יֵב אִם-כֹּחַ אֲבָנִים כֹּחִי; אִם-בְּשָׁרִי נְחוּשׁ.

Is my strength the strength of a stone? Is my flesh like brass?

What does that mean? How much strength does one body have?

Maybe this is a response to מי הוא נקי אבד. I won't be the same.

יֵג הָאֵם אֵין עֲזָרָתִי בִּי; וְתִשְׁיָה, נִדְחָה מִמֶּנִּי.

The מלבי"ם's reading of this is that "You אליפז claimed to have נבואה; if there is divine revelation here why didn't I get the נבואה?"

I don't know if that is פשט but it's interesting that he's going back to פרק ד.

יֵד לְמַס מַרְעֵהוּ חֶסֶד; וְיִרְאֵת שְׁקִי יַעֲזוּב.

למס is a difficult world. Probably most מפורשים read this as מאס, he who rejects treating his friend with חסד.

The רמב"ן has an interesting פשט. The ל is part of the שורש and it is the same thing as נמס. They are similar consonants so they are interchangeable. The friend whose חסד melts.

A line of Ogden refers to the melting friend, and פשט it refers to a snowman.

Iyov is disappointed in his friends.

Iyov's accusation of his Friends

טו אחי, בגדו כמו-נחל; כאפיק נחלים יעברו.

My friends have betrayed me like a river in the desert. A wadi desert. Sometimes during the year that stream is prominent, but in spring/summer it dries up quickly. So you come back and there's no water.

טז הקדרים מני-קרח; עלימו, יתעלם-ש'לג.

He compares them to thin dark ice. When it warms up the snow melts the water runs. The water twists its way through the desert and they're lost.

יז בעת יזרבו נצמתו; בחמו, נדעכו ממקומם.
יח ילפתו, ארחות דרכם; יעלו בתהו ויאבדו.
יט הביטו, ארחות תמא; הליכת שבא, קוו-למו.
כ בשו כן-בטח; באו עדיה, ויחפרו.

They are disappointed because בטח

1. Fall down
2. Or to rely on someone

חפר is a synonym for בוש. It also means to dig. They're coming, there's no water, they start digging. This is the משל.

כא כן-עתה, הייתם לא; תראו חתת, ותיראו.

קרי - you are like that river

כתיב - you have disappeared like that river. You have not been present like that river.

see/fear broken/fear. So we have here a complex set of puns. You saw disaster, you saw me suffering and you feared. Or you saw fear or you feared fear and you turned away.

What exactly is Iyov accusing them of? From a rational point of view, if a friend is going through this kind of experience that's not a reason to turn away from them.

1. Psychological. Even though they know that there is no reason that they should be afraid they are anyway.
2. They are afraid that if they take his side then הקדוש ברוך הוא will punish them.

3. From the audience - maybe they were afraid that they would get attacked as איוב's friends in order to get back to איוב.

What brought on this accusation?

What did they do to abandon him? What did אליפז say?

1. Maybe he minimized איוב's suffering.

Understanding other people's suffering

2. Maybe his whole tone of voice. He says a lot of things that are arrogant. At that point you realize that even if his friends were not betraying him the way that he presents it, other people it is really arrogant of them to understand you in that way.

There's a line that the Rav had. חנה says to אלקנה - why are you so devastated, aren't I better for you than ten children. Then she was answered by הקדוש ברוך הוא. Why this year? Because she realized that her husband didn't understand her, so she understood that she had to go to הקדוש ברוך הוא. As close as your human relations are no one really understands anybody else.

No matter what אליפז would have said it wouldn't have been good.

Why does he include all three of them if only אליפז spoke? Because they are there as a team. If you will look at what הרמב"ן does, he knows about the מורה נבוכים but is not totally impressed, he realizes that as a collective they're together.

כב הכי-אמרתי, הבו לי; ומלחכם, שחדו בעדי.

Did I ask you to help me? Did I ask you to save me from my enemy?

Two possible פשטים:

1. Continues the previous ענין. Did I ask you to help me? Did I ask you to lecture to me?
2. Does not continue. Did I ask you to help me? But if you lecture to me I'll listen. I didn't ask you to save me against G-d. איוב may mean that it is not I who set up G-d as the enemy. I never took it that way. You are creating that element. And in פרק ג then איוב was aristotelian.

כג ומלטוני מיד-צר; ומיד עריצים תפדוני.
כד הורוני, ואני אחריש; ומה-שגיתי, הבינו לי.
כה מה-נמרצו אמרי-ישר; ומה-יוכיח הוכח מקם.
כו הלהוכח מלים תחשבו; ולרוח, אמרי נאש.

כז אף-על-יתום תפילו; ותכרו, על-ריעכם.

You would attack an orphan. If they are an orphan it must be their own fault. By your logic you just look for unfortunate people and attack them.

כח וְעַתָּה, הוֹאִילוּ פָנוּ-בִי; וְעַל-פְּנֵיכֶם, אִם-אֶכְזֹב.

If you were dramatizing the ספר they are getting up to leave. "Come back."

כט שׁוּבוּ-נָא, אֶל-תְּהִי עוֹלָה; וּשְׁבִי (וְשׁוּבוּ) עוֹד, צְדָקִי-בָּהּ.
ל הִישָׁב־בְּלִשׁוֹנִי עוֹלָה; אִם-חִכִּי, לֹא-יָבִין הַזֹּאת.

It's strange if he is telling them to get lost then a minute later he is telling them to come back. It's not a direct response to פרק ד זה. But it raises an important social question. At a human level the question is how do you relate to other people. It may be that his disappointment in his friends may drive him to G-d. But it could be that he doesn't want to be left alone.

פרק ז

איוב פרק ז

(א) הֲלֹא-צָבָא לְאֶנֶּשׁ עַל-עֲלִי-אָרֶץ וְכִימִי שְׁכִיר יָמָיו:

Man has an appointed time on earth, like a hired person.

(ב) כְּעֶבֶד יִשְׁאַף-צֶלֶל וְכִשְׁכִּיר יִקְוָה פְּעֻלוֹ:

Like a slave, you're waiting for the day to be over, to go home.

(ג) בֵּן הַנִּחְלָתִי לִי יִרְחִי-שָׁוָא וְלֵילוֹת עֶמָּל מְנוּ-לִי:

That is what my life is about now. I have long nights/months of emptiness. Nights of travail.

Depression

(ד) אִם-שָׁכַח בֵּיתִי וְאִם-רֵתִי מִתִּי אֶקוּם וּמִדֹּד-עָרֵב וּשְׁבַעֲתִי נִדְדִים עַד־נִשְׁפָּר:

I go to sleep I don't want to get up. Anybody who has been ill or depressed has known that experience. All day you wait for the day to be over already, when you go to sleep and don't sleep well... many of us here have either had that experience or know people who have.

My father's sister enjoyed good Yiddish curses. I think that her alltime favorite was: may you sit shiva in the summer and have a toothache in the winter. Summer is a very long day. In the winter if you have a toothache you can't sleep.

If Iyov knew my aunt he might have incorporated that curse as well. She might have cheered him up more than what אליפז said.

(ה) לָבַשׁ בְּשָׂרִי רֶמֶה וְגִישׁ וְגֹשׁ עָפָר עוֹרִי רָגַע וַיִּמָּאֵס:

My flesh is all melted away.

(ו) יָמֵי קָלּוּ מִנִּי־אָרֶג׳ וַיִּכְלֶיּוּ בְּאַפֶּס תְּקוּהָ:

My days run like the thread on the room.

רמב"ן pointed out that אפס תקוה means without hope, also means without thread. the - תקות השני - scarlet thread. I assume that both are from the same שורש קו - that קו means line, you project a line into the future. I just made that up, it makes sense.

I don't have any good waiting for me

(ז) זָכַר כִּי־רוּחַ חַיִּי לֹא־תָשׁוּב עֵינַי לְרָאוֹת טוֹב:

In a situation where people are suffering. An אדם גדול was dying as said to me and said "my days are very short, and my hours are very long." The hours drag, but can't really get work done.

Remember. Who is he speaking to? Not clear.

My life is just wind I will not return to see good.

Iyov's answer in פרק ו was that I'm suffering so badly that that doesn't make sense. Here he's emphasizing the second point that I made in the last hour - after this life it's not like I have a great situation waiting for me. If I'm restored there's not much ahead of me.

Change in איוב - G-d is in the picture

(ח) לֹא־תִשְׁוֶרְנִי עֵין רְאִי עֵינֶיךָ בִּי וְאִינֶנִּי:

I will not be seen by those who look at me, your eyes upon me and I will have disappeared. עיניך here is speaking to G-d, it's hard to think of an alternative.

So in פרק ג he sounded like an Aristotelian, G-d is out of the picture. Here there is a change in איוב.

Review: Iyov's responses, what he ignores, what is new

So איוב responded to אליפז's opening comments.

מי הוא נקי אבד He may have responded to נקי אבד.

Has not said anything about כללית השגחה.

What is new here:

Complaint about his friends.

Important - he regards G-d as standing against him. I know that the רמב"ם רלב"ג say that he's an Aristotelian, I'm just saying what I see here. How they deal with these פסוקים we'll discuss a little bit next time.

Response to a question in class - There is a change in איוב. It may be due to אליפז. He may have destabilized his position from פרק ג. Or maybe the fact that he is alienated from his friends drives him to G-d.

(ט) כָּלֶּה עֵנָן וַיֵּלֶךְ כֵּן יוֹרֵד שָׁאוּל לֹא יַעֲלֶה:

Just as a cloud passes by, a person who goes to שאול does not come back again.

(י) לֹא-יָשׁוּב עוֹד לְבֵיתוֹ וְלֹא-יִכְרְנוּ עוֹד מִקְמוֹ:

Doesn't come home. He is not recognized, he disappears.

תחיית המתים

תחיית המתים חו כופר is איוב

(יא) גַּם-אֲנִי לֹא אֶחְשָׁךְ כִּי אֶדְבַּרְהָ בְּצַר רוּחִי אֲשִׁיחָה בְּמַר נִפְשִׁי:

בא says that he was denying תחיית המתים here. Since we're interested in חז"ל this is something that we have to pay attention to. This is פשוט פשט. Don't tell me that everything is going to work out in the long range, that this is temporary, rather this is it.

תלמוד בבלי מסכת בבא בתרא דף טז עמוד א

כלה ענן וילך כן יורד שאול לא יעלה - אמר רבא: מכאן שכפר איוב בתחיית המתים.

גוי a big deal because he's a

When בא said that he was denying תחיית המתים he did not mean it as a complement.

Should this be viewed as a great חסרון in איוב? Not necessarily. The רלב"ג points out that he was גוי, and if so this is not such a big deal. He did not know the teachings of the תורה.

From the point of view of ספר איוב not only is איוב גוי but it's a good thing that he's a גוי. Had he been a Jew the issue of תחיית המתים would have complicated the discussion here. What about עולם הבא? By making him a גוי we avoid addressing this question here.

הבא is not a solution for problems in general

This gesture is the direction of the view that is best articulated by the Rav in איש ההלכה that in ספר איוב that עולם הבא is not really a solution. It may be an answer on a certain level, balance the books, but if יהדות is a very this-worldly oriented religion, even if you have עולם הבא that doesn't really address the issue of a צדיק whose עולם הזה goes down the tube. If he were a Jew we would have to go through the whole discussion in איש ההלכה.

It is clear that in most of תנ"ך that עולם הבא is not a solution for these types of a problems. לא המתים יהללו קה. The world is for עולם הזה, deal people don't praise G-d or do much of anything.

So here עולם הבא is not really relevant, so we shouldn't be surprised that it is conveniently left out here.

Last comment: רס"ג had great difficulty with this. He says that he didn't deny תחיית המתים but rather is saying that human beings are very fragile, and if it were not that הקדוש ברוך הוא brings you back to life that would be it. According to רס"ג it's not about the nature of time and שכר ועונש, it's about fragility.

Shiur #9 3/26/18

Iyov's responses:

1. אליפז began with words of encouragement, we saw that איוב responded to that in the beginning of פרק ו.
2. Then we saw that אליפז made the נקי אבד נא מי הוא נקי אבד speech, and we saw that he may be responding to a certain degree, saying that my suffering is no great that even if what you're saying is true that would be irrelevant to my situation.
3. אליפז had the vision. According to the מלבי"ם Iyov is reacting and asking why is it that you had the vision and not me, I don't think that that's פשט but it's also interesting.
4. And we could also find other elements where איוב is reacting to that.
5. Elifaz talks about the fool, we don't see איוב respond.
6. The issue השגחה כללית Iyov as far as we can see has not responded to that.

פרק ו Summary of

1. A lot of kvetching
2. Iyov claims to have been betrayed by his friends

פרק ז

In the beginning he speaks of the brevity of life. Time is short. He speaks of the peculiar experience of night wanting to be morning and morning night.

Then he denies תחיית המתים. We noted that according to רס"ג he's not really denying, rather saying that humans are so fragile that if it were not for תחיית המתים we would die and not come back. So an emphasis on the fragility of humans not the finitude of our time. The רלב"ג said that was a גוי so it doesn't matter whether that he denied תחיית המתים. I added that the logic of ספר איוב is to avoid that question (which is why it's convenient that he's a גוי) and that in general life after death does not play a major role in the way that we think about life over all. There are פסוקים that talk about life after death (I have an idea why פרק חלק quotes certain פסוקים and not others that are very explicit, but it's not our business right now). Despite the fact that there are many פסוקים in תהילים and משלי that presuppose it, it's not talked about very much. The ראשונים are aware of this. There's a difference between what's presupposed and what's preached. The Rav - איש ההלכה - is focused on this world and not what will happen later on.

He denies תחיית המתים, עולם הבא, not. What's the relationship between the two? If you hold like the רמב"ם they're two separate things, then you're right to ask this question. If you hold like the רמב"ן then we don't have an issue.

(יא) גַּם-אֲנִי לֹא אַחֲשֶׁךְ פִּי אֶדְבָּרָה בְּצַר רוּחִי אֲשִׁיחָה בְּמַר נַפְשִׁי:

I will not save my words. I will speak in my bitterness.

How does this connect to the previous פסוקים?

1. If I'm going to die soon, and if I'm dead I'm not coming back, I might as well say my piece now. That may be one part of the logic.
2. Or it means that I'm suffering so much now that how could I restrain myself.

Two fairly obvious levels where the complaining from before leads to איוב saying that he's now going to speak his mind.

(יב) הֲיָם-אֲנִי אִם-תִּגְנוֹן כִּי-תִשָּׂים עָלַי מִשְׁמֶר:

Am I ים? Or am I a sea-monster that you put a guard on me?

Why is "you" here? G-d. we have moved a long distance from פרק ג.

G-d is somehow guarding איוב. Putting him in jail.

There is a mythological background to this פסוק. As we have discussed earlier, it means sea, and it means the deity of the sea. The sea presents a threat to the orderly world. In the

mythologies the deity of heaven does battle with the deity of the sea. Within a biblical framework this is just a metaphor. Like when Milton uses Greek Mythology.

In a mythology there are two ways of guarding against these bad deities. Kill them or lock them up. There is that distinction. What you have in תנין is not about killing the enemies of G-d but rather keeping them under control. Keeping them constrained. He is saying "why are you treating me as if I were a threat to you?".

Rashi - why am I still alive?

Interesting is that my instinct would be to treat ים and תנין is being the same thing, but Rashi says:

רש"י איוב פרק ז פסוק יב
(יב) הים אני - ששמת עלי חול למשמר:
אם תנין - דג גדול שחבשתו בנבכי ים כי תשים עלי משמר השטן הזה לשומרני שלא תצא נפשי:

The way that I would normally read is that he's saying why am I such a threat to you that you have to put me under lock and key. But there's another issue here. If he's threatened by Iyov he could just kill him. So if he's under guard that means two things. He's being persecuted, and he isn't being killed. My tendency is to focus on the first issue. He doesn't let him go as if he's an enemy of the state. What Rashi points out is that part of what is interesting about the פסוק is that he's still alive.

Rashi's answer alludes to the שטן. As if Iyov knows that there is some kind of arrangement here that he's supposed to be tormented and not actually killed.

If you say this, and I'm leaving the שטן out for the moment, what's bothering Iyov is both that he is tormented and that he is alive. According to Rashi he is going back to what he said earlier: why am I still alive?

Dream - possible response to אליפז

(יג) כִּי־אֶמְרָתִי תִנְחַמְנִי עֲרָשִׁי יֵשָׂא בְּשִׁיחִי מִשְׁכְּבִי:

I thought that I would go to sleep and have peace in my dreams.

(יד) וְחִתְתִּנִּי בְּחִלְמוֹת וּמַחְזִינוֹת תִּבְעֵתִנִּי:

You scare me with all kinds of dreams and visions.

This could be interpreted as a literal description of a person who is not feeling well. He wants to have a good night sleep but has a nightmare.

(טו) וַתִּבְחַר מִחֲנֹק בְּפֶשֶׁי מִן מַעֲצְמוֹתִי:

I would rather suffocate than go through nights like this.

You could say, that when he refers to bed dreams and vision he is referring to אליפז. He described these horrifying dreams, so maybe he's playing with that idea. You come and conjure up these scary nocturnal experiences. You could say that. In any case, he prefers suffocation.

(ז) מֵאֲסֹתִי לֹא-לְעֵלֶם אֲחִיָּה חֲדָל מִמֶּנִּי כִי-הֵבֵל יָמִי:

I am sick of my life. I will not live forever. Leave me alone.

If I am so insignificant. I'm going to die soon. I am not a threat to you. Notice that this will be true whether or not you accept תחיית המתים. Even if you hold like רס"ג and ר"ת that he did not reject תחיית המתים, he is saying "who am I? Leave me alone. Either kill me or just stop focussing on me in this way."

Parallel to תהילים - who is man that you should pay attention to him?

(יז) מֶה-אָנוֹשׁ כִּי תִגְדָּלוֹ וְכִי-תִשִּׁית אֵלָיו לִבְךָ:

What is man that he should be so great, that you pay so much attention to people.

(יח) וַתִּפְקְדֵנוּ לִבְקָרִים לְרַגְעִים תִּבְחַנְנוּ:

That you keep on investigating people so carefully.

What do these תהילים פרק ח פסוקים remind you of?

תהילים פרק ח

(א) לִמְנוּצָחַ עַל-הַגֹּת יִית מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד:

(ב) יִקְוֶה אֲדֹנָינוּ מֶה-אֲדִיר שְׁמֶךָ בְּכָל-הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר תִּנֶּה הָדָר עַל-הַשָּׁמַיִם:

(ג) מִפִּי עוֹלָלִים וְיִנְקִים יִסְדֹּת עַד לְמַעַן צוּרֶיךָ לְהַשְׁבִּית אוֹיֵב וּמִתְנַקִּים:

(ד) כִּי-אֶרְאֶה שְׁמֶיךָ מַעֲשֵׂי אֲצַבְעֶיךָ יָרַח וְכוֹכָבִים אֲשֶׁר כּוֹנְנָתָה:

(ה) מֶה-אָנוֹשׁ כִּי-תִזְכְּרֵנוּ וּבְנֵי-אָדָם כִּי תִפְקְדֵנוּ:

(ו) וַתַּחֲסֹרֵהוּ מֵעַט מַאֲלָקִים וְכָבוֹד וְהָדָר תַּעֲטֹרֵהוּ:

(ז) תַּמְשִׁילֵהוּ בְּמַעֲשֵׂי יָדֶיךָ כֹּל שֵׁתָה תַּחַת-רַגְלָיו:

(ח) צִנֵּה וְאֵלִפִּים כָּל־סִגְמוֹת בְּהִמּוֹת שָׁדִי:

(ט) צַפּוֹר שָׁמַיִם וּדְגֵי הַיָּם עִבֵּר אֲרָחוֹת יָמִים:

(י) יִקְוֶה אֲדֹנָינוּ מֶה-אֲדִיר שְׁמֶךָ בְּכָל-הָאָרֶץ:

This is a מזמור that many find to be powerful. Build around this paradox. Looks up, sees the heavens, what are human beings that they are so great that you gave them dominion over your creatures, magnificent.

Iyov is making a parody of these פסוקים. Same reality looked at from two very different angles.

(יט) כִּמָּה לֹא־תִשָּׂעָה מִמֶּנִּי לֹא־תִרְפֶּי נִי עַד־בִּלְעִי רִקִּי:

You're on top of me, you don't even give me a chance to swallow my saliva.

Even if I sinned I don't deserve punishment

(כ) חֲטָאתִי מֶה אֶפְעֶלוּ לִי נֹצֵר הָאָדָם לְמָה שִׁמְתָנִי לְמַפְגֵּעַ לִי וְאֵהִיָּה עָלַי לְמִשָּׂא:

If I sinned. He does not claim to be the perfect צדיק. He is claiming that he does not deserve punishment. He is saying that לו יצויר I sinned, what harm does it do for you? That you treat me as some kind of stumbling block?

burden unto myself - תיקון סופרים

ואהיה עליך למשא חז"ל read it as תיקון סופרים, so And I become a burden unto myself. This is a

The readings. תיקון סופרים generally didn't adopt אבן עזרא.

אבן עזרא איוב פרק ז

ואהיה עלי למשא - תיקון סופרים אף על פי שפירושו כאשר הוא בלא תיקון נכון:

(כא) וּמָה לֹא־תִשָּׂא פִשְׁעִי וְתַעֲבִיר אֶת־עֹנִי כִי־עָתָה לְעֹפֶר אֶשְׁכֵּב וְשִׁחַרְתָּנִי וְאִי־נִי: פ

I'm so insignificant, why can't you just bear my sin? If I'm such a problem for you kill me, if you look for me I'm not there.

Response to אליפז's visions

Is there additional response to אליפז in these פסוקים? Is his vision getting more play here? Even without the מלבי"ם, he is describing these horrible visions. But beyond that, if the message of the visions were that man is so insignificant and doesn't understand anything, then the response is that if man is so insignificant then why torment him? Let him die.

Iyov's change in attitude

Going a step further. Between ג and ז/ו we saw that his attitude changed. In ג he's aristotelian, in ז it's almost the opposite of ג. He's saying "you're persecuting me!". Why did that change come about? A few possibilities:

1. In ב פרק ג and ב פרק ז. We saw that according to חז"ל in ב פרק ז he is already ending, אבל בלבד, He's moving in that direction. And then in ג פרק ז he does not suddenly become an angry man. Even in his bitterness he is steering clear of a direct challenge to G-d. As I explained the so called Aristotelianism of ג איוב as him trying to take a position where

he could express his bitterness without starting a fight with G-d. So we shouldn't be surprised that he evolves. Before he was walking the tightrope between bitterness and confronting G-d, and now time is taking its toll. In purely psychological terms.

He might have developed in this direction even if אליפז has never spoken.

2. What if אליפז is playing a role here? What in אליפז would have lead איוב to this position? I could say that the very fact that אליפז is talking about שכר ועונש is bringing G-d into the picture. A bunch of Aristotelians sitting around the table, you remain in that bubble. The fact that אליפז started speaking provokes איוב in that direction. That's one point.
3. אליפז's vision. Beyond just saying that G-d does judge things directly. If you take that experience very seriously then you could be left with this paradox, that if man is so insignificant then why should G-d care? So you could argue that the very issues that אליפז is saying are what push איוב to react that way that he is reacting.
4. One more point. Half of פרק ו is devoted to איוב's disappointment in his friends. The breakdown in his relationship with his friends is significant, and I could argue that when you have that breakdown that drives you to G-d. Had אליפז not spoken I don't know what he would have done. When אליפז makes this argument and he finds it not satisfactory then in a subtle way or not such a subtle way he is forced to deal with G-d.

The Rav's comment about חנה - when אלקנא says to חנה that I am better for you than ten sons, in religious life often the social framework is a barrier to the relationship with G-d. As long as you have a community of friends then what do you need G-d for. It may be that if you have a friend and he says something that is not satisfactory then he has to go beyond that.

How does the רמב"ם deal with this?

So this is why he is appearing as a different kind of thinker than in פרק ג.

What does the רמב"ם have to say about this? According to him he's an Aristotelian and does not change. Overall his approach is as follows: the רמב"ם believes, against what I was saying earlier today, that in תנ"ך you could have פסוקים that are filler. For two reasons:

1. Poetic. The novel may be very important philosophically, but still within that novel they're not constantly talking philosophy. The רמב"ם says similarly in מורה נבוכים, there are certain משלים where every detail is significant, and others where you don't have to read into every single phrase. The example that he gives is משלי, where he gives the description of folly being a woman seducing man into adultery, and the רמב"ם says that you don't have to *taich* every word. The point is to show how folly seduces someone who is not fully committed to wisdom. My tendency in this regard is that even if it's not of philosophical importance you still should read carefully.
2. But according to the רמב"ם, not only is there filler but there may also be material that will tend to mislead the reader. The רמב"ם's view in his own writing is that philosophical writing has a certain depth and deviousness. Most readers are not the smartest people, so teach them what they can learn, and between the lines teach them what you really mean. That's the way that he claims to have written מורה נבוכים. He will appear to hold

one view but then his real view is something else. Then what's good for the רמב"ם should be good for תנ"ך as well. So you could say that within איוב there are certain פסוקים that give away the real meaning, and the rest may be filler that sounds nice, and the average reader will get what they get out of it, but it's not what the speaker intends to say.

I could go further and bring these two themes together, if איוב is a realistic book, in reality when people talk about philosophical issues it's not all philosophy cover to cover. There will be other things going on. So even if you don't hold of the רמב"ם's whole idea of hiding things, you could still say that in a long book, there are some פסוקים that are more philosophically important and other things are more superficial. This is the way that the רמב"ם would look at all of these פסוקים in איוב where it doesn't contribute to what is officially supposed to be happening.

The רלב"ג wrote his commentary פסוק by פסוק so he was responsible for these issues, so he says that איוב doesn't really mean what he says. This is all לשיטתך. I am an Aristotelian, and if I would believe you then I would think that G-d is persecuting me. It's kind of a reductio ad absurdum, taking what אליפז said and showing that it is absurd.

If you take that פשט then you would be saying that he is presenting something that he doesn't believe in and is saying it with such an emotional vigor yet doesn't believe what he is saying. I prefer to say that he does believe what he is saying.

Let's begin פרק ח.

איוב פרק ח

(א) וַיַּעַן בִּלְדָּד הַשּׁוּחִי וַיֹּאמֶר:

בלדד's philosophy

According to the philosophical approaches, his position is like the Kalam position. Everything has to add up. If someone is a צדיק and they're suffering now then there must be some compensation at the end of the story. If I am reading this way I wouldn't be scared to introduce life after death.

According to the רמב"ם the straight Kalam position would include שכר ועונש for animals, but as the רלב"ג points out since בלדד says nothing at all about animals there is no reason to attribute the animal view to him.

Quick summary - if you suffer now you'll be compensated later.

(ב) עֲדֹאן תִּמְלֹל-אֱלֹה וְרוּחַ כְּבִיר אֶמְרֵי-פִיךָ:

How long are you saying this?

More חוצפא towards איוב

(ג) הָאֵל יַעֲזֹב מִשְׁפָּט וְאֵם-טָדִי יַעֲזֹב-צֶדֶק:

Is G-d distorting justice?

This is less polite than אליפז. Elifaz said "You're such a צדיק why are you in such a bad mood now?" Bildad is being more direct, you are perverting religious belief.

(ד) אִם-בְּנֵיךָ חֲטִאוּ לֹא יִשְׁלַח יְיָ בְּיָד-פִּשְׁעָם:

Regarding his children אליפז said nothing, but we inferred by the way that he was talking that he is assigning them to sin. But בלדד is more direct about it.

If they sin then they're gone.

(ה) אִם-אַתָּה תִּשְׁחַר אֶל-אֵל וְאֶל-שָׁקִי תִתְחַנֵּן:

If you turn to G-d and plead with שקי. Notice that תתחנן is the שורש חנן which is the same as חנינם which played a big role in the first two פרקים.

(ו) אִם-זָךְ וְיָשָׁר אַתָּה כִּי-עָתָה יַעֲרִיר עָלֶיךָ וְשִׁלְיָם נֹתַת צֶדֶקְךָ:
(ז) וְהָיָה רֵאשִׁיתְךָ מִצֶּעֶר וְאַחֲרִיתְךָ יִשְׁגָּה מְאֹד:

If you turn to G-d and you are indeed pure, he will repay you, your beginning will be small and your end will be very great.

For the רמב"ם and רלב"ג this is the essence of בלדד. Is this convincingly Kalam philosophy? I don't know if I would put it that way.

Tradition (מלבי"ם)

(ח) כִּי-שִׂאל-גֵּא לְדָר רִישׁוֹן וְכוּנִין לְחֶקֶר אֲבוֹתָם:

The מלבי"ם pointed out that אליפז's style of thinking is relevant based, I put it as experience based. בלדד refers to tradition. Difference in philosophical style. I believe there is value to the מלבי"ם comment here. Ask the previous generations.

(ט) כִּי-תִמּוֹל אֲנַחְנוּ וְלֹא נִדְעַ כִּי צַל יִמִּינוּ עַל־אָרֶץ:

We live short lives, how could we really understand everything?

(י) הֲלֹא-הֵם יוֹרוּךְ יֵאמְרוּ לָךְ וּמִלִּבָּם יוֹצֵאוּ מִלִּים:

The wisdom of the generation will give you clarity, will teach you.

What is the wisdom of the generations? He expresses it through a משל or a few משלים. We're going to have to figure out what those משלים might be about.

The משלים

The reed

(יא) הִיגָאֶה־גָּמָא בְּלֹא בָצָה יִשְׁגֶּה־אָחוּ בְּלִי־מַיִם:

If you have a reed, it cannot flourish without water.

(יב) עֲדָנוּ בָּאֵבוּ לֹא יִקְטֹף וְלִפְנֵי כָל־חֲצִיר יִיבֹשׁ:

This plant will still be in its budding period, it dries out sooner than the hay.

(יג) כִּי־ן אֲרָחוֹת כָּל־שִׁכְחִי אֶל וְתִקְוֹת חֲנָף תִּאֲבֹד:

This is what happens to those who forget G-d. The משל is very clear - it describes what happens to wicked people. They are well watered but they dry up.

Is it relevant to איוב? He's presumably a good guy so It's not directly relevant. We saw with אליפז that it's sometimes easier to talk about the bad things that happen to bad people than the good things that happen to good people. Bad ends are dramatic, good ends are not as dramatic. Especially when we look for it we find it.

Once some people in a shul were talking, and the name of Franklin Roosevelt came up. One says to the other that he didn't save the Jews and you see what happened to him. He died like a dog and no one remembers his name. To demonstrate this they called over a child and asked if he knows who he is and he said that he's the FDR parkway.

The spider web

(יד) אֲשֶׁר־יִקְוֹט כְּסָלוֹ וּבֵית עֶכְבִּי יִשׁ מִבֶּטְחוֹ:

בית עכביש is a spider's web. If you're looking for references to אליפז's children and you think that שכני בתי חומר was a reference then you'll say that this is a reference. The implication is that if you rely on a spider's web that may be good for holding the spider but for a human being that doesn't work.

Some say that יקוט must be a synonym for בית עכביש. Others take the word יקוט as a verb, that which he relies on gets cut off. Either way the two halves are parallel.

(טו) יִשָּׁעַן עַל-בֵּיתוֹ וְלֹא יַעֲמִיד יַחֲזִיק בִּי וְלֹא יָקוּם:

You lean on it you fall down, you grab it to try to get up and you can't.
Is that a continuation of the previous line?

Next משל:

Plant clutching stones

(טז) רֹטֵב הוּא לִפְנֵי-שָׁמֶשׁ וְעַל-גִּנְתּוֹ וְנִקְתָּו תִּצָּא:

The plant is moist in the morning. The sucker moves out from there.

(יז) עַל-גֹּל שָׂרָשָׁיו יִסְבְּכוּ בֵּית אֲבָנִים יַחֲזֶה:

The plant's roots clutch at the stones. Is this good or bad? Not sure. On the one hand it's good because you're healthy you can put out solid roots. On the other hand it's not good for growing.

(יח) אִם-יִבְלַעְנוּ מִמְּקוֹמוֹ וְכֹחַשׁ בִּי לֹא רְאִיתִךָ:

If you uproot it it is as if it was never there. Is that good or bad?

(יט) הֵן-הוּא מְשׁוֹשׁ דֶּרֶכּוֹ וְמַעַפֵּי אֲחֵר יִצְמָחוּ:

That is the merry way of that plant, and either something else will grow there or the plant itself will grow in another spot. Just pointing out the ambiguities.

Is this last משל good or bad?

1. If you hold that it's good then you have a ballance. You start with the רשע who comes to a bad end, and then the צדיק comes to a good end.
2. If it's bad then you have two רשעים coming to a bad end. It's not so symmetrical, doesn't really for the רלב"ג, רמב"ם, would make him much more anti-איוב and much less like a Kalam philosopher than you would want.

(כ) הֵן-אֵל לֹא יִמָּאֵס-תָּם וְלֹא-יִחַזֵּיק בְּיַד-מְרִעִים:

G-d will not reject the innocent, and he will not strengthen the wicked.

(כא) עַד-יִמְלֶה שְׂתוֹק פִּיךָ וּשְׂפָתֶיךָ תִּרְוַעָה:

If you turn to G-d then you will end up being full of laughter. You'll be in a good mood, thing will go well for you.

(כב) שִׁנְאִיךָ יִלְבָּשׁוּ-בִגְדֵי שָׁמַיִת וְאֶהְיֶה לְרַשָּׁעִים אֵינֹנִי: פ

Your enemies will be full of shame, and the tent of the wicked is gone. This is a balance between good things happening to צדיקים and bad things happening to רשעים.

We skipped פסוקים in the middle.

Ending with assurances

Something about the ending here:

Both אליפז and בלדד ended with assurances. If you turn to G-d. They both describe how things will end up well once he is restored. Seems to be part of the formula. Not surprising.

For אליפז things turning out well meant that you will survive, you will be restored, you will go home everything will be good there, your family will be happy. He describes it in terms of prosperity, a home, זרעך, Children, old age, so forth.

בלדד doesn't emphasize that. Everything is built around vindication and retribution. In life there are people who suffer and when things go well afterwards they think of it as vindication. Look at where my enemies are now.

After emancipation a former slave was doing well and the former master was not, and he says "Well master, which one is the top-rail now?" For the master this was very mortifying. That is the way that בלדד presents things, you'll be up your enemies will be down.

In terms of philosophy it's not important, in terms of psychology it is worth thinking about.

What is going on with these משלים? How does his message hold together overall. To what extent is he responding to what has been said in ז. and פרקים ו.

Shiur #10

אליפז beings saying how could you talk to G-d in this way. Sharper than בלדד. He clearly says that his children died for their sins. Sharper than אליפז.

Does בלדד think that איוב was a צדיק?

What about בלדד's view of איוב himself?

1. There are views (רמב"ן רס"ג) that בלדד holds that איוב is also getting what he deserves. The assumption that he is a צדיק and you have to explain why he is suffering is out of the window already.
 - a. Why doesn't he say it explicitly? רס"ג says that he is being polite. He says his children but he clearly means him as well.
2. If you don't hold that way then you could say that בלדד too thinks that איוב is a צדיק and his suffering has to be explained even though בלדד is more annoyed with איוב than אליפז was. Gap between the emotional climate than the official philosophical position.

If you hold that איוב was a צדיק then בלדד has to respond to that issue. As we saw רמב"ם רלב"ג line says that איוב was a צדיק and we explain his suffering based on בלדד's philosophy which the רמב"ם called Kalam philosophy, the רלב"ג was Kalam minus, the רמב"ם adopts some form of this, the notion that the צדיק may suffer now but his suffering now may be compensated later. Suffering is a kind of investment. You will get more later, be it in this world be it in הבא עולם.

משלים

We saw at the core of בלדד's chapter are these משלים.

1. The first one is about the reed that is in water and flourishing but it is still in its springtime, in its bud, not yet even plucked, dries out before the hay, this is the משל for רשעים that do well right away then go downhill. From the viewpoint of רמב"ם רלב"ג this works well. Does this say anything about צדיק ורע לו? We had the same issue with אליפז as well, it is easier (more dramatic) to talk about רשעים coming to a bad end than to talk about צדיקים coming to a good end. It's more exciting.
 - a. From the point of view of רמב"ם רלב"ג the פסוק וְהָיָה רִאשִׁיתָךְ מִצֶּעֶר וְאַחֲרֵיתָךְ יִשְׁגָּהּ gives away the center of בלדד's position. If you hold רמב"ן רס"ג and so forth, this is not saying very much, it's a statement, you are suffering how, if you turn to G-d things will get better. Not a heavy philosophical thesis.

This is clearly about the רשע. Why not start with a צדיק? Have to answer on literary and psychological grounds.
2. The רשע who is compared to one who leans on the spider's web and falls down, grabs it to try to get up and can't get up.
3. Continuation of the משל, the פסוקים of ru and on.

(טז) רֹטֵב הוּא לִפְנֵי-שֶׁמֶשׁ וְעַל-גִּנְתּוֹ יִנְקְתּוּ תִצָּא:

The plant is moist before the sun. In the early morning the plant is moist.

The sucker juts out from the plant.

(יז) עַל-גֵּל שָׂרָשָׁיו יִסְבֹּכוּ בֵּית אֲבָנִים יִחַצְהָ:

The root moves through the rocky soil

(יח) אִם-יִבְלַעְנוּ מִמְּקוֹמוֹ וְכָחַשׁ בִּי לֹא רִאִיתִךְ:

It's swallowed up from its place as if it had not been there.

(יט) הֵן-הוּא מְשׁוּשׁ דְּרָכּוֹ וּמַעֲפֵר אַחֵר יִצְמָחוּ:

This is its merry way.

There is a משל here, it's a plant with its roots in rocky soil.

1. There is an uprooting
2. And an aftermath of uprooting.

Is this about a צדיק or is it about a רשע? Two possibilities:

1. Rashi - second משל is also about the wicked. The plant is moist early on. This plant seems to be very well rooted. It has rocky soil. (Quote from Wasteland, poem from TS Eliot - "These are the roots that clutch"). The רשע who seems to be so well rooted and you pluck him out, it is as if the place never saw him, he's gone. The word מוש here is ironic. That is the plant's merry way. It will be replaced by another plant, it will be as if it was never there.

Rashi could get away with this. If you think that it's good פשט he's not getting away with anything. If you ask about the philosophical idea he will say that he holds of רס"ג and רמב"ן and this is about the רשע.

2. If you hold like the רלב"ג then you can't say this פשט because then he is not responding at all to the situation that we're supposed to be discussing. So according to the רלב"ג and his school you have to interpret the פסוקים differently. The צדיק emerges in the morning before the sun. The צדיק has difficulty. The soil is rocky. In order to survive you have to work very hard. It's not like a reed where you stick it in water and he has to work hard.

If you plant him in a new location he is happy. Now he's on easy street. So the פסוקים end up fitting his thesis. According to Rashi מוש has to be an ironic statement. That is probably the greatest פשט weakness in Rashi.

How convincing is the philosophical approach to בלדד?

Previously I have tried to present this issue even handedly. This year it has seemed to me that in the end if you go through the whole פרק, it is not as clear to me that the philosophical approach to בלדד is more convincing than the non-philosophical approach. The רמב"ן who did read the מורה נבוכים and who is looking for philosophy when he reads בלדד doesn't say anything new. So if you look at me now, the רמב"ן has one the battle for my heart and mind.

Next few פסוקים.

(כ) הֲנֵאֱלָל לֹא יִמָּאֵס־תָּם וְלֹא־יִחַזֵּי יִקְ בְּיַד־מְרַעִים:

G-d will not reject the innocent. According to the רלב"ג that is going back to a central point in the פרק. If not he's going back to before. If you do תשובה and go back to G-d he won't reject you, in the same way that אלוהים promised אליפז.

Why is בלדד mentioning the wicked? Either a threat. Or that if he's talking about the world there has to be a ballance, talk about צדיקים and רשעים.

(כא) עַד־יִמְלָה שְׂחֹק פִּיךָ וּשְׂפָתֶיךָ תִּרְוָעָה:

Your mouth will be filled with laughter.

(כב) שֹׁנְאֶיךָ יִלְבְּשׁוּ־בִשְׂת וְאַהֲלֵ רָשָׁעִים אֵינָם: פ

Your enemies will be full of shame, disappointed. The tent of the wicked is gone.

If you take the view that tents and houses are references to איוב's family being destroyed then again you have this jab in the ribs. You could say that. Otherwise he's just saying what he's saying.

Things work out in the end - differences between בלדד and אליפז

One more important question about the פסוקים here and the פרק in general. בלדד and אליפז both said how nicely things will work out. So let's compare:

אליפז: If I would turn to G-d etc, he causes pain and heals, he will save you in many difficulties, and then you will be at peace with the animals of the field, peace in your tent, your children are many, you will die in ripe old age, at the right time. You will die that grain that was harvested in the right time.

How is that different from what בלדד promises איוב? If you look at the details of what each one depicts as the beautiful future, אליפז is describing the kind of a life that a person could look forward to, a life that you have no problems, your family is okay. בלדד is not offering him that. It is primarily confounding his enemies, It is true that in the real world there are people whose primary pleasure in life is confounding their enemies. Even in normal people. Sometimes their pleasure is that you look down at me and look at where you are now. For healthy people, even if they have this pleasure it's not the major part of life.

So what בלדד is offering איוב is odd, especially that we haven't seen in איוב until now that he is vindictive, that people are standing in his way. Two of the things that happened to איוב were natural disasters, the other two were robbers.

If you hold the מלבי"ם's view that בלדד is very traditional, then what people think of you is very central to whether you are doing well or not. There are some people who think that what people say is more important, some think that it's less important. This is why he tries to support himself with "they say". This may also explain why his משלים are off-target. If you are basing yourself on other people's wisdom then it may be very general and not specifically applied to what you are focussed on right now.

I thought about this twenty-four years ago. Richard Nixon died. The funeral was on a wednesday. Billy Graham gave a הספד, started with שמואל ב. He was speaking as America's pastor. He spoke about how שאלו dies and דוד is מספיד him, his point being that even a flawed

leader deserves respect in his death. Even the people who hated Nixon, even the people whom he persecuted. I was thinking that tomorrow I'm doing פרק ח, if I held like the רלב"ג that he views איוב as a good guy and is trying to say something encouraging and trying to be nice, not only is there too much about the רשעים in the משלים, but they don't really fit איוב, because according to him the two משלים are the רשע and everything falls apart, or the צדיק and the person has a glorious end. Neither of them are איוב. The story of איוב is someone who is doing well, goes down, then goes up again. It occurred to me if I were to be מספיד Nixon and you told me that I had to use בלדד to do it, I would have to talk about Nixon as someone who had ups and downs. In the words of Frank Sinatra "Up in April, shot down in May." So that would be the reality of איוב. If I were איוב and held like the רלב"ג I would have to say that people go down then up then down then up again. I think that the only way to explain what בלדד is doing is that he is trying to give him collective wisdom, and collective wisdom is not that fine tuned to deal with the yoyo situation. When he looked through his anthology of אבליים things Frank Sinatra's song was not there.

Review

אליפז addressed איוב, said down kvetch so much, מי הוא נקי אבד, the image of the angelic being, the image of the fool who according to Rashi or רלב"ג, the השגחה כללית about Rain and G-d helping the oppressed, and then the ending where if you turn to G-d everything will be good and you'll have this wonderful ending.

איוב responded on the kvetching issue. Spoke about how miserable he was, the brevity of life, even if he is restored now it's not really going to help very much, he speaks of being persecuted by G-d, why are you watching me in this way, he spends time complaining about his friends, presents it as an adversarial relationship.

It occurs to me as I am speaking right now that this may help explain בלדד as well. If you think that I'm your enemy, and I curse your enemies, I'm either cursing myself or I'm showing you that I'm not your enemy. I don't think that this is really פשוט פשוט, but I'm suggesting it anyway.

When בלדד responds to איוב in this פרק, according to the philosophers he has a specific theory, and is telling איוב that this is the way that the world runs. Perhaps that will be more persuasive than אליפז. His evidence is the משלים which implies that we accept the wisdom of the people as being adequate. If you don't want אליפז's experience I'll give you what everybody says. Can't disagree with what everybody says.

If you want to add to the philosophical element or don't accept the רלב"ג line at all he is in effect sharpening the attack on איוב's children, perhaps sharpening the attack on איוב. He is telling him in effect that we don't agree with you and you are being חצוף.

Next פרק:

איוב פרק ט

(א) וַיַּעַן אִיּוֹב וַיֹּאמֶר:

(ב) אֲמַנְנָם יָדַעְתִּי כִּי־גֵן וּמַה־יִּצְדָּק אֲנוּשׁ עִם־אֱלֹהִים:

Offhand this sounds as if (and it is) a direct response to בלדד. So בלדד says how could you argue with G-d (אליפז didn't hear איוב doing this, he heard him curse the day that he was born, now that he argued with G-d בלדד said how could you do this). So he is saying your right, you can't argue with G-d.

(ג) אִם־יִחַפֵּץ לָרִיב עִמּוֹ לֹא־יַעֲנֶנּוּ אַחַת מִבְּנֵי־אֱלֹהִים:

But his reasoning is different than what בלדד may have wanted to hear. You can't argue with G-d because if you do he doesn't answer.

And now איוב introduces a description of G-d and his acts. what does he know about G-d?

(ד) חֲכָם לֵבָב וְאִמִּיץ כַּחַם מִי־הַקֶּשֶׁה אֱלֹהִים וַיִּשְׁלֹם:

G-d is wise and powerful. Sounds very frum. If you read this in a frum place no one would yell at you.

(ה) הַמַּעֲתִיק הָרִים וְלֹא יָדְעוּ אֲשֶׁר הִפְכֵם בְּאַפּוֹ:

He causes volcanoes, pulls up mountains in his angers.

(ו) הַמִּרְגִּיז אֶרֶץ מִמְּקוֹמָהּ וְעִמּוּדֶיהָ יִתְפַּלְצוּן:

He shakes the earth, earthquakes, the pillars of the earth shake.

(ז) הָאֹמֵר לַחֹרֶס וְלֹא יִזְרַח וּבַעֲד כּוֹכָבִים יַחֲתֹם:

He causes eclipses of the sun and darken the stars.

(ח) נֹטֶה שָׁמַיִם לְבִדּוֹ וְדוֹרֶךְ עַל־בְּמֹתַי יָם:

He is powerful over the heavens and the earth.

(ט) עֹשֶׂה־עֶשׂ כְּסִיל וְכִמְיָהּ וַחֲדָרֵי תִמָּן:

Creates various astronomical constellations.

(י) עֹשֶׂה גְדִלוֹת עֲדָאִין חֶקֶר וְנִפְלְאוֹת עֲדָאִין מִסְפָּר:

This reminds us of אליפז:

איוב פרק ה פסוק ט
עֲשֵׂה גְדֻלּוֹת וְאֵין חֶקֶר נִפְלְאוֹת עַד־אֵין מִסְפָּר:

So this is clearly a response to what אליפז said in פרק ה.

When we read פרקים ז ו ח we noticed that he ignored the השגחה כללית speech. Why did he ignore this? Sometimes in conversation ideas get lost. But even when you want a literary text to sounds like real life, a literary text, especially in תנ"ך, it's more fine tuned. I said that he ignored it because it's not relevant. If it's צדיק ורע לו then the fact that the world as a phone is a good place is not an important issue. If a person suffers and says I wish I was dead it may be relevant to say that the world as a whole is a good place. He is upset not because השגחה כללית, the world is a good place just not good for me, so he ignores it.

Why does he come back to it now? Three possibilities?

1. Very simple option that you will find in דעת מקרא. People don't answer immediately. That's the way that it is. I already said that that's not lumdish enough for me.
2. Ralbag. His view is that איוב is some form of Aristotelian and that he does not abandon that position. He is saying that you misunderstood me. You think that I'm arguing with G-d. You think that I'm saying that G-d is persecuting me. That's not what I mean. What I mean is that if you were right and I believe in השגחה פרטית then it would follow that he is persecuting me, but I don't believe in that premise, the same way that he interprets our פסוקים פרק ט. If you were right then G-d would be a tyrant. If G-d were right and I really thought that you could argue with G-d which I don't want to do because G-d is remote, then I would have to draw this cynical conclusion that you can't talk to G-d because he is an imposing destructive tyrant. That only works if you are assuming that he doesn't mean anything that he is saying, and this is all לשיטתכם. That he is passionately expressing a position that he doesn't adopt. You don't have to be a profound psychologist to say that if that's so then he seems to be protesting too much.
3. The third option, what I would like to say. Iyov has a perfectly good reason for not responding to אליפז initially. He held that that part of אליפז was irrelevant. What he doing now is using what אליפז said for his own purposes. His point isn't השגחה כללית, his point is that you can't discuss anything with G-d because he's a threatening presence. He's so great and wonderful that he is constantly making earthquakes and volcanoes and eclipses.

If איוב had wanted to say that השגחה כללית is awful, that the world is not run well at all, he could have given examples of G-d directly harming people. אליפז talks about rain, so talk about a flood. That's a very straight refutation of אליפז. The examples that he gives are not examples of G-d harming people, they are examples of G-d being destructive. In the world that we know, usually when there is a volcano there are dead people around it. He's choosing examples that are not G-d being bad to people, it's about G-d being threatening.

(יא) הוּן יַעֲבֹר עָלַי וְלֹא אֶרְאֶה וְיִחַלִּיף וְלֹא אֶבִּין לוֹ:

He can pass over me, I don't see. I don't relate to G-d.

(יב) הוּן יִחַתֵּף מִי וְשִׁיבֵנו מִי־אִמְרֵי אֱלֹהֵי מַה־תַּעֲשֶׂה:

He can grab something and you can't get it back from him. You can't speak to him.

(יג) אֵלֹהִים לֹא יֵשִׁיב אִפּוֹ תַּחְתּוֹ תַּחֲתֵי שָׁחַח וְעֲזָרִי רָהֵב:

His anger is implacable and crushes even the sea monster.

(יד) אִם כִּי־אֶנְכִי אֶעֱנֶנּוּ אֲבַחֲרָה דְּבָרֵי עִמּוֹ:

If he is so awesome, can I choose my words with him? If you're afraid of someone, you may be able to answer them, but you don't have the serenity to choose your words carefully.

(טו) אֲשֶׁר אִם־צִדְקָתִי לֹא אֶעֱנֶה לְמִשְׁפָּטֵי יְיָ אֶתְחַנֵּן:

If I am right I cannot answer, I must plead to the one who is judging me. We pointed out that the שורש of חנן appears multiple times in איוב.

1. חנן means for no reason.
2. חנן meant to plead.

So this root plays a funny role here.

(טז) אִם־קִרְאתִי וְיַעֲנֵנִי לֹא־אֶאֱמִין כִּי־יֹאזִין קוֹלִי:

If I cry out and he answers me I won't believe that he actually hears me.

(יז) אֲשֶׁר־בְּשַׁעֲרָה יִשׁוּפְנִי וְהִרְבָּה פִּצְעֵי חֲנָם:

The word חנן turns up here.

(יח) לֹא־יִתְּנֵנִי הַשֵּׁב רוּחִי כִּי יִשְׁבַּעֲנִי מִמָּרָרִים:

(יט) אִם־לֶכְחַ אֲמִיץ הִנֵּה וְאִם־לְמִשְׁפָּט מִי יוֹעִידֵנִי:

(כ) אִם־אֶצְדֵּק פִּי יִרְשִׁיעֵנִי תִם־אֲנִי וְיַעֲקֻשְׁנִי:

If I am right my own mouth accuses me.

(כא) תִם־אֲנִי לֹא־אֲדַע נִפְשִׁי אֲמַאֵס חִי:

(כב) אַחֲרַיִת הִיא עַל־כֵּן אֲמַרְתִּי תִם וְרָשָׁע הוּא מְכַלֶּה:

I conclude that it is all the same. He destroys the innocent and the wicked people.

(כג) אִם-שׁוֹט יָמִית פֶּתְאִם לְמַסַּת נִקְיִים יִלְעָג:

If someone dies suddenly he laughs at what happens to the innocent. A strong indictment of G-d. It's random. He's not saying that he's malicious. He's saying that the world that I see is one that has no order at all.

He's saying that it's as if G-d gave dominion to chaos. Not what he said in פרקים ז ו ז, where he said that he was being persecuted.

Two points that I'm making right now:

1. If you want to understand what he's saying in פרק ט you have to understand what he said in ו and ז.
2. The second point is that this question of how do you define injustice. There's a word here that isn't completely clear.

Assume here that we know what justice is. That could be a whole course in and of itself.

An unjust person could be unjust in two different ways:

- a. I could be unjust because I evaluate people, I know what every person deserves, and then I do the opposite. That's injustice. I owe you money, I find money on the street, and I give it to someone else. ← *perverts* justice
- b. Or you could have someone who just acts chaotically to you. Not that I have a theory of justice, rather there is no pattern at all.

I could say that if אליפז is speaking of a general justice in the world, the way that the world was set up, the soda machine was set up that you put in your coin and you get exactly the amount of soda that you're supposed to get, with a cup. איוב says that I'm not interested, today I'm thirsty and the machine is not working.

Now you could say that the soda machine is set up in a deliberately frustrating way, or it's set up in a way that it's not so good at what it's doing. In the former G-d is playing games with people, in the latter it was set up with good intentions but it doesn't work very well.

In the opening section of the פרק there is too much going on, you can't talk to G-d. later in the פרק it's something else. People may have a certain image, and then you start working out what the intellectual implications are.

Shiur #11

We're in the middle of פרק ט. To sum up where we're holding, איוב in answering בלדד answering איוב answering אליפז answering איוב. We looked at the opening. איוב seems to be using the language of אליפז in פרק ה. We discussed three possibilities why he is doing this now as opposed to before. The דעת מקרא that he didn't answer everything immediately. The רלב"ג that it's all לשיטתך. I have to draw the conclusion that you cannot have a discussion with G-d because he's violent and arbitrary. The third option, which I was saying, since בלדד had said

how could you argue with G-d, איוב's answer then is sarcastically that you really *can't* argue with G-d, I tried he doesn't answer me. It's a direct answer to בלדד. Using the imagery of אליפז because in part that in טז he had no reason to respond to אליפז, he ignored that speech in פרק ה because it was irrelevant to the way that he saw things. Now that it's become relevant, now that the issue came up how could you argue with G-d, he will bring up the discussion of השגחה in general and not just what happened to him personally.

The imagery that he uses in the beginning of פרק ט is the volcano, earthquake, eclipse. I have been arguing that the imagery that he uses here is one that makes G-d appears to be frightening, but not one that describes G-d doing harm to human beings. If he wanted that he could have talked about floods. Here you don't see people suffering, you see him doing things that are frightening, that commonly boil down to human harm. Very often if there are earthquakes there are people who are going to be harmed by that earthquake. No one is affected by an eclipse even if you believe that they are bad omens.

Someone suggested last time that this is about G-d being arbitrary. In that discussion I can't to the conclusion that both elements may be there, as we continue to read ט פרק the element of anarchy comes out more clearly than it did before.

Often people think of a certain image and insight, and as you think it out you put more and more rationale into it. In the opening פסוקים I hold like myself. As you read on, that element of randomness may become more evident.

We have the פסוקים where איוב said that he can't talk to G-d, and there are two major images not talking to G-d, one is that he ignores you, the other is that he's frightening. You're two scared to choose your words.

Back to כא פסוק:

איוב פרק ט
(כ) אִם-אֶצְדֵּק פִּי יִרְשִׁיעַנִי תִם-אֲנִי וַיַּעֲקֹשְׁנִי:

If I'm right my own mouth condemns me. The fact that I'm rebelling shows that I'm in the wrong.

(כא) תִם-אֲנִי לֹא-אֵדַע נַפְשִׁי אִמָּאס חַי:

I am innocent, I don't know my own life. I reject my existence. Interesting פסוק, we'll come back to it.

(כב) אֲחִתִּי הִיא עַל-כֵּן אֶמְרֵתִי תִם וְרָשָׁע הוּא מְכַלָּה:

I come to the conclusion, G-d destroys the innocent and guilty alike. The conclusion that I have arrived at now is that there is no justice in the world, everything is arbitrary. He is not saying that G-d goes out of his way to punish the righteous. It's all random.

(כג) אִם-שׁוּט יִמִּית פְּתָאִם לְמַסַּת נִקְיִים יִלְעָג:

The whip destroys. The word שוט reminds up of והתהלך בה. I would go further and say that the word מסת, the point that I made in the beginning of פרק א, that ספר איוב plays with the word נסיון, that the ordinary reader would come to the same conclusion that רס"ג came to that this is a נסיון even though it isn't said explicitly, then I suggested that whenever you have that שורש of נסה it is as if the ספר is daring us to come to that conclusion. So here too, I suggest that when he says that *he* laughs at the troubles of the innocent, he is coming very close to describing what went on in פרק א.

(כד) אֶרְצוּ וְנִתְּנָה בְּיַד-רָשָׁע פְּנֵי-שִׁפְטִיָּה יִכָּסֶּה אִם-לֹא אֶפְּאֵא מִי-הוּא:

The earth is handed over to the wicked. Sounds very much like פרק א. The רשע is at home in the ארץ, and G-d handed over the events of the world to the שטן. That is a way that you could read פרק א. Of course, איוב did not read פרק א. So the author is inviting us to make the connection to פרק א. There is an irony here. He says more than he really knows.

An alternative reading:

A few years ago, someone published a commentary on איוב ח"ו. A man named שושנה, a frum yeshivishe person. He published a good text of Rashi as well as other Ashkenazic מפורשים Rav Yosef Kara, ח"ו. One of the big headlines of this ח"ו which in his introduction is worthy of a whole several page section in the introduction, is that ח"ו thought that איוב was aware of פרק א. That's good for me, I'm claiming that there are all of these similarities to פרק א. That's means tha ח"ו saw what I saw. But he's going beyond me, he's assuming that איוב was a נביא, so he knew פרק א. So you're committed to the notion that this definitely is a test, and he knows that it is a test. In פרק ט he's saying that he knows exactly what's happening here. G-d handed over the earth to this indifferent power, he's toying with me. So how does he understand what's going on? What's the point of the whole ספר? Even though he knows what's going on, it bothers him that he's suffering in order to put on this kind of display.

That's important for history of פרשנות.

Remember Rashi in פרק ז. When רש"י said

איוב פרק ז

(יב) הֵימֶ-אֲנִי אִם-תִּגִּין כִּי-תִשָּׂים עָלַי מִשְׁמֶר:

רש"י איוב פרק ז פסוק יב

(יב) הים אני - ששמת עלי חול למשמר:

אם תנין - דג גדול שחבשתו בנבכי ים כי תשים עלי משמר השטן הזה לשומרני שלא תצא נפשי:

The simple פשט is that איוב is saying "why are you viewing me as a threat?" Rashi interprets it to mean why are you putting the שטן to watch me and not to kill me? As opposed to my reading where he is paranoid, for Rashi he wished for death, and is complaining that you told the שטן not

to let me die. Had he not known ב פרק how did he know that G-d told the שטן not to let him die? I could still say that even if you hold like Rashi איוב is imagining this.

There are similar ideas in רב יוסף קרא. Once you take that book and read all of those פירושים it may seem that there was something in the Ashkenaz environment that you believe that איוב knew more about this than you would think.

If איוב really thinks that this is what is going on then why don't his friends disagree with him about it/ since I don't hold תם רבנו's position it doesn't bother me that much.

From the perspective of ר"ת, ultimately from this point of view, the issue between איוב and his friends is not so much why does G-d do what he does, it's more is א רשע or not a רשע? There are two issues going on in this book. One is why is there צדיק ורע לו? From איוב's own point of view the issue may be why are my friends treating me like a רשע? The closer that you are to the philosophical approach the more that you are assuming that איוב's friends think that he's a צדיק, and have to explain why this is happening to him. Otherwise it's not a debate about צדיק ורע לו. But if you don't take the רמב"ם רלב"ג view, and you say that this book is about a man who was a צדיק but suffered anyway, are his friends right or wrong in imputing that whatever happening to him he deserves? The תוספתא ב"מ says don't talk to someone who is suffering like his friends spoke to him. That תוספתא does not evidence any general issues of justice in the world. That is interested in a very specific question of אונאת דברים. So it may very well be that the tendency of Rashi and ר"ת to look at the ספר in terms of specifics happening to איוב, may be connected with the lack of interest in the general issue of theodicy? There are middle positions as well. The way that I would read בלדד different this time is that the רמב"ן is right, he's not adding an important new philosophical doctrine.

(כה) וַיָּמִי קָלִי מִנִּירְצָן בְּרַחֲוִי לֹא־רָאִי טוֹבָה:

My days are running away from me faster than a runner.

(כו) חָלְפּוּ עִם־אֲנִיּוֹת אֲבָהָ כִּנְיָשָׁר יָטוּשׁ עָלִי־אֶכֶל:

My days have passed like a ship. אבה is an unclear word. You could translate it as a reed, a ship made out of reeds. Presumably such a ship has very little friction. Or it is מלשון אבה to desire, to יובה השם סלוח לו, a ship that has a destination to get to.

Like a vulture sweeping over food.

Three images of how fast his life is passing. More than a runner, like a ship that has somewhere to go, and like a vulture that has food.

This is the second time that he speaks of the brevity of life. The first time was פרק ז.

איוב פרק ז

(ו) יָמֵי קָלוּ מִנִּי־אָרֶגְ וַיִּכְלֹּוּ בְּאָפֶס תִּקְוָה:

The imagery is different. How are the images different? And why are they different? The spool just rotates, as the cycles become shorter and shorter the rotation is quicker and quicker. It swiftly comes to an end. In פרק ט the images are images of having a goal.

Not only that, if you take פרק ט, the goals exxcellerate. The runner the ship and the vulture. Which one is more motivated. The runner is running. A ship has more of a sense of purpose. And a vulture has more of a sense of purpose. The crescendo, each one is more intense. The runner has friction, the ship glides, the vulture is going through air so it has the least resistance.

The images in פרק ט are more goal oriented. What does that mean as far as our discussion is concerned? Is he only talking about how fast life is over, or is he talking about something else as well? In פרק ז I'm going to die, but even if I'm going to be restored I'm going to be dead. The spool is emptying out. Or even if I'm restored now there is very little time for me. I'm beaten down, I can't go ahead. That's פרק ז. Why is he coming back to this theme in פרק ט?

In פרק ט, it's not just life being short, it's someone not having control over his own life. My life is being pulled in a different direction. It's a funny image. There's me and my life. I'm here and my life is running away from me. פרק ז was not saying that, it was just saying that my life is difficult and short.

If you're one thing and your life is something else, you're divided. It's as if your life is divided against itself.

(כז) אִם־אֲמַרְי אֲשַׁכַּחַה שִׁיחִי אֶעֱזֹבָה פָּנַי וְאֲבִלְיָגָה:

I said to myself let me keep quiet and forget my troubles.

(כח) יִגְרָתִי כָל־עֲצָבַתִּי יָד־עֵתִי כִּי־לֹא תִנְקֶנִּי:

If I'm quiet it doesn't help, as he said before, if I complain I'm a rebel, if I don't I'm also accepting my guilt. So what he is saying here is that I thought that I would keep quiet and have peace of mind, but my silence leads to further judgement, it is an admission of guilt.

I believe that this is consistent with the way that we have interpreted the imagery. He is divided against himself. If he speaks he is in trouble, if he is quiet he is in trouble. He can't control how he communicates, he can't control how he thinks of himself.

I'll come back to this idea in a moment. I want you to know the מלבי"ם in this פסוק. I don't think that the מלבי"ם here is פשט, but it's too interesting not to talk about.

As we know, the מלבי"ם followed the רמב"ם רלב"ג approach, בלדד had a specific philosophy. You suffer now, you get the dividends later. He is left with the question: is איוב responding to בלדד in פרק ט? According to my approach, his response to בלדד is primarily that opening where he says "how could you have the חוצפה to complain" so the core of his discussion is that you can't argue with G-d. But the מלבי"ם finds in these פרקים no less than five arguments against בלדד. One of them goes as follows:

If I say that the more that you suffer now the more dividends you pay later. If you accept that logic, that means that if you are comforted and you stop suffering, then you're losing all of that dividend. You're experiencing an attack of tigris fever, and the more that you suffer the better it will be for you later, so the more that I do to diminish your suffering I'm actually harming you. So he says:

איוב פרק ט
(כז) אִם-אֲמַרְי אֲשַׁכַּחַה שִׁיחִי אֶעֱזְבָה פָּנַי וְאֶבְלִיגָה:
(כח) יִגְרַתִּי כָל-עֲצַבְתִּי יָד עֲתִי כִי-לֹא תִנְקֶנִּי:

I will stop kvetching and take comfort in your idea, but now that I'm taking comfort I'm not suffering any more, and since I'm not suffering anymore I'm losing out on all of that שכר. Your words of comfort make things more difficult for me. It's a very interesting logic.

Tells you something about the way that human beings can think sometimes. Whether it's פשט here is a different question.

(כט) אֲנֹכִי אֶרְשָׁע לְמַה-זֶּה הִבֵּל אֵיגַע:

I am condemned. Why should I make an effort to cleanse my record, no matter what I do I'm doomed.

(ל) אִם-הִתְרַחַצְתִּי בַמּוֹ-בַמִּי-שֶׁלֵּג וְהִזְכִּי'וֹתִי בְּכֶרֶם כִּפִּי:

If I wash in snow. Snow is presumably clean. I clean my hands, either well in water, or in soap.

If I cleanse myself with the most powerful cleansing possible,

(לא) אֲזַבֶּשְׁחַת תִּטְבַּלְנִי וְתַעֲבֹוּנִי שְׁלֹמוֹתַי:

You will dip me again in the dip, and my clothing will abhor me. You are cleaned and then immediately dipped in the water.

His point is that all of my efforts to cleanse myself make me more dirty. My insistence on my innocence makes me a rebel.

Your own clothing rejecting you. Sometimes you have that experience you have a stain and you try to clean it and you just end up spreading it.

Iyov feels that he's divided against himself. In τ ι he imagined G-d persecuting him. Here he's persecuting himself. His very attempt to speak to G-d, assuming that speaking to G-d is important to him, the very attempt puts him in a more difficult position. In life there are situations where you are in conflict with someone, and the more that you attempt to solve that conflict the more that you become weighed down by that conflict.

When I was your age there was a psychologist name Laing. Radical psychiatrist. One of his theories was that much of mental illness serves a kind of social purpose. You have a family, and in that family it is useful that one member is designated the problem member. It happens that way. It is possible that if you know enough people that you actually see such things happen.

Someone that Rabbi Carmy talked too made a point that every family has something like this. In any family, any time that the family gets together most of the conversation is about the problem person in the family. That brings everyone together because the one thing that we all share is that we all are talking about what is wrong with so and so. Sometimes that also happens in the college faculty.

If you think of that and you think of what is going on here in איוב, that a person in that situation there is no way out because whatever you are going to do, you are in that role and tied down to it and there is no way to escape it. And איוב views himself in the same way. He says that no matter what I try to do I can't pull myself out of this situation. In the family why don't you leave? That doesn't really seem to be an option because you can't draw a border in the family situation, you can't sever yourself from your family, you could but it's not easy, and in איוב's case you can't sever yourself from G-d.

We are very far from איוב in the first פרקים. In γ he is saying that G-d is ignoring people, in ι and τ G-d is persecuting him, in τ and ι he is thinking of himself as a divided person because he can't separate his desire for G-d from himself. That is a very big step between the previous speech and this speech.

The way that I'm reading איוב, in each speech there is a development in his thinking.

(לב) כִּי־לֹא־אִישׁ כְּמֹנִי אָעִנְנֹו נִבְּוֹא יַחַדְיוּ בַּמִּשְׁפָּט:

A man like me cannot answer him. I can't take him to a דין תורה.

(לג) לֹא יֵשׁ־בִּינִינֹו מוֹכִיחַ יֵשֶׁת יָדֹו עַל־שִׁנָּיִנֹו:

There's no umpire. There's no way that there will be a judge and we'll come before him and speak out these issues.

(לד) יִסֹּר מֵעָלַי שְׁבִטָּו וְאַמְתּוֹ אֶל־תִּבְעֵתִנִּי:

If G-d were to stop beating me. Same point that he made earlier in the פרק.

(לה) אֲדַבֶּרָה וְלֹא אִירָאָנוּ כִּי לֹא־כֵן אֲנִכִּי עֹמְדִי:

Then I could speak up without fear. Meanwhile I am not that way.

This is the benefit of the discussion that we had last time. If you take the opening of the פרק he is saying that you can't argue with G-d because he is terrifying, that has moved to G-d being arbitrary, the פסוקים in כב כא the sense where he is almost about to quote א ב פרקים, and then at the end of the פרק he is yearning for that opportunity to have a relationship with G-d.

Move on to פרק י.

איוב פרק י

(א) נִקְטָה נַפְשִׁי בַחֲיִי אֶעְזֶבָה עָלַי שִׁיחִי אֲדַבֶּרָה בְּמַר נַפְשִׁי:

Let me speak in my bitterness.

(ב) אֲמַר אֶל־אֱלוֹהַּ אֶל־תִּרְשָׁעֵנִי ה', וְדִיעֵנִי עַל מַה־תִּרְיָבִנִּי:

I would speak to G-d. He is rehearsing what he would say if he would be able to speak to G-d. He would say "don't convict me, speak to me.

(ג) הַטּוֹב לָךְ כִּי־תַעֲשֶׂה קִי־תִמָּאֵס יִגִּיעַ כְּפִיךָ וְעַל־עֲצַת רָשָׁעִים הִוָּפַעְתָּ:

Is it good for you to reject the creation of your hands? You have appears on the counsel of the wicked. We'll get back to this פסוק later.

(ד) הֲעֵינִי בְּשָׂר לָךְ אִם־כְּרָאוֹת אֲנוֹשׁ תִּרְאֶה:

Are your eyes like those of the human being? The words are very simple, what it means we'll get to later.

(ה) הֲכִימִי אֲנוֹשׁ יָמֶיךָ אִם־שָׁנוֹתֶיךָ כִּימֵי גִבֹּר:

Are your years like the human being's years? Is your conception of time the same as that of the human being?

(ו) כִּי־תִבְקֹשׁ לַעֲוֹנִי וְלִחַטָּאתִי תִדְרֹשׁ:

That you seek after my sins.

(ז) עַל־דַּעְתְּךָ כִּי־לֹא אֶרְשָׁע וְאִין מִיֶּדְךָ מִצִּיל:

We'll get back to these פסוקים. Next section:

(ח) יְדִיךָ עֲצָבוֹנִי וַיַּעֲשֵׂנוּנִי יָחַד סָבִיב וַתְּבַלְעֵנִי:

He describes the way that man was created. You molded me.

(ט) זָכַר־נָא כִּי־כַחֲמֶר עָשִׂיתָנִי וְאֶל־עֹפֶר תִּשְׁיִבֵנִי:

You made me like clay and eventually you'll return me to dust.

(י) הֲלֹא כַחֲלָב תִּתִּיכֵנִי וְכַגְבֵּן הִתְקַפִּיאֵנִי:

Compares the creation of man to the creation of a cheese.

(יא) עוֹר וּבָשָׂר תַּלְבִּישָׁנִי וְבַעֲצָמוֹת וְגִידִים תִּסְכְּכֵנִי:

You dress me up with skin and flesh. You cover me up with bones and sinews.

(יב) חַיִּים וְחֹסֶד עָשִׂיתָ עִמָּדִי וּפְקַדְתָּךְ שְׁמֶרָה רוּחִי:
(יג) וְאַלֶּה צַפְנֹת בְּלִבְךָ יְדִי עֵתִי כִּי־זֹאת עֲמָךְ:

Let's go back to the earlier פסוקים.

איוב פרק י'

(א) נִקְטָה נַפְשִׁי בְּחַיִּי אֶעְזְבָה עָלַי שִׁיחִי אֲדַבְּרָה בְּמֶר נַפְשִׁי:

(ב) אִמֵּר אֶל־אֱלוֹהַּ אֶל־תִּרְשִׁיעֵנִי ה' וְדִיעֵנִי עַל מַה־תִּרְיָבִנִי:

It seems clear when he says אל תרשיעני that he means don't convict me.

(ג) הַטּוֹב לָךְ כִּי־תַעֲשֶׂה קִי־תִמָּאֵס יִגִּיעַ כְּפִיךָ וְעַל־עֶצֶת רַשָּׁעִים הוֹפָעֶת:

(ד) הֵעֵנִי בָּשָׂר לָךְ אִם־כִּרְאוֹת אֲנוּשׁ תִּרְאֶה:

What does this פסוק mean? There are two, almost diametrically opposed approaches from a philosophical point of view:

1. The רלב"ג. This is לשיטתו. He holds that G-d does not know future contingencies. His question is that human beings look at the world with sensual eyes and sensual ears so you see contingent events, but if G-d is looking at the world the way that an architect looks at the ground plans then the details G-d does not condescend to the ___. Then איוב is saying to G-d "are you like a human being that is preoccupied with human sin? You're on a higher level, you shouldn't be concerned with that. (Next פסוק) A human being knows what going on in a

contingent world because a human being lives within time, G-d is beyond time so his knowledge doesn't relate to contingent events." So his complaint is "how could you be concerned with my sins when your relationship with the world is a different kind of relationship."

2. The רמב"ם is almost the exact opposite. This means are you limited the way that human beings are limited. A human being may not know the future because he is limited, but G-d knows what is going to happen. Next פסוק, you *know* the future. Exact opposite of רלב"ג. And if you know the future how could you hunt me down for my sin, since if you know the future then you are responsible for any sins that I might have. For him the whole puzzle of divine foreknowledge and free will comes into play. Why are you preoccupied with what I'm doing, you're in control, everything that happens is your responsibility.

According to the רלב"ג G-d shouldn't be involved in any of this. According to the מלבי"ם he has no right to punish איוב because he is very involved in everything.

If you don't hold either of those views and you look in the רמב"ן and want a more neutral approach, then he might be saying "why are you so preoccupied", he's not claiming to be perfect he's just saying that I don't deserve what you're doing to me, and the question is very much like the questions that we had earlier. Why are you so preoccupied with me? Don't you have something more important to think about?

What do I have to add to all of this? What I would say here (I'm using the מלבי"ם for my own purposes) go back to פרק ט. As the פרק unfolds איוב has a greater sense of being at war with himself. In פרק ט he wants a dialogue. Part of that desire is the sense that he can't really separate himself from G-d. when he speaks about life having a goal of its own is emblematic of that sense that part of איוב is with G-d and he can't just separate what's happening to him with who is is. And he's frustrated. He says that I can't talk to G-d. I wish that I could. Not just because if I could then maybe i could prove that I'm innocent, rather if I can't talk to G-d then who am I, where am I. if you read how I was reading then פרק י confirms that way that I was reading.

This is somewhat like the מלבי"ם, but he's preoccupied by this classical issue of free will and foreknowledge. That particular theological problem may not be what איוב is talking about, because איוב may not have read the late Greek philosophers who were bothered by this problem. He may not even has read the Rambam and רס"ג. What's bothering him here is that *you* made me, everything that I am is what you created, I can't separate myself. I can't say that G-d is my enemy and I'll stay as far away as possible. In these פרקים it is important for איוב to have a relationship with G-d, and his argument for that is how could you be indifferent to me, you made me. Why are you hunting me down in this way? פסוק ח, you did חסד with me, you created me, you invested in me. פסוק ט,

(ה) הִכִּימִי אֲנוֹשׁ יִמְיָךְ אִם־שָׁנוֹתֶיךָ כִּימִי גָבֶר:
 (ו) כִּי־תִבְקֹשׁ לַעֲוֹנִי וְלַחַטָּאתִי תִדְרֹשׁ:
 (ז) עַל־דַּעְתְּךָ כִּי־לֹא אֲרָשָׁע וְאִין מִדָּךְ מִצִּיל:
 (ח) יְדִיךָ עֲצֹבוּנִי וְיַעֲשׂוּנִי יָחַד סֶבִיב וְתִבְלַעֵנִי:

(יב) חַיִּים וְחַסֵּד עֲשִׂיתָ עִמָּדִי וּפְקַדְתָּךְ שְׁמֶרָה רוּחִי:
 (יג) וְאַלֶּה צַפֹּנֶת בִּלְבָבְךָ יְדִי עֲתִי כִי־זֹאת עִמָּךְ:

According to the רלב"ג, this means that this is hidden away, you don't know your relationship with me. But the רלב"ג is not my שיטה. According to the מלבי"ם this means that you know everything that is happening, you know me, you are intimately connected with me and I am intimately connected with you.

(יד) אִם־חַטָּאתִי וּשְׁמִרְתָּנִי וּמַעֲוֹנֵי לֹא תִנָּקֵנִי:

I am in a situation now where if I have sinned you are watching over me and don't give me a chance to be cleansed of my sin.

(טו) אִם־רָשָׁעִתִּי אֵלַי לִי וְצִדְקָתִי לֹא־אֶשָּׂא רֹאשִׁי שִׁבְעָה קָלֹון וּרְאָה עֵינָי:

If I wicked woe unto me, but if I am righteous I can't raise my head because that would be rebellion.

(טז) וַיִּגָּאֵה כְּשַׁחַל תִּצּוּדֵנִי וְתִשָּׁב תִּתְפַּלֵּא־בִי:

You hunt me down like a lion. And you wonder at me. You take an object and look at it from this and that angle.

(יז) תִּחַדֵּשׁ עֵדֶיךָ נִגְדִי וְתִרְבֵּךְ עֵשֶׁךְ עִמָּדִי חֲלִיפוֹת וְצָבָא עִמִּי:

You continue to go after me.

(יח) וְלֵמָּה מִרְחָם הוֹצֵאתָנִי אֲגִוֵּעַ וְעֵין לֹא־תִרְאֵנִי:

Would that I should never have been born. In פרק ט he wants to be killed, now he's going back to פרק ג. Then he wishes that he has never been born because the day had been a bad day, didn't turn out well. Here he is saying that wishes that he had never been born.

(יט) כַּאֲשֶׁר לֹא־הָיִיתִי אֶהְיֶה מִבֶּטֶן לִקְבֹּר אוֹבֵל:

Just as I never was I would continue not to be. Go straight from the womb to the tomb.

(כ) הֲלֹא־מָעַט יָמֵי יַחַד לְיָחִיד וְיָחִיד לְיָשִׁית וְיָשִׁית לְמָוֶת נִי וְאַבְלִיגָה מָעַט:

My days are short, leave me alone, give me a chance to rest.

(כא) בְּטָרֶם אֵלַי וְלֹא אֲשׁוּב אֶל-אֶרֶץ חַשְׁךָ וְצִלְמוֹת:

I will go very soon to a place of darkness.

(כב) אֶרֶץ עִיפֹתָהּ כִּמוֹ אִפֹּל צִלְמוֹת וְלֹא סֶדֶר יִים וְתַפֵּעַ כִּמוֹ-אֶפֶל: פ

I am going to the dark place where the dead are.

Here I could say that he is speaking about human fate over all. Not quite because he's speaking in the first person and not in general of people dying. But he seems to be describing a general human situation that you come to the end of life and it becomes dark and he takes a nice couple of פסוקים to describe that he goes to death and is gone.

In the end of פרק ז he says that if I were dead you would look for me, but that's because G-d is trying to persecute him. If he is dead then you can't persecute him anymore. In פרק י he's describing reaching that point that given that I am alive whether I like it or not, give me a chance to rest a little bit before it's time to go.

He answered a question for the last fifteen minutes, I didn't take notes on that.

In the end he's talking about the desire for death, different than פרק ג which is that he never should have been born at all. Here it is a plea for mercy, leave me alone let me die already, give me some peace for a short while before I die. In פרק ז he was saying kill me right away.

It occurs to me that if part of what is happening in ט and י is that he is describing a world of darkness, of emptiness, then here where he describes death as entering into a land of no order a land that makes no sense at all, that would fit as well.

Going to צופר, then איוב's response, then we start rushing.

Shiur #12

יא for most of the meeting then we go more quickly afterwards.

We are dealing with צופר. If you take the official philosophical position then according to the רמב"ם he is an Asharite according to the רלב"ג and מלבי"ם there is some sort of variation involved. And to make a long story short, he is insisting that what's right and what's wrong is only understood by G-d. According to the רמב"ם it's the Asharite position where no one could say anything. According to the רלב"ג where the question would be how do we know that a צדיק is not a צדיק. Or according to the מלבי"ם where we don't really know what a person's potential is.

The common denominator is that we don't understand G-d's ways, and that solves the problem of צדיק ורע לו. He knows what's true, what we see doesn't mean very much.

Whether that fits the פסוקים or not - fits it to some degree but we'll see whether it fits precisely.

איוב פרק יא

(א) וַיַּעַן צֹפֵר הַנְּעֻמָּתִי וַיֹּאמֶר:

(ב) הָרַב דְּבָרִים לֹא יַעֲנֶה וְאִם־אִישׁ שִׁפְתָּיִם יִצְדָּק:

איוב is a man of words, and he cannot be right

(ג) בְּדִיךְ מִתִּים יִחְרִישׁוּ וְתִלַּעַג וְאִין מְכָלִם:

I would translate בדיך as לשון בדה, to invent. Fantastic words are deafening. מתים means people. במתי מעט. You have jeered and no one has stopped you.

(ד) וַתֹּאמֶר זֶךְ לִקְחִי וְבִרְהִיטִי בְּעֵינַיִךְ:

You said "my word are pure". You are innocent in your own eyes.

This is a new point really. Early on he never claimed to be perfect, he says what's the big deal. Now the way that צופר perceives things, the lines between איוב and G-d are more sharply outlined, and he's saying I'm innocent, which is what he's saying in פרק ט, I'm innocent but I don't know what's happened to me.

Here we come to the פסוקים that are important for the philosophical approach.

(ה) וְאוֹלָם מִי־יִתֵּן אֱלֹהֵי דְבַר וַיִּפְתַּח שִׁפְתָּיו עִמָּךְ:

Would that G-d would speak to you. איוב said that you can't talk to G-d, I wish I could. צופר is saying that you would be lucky if G-d would speak to you.

(ו) וַיַּגְדֵּלְךָ תַּעֲלָמוֹת חֲכָמָה כִּי־כָפְלִים לְתוֹשִׁיָּה וְדַע כִּי־יִשָּׂה לְךָ אֱלֹהִים מֵעוֹנְךָ:

He would reveal the hidden thing to you. I don't fully understand. ישה means to forget. If you knew the truth you would know that G-d is going easy on you, really you deserve more.

(ז) הֲתִקְרַ אֱלֹהֵי תִמְצָא אִם עַד־תִּכְלִית שְׂדֵי תִמְצָא:

Can you claim to understand G-d?

(ח) גָּבְהִי שָׁמַיִם מִה־תִּפְעַל עֲמָקָה מִשָּׂאֵל מִה־תִּדְעַ:

You know what's higher than heavens? What's deeper than שואל.

(ט) אֶרֶץ מֵאֲרָץ מִדָּה וְרַחֲבָה מִנִּי־יָם:

G-d's wisdom is infinite, it's beyond what people can't fathom.

(י) אִם-יִחְלֹף וְיִסְגֹּר וְיִקְהַל יְל וְיִי שִׁיבֵנו:

He does what he pleases, you can't argue with him.

(יא) כִּי-הוּא יָדַע מִתִּי-שׂוֹא וְיִרְא-אֶן וְלֹא יִתְבּוֹן:

He knows the vanity of people

one translate given the רלב"ג's view of divine foreknowledge, he sees iniquity but doesn't investigate it. He is not involved in future contingencies.

If you want to take the מלבי"ם's view it's the opposite and is a rhetorical question. He sees and doesn't pay attention? on ושלום.

(יב) וְאִישׁ נָבוֹב יִלְבָּב וְעִיר פֶּן רָא אָדָם יוֹלֵד:

The hollow man will receive a heart. The basic notion that human beings don't understand G-d. human beings are wild and raw need to be educated. Man is born like a wild donkey. They don't understand anything. So if you take a philosophical approach, who are we to challenge G-d anyway?

If you don't take the מלבי"ם רלב"ג approach the content won't be that much different. He's clearly saying that we don't understand G-d's ways. Either way.

So if you go back to what I said earlier. When we talk about רלב"ג here, the general shape of what they're saying, I'm not buying into the notion that all of them have degrees in philosophy from some medieval philosophy school. I'm not saying that. At the same time, what they're saying may reflect what these people really are saying. For אליפז it more or less worked out. For בלדד the way that I studied the פרק this year I really ended up ignoring that approach to בלדד. I ended up like the רמב"ן מלבי"ם. He didn't see the רמב"ם's approaches in the world of בלדד, and was more skeptical of it.

Alexander Brodey professor of economics would ask the same question in his class every year and the answer would keep on changing because the economy kept on changing.

For צופר I'm saying that the philosophical approach captures something important going on in the פסוקים. That doesn't mean that he was a medieval Islamic theologian. It means that there is some similarity between the Asharite position and צופר's position.

One more comment. Someone in the Tuesday class made the point that if you treat צופר as a total skeptic then how come he *does* know that איוב is a רשע? An Asharite would answer that by saying that G-d knows what's right and what's wrong, end of discussion. But if you really want to learn פשט in איוב then you don't really get skepticism here. צופר is more confident in אליפז and בלדד were in the first round that איוב is a רשע.

So I made the distinction between skepticism and mysteriousness. I may have used such language in the past but didn't realize it. The approach to צופר is not just the "מלבי"ם Kant, we don't know anything and therefore as Wittgenstein would say later in a different context, "of that which one cannot speak, one should be silent". Example from Kant: what does the other side of the moon look like? We don't know. Not that we can't know. So that distinction is one that you should bear in mind. What צופר is doing is presenting G-d as being very mysterious.

You may ask me that forget out אליפז and בלדד, isn't it a fact that G-d really is mysterious? My answer would be that not everything that צופר is saying must be false. איוב's friends may be saying a lot of true things. In real life stupid people very often say things that are true.

What about חז"ל? They will often quote פסוקים from צופר and apply it to דברי תורה! The answer is two things, one is like I said before that just because he's not the correct view doesn't mean that everything that he says is narishkeit. And the other is that דרוש is דרוש, from the point of view of the מדרש it's a פסוק, it's not something that צופר said. The מדרש will very often take a פסוק out of context without necessarily going into the same kind of analysis that we would go into in class.

Q: What's the connection between G-d being mysterious and איוב being a רשע? Wouldn't either argument be sufficient to explain what's going on?

A; The connection is simply that they're both in the same פרק. In purely psychological terms, leaving out the content of צופר's view, it's understandable that as the dialogue goes on that איוב's friends are going to become harsher. צופר has really crossed a line that the others have not crossed by calling him a רשע. If you take the general theory that we don't understand anything, from the viewpoint of the "מלבי"ם רלב"ג then there is a connection between he is saying that there is a צדיק who suffers and I could explain why. בלדד according to them could be saying that he is a צדיק and explains why he is suffering, while צופר must really be calling him a רשע. The point is that only G-d knows who is a צדיק and who is a רשע, the only problem is that we can't determine who the צדיק and the רשע is, so then there would be such a connection. According to my approach if he is saying that everything is mysterious there is no necessary implication that איוב is a רשע. The question is logically correct but I have answered it.

Next is a passage which offhand is of no philosophical value:

(יג) אִם-אֶתָּה הַכִּינֹתָ לְבָרְךָ וּפְרַשְׁתָּ אֵלָיו כֶּפֶר:

If you prepared yourself and prayed. Interesting that they would not use the actual word pray. Rashi פרק ה said תפלה or other things as well. In תפלה said אליפז interprets that as prayer but other ראשונים interpret it differently.

בלדד - also wants איוב to turn to G-d. plead with G-d. the word תפלה doesn't appear but they are all saying that איוב should pray to G-d.

So צופר says that if you turn to G-d and spread your hands to him.

(יד) אִם-אָנוּ בַדֶּרֶךְ הַרְחִיקָהּ וְאֵל-תִּשְׁכַּח בְּאֵהָלֶיךָ עֲוֹלָה:

If you have sinned repent and remove yourself from that evil. Remove the iniquity from your tent.

(טו) כִּי-אֶזְרָא תִשָּׂא פָנֶיךָ מִמּוֹם וְהָיִיתָ מְצֹק וְלֹא תִירָא:

If you do that then things will be good.

All of איוב's friends so far have offered good things. אליפז said at the end of פרק ה that אשרי איש. And בלדד also said that you will end up being great. So he's making a similar promise. You turn to G-d and then you will be able to lift up your face, you will be solid, you will not fear.

(טז) כִּי-אֶתָּה עָמַל תִּשְׁכַּח כָּמִים עֲבָרְךָ תִּזְכֹּר:

All of the troubles that you had you will forget.

(יז) וְיִמְצְהֶרִים יָקוּם חֵלֶד תֵּעַר פֶּה כְּבֹקֵר תִּהְיֶה:

The world will arise like noontime. It will appear עף means to appear, like הופיע.

(יח) וְיִבְטַחַתְּ כִּי-יִשׁ תִּקְוָה וְחִפְרָתְּ לִבְטַח תִּשְׁכַּב:

You will be secure. You will be able to dig a hole and sleep in that hole securely.

(יט) וְיִרְבְּצַתְּ וְאִין מִחֲרִיד וְחָלוּ פָנֶיךָ רַבִּים:

You will lie down and no one will disturb you. And many will come to you for benefit.

(כ) וְעֵינֶי רִשְׁעִים תִּכְלֶינָה וּמְנוֹס אֲבָד מִנֶּהֱמָ וְתִקְוֹתָם מִפֶּח-נֶפֶשׁ: פ

Meanwhile the wicket, their eyes will be consumed. They will come to a bad end. אליפז doesn't say anything about the wicked. At the end בלדד said that איוב's enemies will be shamed and humiliated. And צופר says in general, the wicked will suffer very badly. Since צופר is more extreme in condemning איוב than the other two he could be saying that if you turn to G-d then good, if you don't then what happens to the רשעים will happen to you.

Q: If G-d is so mysterious then how could צופר be promising איוב anything?

A: Let me raise this question regarding other views. How would a real Asharite answer that question? How do you know that if you press this button you will get a soda and not a blow in the head? Let's say that you're a 17th century Calvinist who believed that G-d is inscrutable, had problems with free will, and at the same time are interested in signs of divine favor. You have what's called predestination, G-d has selected people to go to heaven and people to go to hell. All of this is set out, and nevertheless these people try to do things that will put them in the company of the elect and not of the damned. You're living in such an irrational world, how do you handle something like that? What happens if you're dealing with a crazy person? In life that happens. What he decides is very important for where you're holding. What he is going to decide is virtually unpredictable. In the real world people actually try to sway him. They really have no idea but they try to do it. If you deal with animals it doesn't always work that way. If the rat presses a button it gets a reward, the other button gives it a shock. You could train it to go for the reward button. If you then switch things up and make it inconsistent eventually the rat will give up. In the human world people keep trying, maybe they'll get a response.

If you take his view as being completely mysterious, I could still say that צופר says "pray to G-d", aye he might slap you in the face? אה"נ. I'm using analogies to fill in the blanks for how to explain צופר. You might tell me that what I'm doing is irresponsible. But it answers your question to a point. And it may be that if we read the פרק a little bit better that it may turn out that this stab in the dark that I'm making may have more supporting it that you may think right now.

What are the differences between the happy predictions of אליפז and בלדד and those of צופר? We saw that in אליפז it was a very understandable prediction. G-d will save you from your troubles, you will be restored. You will die at a ripe old age and have children. Everything is great. For בלדד you will be full of laughter and your enemies will be confounded. What is צופר promising, and more important, how is his prediction going to come true? Very interesting דיוק here. According to אליפז and בלדד, what is the mechanism through which he will be restored? G-d will respond to you. What about צופר? Will G-d respond? The פסוק does not say. Now you realize why I drew those analogies to Asharites and Calvinists. G-d is not the agent of איוב's recovery. There is no agent. It doesn't say that G-d will help you, it says that then you will recover. According to my reading, if G-d's relationship to the whole business is mysterious then צופר says איוב that you should turn to G-d and there is nothing at all about G-d turning back to איוב. No road to G-d whatsoever.

איוב פרק יא

(טו) כִּי־אֶזְרָא תִּשָּׂא פָנֶיךָ מִמּוֹם וְהִיִּית מִצֶּקֶ וְלֹא תִירָא:

מֹמ could be an abridgement of מאומה. You will have nothing to complain about. Or it could mean a defect. There will be no defect affecting you.

How is his situation going to improve? He will lift up his face. He will literally save face.

The idea that I want to present to you is that sometimes emphasizing divine sovereignty might end up kicking G-d upstairs. Who has a stronger sense of השגחה Tzofar. If he is an Asharite then every little thing is what G-d does. All G-d and nothing else. I'm suggesting that very often if you place G-d very high that way, then everything that G-d is totally mysterious and removed from any conception that we have, you may end up leaving the world very much demuted of G-d. You are putting him up there and he is less acceptable.

Where am I getting this analogy from? Calvinism! You have a religious outlook where G-d is very powerful and arbitrary, and that emphasis means that you have a world that is emptied out of the divine presence.

One form of that position - Karl Bart. Very important protestant theologian in the 20th century. Some call him a neo calvinist. He is much more friendly than a traditional calvinist because he's not committed to the notion that G-d damned anybody. More pleasant doctrine. But the basic idea, there is no way that a person could start from the world and end up with G-d, all that we know about G-d is what G-d revealed himself. The interesting part of it is that in a strange way, from removing any road from the world to G-d you really make him very inscrutable. Normal human moral judgements become standing on nothing at all.

So I am suggesting that that may be happening here. The theology of צופר is one where G-d is very much up there in heaven, inaccessible to human beings. Really means that it also becomes difficult for צופר. The mentality is a very similar mentality. G-d is up there, and to say that he will do this for you and that for you, we don't know anything about G-d.

What is his recovery about? For צופר it means that איוב will be able to raise his head in society. Losing face means that you can't show your face in public.

Begin was the only Israeli Prime Minister who did not give his resignation to the president. This was strange because he was the one who believed the most in these formalities. They say that this is because he had a rash on his face and couldn't go out in public.

When he puts such an emphasis on this that supports what we were saying before: if you're not thinking of the restoration as a part of the relationship with G-d because G-d is

up there, then your relationship with G-d may be replaced by the way that you see yourself in the presence of other people. The social replaces the relationship between man and G-d. If איוב has previously argued that he wants to talk to G-d and can't talk to G-d, in פרק ו he had expressed great disappointment in his friends, and one of the reasons that he is turning to G-d is because of his friends, צופר is in effect saying that you don't want to talk to G-d because if you would then you would be much more depressed than you were before. He is removed, and if so then what's left? And your status is that you could show your face in public.

These movements are not just philosophy, they are being played out in terms of the personal psychological aspects that you have here.

(טז) כִּי־אַתָּה עֹמֵל תִּשְׁכַּח כָּמִים עֲבָרֶיךָ תִּזְכֹּר:

You will forget everything that happened to you.

(יז) וּמִצָּהָרִים יָקוּם חֵלֶד תֵּעָרֶפֶה כְּבִקָּר תִּהְיֶה:
(יח) וּבִטְחָתְךָ כִּי־יֵשׁ תִּקְוָה וְחִפְרָתְךָ לִבְטַח תִּשְׁכַּב:
(יט) וְרִבְצָתְךָ וְאֵין מַחְרִיד וְחִלּוֹ פְּנִיךָ רַבִּים:

Interesting. The highest part of his restoration is that other people will treat him with respect and look to him for help. This fits what we said about צופר. G-d is removed, what you have instead is your social standing.

Interesting - look at טז פסוק. You will forget your troubles, they will pass by like water. Why should amnesia be part of his recovery? Why is צופר thinking about it? אליפז didn't say anything about it. On the contrary, אליפז said that you will have gone through so many troubles and come out the other side. Start with how bad things are end with how good things are. צופר unlike the others presents forgetting as an ideal.

If a person had a terrible headache then he may not mind forgetting about it the next day. But normally a healthy person would not be interested in forgetting. But if you were in an embarrassing situation then you would want to forget about it so that you don't remember it every time that you're around the same people. This reinforces the social aspect of it.

(כ) וְעֵינֵי רָשָׁעִים תִּכְלֶינָה וּמָנוֹס אָבִד מִנֶּהֱמָם וְתִקְוַתָּם מִפֶּחֱ־נָפֶשׁ: פ

This is more or less what I wanted to say about צופר. Let's go to פרק יב.

פרק יב

איוב פרק יב

(א) וַיַּעַן אִיּוֹב וַיֹּאמֶר:

(ב) אַמְנֵם כִּי אַתֶּם-עִם וְעַמְכֶּם תִּמּוּת חִכְמָה:

You are a great nation (he's being sarcastic) and with you wisdom will die.

(ג) גַּם-לִי לִבְבוֹ כְּמוֹכֶם לֹא-נָפַל אֲנִכִּי מִכֶּם וְאֶת-מִי-אֵין כְּמוֹ-אֱלֹה:

I'm just as smart as you are, which is not saying too much.

(ד) שִׁחִק לְרַעְהוּ אֱהִיָּה קָרָא לְאֱלֹהִים וַיַּעֲנֵהוּ שׁוֹחַ צְדִיק תַּמִּים:

I have been a laughingstock to my friend, he who calls upon G-d and G-d answers him. May be a reference to אליפז.

(ה) לַפִּיד בּוֹז לַעֲשֵׂתוֹת שְׂאֵנָן נִכְוֹן לְמוֹעֲדֵי רָגֶל:

To those who are stumbling there is a torch of contempt in the opinion of a secure. Meaning you look at someone who suffers and you justify what happens to them, that means that you make fun of someone who suffers.

(ו) יִשְׁלִי אֱהִלִּים לְשֹׁדֵדִים וּבִטְחוֹת לְמַרְגִּיזֵי אֵל לֹאשֶׁר הִבִּיא אֱלֹהִים בְּיָדוֹ:

There is security for the wicked. The people who seem to have somehow taken over G-d. He is saying in effect that his friends are wrong about him, and that their claims to wisdom have no justification.

Why is he responding about this right now? צופר talked about hidden wisdom, he is saying that you have no claims to hidden wisdom. Neither you nor the other two guys.

(ז) וְאֹלִים שְׂאֵל-נָא בְּהִמּוֹת וְתִרְךָ וְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וַיַּגֵּד-לָךְ:

You claim to be wise, I'll tell you that either an animal is wiser to you are. Nice pun תורך could mean will teach you, or it could be a תור bird.

(ח) אוֹ שִׁיחַ לְאֶרֶץ וְתִרְךָ וַיְסַפְרוּ לָךְ דְּגֵי הַיָּם:

שיח is a pun, either talk to the earth and it will explain it to you, or it means a bush. If it meant a bush then שאל goes on this too.

(ט) מִי לֹא יָדַע בְּכָל־אֱלֹהִים כִּי יִדְיָקוּק עֲשֵׂתָהּ זֹאת:

Who does not know that G-d has done all of this? Even the fish and the birds know the acts of G-d. you tell me that there's a mystery, I'm telling you that there is no mystery at all.

(י) אֲשֶׁר בִּידוֹ נָפֶשׁ כָּל־חַי' וְרוּחַ כָּל־בֶּשֶׂר־אִישׁ:

(יא) הֲלֹא־אֶזְנִן מְלִין תִּבְחֹן וְחֹךְ אֶכְלִי יִטְעִם־לִי:

(יב) בִּישִׁישִׁים חֲכָמָה וְאֶרֶךְ יָמִים תִּבְוֹנָה:

He's quoting his friends. He's quoting בלדד. You said that the old traditional people know everything.

(יג) עָמּוּ חֲכָמָה וּגְבוּרָה לִי עֵצָה וּתְבוּנָה:

They don't know anything, it's G-d who is wise.

(יד) הֵן יִהְיוּ וְלֹא יִבְנֶה יִסְגֹּר עַל־אִישׁ וְלֹא יִפְתָּח:

He destroys and nothing gets build up. Closes in on a person and there is no way out.

(טו) הֵן יַעֲצֹר בַּמַּיִם וַיִּבְשּׁוּ וַיִּשְׁלַח־ם וַיַּהֲפֹכוּ אֶרֶץ:

He can stop the water and everything dries up, or he could let the water loose and the world is overturned.

(טז) עָמּוּ עַז וְתוֹשִׁיָה לִי שִׁגְגַּת וּמִשְׁגָּה:

He has all of the power, misleads people and controls those who lead other people astray.

(יז) מוֹלִיךְ יוֹעֲצִים שׁוֹלֵל וְשׁוֹפֵטִים יְהוֹלֵל:

(יח) מוֹסֵר מַלְכִים פֹּתַח וַיֹּאסֵר אֶזְרוֹר בַּמַּתְנִיָּהם:

Your kings and he undoes your girdle and your pants fall down and he ties them.

(יט) מוֹלִיךְ כְּהֹנִים שׁוֹלֵל וְאַתְנִים יִסְלֹף:

(כ) מִסִּיר שִׁפָּה לְנֶאֱמָנִים וְטַעַם זִקְנִים יִקַּח:

(כא) שׁוֹפֵךְ בֹּזֵז עַל־נְדִיבִים וּמְזִיחַ אֶפְיָקִים רָפָה:

(כב) מְגַלֶּה עֲמֻקּוֹת מִנִּי־חֹשֶׁךְ וַיֵּצֵא לְאוֹר צִלְמוֹת:

(כג) מִשְׁגִּיא לְגוֹיִם וַיַּאֲבֹדֵם שֹׁטֵחַ לְגוֹיִם וַיִּנָּחֵם:

(כד) מִסִּיר לֵב רָאשֵׁי עַם־הָאָרֶץ וַיִּתְּעֵם בְּתֵהוּ לֹא־דֶרֶךְ:

(כה) וַיִּמְשְׁשׁוּ־חֹשֶׁךְ וְלֹא־אוֹר וַיִּתְּעֵם כְּשֹׁכֹר:

In a word, he says here that you claim to be wise, you're not wise, even the fish and the animals are as smart as you are. I know the mighty acts of G-d they are quite evident. Where are they?
Two basic things:

1. He can destroy. Very specifically he could either stop the water or let the water loose.
2. He confounds the leaders. The wise.

If we take these two examples, what does it remind us of? פרק ה's speech in חקרא. He made the speech. Using water and confounding the wicked as evidence that the world as a whole is a good place. He ignored this and I said because it's irrelevant. After בלדד spoke he comes back to this issue. He even quotes him verbatim עושה גדולות עד אין חקר. His examples though are different than חקרא's examples. His examples were the water and the wicked, and חקרא's examples were the earthquake, the eclipse, and the volcano. All things that are ominous and perhaps random. Doesn't describe causing harm to people. No direct description how G-d harms people. Who doesn't he use חקרא's examples? Because in פרק ט his major point was that you can't have a conversation with G-d, he's frightening. So he chose עד אין חקר.

Now that חקרא has spoken and his approach is "you can't talk to G-d, you may pray but you can't have a תורה. No one will explain his ways to you. Now his goal is to show that his friends are foolish, and to show that חקרא's speech is the exact opposite of what it purports to be. Not just that he's frightening, but that he really can be harmful. The acts of G-d in the world are harmful and even a fish could recognize that harm. So the images get shifted around based on the need of the particular פרק.

As a response to חקרא, he's saying don't tell me that G-d's ways are mysterious, we see a great deal of evidence in G-d's ways.

איוב פרק יג

(א) הֲנֶלֶךְ רִאֲתָה עֵינִי שְׁמֶעָה אָזְנִי וַתֵּבֶן לָהּ:
(ב) כִּי דַעְתְּכֶם יִדְעֵתִי גַם־אֲנִי לֹא־נִפְלְ אֲנֹכִי מִכֶּם:

I'm just as smart as you are.

(ג) אוֹלִים אֲנִי אֶל־שֵׁנִי אֲדַבֵּר וְהוֹכַח אֶל־אֵל אַחֲפָז:

I'm different from you, I want to talk to G-d. חקרא in my reading has placed G-d over and beyond, and איוב is saying that i want to make it clear as I was saying in ט ז that my goal is to have that connection with G-d.

(ד) וְאוֹלִים אַתֶּם טְפִילֵי־שָׁקֶר רִפְאִי אֵלֶּל כְּלָכֶם:

You are fakers. phonies.

(ה) מִי־יֵתֵן הַחֲכָשׁ תַּחֲרִישֹׁן וַתְּהִי לָכֶם לְחֻמָּה:

Your wisdom would be if you kept your mouth shut.

(ו) שְׁמַעוּ-נָא תוֹכַחְתִּי וְרַבּוֹת שְׁפָתַי הִקְשִׁיבוּ:

Now you listen to me.

(ז) הֲלֹאֵל תִּדְבְּרוּ עוֹלָה וְלֹא תִדְבְּרוּ רַמְיָה:

Do you intend to speak iniquity to G-d, to speak deceitfully to G-d? This is sharper. In פרק ו he was talking about his friends disappointing and betraying him. Here they're betraying G-d.

(ח) הֲפָנִיו תִּשְׁאַן אִם-לֹאֵל תִּרְיִבּוּ:

Are you trying to in some way cover up something with G-d? Trying to argue on his behalf?

(ט) הַטּוֹב כִּי-יִחְקֹר אֶתְכֶם אִם-כָּהֵתֵל בְּאָנֹכִי וְשׁ תִּהְיֶה לּוֹ בּוֹ:

Would you want him to investigate you? Would you make fun of him the way that you make fun of people?

(י) הוֹכַח יוֹכִיחַ אֶתְכֶם אִם-בִּסְתֵּר פָּנִים תִּשְׁאַן:

He will reprove you if you surreptitiously try to flatter him, make him look good because you're trying to curry favor with him.

(יא) הֲלֹא שְׂאֵתוֹ תִּבְעֵת אֶתְכֶם וּפְחַד־י' יִפְלַע עֲלֵיכֶם:

His elevation will frighten you.

(יב) זָכְרֵנִיכֶם מְשָׁלִי-אֶפְרַיִם לְגִבִּי-חַ' מֶרְגֵּבֵיכֶם:

(יג) הֲחִרְשׁוּ מִמֶּנִּי וְאִדְבַּרְהָ אֲנִי וְיַעֲבֹר עָלַי מָה:

Keep quiet and I will speak, whatever happens to me I don't care anymore.

(יד) עַל-מָה אֶשָּׂא בְּשָׂרִי בְּשֹׁנִי וְנִפְשִׁי אֲשִׁים בְּכַפִּי:

How long will I put my flesh in my teeth? Put my hand over my mouth?

(טו) הֲנִי־יִקְטְלֵנִי לֹא לֹא אֵיחָל אַךְ-דִּרְכִּי אֶל-פָּנָיו אוֹכִיחַ:

איוב עובד מיראה גמרא references this פסוק, when the גמרא talks about מיראה versus אהבה that seems to depend on whether we follow the קרי or the כתיב, לא פסוק If you read the

as כתיב then he's presumably saying that the worst that could happen is that he kills me, and I have no hope anyway. The other way, if I read following the קרי, I could read two ways, one is not the גמרא's way, that I am hoping that he will kill me. But the way that the גמרא says is that even if he kills me my hope is with him. This is a very important פסוק. Even if he kills me, what really matters is my relationship is him. I know that my relationship is with G-d, I could say that איוב has been developing in this direction over the last few פרקים. In ו and ז he is persecuting. In ט he is recognizing that he is intimately connected with G-d. if he's at war with G-d he's at war with himself. צופר may be responding to that by saying that you should focus on restoring your social standing, G-d is remote anyway. And that drives איוב one step further. He says no no no, you're idiots, you hypocrites, for me it's either G-d or nothing at all.

I'm going to argue, I'm going to maintain my position.

(ז) גַּם-הוּא־לִי לִישׁוּעָה כִּי-לֹא לִפְנֵי יוֹ חֲנָף יָבוֹא:

He is really on my side because he does not tolerate flattery. A new aspect to his relationship with G-d.

(יז) שְׁמַעוּ נְשִׁמוּעַ מִלְתִּי וְאַחֲזִיזִי בְּאָזְנֵיכֶם:

Listen to what I have to say, that I have expressed in your ears.

(יח) הִנֵּה-נָא עֲרֹכְתִי מִשְׁפָּט יָד־עֲתִי כִי-אֲנִי אֶצְדָּק:

I have prepared myself for judgement.

(יט) מִי־הוּא יָרִיב עִמָּדִי כִי-עֲתָה אַחֲרִישׁ וְאֶגְוֶה:

If one were to argue with my I would fall silent.

(כ) אַךְ-נִשְׁתִּים אֱלֹהֵי-תַעֲשׂ עִמָּדִי אִם מִפְּנֵיךְ לֹא אֶסְתַּר:

Two things don't do, same as ט. I will not hide from you.

(כא) בִּפְךָ מֵעָלִי הִרְחֵק וְאַמְתֵּךְ אֶל-תִּבְעֵתִנִּי:

Stop hitting me, don't scare me. Can't have a conversation when that is happening.

(כב) וְקֹרָא וְאֵנֹכִי אֶעֱנֶה אוֹ-אֲדַבֵּר וְהִשִּׁיבֵנִי:

Call out I'll answer.

(כג) כִּמָּה לִי עֲוֹנוֹת וְחַטָּאוֹת פִּשְׁעֵי וְחַטָּאתֵי הִדִּיעֵנִי:

Tell me whatever sins I have.

(כד) לְמַה־פְּנִיךָ תִּסְתִּיר וְתִחַשְׁבֵּנִי לְאֹיֵב לָךְ:

Why are you treating me. You hide your face and treat me as an enemy. ל notice the pun, that instead of איוב it's איוב.

(כה) הָעֵלָה נִדְפָּה תַּעֲרוֹץ וְאֶת־קֹשׁ יִבֹּשׁ תִּרְדֹּף:

(כו) כִּי־תִכְתֵּב עָלַי מִרְרוֹת וְתוֹרִישׁ־נִי עֲוֹנוֹת גְּעוּרִי:

(כז) וְתִשָּׂם בַּטֶּדּוּ רַגְלִי וְתִשְׁמֹר כָּל־אַרְחוֹתַי עַל־שְׂרָשַׁי רַגְלִי תִתְחַקֶּה:

(כח) וְהוּא כְּרֻקַּב יִבְלֶה כָּבֶד גֹּד אֲכָלוּ עֵשׂ:

Where we're holding right now. It's a complicated book. At this stage, maybe because of the way that צופר intervened in יא, that איוב progresses to a point where he and G-d are on one side against his friends. This may be too strong, but איוב says that.

Shiur #13

We are in the middle of איוב's last response to the first round.