

Intro to Bible

R. Shalom Carmy

Fall 2000

Class 1 – 09/07/00

Today we're dealing with the use of non-rabinick sources about the torah

With the pasuk we're dealing with yosef being a lad at age 17 assuming we know the meanings of the words what problem must we contend with before we move on to anything else we need to know how much the context of the posuk should be taken we also need to know why it's telling us these things but there is also a more basic problem with the posuk lets say that one child punches the other in the stomach the victim goes and complains to the agresor's parents or you could address the parents of the victim saying your son is being pushed around here the children are all of the same father he is listening to the complains of his sons and the complains about his sons it's really not yosef complaining to his father rather to their father but the main problem with this posuk who was he complaining about? It seems like the children of bilha and zilpah because they were just mentioned in the posuk or go a bit further back in the posuk that mentions he's with all the other brothers or a sub-note of that the children of Leah and there also is an unclear letter in the posuk the letter נ in the word דבתם what does the midrash do? Some say when the midrash says something that's what really happened no if ands or but others say it's just using the material in tanach and giving you some moral lesson they can fit into the tanach it might just be dramatising or exemplifying the idea or it may be interpreting not just the events but also the posuking themselves making it into a mesorah or it was just darshaning the posuking with no specific mesorah to get it from there might not be answers for this BERAISHIS RABAH is the earliest thing written on it they mention three tana'im on it one view being that he accused them of eating eiver min hachai the second was looking at the women of the area the last being they called the sons of the shfachot slaves then an omorah rabi simon says it was all three and he was giving a midah kneged mida for all of them you can derive from rabi simon so it must be only applying to the children of Leah because he was punished for the talking about them called the none Leah children slaves there is no reason to assume ba'ased on pishat that this is true this is just midrash does the eiver min hachai point us to any group of the brothers or the looking at the women there is another point about this midrash brought by the maharal brb if they had wanted it to be more clear they would have hinted at which way they wanted us to understand it much better if asking what did the medrish really mean they would have given more info so can't really ask that onto rashi he quotes all three approaches of the midrash this implies not only did rashi assume them but he also felt it was the pshat he doesn't quote midrashim for fun he does it when he feels they are the pshuto shel mikrah when he does there is something in the posuke that is bothering him but do we really want to say that every word in rashi has to deal with pshat and that is all he cares about or could you say in a sloppy matter that rashi talks because he started about something in the pshat but once he started he kept on going the lubavitcher rebbi noticed everything that was going on in rashi and commented about what he felt rashi was writing his problem wasn't what did he say rather what are the words saying and the midrash being quoted is the answer for it

Our question about non rabinick texts in the 12 testamits they don't agree with rashi GAD a son of a shifcha feels very bad about the selling of yosef it explains how he ended up not liking yosef so much they were in the flock a bear attacks a sheep, gad gets it out of the bears mouth but the sheep was no good anymore so he shechted it, yosef saw him eating the sheep and just told their father nothing but they were eating the animals it's an issue here now of gezel or eiver min hachai that is very opposite sides in halacha and thus huge changes in understanding the lecoch tov has 3 things also but no the eiver min hacha but rather he has gizelah

Class 2 – 09/14/00

The idea of 70 faces to Torah it's very much can be like the distinction between pshat and drash but they're just different aspects of meaning and aren't defined as one is one the other is the other we talk about pshat we're talking about the relationship between the dimensions there is the common way that things are understood told to us in the gemara but they don't tell us weather it's the pshat or the drash and that comes from our understanding we can even distinguish between the midrashim from rabbi akiva or rabbi yishmael the school that is more pshat was rabbi yishmael and akiva was more drash it seems like rabbi akiva's were looking for trouble there's no where in literature where someone will say this though you can't mix the ideas from different areas or times of perushim into one big chulent we shouldn't go overboard on different periods and different areas rashi is the first to make a distinction between the pashat and the drash but since torah it one big thing, to totally seperate them is wrong also so there is a development of pshat and drash by

Intro to Bible

R. Shalom Carmy

Fall 2000

the ta'anin and the amoraim, why does this happen though, the first writer to deal with this was RAV ADIA GOAN he's already making a distinction between the levels but doesn't go all the way to pshat the question comes up what goes in and what doesn't go in, do you include every midrash, he in the intro to chumash says she will translate word for word what's there the only times he doesn't will be when either the torah is illogical like when it says that g-d is fire which can't be or when the posuke goes against what everyone knows like "chava was the mother of all living beings" is changed to all rational beings so we have to deal with the challenge of heretics, like the TZEDUKIM who didn't believe in torah she'balpeh so the rabbi's had to categorize things and as the development of grammar enables you to sharpen the categorize of pshat rashi does have a literal distinction between pshat and drash he's the first to do so he's responding to outside pressures they being the Christians they were challenging the rabbinic approaches to torah including she'balpeh the rishonim are constantly responding to what the Christians are up to the these were writing that were directly against the Christians another option may be the nature of intellectual work to ask questions and want to give answers you start off young asking is it correct or not either you adopt it or not but after a while you get to the point that you have 10 statements 3 LCD and the others don't and you classify things this is the natural progression that the rishonim ended up going to start asking the old questions in the new way and analyze from a different point of view getting different answers the rashbam who's a radical poshtan will say that drash is more important just because your into one doesn't mean you must down play the other interms of rashi there is no such distinction that one is good and one is bad the more complex position would be to totally separate them the third option is idiosyncratic the lubavicher rebbi was very big into rashi his theory was the foundation is a mishna in avos the 5 year old child studies mikrah which meant chumash not tenach so you must teach him without torah she'balpeh because those come in later, the purpose of pshat is to give a commentary with a minimum of balpeh for him to get pshat he felt that rashi was ment for the first time learner why didn't this come before hand, because we felt I a healthy society the father teaching couldn't do this themselves, butt with yerida hadoros we now needed it written because the father couldn't do it anymore

Genesis 3.8 there is pshat problem, is the voice walking, as it states literally the second possibility is they heard the voice of g-d as he was walking in the midrash there are many things going on non that are candidates for the pshat they are hearing the trees talking about them being evicted what's the midrash want to establish, to make it seam more like the voice is walking, or how is it walking anthropomorphism giving g-d human attributes rashi gets mythological rashi here states what his mission is that he's after the pshat what he seems to be saying if you want midrash go to them if you want pshat stay here or agada that some ways connect to pshat only give agada when it contributes to the pshat the next stage if rashi says this when rashi deals with a posuke gets down to the work do we expect him to agree with the midrash or not, norm we would say no it makes more sence he's making a big deal that he's not following the midrash that he's rejecting all the views of the midrash most meforshim say rashi's against the midrash, except the TAZ philosophically it's easier to say other wise though go ask rambam how they deal with anthropomorphic languages rashi just goes along with it there are times that he doesn't want to but rarely the meforshai rashi ask what's the actual phrase, we know based on the midrash that a voice can walk we don't have evidence else where about a voice walking back and forth though midrash said we have one why not the other modernly could just be it reverberating rashi didn't want to make such a leap though why shouldn't he limit himself to hashem doing the walking and just as the person we have the idea why can't g-d we see rashi's general method next the second example of this also in the narrative why in lechlecha does the order of the 4 kings change the midrash felt that NIMROD and AMRAFEL were the same person because AMRAFEL is he had avraham PL being fall into the furnace rashi does the sometimes thing when it comes to darshaning out names in noach we don't see it but in lechlecha we do so it will depend on if he takes ther person seriously

Class 3 – 09/21/00

Rashi and halahca we don't assume there is pshat or drash not taught so in high school because not ready a law book must have a defined meaning you wouldn't assume that new York traffic code can be used to figure out who will win the world series is it true that law should always operate on one level lets say we have a person that teaches in many different departments get a guy teaching law, history, and American hashkafa he writes a book on all these topics and the out look of the future it wouldn't be surprising if while writing about the history he spends lots of time on the law he would consider the discussion of legal matters

Intro to Bible

R. Shalom Carmy

Fall 2000

to be central in each area he would emphasize different aspects of law when he writes he would leave out the laws of slavery because they're not relevant but in history he would write about it the same person with the same outlook would emphasize different things and omit different things as he writes the three books if you look at the books you might even find that he contradicts himself could just be he's inconsistent but it could also be he's just writing what he's finding to be correct for the topic torah shouldn't be viewed as a legal documents chumash isn't the shulchan orech or anything else in that range it's a recording of moshe's reactions to what's going on in the world it does have tons of law we don't view chumash as the only source of halacha it is an entity that has many different purposes in day to day life such as the stories the organization is different than you find anywhere else not the way we would write especially with all the repetition sometimes the halacha takes an approach that goes against the rishonim on the posuk hence there is a drash people many times will say there is a contradiction in pshat but don't ask why we will see rishonim that ask these very questions but rashi rashbam and iben ezra seem to never look at these in shemos ZACHOR of shabbos with a kametz when it should have a shvah there SEAMS to be a mochloks between bais hillel and beis shamai beis shamai saying if you find something nice set aside for shabbos, if find something nicer then you replace the first with the second hillel says just barush hashem yom yom rashi goes according to shamai seemingly one could ask why? Remember that it isn't totally a halchick word the drash would be halacha but pshat could just be not intended to work with halacha thusly rashi being a pshutist doesn't care about the halacha here if you want to take this solution a bit further we could say, not that rashi was thinking this, that over all in a mochlokes hillel and shamai even though we got like hillel the view of shamai has a philosophical importance with Judaism they also talk about in olam hobah they poskin like shamai we might even say just the distinction drash is the halcha and the pshat is an ideal world they there is rashi really coping shamai? No there is a difference the second act of replacing with better when found rashi leave out we also have midrashim of halacha in BAMIDBAR about pesach sheni so what is the definition of the DERECH RICHOKA and does it make a difference in the pshat level the iben ezra says it is what ever chazal say it is he didn't want to get involved rav eliezer says it's anyone who's outside the azarah when the time comes no matter what he's doing as long as he didn't step inside he's ok its very makil but the midresh comes to talk about the dot on the heh and what does it mean in antiquity it used to be dots on letters meant there was a question on the text even in a text of homer that doesn't make sense for the torah because we should fix it so it indicates there's a question mark relating to those letters it could be in the midbar derech richoka meant nothing because no one was far away so the dot was put there because they didn't understand what it was doing there that's how the iben ezrah gets his statement, but rashi doesn't agree so he goes like rebbi eliezer acc rashi in the midbar the idea of derech richoka went like rebi elizer the questions in why does rashi explain things the way he does, what's bothering him and then what justifies his going against halcha what are the implications, they are very different in their methods and have different historical context

Class 4 – 09/28/00

The rashbam 3 text today first if famous for content and the issue he was rashi's grandson they spoke a lot and these conversation were famous the issue here though is a textual issue what is the meaning of the word TOLDOTE simplest meaning is generations from the shores of YOLOD but that doesn't work so well with the actual posuke because it goes over to yosef right away so it could better be this is the history of or the story of rashbam says that chazal wasn't concerned with peshto shel mikreh they didn't emphasize it they even say in many gemarot that pshat isn't important or shouldn't be the center of ones study what is the rashbam then saying and why is he saying it? It doesn't mean that drash isn't a bad word, it doesn't mean he felt it was worth nothing, the rashbam is a pashtan but he's saying that drash is more important he says many time he spoke with rashi and rashi said if he could he would go back and redo the way he did things and change his works to be the *יום הפשוט המתחדש בכל יום* but he is about to disagree with rashi he saying that pshat is a new issue and if so he's not just justifying the method of pshat he's showing that it it's still being developed here is a point of dispute in other circles people will say that rashi is mostly just the midrash or tonchuma we do say he started off as an attempt for pshat but as we read he is many times or mostly midrashim so if he's just pshat how does this end up in there and how is it so different from iben ezrah and the rashbam talk to rashbam and he'll say rashi admits to not doing what he set out to do so why didn't he just do it, because the agadeta and drash is more fun he was writing to make it more interesting rav carmy disagrees with this, rashi doesn't view himself as failing, he just feels pshat isn't build in one

Intro to Bible

R. Shalom Carmy

Fall 2000

night, only looking back could he see the mistake and that is when he says he would do it over again in the academic world they think that rashi was too radical but the things that he raises are sensible this was the first point where there was an argument between the two of them you could also say the dictionary is new everyday, but it really shouldn't change much so how could say will be changing the rashbam insist that toldote must mean genealogy so then why only mention yosef so his answer for this is what really is happening the natural continuation would be a list of the 70 who went to Egypt but to explain how yosef gets to Egypt we needed to know this story, it's really just in parenthesis till we get to that list in vayigosh it should have then said yosef was 17 blah blah blah and only said toldot in vayigosh so it seems like a juxtaposition of toldot esav another question what is going on, and why do we need to know this why can't it just come out and say the simplest story also there are examples of the rashbam learning against halacha the posuke vayhi erev vayhi boker which comes first in chazal everyone says that night comes first the rashbam says the opposite he holds if the posuke meant that night was first it would say it in the LILA came first then YOM not evening followed by morning we know the halacha what's the point of having the double system he ends up saying that the language between tanach and torah are different it is possible to say that before matan torah we could say pshat was day came first then we have the correctness of halacha that being for the generations or drash with that we can see that when it says they ate pesach on pesach being the 14th makes sense and entering Israel and eating the chodosh on the 16th both being termed the same way does make sense the second example to deal with in BO it speaks about tefillin the rashbam says it's not about tefillin rather the torah should be such a part of you that it's like it's written on your heart the interpretation by rav koshe says the rashbam uses a historical interpretation what did they use as tefillin in the midbar the fact that the parshiot only appear in devarim doesn't mean they didn't have it before hand rav kasha says with this rashbam we could say since they didn't have the last two they wore figurative tefillin he says look at the way it ends in devarim the rashbam doesn't say anything because now it was possible so they had it literally no need for a figurative meaning of the posuke something completely different the iben ezra in his introduction to chumach he would write on the same sefer in tanach more than once he would wonder around and be asked to write so he would he outlines 5 different ways of writing a perush he rejects without enthusiasm the approach of the geonim he says they were too verbose, if you think you've got a bulls eye then don't talk about all the target just belt it out second approach was the carrites, they miss the target completely they reject the bal peh so worth nothing but if the carrites are correct the torah was written terribly you could say that is a question against rabbi's why is there so much more bal peh than bichtav? The third drech is of allegory they don't mean what they mean literally but they have another one also the Christians felt many things in chumash had to have other meanings or else they went against jesus the fourth approach is of midrash he says it's not replicable you can't have it all work in other languages also it's been done already that vain has been exhausted then comes his approach he will explain them in the simplest won't be meidyak from missing or extra letters or in dots on top of letters he just wants to know what the story going on is the last point he makes is he believes in the bal peh and any case where two possible interpretations one of chazal one not and equally plausible will always follow chazal but he doesn't always do that he slipped it by us

Class 5 – 10/05/00

The iben Ezra says he's loyal to chazal but isn't always so we find an example where he talks about this in shemos a man sells her daughter for slavery and marries either the dude or his son blah blah blah the last clause says he can't sell the girl to anyone else anyone else being probably another nation so this posuke must be directed to the father or the owner so it must be talking about the father can't sell to a non Jew we translate am nochi as non Jew but for this it goes out of order but to translate as another Jew it's a problem so it would mean once sold can't resell her to another Jew in the michlta derabi yishmael they hold that am nochi is a non Jew the phrasing there it's a warning against the father to not sell to a non Jew but the gra changed the girsa to be Beis Din his change would make it the authorities shouldn't let such a sale take place which removes all our problems the gemara says it's a Jew and rashi follows them up to a point the gemara doesn't explain how it ends up being a Jew the gemara does discuss other things here the gamara leave the question of who can't resell open three views one it's the father, or the master, or both we need to know does it say no sail after slavery or is it after a marital relationship she can't be resold if read further we would see this action what ever it is would be a betrayal to her which can also go many ways the word used is BIGDO which can also mean clothing, on pshat definitely betrayal because no verb with clothing in

Intro to Bible

R. Shalom Carmy

Fall 2000

that way but gemara drashes it for something kinda like sucose with the different spelling for how many walls you need in a suka makes a difference if you look at the kri or the ksiv the problem here is we don't know how to figure out which is the yesh aim lemikre and which is the yesh aim lemesora if they wanted us to go bigdo it should have written it with the vav so there could be no way to be a garment it could be used as garment a euphemism for sex being he spread his cloak or blanket over her the right to resell is gone you could do the exact opposite where it's the cloak it should have been with a yud thusly having to be cloak rashi holds it goes by the father and master and he doesn't say it means cloak it comes out that chazal knew the answer but they use this as an asmachta it's always a dirabanan could it be in a posuke though or something external being used to remember something he quotes sadiay goan who attempt to salvage the langue he says it could mean a nation or an individual the individual being in beraishis the iben ezra rejects this because the posuke in beraishis gives over a different sotry about more people iben reacts violently to the idea he says they're distorting the torah and gets violent why he gets so violent we'll discuss right away in Arabic am means uncle on your father's side the mechilta derashbi says because of this we know you can't sell her to a relative normally you could figure out in a conversation what things mean from context writing they way you talk can be miss leading there is a posuke on the mountain stands a water easily can say there are mountains with lakes on it Janach says would be more miraculous to say mountains on top of water so we must ask are there words in Hebrew with contradictory meanings in English there are, like cleave even if it's clean on paper there could be spoken problems that will translate onto the paper the iben ezra says you can't ever change the langue and it's meaning the way Janach does

Class 6 – 10/26/00

Issues with the iben ezra he normally tends to fight for unambigus pshat he's annoyed with approaches that don't follow what's right in front of you from both sides, janach or chazal he's loyal to the reactions of chazal thought there are places where chazal uses the words TIKUN SOFRIM or CINA HACASOOV trying to get a more respectful method of referring to g-d or something else but normally g-d these words are the expression explaining why certain expressions or words are used that clearly aren't so there could be a second view, initially it said what it really was but the "editor" changed it to make it seam more respectful a third possibility distinguishes between nach and torah this showing torah as more important, more holly because it came only from navi of Moshe rabainu torah can't be any thing else with other navim could have had the words change it's clear the iben ezra won't by these approaches in parsha vayera we have a classical case of this it says Abraham was waiting for g-d most pshatim say it's the respectful method of saying g-d was waiting for Abraham also in bamidbar they had rebellions going on and it says "I would rather be dead than see the evil that would befall me" the pshatim say it was tikun sofrim rashi holds it should be read the evil that befalls am yisroel iben ezra says why need to say this it makes sense the way it is what happens when a posuke alludes to something but it's not clear to what this could simply be a case of people using innuendo to frighten others or just to prevent eaves droppers from understanding what we're talking about the posukim in birchas yaakove he says something about gad engaging in military purposes we don't have much o him out of tanach so it's a good place to those who say it's a very futuristic phrase the iben ezra says there was a battle he lead we don't know about

The rambam in his hackdama talks about 5 elements of what torah shebal peh is all about 4, 5 are about dirabanan 1, 2 are about halacha Moshe misinay one with bases in posuke one without example being with ayin tachat aying, has a bases, tefilin doesn't then category 3 very big regular halacha, rambam said on moshe mesinay there shouldn't be any argument, it's entrupreted as we shouldn't have, there is a mesora, but it's been lost at some points hence we have the arguments the question now, how does machlokes come about and why are there so many disputes it's been suggested that all it came from just having bad memories and then trying to recapture what's been forgotten there is a gemara that supports this rather we must say that gemarah wasn't a failure to memories properly rather to reason properly another one could be before hand they weren't recorded they way it was with talmiday of bais hillel and shamai you could also view it as both are correct and it's just tragic that we have to go like one side or the other thusly mochlokes isn't so bad we don't want it to be a there is a sefer hamitzvos with an introduction with 14 shorashim one states anything derived through midrash halacha doesn't count in the taryag it's called divrai sofrim the rambam explaining his categories he's sort of talking about the distinction of pshat and drash in the second shorash he defines pshat on the posuke and only the posuke we see he's not writing an explanation in morenevuchim he talks in second half of chelck gimel talking about reasons for mitzvos he goes on to

Intro to Bible

R. Shalom Carmy

Fall 2000

explain different types of contradictions within a book alone by itself so back to reasons for mitzvos he's not looking for pshat in tanach it's to deal with a philosophical question, is g-d rational or just wily nily doing what he wants

Class 7 – 11/09/00

Kri ochtive they sometimes are complimentary as in no other way to interpret what is going on other than loшон nikina the issues about chimash could be related to inconsistencies in the text minor more differences in nach than were in torah there are sources in rashi or other drashes that our text doesn't support the drash being made the poskim dealt with the issue of what to do with the variations if it happened today we would revert back to what we know we ignore the inferences from the gemara about the text the abarbanel in the intro to yirmiaho mentions there are tons of kri oshtive in the sefer he concluded this could be because he had minimal preparations for being a navi so his spelling we defective this is the ctive and the kri is the correction by chazal this presupposes the significant of nevua is the words and not the writing the actual recording was the main thing hashem wouldn't let that go on the malbim get ticked by this he feels everything in text has significant as long as you get the idea that's all you need the kuzari helps out showing there is not real intellectual requirement for there to be a prophet rambam requires him to be a philosopher the rambam would say knowing is not enough you must internalize the mitzvot the radak felt we have both, we don't know which is correct, so we keep both neither is felt to be more important rav broyer suggests says you're a sofer, and write the sfarim, you copy if you have a safek, you have a mesorah we don't make it up he must follow what is written if you're a ba'al koreh your also taught with a mesorah to read and you keep by that now it's conceivable these two mesorah's might not blend perfectly if they don't confer don't worry your job is to be loyal to both sides as you go along you could get a mesorah for kri one way ctive the other, and your best friend has it the other way around what about the physical similarities amongst certain words there are points where the same name appears under different spelling not a problem when sound alike, but if different sounds amongst the benai yefes they have the same list and are called DODAIM in divraih hayamim they are called RODAIM the daled and raish looks alike it could be a problem could this simlariey be the cause of this mistake the radak attacks this also if mistake go with one or the other not both the radak says because the name look alike in writing we did have two different names they were called by both this grew out of a variation in scripts then adds of course the version in chumash is more correct and ezra just wanted to keep the second one alive it's not clear if this was the ksav that the torah was really given in the gemara talks about two types of letters one called ASHURI the type that we have then there is IVRI as well as the third being either RAOTZ or DATZ the ivri is used by Samaritans scholars use this as the old Hebrew all inscriptions from first mikdash is in IVRI it also is considered a direct ancestor of our English alphabet we hold Ezra at one point changed us over to what we have now ASHIRI others say started in ashiri lost it came back with ashiri when Ezra reinstated it when you look at the data there were two types of kitav one for secular writing and one for kedusha the argument off dodaim and rodaim only applies with ashiri inn ivri they don't appear similar

Ramban in kittin there is a machlokes about TORAH CHATUMA NIKNA means it was given sealed as one unit in year 40 all given in one shot TORAH MEGILA MEGILA NITNA meaning it was given as it happened in the midbar after 40 years finished and put together the gemara mentions that a brisa says 8 parshiot were given on the day of finishing the mishkan, and they're spread out all over the place tosfote has a problem with this based on a rashi in chumash saying moshe took sefer habris, being history till that point this first half of shemos and beraishis thusly supporting MEGILA MEGILA rashi would be disagreeing with certain things tosfote then says CHATUMA says it was given progressively through time but always in the next order as we now have it MEGILA MEGILA would say it was done by any order with several different text flying around ramban says it was written till TIZAVE while moshe was on har sinia and the rest was written in the 40th year he minimizes total arguments he holds the torah in addition to pshat drash there is a method of reading it as an anagram for the names of hashem now we have a question on the ramban about tosfos shita, what about this entire sefer habris thingy the ramban just learns is to be defined differently the usage of the term yayin nesech wine for idol worship sometimes in chazal they use the term about normal wine owned by a non Jew in haozinu there is a sarchastic comment by g-d about yayin nesech but since don't need one it refers to stom yano rambam distinguishes between yayin nesech and the solids of korbanose why should it be different for the times that the wine is drunk even if not have the issur wine is wine is win will get you smashed

Intro to Bible

R. Shalom Carmy

Fall 2000

Earlier in term mentioned tanach in relationship history at the time like with story of yehuda and tamar does yibum really go to father inlaw, bother in law and in Rus once chalitza is done there shouldn't be any yibum so are these real or not could say before matan torah it's ok after it's incest and rus there is a minhag the family takes responsibility

Class 8 – 11/16/00

There are certain issues we've discussed before earlier we discussed midrash and pshat in regards to not halachick material it needs more attention but there are also meforshim that think chazal through with regards to nimrod it talks about him being a mighty hunter before the lord what does this mean its in the beraishis raba it means he hunted people and took them away from hashem there are two separate things to agree and disagree upon first that he was a rasha and second is this is what the posuke is talking about rashi foloows it down the line the iben ezra says that nimrod was a tzadik he looked at the posuke and saw GIBOR ZTAYID LIFNAI HASHEM he's a gibor before g-d he's hunting and bringing korbonose he rejects both the ranban says it can't mean he's a rasha it means he was a mighty hunter about him being a rasha we have a mesorah on it so it is they all make their own judgment in weather to follow the midresh or not the nitziv one thing that is carachterisik of froom people in specific the nitziv wanting to get both sides working together and can be done very often if respect the rishonim don't want to just throw something away he does this very well hard to do in this case he says nimrod was a rasha but his hunting had an element of avodas hashem because it lead to korbonote doesn't matter if you buy it rather look at the method one example of ramban where is reflects certain literary position as opposed to halacha or if it's a tradition as apposed to halacha when look at the rambam already see there are tamay hamitzvos that fit the historical context that fit for the doros the ramban we have an example fitting into this frame work with inheritance the posuke says it goes to the father halacha says it goes to the brothers realty goes to the heirs of the father two explanations why the father is left out first terrible to mention the father inheriting from the son it would be terrible to leave this out of a halacha sefer but the torah is a literary book no need for the discomfort second answer could be in the midbar this never came up if never came up no need for it

The brisa and the mishan list the authorship of the books they say moshe wrote torah, bilam, eiyov Yehoshua wrote himself, shmuel wrote shoftim, shmuel, russ the anshai chizkia wrote yishaiya mishley shir hashirim kohelles anshi kinesses hogedola yichezkel Daniel trey azar david tehillim with help of others ester was ester ezra and nechemia did themselves and divrai haymim yirmiaho did maluchim dealing with yehoshua the gemara says if he wrote it deal with posuk that says he died answered elaza wrote that but he's dead also so they said it was the zikainim that out lived him the abarbonei did reject it with certain sefarim he held the braisa wasn't the mesorah just and opinion what gives him that right if you agree then messorah if not testimony that doesn't at insight though have to take into account the presence of mochlokes he says since there is the disagreement in the gemara it raises doubt we could say not so just asking questions what about the places where it says OT HOYOM HAZEH it implies it was written after the fact he says that shmuel was the one who did it because he was the next candidate connected with authorships then must ask what about chumash it says it may times but there are many years between writing and beraishis happening also happens in devarim where it's the closest time to the writing in terms of ever hayardein it says he took the land until this very day this occurs a few months before it was written the abarbonei says nothing he wasn't a liberal when it came to chumash rav Hirsch answers idiomatically this is the way it was doesn't necessarily mean the way it was written in chumash we divide into three parts last 8 posukim rest and others last 8 Moshe or yehoshua wrote it rather odd to include your own death rabi yehuda and rabi nechemia says it was yehoshua rest say since it must all be exact hashem told Moshe, he wrote it but wrote it in tears the kedusha is bound to the unique status of Moshe as a navi it needs this aspect the opinion saying yehoshua is bothered by more than it's not true yet, but also an oddness the present falseness is being rubbed in your face it's asking you to jump the iben ezra extends this to the last 12 posukim very liberal he gets criticized for this because it seems to strengthen those who say there are forgeries in the torah just saying yehoshua wrote helps them the vilna gaon tries to eliminate this from the gemara he claimed the rabbi shimon doesn't disagree he's explaining and writing in tears cold be translated as being written in a mixed up way and then yehoshua unscrambled the letters he didn't want anything written post moshe rabainu the brisker rav says here there is the nafka mina of one person writing it all he held the last 8 posukim don't need a minyan to lain to explain this statement of the rambam he says laining

Intro to Bible

R. Shalom Carmy

Fall 2000

isn't an act of the torah but a reenactment of matan torah not just har Sinai but rather the entire action throughout the 40 years there are two elements the torah shebichtav and then also the matan torah she ba'al peh moshe would teach that part as well the requirement of minyan has to do with the second element so the last 8 were written by moshe but he didn't teach it, didn't present it he wrote it BIDEMA not for public since it wasn't given to the tzibor no need for one present so what about other porshiot in mokos at the top of yud aleph aleph says yehoshua wrote these things britorat elokim two views what he wrote one is the last 8 the second view he wrote the parsha of araih miklat asks how say this answers doesn't mean he wrote it he copied from chumash into his own book

Class 9 – 11/30/00

Status of chumash in terms of authorship we're discussing differences in phrases there are a few places in chumash where the iben ezra makes vague comments in lechlicha it says OD MAKOM SCHEM OD ELONE MOMER VHAKENANI HAISA BAARETZ the kenanai was then in the land rashi says it means they has just first showed up the iben ezra says the exact same thing, then brings down a SOAD he says anyone who understands that will KEEP SILENT in another version of chumash they say in devarim it's being written in a futuristic point of view, saying in time of moshe still in the land, but today isn't so it uses the strange set of words another point of view he's saying this word AZ is an addition, someone editing the words of the torah to explain how not kefirah proposed it's only matters on exact words for the halachik parts because there are drooshim there but for naritive don't care the editor was probably a navi according to the froomer view there is a problem pertaining to what is the big SOAD here we say it's sometimes better to leave it closed rather than get you want in life this can be a very useful rule to use there is another rishon that does talk about things being added after moshe died about 20 years ago a volume was published of REB YEHUDA HACHASID on chumash he had statements about certain pesukim being added in latter on he doesn't treat it as serious as iben ezra the later rishonim just weren't playing for keeps they were relying on rashi to take care of bissness and they just went with huge midrashik explanations they were more shalishudis torah kinda like the chizkuni you get the feeling they lost discipline rav moshe said this must be a forgery in bamidbar the posuke in chukat says the kenanai went down to the king of arad and they saw the jews passed through derech ataraim so arad attacked the jews but in yehoshu it says that he took over the king of arad in the beginning of shoitim there is a refrence to a tzefas in the negev and it says the benay yihuda took it and called it by the same name that the jews called it earlier so we have three destructions of the same place so we must ask what happened here the iben ezra quotes the TZIDUKIM holding it took place after the destruction his own view that there are two places names arad it turns out that arad was a popular place name but it's on the western side no the eastern side the problem is what's up with the moshe one that being on the west ramban says it can't be a third because in maasye it retells the story and there it says it was in the midst of the desert on the western side they took an oath showing they were far away because they couldn't do it, also says they heard it meaning it's far away so it seems to apply it was all far away then the posuk continues that after time of moshe they found the time and way to go on and fight so they did and called it charan and it's was written biderech nevua so the rambam can be contorted to say that pesukim are added in later

Onto the OCHRONIM until this time the people we've been talking about have been gedolim in halacha as well so they could come up with better pshat that way rashi not being so said it when entering areas with large amounts of halacha in them that he just stopped saying new ideas one reason it stopped being done could be they were exhausted so they just had nothing new so why write what you do get in this era are gedolay halacha writing about rashi you can divide these achronim into two groups those that discuss relationship between torah shebichtav and torah she balpeh and justifying the balpeh then the second group will frequently do the same thing interpret the pesukim baied on chazal but they'll also do what rishonim do when pshat and drash aren't the same bring out a pshat from halacha paradox we'll notice this second group are the less exposed to the outside challenges of the real world we take achari moss it doesn't mention Yom Kippur until psouk chaf tet and when it does it stops talking about aharon doing it and goes to his sons doing it after his death and they've replaced him they reflect two different layers and two different era's being described first a purification ritual in the sanctuary and it doesn't recognize Yom Kippur then the second layer brings a latter stage of development and it knows all sounds very bible critic like rather the gra is the on who says this he proposes that aharon could do it whenever he wanted just had to do it correctly then the second part his descendants could only do it on this day once we're into this gra

Intro to Bible

R. Shalom Carmy

Fall 2000

there are more ideas hidden within it the posukim are all out of order such as where does the musaf fit in there are two different ideas in torah shebichtav that confer on Yom Kippur the ritual of purification that's described then there is the spelling out of how the work is done being part of the ritual then comes the holiday of Yom Kippur which is also brought up in other places as a holiday historically they're also separate because the ritual could have been done any day Yom Kippur is only one the onto rav Hirsch he's from the first group of defending balpeh he has some peculiar features he analyses the meaning of words strangely he also tries to have complete toamay hamitzvot when you go from the pesukim to the drashim they seem to come from no where is it they knew the halacha and this is to confirm or from the drash comes the halacha notes leave things out and private language in them as well rav Hirsch says this is the exact same method hashem had for torah shebichtav it is just notes to be analyzed to figure out the code within many cryptic hints

Class 10 – 12/07/00

We're looking at the kabbalah part of the group described in the last meeting the orientation is very much towards that of chazal looking at it want to say the torah can't completely communicate show ups to help with early writers who had a hard time with pshat first example is with chametz and matze being that matze has to be made from the five grains not matze if it couldn't become chametz learned from a heckesh in devarim from matze to maror there is a question on it raised by the nodah beyehuda he's a few generations before kabbalah got big he asks why did the gemara choose the posuke in devarim why not from shemos 12,16 or so we would expect chazal if they have two sources to go with the first one mentioned kabala offers an answer that will explain the drasha also into pshat we must also understand the theory of the two letter root grammar wise normally have three letter roots in terms of meaning you get the notion that two letter roots may be basic in terms of meaning not grammar this shows we have a core meaning where you'll get many different 3 roots that have similar meanings then come the phonetic exchanges where the prefixes or letters sound alike so you can get many of these relationships take the case of chametz and matze they suggest the meaning of the word chametz is related to the word cham, warm, because leavening is exothermic the word lechem also has this cham in it because of this relationship so based on this linguistic pshat it must be something that could become chametz devarim describes the matze as lechem oni but shemos doesn't the chazal aren't just saying a drasha but also a linguistic insight into the text also have all these other meanings of lechem being food, main courses in Arabic it means meat nothing to do with bread just we're dealing with a bread eating society second example in kit savo it says ARAMI OVED AVI rashi's pshat is how we use it in the agada most people assume there are 7 binyanim in Hebrew reality is there are more in the beginning of bamidbar it uses the word pokpkodo many times and it doesn't fit any of these 7 so we have a biblical binyan they just aren't used now most of the 10 Arabic binyanim will have a parallel in Hebrew but some don't like PHAILE when you go to the malbim rav Hirsch normally tries to justify chazal based on mesorah being accurate the malbim had the opposite strategy so if you know Hebrew grammar as well as chazal does but the understanding of Hebrew has been lost so he tries to uncover that truer understanding in a sense the malbim would collapse the difference between chazal and pshat where we have huge midrash malbim stops writing about pshat goes onto halacha he also holds there are no synonyms in Hebrew they do have different meanings his reasons we know there are the vav hahipoch the malbim doesn't hold that past and vav hahipoch are the same terms used for embarrassment in tanach we could operate by just knowing all of tanach and go by example the table the malbim offers most popular word is BOSHA second word is KLIMA third is CHFAR fourth is CHARPHA it may be interesting the last two are similar what different could there be from the first two grammatically when use BOSHA as a verb you use the KALL form with KLIMA you can't use the KALL form would have to use the NIFAL form the malbim concludes there maybe a systematic difference between these two types of shame described first could be to feel shame second gives a sense someone else is causing he shame when you take the latter two it works the same way in the same order except you're causing the shame on the last the malbim says CHAFAR is much worse than boosha because it also means dead, so embarrassed you want to dig and hole and live in it so we can hold the final meaning is what's important not the true in yishia we see him using these words in posukim while describing an eclipse it uses the chafra then bosha ask why not build up to a crescendo answers building up to sun bit later in yishia talking about people who relied on Egypt for help says the strength of pharaoh will become boshes and those hiding in the shade of

Intro to Bible

R. Shalom Carmy

Fall 2000

Egypt LIKLIMA principal in the malbim is to have no repetitiveness the nitziv if you want to figure out categorically should figure out what was being studied in the tanik times were they looking at the midresh or the mishne this raises questions if the earliest form of mishne would be a more straight halacha the posuke of pshooto shell mikre is talking about their generation then the drash is talking about the application to the generations to come there was a special standard with the mishkan fire was different because they used lots of metal in the mishkan it makes sense if have fire going all weeks to leave the metal in there and be ready for Sunday, rather they must put the fire out and start over on Sunday then comes a different matter what to do with ambiguity the desire to get the benefit of both shitote is what he does for these you must ask how far will you go with it the posuke in shemos says he made BATIM for the daughters is it that hashem made houses or pharaoh, and are they houses or something else you get sophisticated techniques to figure out is he just ambiguous or fighting

Class 11 – 12/14/00

Lets get down to business the major subject we're dealing with a sensitive one the orthodox reaction to date on certain studies if you approach tanach not believing in nevua there will be differences no concerned with these things not concerned with the little minute details you would have if you're learning the daf does want to deal with general issues with regard to chumash if you don't know certain views from past can't understand all sorts of things other institutions have general assumptions denies it's from Sinai and Moshe's agency in writing of torah they hold it's a composite of several different documents from different writers or conventions we're talking about several different groups followed by editors of the major authors spoke about are designated by letters J,E,P,D there are subgroups in each one and if we take beraishis and shemos they talk about three major documents J,E,P J stands for the yud key vav key E stands for elokim and P is priest if they refer to g-d differently it must be two different authors the fact that places are using both names didn't bother people until now when it was raised no so long ago it's normal to say even when have a question not always willing to ask if this was the only issue being raised could respond as follows we already know from chazal the two names have different connotations first a proper noun second refers to judge a writer who varies should have a pattern as to why and there seems to be one here the second stories refers to J the first refers to E observed if take the two parshiot the content is very different both describing creation of man but different in methodology first creation occurs with everything else not that unique in second totally devoted to man first the gender relations are different but they seem rather similar in relationship in second it shows the process of needing a wife and being lonely part one is to conquer the earth master it in second talks about withdraw from the world rav says it's just different dinim in humans best way to show is this way with two stories if this were all that needs to be said then the bible critics aren't just kofrim their completely insensitive to ideas it's more a chiluk of people who are willing to think about existential problems and finding a complex answer or a simple answer this says a great deal about the subject you will get those who say torah is its own category another problem posed by the critics with beraishis is beyond the responses we've already had also claim to have a story about how these different documents came to be the way they are it may even have a proof from chumash itself today Jews have both name no arguments only argue about the time chumas was put together now what's going on the individual documents if taking this view it's just a tradition handed down by the priest when read second story getting to you through the author J in beraishis all would be from one author or another only the redactor put them together one particular issue comes into play J uses shem havaia during the stories of the avos the others don't use that name because the avos didn't know the name why they leave it out from the narrative parts is a question different hypothesize they asked g-d what name to use he responded **EHIE** this is in shemos and that is when it's first introduced to Moshe now E can use this name of g-d also later in Reaih hashem seems to tell Moshe the avos didn't know the name this is where it comes in for P first question we must raise what alternative is there for explanation of this to our side rashi says in the first case he wasn't asking what name should he give like for a credit card rather asking how will g-d relate to the Jews and he was using his name to explain the relationship showing because the situation got worse for them in Egypt so had to back it up saying the avos didn't know this they didn't just get things how you will second case they needed an excuse to use the new name there are three ways to look at it historically J had that name the entire time or the name shows up later and didn't exist before and there are just two possibilities of when it was introduced even though in instinct we would look for a light switch even if we know there's no electricity if we assume it was forgotten at some point and re-found later makes more sense to a Jew second is refutable

Intro to Bible

R. Shalom Carmy

Fall 2000

based on the evidence there is sources outside of chumash at the same time using the same a place named Ebla they found thousands of tablets with names written on them with Theophoric names on them names with the name of g-d added in so the second and third possible options can't be