

ישעיהו

R' Carmy

There will be a literary-theological approach. The primary purpose of Tanach is to learn about Hashem. By literary we mean that how something is stated it is important about what is being stated. We will use classical Parshanut dually because it helps us with Pshat and they are important as primary sources being part of the Mesorah. We will understand what we get from Western culture and what we are rejecting from Western culture.

General Introduction

Yishai was during the period of 4 different kings

- 1) Uziahu
- 2) Yotam
- 3) Achaz
- 4) Chizkiahu

This gives us a window of about 50 years here or there (when these kings reigned is not exactly clear). Seder Olam has Yishayah giving Nevuah for 84 years, Amos Chacham quotes secular scholars who place the time of the Nevuah as somewhere between 60 and 35 years.

When Yishayahu starts giving Nevuos, it is not exactly clear. Many Meforshim believe Perek 6 to be the first Nevuah and that is recorded as the day of Uziahu's death, which means Yishaya started prophesizing late in Uziyahu's reign. Moreover there is a Machlokes if this was the day of Uziahu's death or when he got Tzaras. And Chazal have to deal with how the reigns of the Malchei Yehudah and Yisroel work together to synchronize things and then work out overlaps. Chazal say that Yiahayah gave Nevuah during the reign of Menashe and Menashe killed him.

During the reign of Achaz there was a war between Yehudah, Yisroel and Aram. The Assyrians were in a slump. During that period the Aramenians were moving in. They wanted to fight Ashur, they wanted Achaz to come too and Yishayah told him not to go. Achaz asked the help of the Assyrians and they did.

Achaz died and Chizkiahu took over. According to Divrei haYamim in the 6th year of Chizkaihu reign, Malchus Yisroel was no more. Chizkiahu is a Tzadik but he tends to rely on Egypt. Yishayahu tells Chizkiahu not to take sides. Eventually the Assyrians invade Yehudah. There is a great dispute whether there were 2 campaigns or one campaign. The great campaign will be assumed to have taken place in 701. When push comes to shove the Chizkaihu relies on the Nevuah and the army of Assyria was destroyed overnight by a plague.

The first 5 Perakim are not markable. 2 times they are said to be the Nevuos of Yishayah. From 6 to the 12 the Nevuos seem to have a place in history where they are dated (around Uziahu and one probably to Chizkiahu). This is followed by the Nevuos for the other nations – נְבוֹאוֹת לַגּוֹיִם. The major concentration is 13 to 23. They speak about, Moab, Aram, damasec and Egypt. Yishai is here running around naked to show how Assyria will invade Egypt and Yisroel. These Nevuos are a different genre.

From 24 – 26 there are apocalyptic Nevuot. And 27 – 35 are a repeat of Bet.

36 – 39 is mostly historical, it is a record of the invasion of Sancheirev. 38, 39 is mostly a repeat from Melachim. 39 ends with a frightening note about Yeshayah declaring Galus Bavel. Chizkiahu gives a surprisingly positive retort, that at least there will be peace in his time.

40 and on is all Nechama. The setting in 40 on is the Jews being in Bavel and the Jews coming back from Bavel. There is a specific reference to the Persian king Koresh who will conquer Bavel. From 49 on there is no longer any reference to Bavel or to the Persians. The Ramban points out that there are 2 Nevuot in the end of Yishaya, one about Bayit Sheni and another, which are clearly for a later point.

With regard to the 2nd half of the book:

The Bible critics will say that after Perek 40 another Navi wrote the Sefer. Earlier times the course was given this discussion was reserved for the end. However, by doing that there is begging the question how the 1st and 2nd half of the Sefer relate.

Is it Apikursut to ascribe Yishayah to 2 separate Neviim? If the problem is that you divide the Sefer because you do not think that a Navi can talk about something that happen in the future – that is denying Nevuah. We can close the book here. However, if we say that it is not the Minhag for Neviim to make this type of prediction. If we think we know that Tanach works, certain predictions are more common then we have room to wiggle, particularly the fact that Koresh is mentioned by name. From the traditional point of view it makes sense that Yishayah said you would go to Bavel, then a Geulah from Bavel makes sense. Then the idea of adding Nehamah is also there. The Navi (Yeshaya) says the fulfillment of the bad Nevuot makes clear the consoling Nevuot we are hearing now. Buber called Yishayah as one book with more then one author. There are many books written (such as the indivisible Isaiah), which show the similarities before the first and second halves of Yishayah and shows how it is one writing style. The current trend in the Apikorsus world that they see it as one book now.

We have a place in Parahas Balak where Bilaam talks about Agag and he gives answers how this could be a generic name for a king. Another case is in Divrei haYamim that there is an earlier reference to Yoshiahu, which could also be a later addition.

Many people say that Ibn Ezra and Abrabanel believed in 2 Yeshayah. No one can find this Abrabanel - it is not there. People say the Abarbanel says this because he

does argue in places with Chazal's discussion of the authorship of the Tanach (R' Carmy believes this is how the rumor got started, by people who did not know the Abarbanel too well).¹

The Ibn Ezra is a much more interesting case. The famous passage of Ibn Ezra is at the beginning of Perek 40. The Ibn Ezra says he thinks most of the Nevuot are on our Galut, but some points are about Galut Bavel, such as the part about Koresh. He then says that not all the Neviim were finished by the Navi who started the Sefer and he quotes the Pasuk of מַלְכִים יִרְאוּ וְקָמוּ. The blaring question is why does he throw this in at the end?

At the end of the Sefer there are Nevuot that describe someone as being Eved Hashem who is suffering. There are Nevuot in the middle where this Eved Elokim suffers terribly. For the past 100 years there has been a view that these Nevuot must be treated differently. These Nevuot have a separate theme. The Rishonim identified the Eved Hashem as different personages. Either they didn't see it as a separate category, but the erudition varied. There is no contradiction to sometimes refer to the Eved as Am Yisroel or an individual. It has been suggested that the idea of a servant who is suffering being a separate category completely came from the Christians and is a Christian idea, which comes from reading into the text, but is not implied by the text. Even if the theory is correct then we have to be careful because it came from the Goyim. In the same Perakim where we have the Eved Hashem (most Mefarshim say that the Eved Hashem is Am Yisroel as a whole – the Ramban wrote a book about these Perakim against the polemics), there are quite a few Nevuot as a woman. The reason no Bible critics got involved in the woman is because Jesus wasn't a woman and now people care about her because feminism is in.

Ibn Ezra many times identified the person as the Navi himself. If the Navi himself is speaking then he is speaking about things happening to him that will occur 140 years in the future. If it is speaking figurative then there is no problem. But if the Navi really means to walk around with Koresh then we will have to split it.

There was a Jew named Yaakov Bart, who taught at Hildesheim seminary. Bart makes the point that in 64 there is a Pasuk that mentions the burning of the Beis haMikdash. However, Yishayah never spoke about the burning of the Beis haMikdash and that shows up later.

There is a Midrash in Vayikra Rabah, regarding Yishayah 8:19. The Midrash says that Yishayah did not write this, rather it was written by another Navi (Hosea's father) and it was thrown here. Krochmel said that once you could accept the principle that you can have 2 different Neviim in one book then there is no reason to say someone else did not write the later parts as well. The Netziv was clearly bothered by this. He

¹ In general in questions regarding biblical criticism, the Rav did not want to be bothered. R' Carmy thinks that the problem is people are focusing on the wrong part of Torah.

said that this was not another Navi getting thrown in here, it was Yishayah quoting an earlier Navi.

In the last few years the tendency has been to unify the book.

Yishayah is interesting that he is the only Navi who talks to the Melech without any fear. He is not persecuted and he is a major player in the establishment. This is probably why Chazal identify him as a 1st cousin of Uziahu.

The Gemorah in Bava Batra is clearly interested in editing more than authorship. Chizkiahu and his Beis Din is a governing, canonizing body.

Shiur # 2

Should we start with Perek 1 or Perek 6. We will start with Perek 6.

There are those that say Perek 6 is the first Nevuah of Yeshayah. It sounds like one and is the first dated Nevuah. Here Yeshayah is given a mission to teach Am Yisroel. This is similar to Moshe, Yirmiyah and Yechezkal. In every case one of the Neviim is not happy about becoming a Navi and something is done with the mouth.

There is a strange Pasuk the Navi says don't listen because if you do you might be healed.

The content of the Perek is fairly clear – although a bit odd. The Navi sees God, he hears the song of the Melachim and is struck by it and he is given a strange Nevuah. If this is an inaugural Nevuah then it makes sense, if not then we will have to explain this is a special task. This raises a question of how Uziahu's death relates to all of this. If you hold his death is real then this is a significant point in the Navi's career – if it is Uziahu's day that he got Tzaras, either it is his inaugural Nevuah or that the Uziahu's Tzaaras is a significant point in Yeshaya's career.

If we go back to the Tzaaras – we will have to ask the relationship between the Tzaarat and the Nevuah. If we go back to the question of what happened to Uziahu's Tzaaras, in melachim it is only mentioned that Uziahu received Tzaras and he lived the rest of his life in a בית החופשית. In Divrei haYamim there are a lot of favorable things about Uziahu, however he eventually went to bring Ketoros in the Kodesh haKadoshim (Perek 26). In Divrei haYamim he is called Uziahu, not Azaryahu – to avoid the confusion with the Cohn Gadol. Azarayah the Cohn Gadol tells him not to bring Ketoros. Uziahu got angry and as he got angry Tzaaras broke out on his forehead – he ran away and spent the rest of his life as a Metzora and his son Yotam ruled.

How did this happen? There was a very interesting relationship between the king and the Cohn Gadol at this time. When Atalyah was queen on Yehudah, she killed all of Malchus Beis David, the Cohn Gadol saves Yoash and Yoash eventually takes control.

At this point we could say that after this point the line between Malchus and Chunah was blurred.

Additionally we know there was an earthquake during the reign of Uziahu based on a Nevuah in Amos and a reference to it by Zechariah 14. In the view of Chazal there is a propensity to turn these events into one story. By the time we get to Chazal we will tie the Tzaaras to the earthquake. And it makes sense because Korach has the earthquake as well. We can try and get the dating based on working back from Yotam. If you identify the earthquake of Uziahu, then we have more information to date the events.

If the Nevuah of Yeshayah – then conservation of events – it should not just be the year Yeshayah becomes a Metzora. Yeshayah has a certain vision (it is a very eventful time in the Beis haMikash) – he sees the Serafim and then he sees the earthquake – so the vision of the Navi is the same as the actual events. It does not need to be that same moment, but the imagery connected with Uziahu will suffuse the imagery of the Nevuah. Yeshayah sees God sitting on a throne – that makes God look like a king. There is then a contrast between Melech Uziahu and God as king. There is one previous case where there is the imagery of God as king, where Achav and Yehoshafat are going to war and they speak to Amichayhu the Navi – who depicts God sitting on a throne and the heavenly hosts are on his right and his left.

In terms of the anthropomorphism there is a difficulty and the Gemarah in Yevamot Menashe uses this imagery as an excuse to kill Yeshayah. However if you will be making this imagery it is not that far out.

However the significant imagery here is the ‘coattails’ of HKB”H dragging onto the Beis haMikdash. The idea being hammered here is God is elevated, but God’s coattails do reach down to the earth. We see an image of God being both transcendent and imminent at the same time. This is a focal idea in Yeshayah. The reason the Seraphim are standing is to laud God. From our perspective there are ranks of Melachim. There is a whole angle-ology. In Tnach on a Pshat level – Melachim are Melachim and to call them Seraphim does not differentiate them from Chayot. The idea of a Seraph – is that one of fire and we see smoke and the whole contact of Ketoret and the fire of Ketoret and he touches him with coals.

The other image of the Seraph is that Moshe Rabbeinu made a Seraph in Bamidbar as a way to deal with the bites of the stinging serpents. We find out later that people began to worship the serpent. There is one other reference to נחשים שרפים in Tanach, which is a flying serpent attacking Yerushalayim.

The Seraphim are declaring Hashem to be קדוש קדוש קדוש, which is then ended with מלא הארץ כבודו, which is again a mix of transcendence and imminence.

Whether the earthquake is at the same moment or proximity of time. It is a quaking and smoke that would normally be associated with Ketoret. נדמיתי could be a Lashon of I have been stopped up or mingled. OR that he is afraid he will be cut off.

The remarkable part about the imagery is that he takes the hot coals with tongs. They are so hot that the Malach must take tongs to take it out. In contrast to Moshe there are no aftereffects of the hot coals.

Clearly the mentality in the ancient near east is that the locus of intelligence and spirituality is in the mouth and this is why Yeshayah is touched on the lips.

For Yeshayah there is much less reluctance to take the mission than there is for Moshe Rabbeinu and Yirmiyahu. Here he says he is ready to go. The Pashtus is that he is being sent with the purpose of making people stupid. It could be that in Perek 5 free will is addressed and here we take away free will in Perek 6. It is a very difficult Tzivui. The Rambam says that when someone wants to do a Chet HKB"YH makes it easy for him. Another Pshat of the Radak is that the Navi speaks to the people and he describes that they don't understand. The Radak says it's not that the navi should tell the people not to listen, but rather the navi should speak to them and it will be as if they don't hear it. It is descriptive. Speak to these people who listen but do not hear – the heart is stupid. The Radak also offers the Rambam's answer (if you rebel against Hashem, eventually your bechira will be taken from you). He says speak to the people that don't understand.

It is difficult to see this as a straight Tzivui then God is taken as very nasty, however if the Radak is right then it isn't that bad. The only one that describes this way is in the New Testament. This is hard to treat as a strait tzivui, or G-d comes out very nasty. In each one of the four gospels there is an idea that the Jews are obtuse, and G-d condemns them. G-d is encouraging them to be blind and to rebel.

In terms of free will we have two main approaches:

1. This is descriptive – he isn't telling people to be stupid – he is given a depressing picture
2. It seems like the navi is supposed to help them become worse. This leaves us with a question of how the navi is supposed to interact with all of this.

Carmy quotes Binyan itim, in reference to Pharaoh, says that Hashem seems to have power and he can do what he pleases. Every time Moshe comes to power, though, Moshe asks for permission. If Hashem just marched the Jews out of Egypt, the likelihood would be that Pharaoh would have bowed to the inevitable. The moment you ask Pharaoh for permission, he is no longer a beaten autocrat; he is someone who has a say. No matter what Hashem did to Pharaoh then, Pharaoh still had that power. If he has to give Jews the ok, then clearly he still has power. Similarly, by Yeshaya, if you tell the people this is what will happen is a sense that the navi's intervention may be making things worse.

Shiur # 3

There is an article about Yeshayah Perek 6 that says if you think about Avodah Zarah – where Tehilim says they have eyes and ears, that don't hear and see. With Tehilim in the background the people are עִוְרֵי עֵינָיָם עִוְרֵי שְׁמֵעָה זָרָה punishment is that they won't

hear or understand and do Teshuvah – that is why there is this abnormal imagery used here. This is similar to the imagery in Yeshayah 29:29 is of a person dreaming he is eating and he wakes up hungry. This Pshat explains the imagery without contradicting what we said last week.

Even with the text we have in front of us – the Dead Sea scroll copyist read it as במה. This would imply that the copyist had an image of ע"ז in his head.

However, if Avodah Zarah is very important in the Perek, then why aren't the Pesukim more explicit about Avodah Zarah? It could be we are not looking at the action of Avodah Zarah then we are looking at the mind set. The question we are asking is what type of Avodah Zarah is Yeshayah dealing with in this Perek? R' Hutner said that we crave the taste of Avodah Zarah of Bayis Rishon. We are suggesting that what we have in the first half of the Perek might explain the 2nd half of the Perek. Based on the way Chazal interpret the Perek it is about Tzaaras Uziah and Uziah invading that borderline. Are we talking about major Avodah Zarah or something else? Based on our knowledge of the reign of Uziah we would assume that we are not really that bad in terms of Avodah Zarah. The kind of Avodah Zarah we are talking about – might not be large scale Avodah Zarah and that would answer the question. The Pesukim allude to Avodah Zarah. The people are being described as being foolish. Here the one arrow that is being struck is that you are hitching your wagon to a blind star.

Perek 1

There is a lot of Parshanut how the opening Pesukim echo האזינו. The point here is lending an ear – it is more intimate than just hearing. The Drush would be that the heavens give the ear because Moshe was closer at that point to heaven. There is the (Moshe) Seydel's law (Talmid of R' Kook), which states if a Pasuk copies from another Pasuk then it turns it around for purely aesthetic reasons.

There is a difference between what is going on in Yeshayah and Hazinu. The Pasuk about יודע שור is a usual powerful piece of Mussar. It is almost as if the Pasuk came down from heaven with an elementary finger attached to it. This can be an attack on their stupidity or ingratitude. What it may boil down to is recognition. If we want gratitude then we can build on אבוס בעליו. If we work with this approach then there is a contrast between Haazinu, which talks about gratitude and Yeshayah that talks about recognition.

There are 2 ways a person can get benefit from someone. To elevate someone is presumably being regarded as being elevated about. If something is objectively excellent – there is a sense of being an elevated position. Gratitude for a special status and people may be indifferent towards it. The Radak makes reference to the Pasuk coming from Hazinu and he says that this Perek refers to the entire time period that Yishayah prophesized. He says that גדלתי means God made Yisroel great, however his father says this is a reference to the Torah. This will say that Hashem recognized us – not a gratitude

reference per se. For Rashi the Ikar is the recognition issue. The issue is not that God is angry with the Jews because of all he did it for him. In these Pesukim we are not getting every argument about the way the Bnei Yisroel are behaving. The recognition issue is a lot less striking than the gratitude issues. A sense of authority is defined as neither fear nor gratitude, but merely God is God and man is man. Therefore someone might read these Pesukim and therefore throw gratitude into the Pesukim. Here the Navi could have used the gratitude issue (other Neviim did it) – he doesn't.

There are 3 factors here:

- 1) General philosophical concepts
- 2) Comparison to Haazinu
- 3) Read Rashi carefully – we realize Rashi was onto things we hadn't seen before.

The Kitzur is the opening Pesukim we have the indictment – sinfulness and punishment.

The description of Bat Tzion is very reminiscent of Sancheirev's conquest of Yehudah. Sancheirev wrote that he locked up Chizkiahu like the bird in a cage. If we are willing to say this is referring to the 10 Shevatim (as R' Yosef Karah does) then we can say that this is a reference to the Galus of the 10 Shevatim. And then Bat Tzion refers to Yehudah and Binyamin – whoever is left over after 722.

This should open up a further discussion – how much is the Sefer talking about the 10 Shevatim as part of Am Yisroel or as a different nation altogether and it is basically hopeless. Clearly in Hosea no one sees them as Goyim. If you read Yirmiahu – you get a very strong sense of a desire for unification. The question is how do we view things over all. From Yirmiahu and Hosea they were Jews and Yehudah were Jews. The answer in Yeshayah might be more complicated than other Neviim. If we hold by R' Yosef Karah and the Abarbanel – there Churban is our Churban. We see how everyone is part of one body and everything is affecting this one body. If the Radak does not learn that way, it could be a grammatical perspective, or it could be that the crisis is only within our narrow 4 Amos – Yehudah and Binyamin. This sheds light on how we treat the Northern Kingdom within the framework of Yishayah. And then we will have to ask why we do this.

Next time we will discuss the issue of Karbanos and there is an issue with regards to what is his problem with Karbanos.

09-21

The surprising thing in Yeshayahu is the emphasis on recognition as opposed to gratitude – Nevi'im usually yell at Bnei Yisrael about gratitude. In a certain way, recognition is more pure.

The Rav – religion is not something expressed only to people who are religious virtuosos. Shevach is close to recognition. Here we're something even sharper –

recognition can come even from animals. We can and should add to that relationship, but the relationship of recognition is a very basic one and essential.

How seriously do we take the relationship between Yehuda and Yisrael? - Yeshayahu seems to ignore Yisrael and treats it as just another nation.

In 1:10 we get the impression that Yisrael deserves to get the sins of Sodom because they are behaving like the people of Sodom.

Sodom is also mentioned in Eicha – **Rashi** learns there that “avon” means sin, but **Ibn Ezra** holds that “avon” means the consequence of the sin.

1:11 - The bringing of korbanos.

1:12 - Who asked you to come in and trample the courtyards? (behavior in shul)

1:13 - **Gra** – tefilla and birkas cohanim both require prishas capayim – by kohanim – palms are down trying to bring something down, while in tefilla the gesture is opposite – the palms are up and open trying to receive bracha.

Different language for tefilla and for korbanos. For korbanos, it's a “toeiva”, But for tefillah Hashem just says “eini shome'a”. So what about birkas kohanim, when it says “I will hide my eyes from you”? - it seems to be assimilated into korbanos in a certain sense.

So what is the Navi really upset about? - is it a mitzvah haba beaveirah (retzicha), or is it hypocrisy (a tainted person coming before Hashem).

If we go over all the pesukim, the only complaint about other aveiros they do is injustice. There is nothing about avodah zarah.

Now, the complaint about korbanos appears quite often in Tanach.

Amos 5 – “Did you bring me zevachim in the midbar? Let justice roll like a river.”

Back to yeshayahu:

Rashi comments that Bnei Yisrael are being yelled at for having avodah zarah in their hearts – but this is not in the pasuk.

Why are Shabbos and Mo'ed mentioned here? - because they are the days that involve the most korbanos so Hashem is inundated with these offerings that He hates.

1:14 - “Neso” - burden. This is a weird phrase – being burdened is different than being offended. Hashem is almost being tired out by the bad korbanos – this is different than usual.

All these events are happening in the Beis Hamikdash – we don't usually have the complaint about the Beis Hamikdash juxtaposed with the complaint about the korbanos. It's not just a complaint about too many bad korbanos, it's a complaint about someone coming into the house to hand Hashem bad korbanos.

Element of annoying Hashem and fatigue and the Beis Hamikdash, and the moadim.

If the issue is annoying Hashem, then we understand why the complaint is not just the korbanos but rather about the occasions of korbanos. The reaction is not as if we forced Hashem to enter an eating contest, but rather that He is being visited in the wrong context. People are dropping by who he doesn't want to see.

So all these elements go together and are part of the same phenomenon. The key issue is the invasion of the Beis Hamikdash.

Mishlei - “be spare in visiting your friend, or he will weary of you” - the gemara in Chagiga compares this to korbanos – Hashem doesn't like too many korbanos.

To annoy Hashem, come only when you need Him. It's annoying when someone only talks to you when they need you and when there is a problem.

R Lichtenstein – if people are getting married they will come to him, but then when they have a child they don't bother to notify him. This bothered him. If someone really cares about you they will care about your troubles, but they will also care about good things that happen to you, and are offended when you don't keep them up to date.

The issue is not that Bnei Yisrael were bringing too many korbanos. The issue is that Bnei Yisrael were bringing korbanos to atone for sins, but were not ever serving Him. They were never coming to Him for good things or to praise or have a real relationship with Him.

Hashem's reaction is almost an exasperated “What do you want now?”

this applies now as well – there are people who only go in front of Hashem when they have problems or when they want something – this is not a good way to have a relationship with the Ribbono Shel Olam. Treating Hashem as an “emergency room” is a big mistake.

These are not people who are oved avodah zarah with chutzpah like in Yirmiyahu. There is an avodah zarah here with gayva though. People going places they don't belong. What we are describing is a kind of rishus that is involves taking Hashem for granted. This is the first period in which all of Yisrael is going to the Beis Hamikdash. There were also more people just hanging out in the Beis Hamikdash. It may not have been such a special place anymore.

Back to the comparison with Haazinu:

Yeshayahu focuses on the Beis Hamikdash. In Haazinu we have the theme of gratitude and in Yeshayahu we have the theme of recognition.

In Haazinu we have no discussion of teshuva. Things just happen. Hashem redeems people because of chilul Hashem and whatnot, but there is not teshuva.

Yeshayahu 1:19-20 talks in very concrete terms about teshuva. If you do this then this and if you do this then this.

Even taking Haazinu in a very broad sense there is no emphasis on teshuva like there is in Yeshayahu. In Dvarim Hashem's actions are inevitable in history, while in Yeshayahu there is a lot in our hands.

The pesukim in Yeshayahu about teshuva seem simple, but they are really controversial because this sentiment is not expressed in Haazinu.

The **Ramban** notices this fact in Vayeilech: why is it that in Dvarim we are told everything in such deterministic detail? - because the people were so bad – were it not for the fact that the people were already in such breakdown, Moshe would have spoken more like the Navi in Yeshayahu in 1:19-20.

Yeshayahu is giving much more choice. This is a tnai bnei gad and reuven. There is a very strong sense of free will.

In Chumash there is a push to one side, while in Yeshayahu there is no incentive either way. Why is this? -

There are two ways of thinking about free will:

Yeshayahu – (1)choose A you get this, choose B you get this. The weakness of this is that it doesn't push you in one way or another. (2)We see in Chumash that part of our conception of freedom is not only that there is a choice but that there really is a good reason to take one way over the other. We hold that at a certain level when a person is doing teshuva, the implication about doing teshuva is that we're not choosing where to go, but rather we're going where we belong.

Dvarim emphasizes the element of belonging, while in Yeshayahu the element of ultimate freedom is emphasized.

Ties in to **Bina La'itim** – Pharaoh lost his free will. ??? (unclear)

One of the issues we had with Perek 1 was the contrast with Hazinu. One issue was that of ingratitude. In Yeshayah it is lack of recognition. The recognition is much purer from the religious point of view.

Then we emphasized further that in Haazinu there is a lot emphasized about A”Z. Here we haven’t seen A”Z mentioned. The 3rd issue is that in Haazinu Teshuvah does not play a role. If you just read Hazinu there would be redemption without Teshuvah. In Devarim over all – there is a different way of thinking about Teshuvah that we have in Yeshayah. In Devarim where Teshuvah is discussed it is presented as inevitable. There is a question of uveShavtem is it a Mitzvah or a Havtacha. If it is a Havtacha – then Teshuvah is part of the way things are – one way or another you will be redeemed. In Devarim it says you should choose life – God is giving you a choice – but then he says you better choose life. What about if I want death? How can you deny that choice? What this underlies is the awareness that in Devarim there is a certain type of determination. Sooner or later you better end up doing the right thing. In Yeshayah it is really open. This is a different mood then in Haazinu and in Devarim as a whole. This is a Tenai Bnei Gad uBnei Reuvein. In terms of free will issue – both outlooks are essential to a full Hashkafat Olam. Part of Teshuvah is not only to choose A over B but to realize that A is the appropriate choice. If it is really an equal choice then the choice doesn’t really mean anything. Part of the notion of freedom is that where I belong is A not B. Where I choose A I go in a direction prepared to deceive me and choosing B is the true way. In R’ Kook you get this very strongly that Teshuvah is a return to yourself. There is a realization that you don’t feel certain places are where you belong. Devarim reflects that deterministic aspect. And in the concept of Haazinu – the Ribono Shel Olam is going to win. If you just read Chumash the picture of the world you get is not the Milchemet haYetzer. The stories in Tanach do not sound like a Mussar Sefer – unless you have a Mussar Sefer helping it on.

Chumash is a model of the world in a way that Neviim are not. Halacha as being a model for the universe. But if we reflect a certain structure of the world – this is a plan for future history the same way Bereishit is a structure of past history, and Halacha is a certain structure of the world as well. The fact of the way the Gra thought in those terms is the way we see things. Yeshayah by contrast – when you move from Torah into Nevuah – it is about giving choices and finding where they are holding. Every difference between Yeshayah and Devarim is much more clear because of the stylistic parallel of haazinu. The idea that you really belong somewhere is greater then that attraction of that position is greater then the attractiveness of the other position. You do not make calculations that you will make dividends in the end under torture – most Frum people don’t think in those terms – they just say that my place is with the Ribono Shel Olam.

This might help understand Perek 6 – where Yeshayah says he will turn people off. The message maybe that if Yeshayah is presenting freedom and no one is pushing you – then people will say I won't do Teshuvah.

The nature of Nevuah is to say that you go one way you get what you bought (moral dessert).

In the discussion of the Karbanot issue – there is this emphasis that God is tired with people. The idea of tiring God out you say in Yeshayah 1 – you see it in Yeshayah 43 as well.

Continuing in Perek 1 – the sins you have seen are bringing Karbonot when they are not wanted and Shefichat Damim - the opposition between justice on one hand and murder on the other. There is an image of the watered down wine. The sinners are compared to trees that will wither away and then burn.

You don't see attention paid to Avodah Zarah – all the attention is given to social sins. If this is an open Nevuah as a representative of the rest of the Sefer – where is the attack on A"Z? Rashi tries to throw in A"Z as a difference between Poshim and Chataim (Poshim are A"Z).

One N"M is what happens in Perek 2? If there are really 2 superscripts for 1 and 2. The first Nevuah is a medley for Uziah and ... you might say that Perek 1 is only referring to the time of Uziah and A"Z isn't an issue.

Rashi seems to be bothered by something. One could argue more readily that trees and gardens refer to A"Z. There are a lot of ways to talk about A"Z directly. This way would be talking about the things revolving around A"Z. A comment that can be made is that in terms of the Issurim of worshipping at groves. There is an interesting Semichat Parshiot between the Parsha of Shoftim and Lo Titah licha Asehira kol Eitz. In Sanhedrin 7a it says that whoever appoints a Dayan for monetary reasons it is as if he planted an Asheirah near the Mizbeach. The Gemarah makes the comparison to a Dayan that is not Hagun. If you want to make a connection between Mishpat and the Beis Hamikdash is this perek. Rashi sees A"Z probably because in Shoftim we have these connections. This really means that when the Gemarah makes the connection the Gemarah is not just making an interesting Semichat haParshiat. The Gemarah's Drasha maybe rooted in a much earlier way of making bribery into A"Z. This then will tell us that if these are A"Z references the focus is not A"Z but about the ethics issue – which is compared to A"Z.

If we are talking about ungratefulness in the unfaithful wife then there is an existing relationship that is being undermined. If you see this in terms of the dishonest businessman it is an issue of denying the facts. We can now understand how the whole Perek fits together. The very fact that A"Z is appearing again fits in this oblique way. The point of this Perek is a denial of reality.

Perek 2

We have a new Nevuah here. It starts with this messianic dream of everyone coming to Beis Hashem. Radak says this is referring to Mashiach, this is probably a comparison to similar Messianic prophecies which do differentiate a single Messiah.

This is a very significant Nevuah about a time of universal peace. It is not for naught they put this on the UN.

What is the difference between Goyim Medamim? The question is where do these Pesukim at the beginning of Perek 2 fit? What is the connection between the Tochachah here and the Messianic vision? The alternative is that this is the continuation of Perek 1 – but we will have to ask why there is a new super scripture. We could answer that this is a later combination.

One other issue is there are some very similar in Mica - in Perek 4 there is great similarities between these 2 Nevuot. There is a question which one is earlier. There is clearly a greater emphasis that Mica is younger than Yeshayah based on when they gave Nevuot. Abarbanel actually says that Pashtus is the pasuk in Yeshayah says that this is the Nevuah that originates in Yeshayah and not in Mica. If it fits in Mica - he uses it too.

We might want to look at the Psuk, which is earlier, and we may want to look at these Pesukim from a theological point of view and why does the UN choose Nevuah Yeshayah and not Micah.

The Abarbanel says that the differences in religion are the cause of war and therefore if everything believes in Hashem then there will be no more war. Rashi seems to say that the reason that cessation of war will be connected with going to the Beis Hamikdash is that if people have disputes they will go to Beis Din. Rashi is more parallel that wars arise for economic reasons.

In Perek 11 there is again a theme of peace – in Perek 11 you have the Melech Hamashaich who is judging and because of his judgment the lion lies down with the sheep. If we see this like the Rambam – Rashi makes sense. However even according to Rashi you want something a little more than simply Rashi. So some integration between these 2 Pshatim will be needed when we get to Perek 11.

What is the substantive difference between the versions, Yishayah and Mica?

The major differences are that Mica adds the people sitting under the Gefen. In Mica the implication is that even after this Nevuah there is still some exclusivity. In Yeshayah there is nothing about divisions. Likewise in Mica there is much more of an emphasis on security. Mica is more materialistic and more exclusive.

...

The true greatness is out of the Ribono Shel Olam and not out of the heights – there are a lot of height images. Everybody will go into the caves because of the fear of Hashem.

Clearly this Perek is about A”Z and it is about Gavah. We have the image of the gold and silver, the shaping element and height. In terms of the structure of the Perek – we seem to have a lot of repetition. There is a lot of repetitiveness in the Perek. Lastly the ships are a little bit odd; they are not necessarily tall ships.

A suggestion by David Stern (ours) is that there might be chiastic structure in the Perek.

We start with the beginning with A”Z. At the end we have to do with people being Chadal from Adam. Before that we have people hiding in cracks and rocks and throwing away A”Z. At the beginning there were people making a A”Z. The central part of the Perek is Yom Hashem Tzvako and all the high parts being lowered. The central issue must be Gavha – Gavha must be brought down.

Ships don’t fit perfectly – the time people think about ships being smashed – when there is an earthquake. The one story where ships are smashed is in Divrei Hayamim with the ships being destroyed in Eilat as a punishment for the closeness between Yehoshafat and Achav. This might have something to do with the earthquake in the time of Uzziah and Perek 2 might be describing the earthquake then we know why we are describing the ships being shattered.

The reason is that a person who is an apostate from God is an apostate from his own people – because as an abandonment of yourself you favor something foreign. The distinctive A”Z is connected with arrogance and luxury. All of this may tie back to Perek 1 where A”Z was connected to injustice. Perek 2 and 1 both pick up from similar themes in Chumash.

The theme itself emphasizes the transcendence of God.

With regards to Perek 3 we will not say anything.

In Perek 4 there is a line at the end that the Abarbanel explains where these women want their name on them and their willing to give up everything for this (money and sex). This Tenai is questionable if it is Kayam. The Mishneh liMelech says that a Tenai against sex will not work. The Abarbanel does point out another view – there are Christian commentators that say these women only want a child. It could be the Abarbanel is the slip of the pen, polemical against the Christians or he is Cholek on the Christians.

Perek 5

Perek 5 is a song about a Kerem that goes sour. One way of reading this is that you start listening it is a cool song and then goes into a religious idea. The other idea is that we know when Yeshayah starts talking there is something religious from the very beginning. And then we have to ask is there a literary device here to make the listener listen until it is too late. Or is there some deeper religious meaning.

There is a question of who is this person is referring to. It could be this is a Mashal to Adam haRishon and then it is turned around and the judgment is about you.

Another way of seeing this is that of the Abarbanel that the Kerem refers to Malchus Yisrael and then they turn it around and it really refers to the audience.

Hear again the complaint is a lack of justice.

These people are trying to build one house next to the other – he is describing land greediness. They are fewer houses and larger houses archeologically from this period. There is urbanization. The rich people get richer and the poor people lose their land. You wanted houses – you get empty houses. You will plant a great deal and you will not harvest a lot. This is the first הוי – the land grabbers.

The second הוי is on the drunkards. There are people who are constantly partying and making musical instruments. For the sin of drunkenness there will be hunger. God is elevated in judgment. Instead of people and agriculture the animals will take over the open places. In Yeshayah there is a standard comparison between man who is low and God who is holy.

The third הוי are people who do a lot of Aveirus. Drag out sin – jeering at God.

Fourth is people who say that good is bad and bad is good.

Fifth are wise guys – wise in their own eyes.

Sixth are people who drink wine and rationalize a Rasha. God for this reason has smitten them and for this reason remains outstretched.

God is eternal – his belt never busts – his shoelaces don't rip.

If we look at the 6 Hoys a few problems:

2nd and 6th are very similar. The difference is the 6th has bribes mentioned.

We can say there are 2 aspects of drunkenness:

- 1) You can drink because you want to be unconscious of certain things
- 2) You can drink to erase certain moral inhibitions.

A N”M is ugly drunks and happy drunks.

These Pesukim in Yeshayah is between people who drink to be unconscious of certain things – their punishment is the world goes fallow. They are not running away from things they drink to be uninhibited and their punishment is destruction.

If that is the case then the Hoys are a progression of people not seeing God's hand in the world.

The 6th Hoy is about the belligerent drunk.

At the end of Perek 5 – the enemy is introduced.

Perek 7

The basic story line is that Pekach Ben Ramalyahu and Aram want Yehusdah to join them in battle. Achaz sent for help and the Assyrians came to help him and they won. They tried to defeat Achaz and they weren't successful. In any event in Yeshayah you get a picture that there was a threat.

He says that his heart and the heart of the people were intimidated.

Yeshayah is told to meet Achaz with his son Shor Yoshuv. This sounds symbolically very rational. Be quite and don't be afraid. Aram has a council against you. Yeshayah basically tells him don't react and don't join the war. Here what is important is that Achaz messed up by not listening to the Navi. In Divrei haYamim the point being made is that there was an attack and there was a lot of casualties before it was repelled.

By and large it seems that Yeshayah has a strong power base. Yeshayah seems to be very much a respect personage. This Perek confirms this – he goes up to Achaz and talks to him – like any other cabinet minister.

Is Yeshayah treating Yehudah and Yisroel as being both Jews and he happens to be in Yehudah or is Malchus Yehudah 'us' and Malchus Yisroel 'them'. The Abarbanel seems to take the second option. This is parallel to a reference to intermarriage as being 'us' or 'them'.

What could be happening with Yeshayah here – is that given there is a war between Yehudah and Ephraim this works well with the way Yishayah refers to Yisroel as 'them'.

Who is Ben Toval? The earlier Mefarshim identify him as Petach ben Remalyahu. In a certain Gematriyah Ben Toval = Ben Ramalyhu. This could have been a code word for some type of coup. Another possibility is that he is from Eretz Tov – which is Eiver haYarden (this could be Pekach ben Ramalyahu as well). In any event they are trying to replace Malchus Beis David with an alternative.

Yeshayah says this will not happen. He says don't take any of this seriously. He says trust God on this. In 65 years they will not be here anymore. Most Meforshim say this is a reference to an old Nevuah about Ephraim being wiped out. The most obvious candidate for this is the Nevuah of Amos. Another possibility is this is a reference to the ethnic cleansing of Shomron. This would then be a reference to the population exchanges. The Pasuk is difficult enough that Shadal says this means 17 (this is crazy no matter how you add it).

And Hashem spoke further to Achaz ask for a sign. Achaz says I don't test God. Yishayah retorts your refusal is not because you are so Frum but because you are a pain in the neck. He says God will send you a sign - a woman has become pregnant and will call him Immanuel and he will drink milk... until he knows Tov vRah. Before this youngster reaches this stage the two kings will not be around until the man comes for you.

The early Christians followed the Greek translation and had this refer to a virgin birth. In Hebrew an Olmah can refer to any young woman. For Jews the pregnancy is not a miracle. If this happens 700 years later it doesn't help us in context. Is there something significant about her having a son – the name of the kid and what is with the breast milk and honey? This is all unclear and there are a lot of ambiguities. What seems to begin as a favorable Nevuah. It turns into a negative Nevuah. The king of Ashur will give you a very close and humiliating shave. A man will be lucky if he has sheep. There will be so much milk that people will eat Chemah. The most expensive fields will be Hefker. The mountains will have animals grazing – which seems to be the opposite of agriculture. It is a sign of economic regression.

The very Pesukim after what we read before speaks about a Navi named Oded – who talks to the people and tells the people of Ephraim that they should be ashamed for killing so much of their brethren. In the end they let the captives go free. However why is it that Yeshayah is not mentioned? There is a Gemarah in Brachot 10 that has a conversation between Yeshayah and Chizkiah and there is a question who should visit who. The question is why didn't Chizkiah think about his father and instead they talk about Malchei Yisroel?

We raised the question why does Yishayah go to Achaz and not vice-versa?

One might say in this case there is such a necessity that Yishayah does not stand on ceremony. We can explain the case in Melachim that Achav knows he must go to Eliyahu (famine) and therefore he goes. Achaz does not know the need to go to Yishayah and therefore Yishayah does not go.

R' Kook writes that it is made to look like the Melech out ways the Navi even though in reality it is not so. For R' Kook the issue isn't the value of the 2 Tzadikim but rather what they both bring on. Another point is that Yishayah's the bigger pusher of Malchus in the Gemarah in Brachos.

The Gemarah says that God made Chizkia sick in order not to be Machriah either way.

The second option is simpler – if we believe the threat in Perek 7 – is not Yisroel and Aram, but a threat to Malchut Beit David directly (they want to make Menachem the king). Therefore this is a specific situation and therefore we will make the exception. This is backed up by the text how Yishayahu keeps referring to Malchut Beit David and not Achaz by name.

Is this for the kingdom of the day or an eschatological consideration?

What is Mashiach? An ideal king from Beit David who ends up in the future

If we are thinking about Mashiach this is the right place to discuss it. That Gemarah implies you can distinguish in eschatology where the Melech haMashiach plays a central role and where he doesn't. You have Malchut Beit David and you are adding a place where a Messianic vision plays that role.

If the importance is the figure of Mashiach then what is the problem of a Messianic age without a figure or no Messianic figure and then we have to ask why we want this one royal figure.

In any event if we define Mashiach the way we define him then that doesn't mean we don't run around to say that he is Mashiach. What does one thing have to do with the other. And then we have to ask at what point does Malchut Beit David come around. There is a sense in Hosea 3 the people will miss the Malchut beit David. We can have this issue as well in Bayis Sheni and we can have this in the time of Yishayah.

Then we might want to ask what is so special about Malchus Beit David? One possibility is the unity of the people. In Neviim Rishonim we don't see the overall division as a tragedy except during the break itself – but not during the ensuing centuries. There are even points – where you ask why don't they unite? The problem with Yisroel is they are Rashaim and not that they are separatists.² We don't see that era as inherently sinful because there are 2 kingdoms.

These are issues that should come in as well – especially with regards to the issue of Malchus Yisroel and Yehudah together.

As far as Yishayah is considered we might not care about Achaz but the real issue is Malchut Beit David.

² This came out in a context of disunity of the church.

A spin on this might be that based on doctrine – Yishayah, as a son of Amotz brother of Amatzayah, could become king (at least based on the Rambam). Of course based on Pshat there is no reason to assume he is a relative.

Next point to raise is that there are strange Pesukim in Divrei haYamim – after the war that Yehudah lost and if the issue is Yehudah the fact they lose the war is important – but it is not really played up in Melachim and Yishayah. If the issue is Malchus Beis David then the lack of importance makes sense. In Divrei haYamim the theme of unity is an important theme.

Divrei haYamim is very concerned with the integration of Yisroel into Yehudah again. This is the question of how and when Yisroel gets attention in Divrei haYamim. The kings of Yisroel do not get mention in Divrie haYamim. However the wars between Yehudah and Yisroel have more attention in Divrei haYamim. The end of the war in Divrei haYamim there is a Navi Ido that tells everyone that they should let the captives go free.

Why does Ido do this and not Yishayah? If you are a Bible critic it is a bigger question – we can answer that is what happens. If one were a Bible critic you can say that it is better to further the agenda with names that are already familiar. This is similar to the Gemarah asking why Chuldah and not Yirmiah gives the Nevuah to Yoshiahu. Chazal pay more attention to Melachim then Divrei haYamim. There is a question of density of attention. Divrei Hayamim does not get a lot of Divrei Chazal.

We ask a question why Takah is not Yishayah and someone else? (Them it is a bigger question because if it was someone else then they would have written Yishayah).

We can answer very simply that Yishaya is close to Malchus Beis David and that people in Yisroel would not be receptive to his rebuke. This would work well for us (and the Gemorah-like approach) but it is a tough answer for a Bible critic.

When we go on Achaz refuses to ask for a sign and the Navi sees this as Chutzpah as opposed to Frumkeit. He says I know you don't want to engage God at all. We discussed last time what miraculous elements there might be here. To talk about Jesus here it would be very relevant. We can talk about the 65 years as the time where the people of Ephraim will go into exile.

Amos Chacham writes a Pshat from his father who said that the number 70 would normally mean a human life span. This could be why the number 70 places such an important role in Tanach. In Am Yisroel the number 70 is well known (the years of the Churban – the years of the first Churban to the rebuilding). From that point of view 65 is less then a human life span. Ephraim may not be destroyed immediately but the handwriting is already on the wall. In the modern era 3 or 4 years is a whole new era – but in a different society, the idea that this will happen in your own life item means it will happen soon. If someone in 1917 would say that the USSR would only last 72 years – it would not be comforting. But people are more self-centered. We are not so much the

defeat of Ephraim – rather the loss of Ephraim as a nation. This makes a lot more sense if our issue is Malchut Yisroel.

Why does Yishayah tell him not to make the treaty? We know that once the Navi says something then not listening is a lack of Bitachon. We can say that once the Assyrians come in then they don't leave too early. However it seems that Yishayah and then Chazal in context of Yishayah are very concerned with Bitachon per se.

We then asked what is the miraculous nature of the Nevuah of the birth of the child Emanuel (Imanu El). It could be the speed of the child growing up or the time frame of the destruction, the name. A scholar pointed out that part of making an A"Z is to rub the lips with a special food. Rubbing the lips with food will make the kid intelligent. Then Yishayah says that speed the kids maturation as much as possible and then when he grows up the kid will be gone. Either way this is a good thing about Chemah uDvash.

Another question is an Ote always miraculous? Some signs are always an indication. The Gra raises this issue in general – but then says that not all times does an Ote have to be a miracle.

A symbol according to Tillik participates in the reality it indicates.

Churchill walks around with a sign but you identify with that symbol. You will say with the birth of the child. Then whatever the birth of the child must signify some ideal. Not suprising the Gra sees all of this as learning Torah and in Chazal the period of Chizkiah is the time where everyone knows Torah and Tumah & Taharah.

(Missed 20 minutes of class) ...

Perek 8

We ended off with a few possibilities about who this child at the end of Perek 7 is. The Radak says this would be a descendent of Achaz. Most modern scholars reject this. The only idea is to say that the importance of continuation of Malchus Beis David.

Rashi and Ibn Ezra both say that this is the child of the Navi. We have to ask are there 2 children are one child. If it is one child there are 2 ideas that are here. Emanuel is a very good name – God is with us. The other name מהר שלל חש בז is a pretty negative name – it implies destruction.

It would seem to be pretty much the same idea of the child reaching some level of maturity. Conceptually is there any difference between the 2 criteria Chemah uDvash and

To summarize the differences:

| ח' | ז' |
|---------------|--------|
| נביאה | עלמה |
| מהר שלל חש בז | עמנואל |

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| קרוא אבי ואמי ישא את חיל דמשק מפני מלך אשור | מאוס ברע תעזוב האדמה |
|--|-------------------------|

In Perek 7 the Aram just gets defeated. In Perek 8 it is done by Melech Ashur.

In Perek 7 the point is that things will get better – there is a description of Yeshuah. In Perek 8 there is a description of the defeat of the enemies. This is enunciated by the different names of the children. As well as the 4th point – who will defeat the enemy is significant.

You may very well that the act of sweeping away the 2 kings is not just a question of Yeshuah – but also a question of who the real authority is. If we see that Perek 8 is about the legitimacy of Perek 8 – and that might be significant about God vanquishing the 2 kings and it isn't just the kings leaving on their own. It is implied that because you didn't trust God then Ashur will be involved. When the Assyrians come later on they say we have taken everything – don't listen to Chizkiah. This means the involvement of Ashur is not encouraging from a theological point of view.

It could be that קרוא אבי ואמי is about the child recognizing authority and מאוס ברע is about the child's development. קרוא אבי ואמי would then imply that Am Yisroel has to learn who the real authority is.

What is the difference between Almah and Neviah? Rashi says Neviah is because she was over there. The Malbim is also bothered with the issue of why we need 2 different Nevuot? The Malbim says a Kllal we know that a Nevuah for good cannot be reversed a Nevuah for Raah can be reversed. Some times God gives symbolic actions to clinch a Nevuah for Raah. That is why you need a symbolic action here – in order to guarantee the Churban of Yisroel will indeed occur. There is a Diuk in the Malbim – is you have symbolic actions for both, with regard to Emanuel you have one symbolic action and Retzin and Pekach you have 2 symbolic actions. However the problem is the principle we have from Rishonim is that there is no difference between 1 and 2 only between 0 and 1, once there is a physical piece of evidence getting 2 or 3 doesn't change anything. The issue is public versus private. R' Carmy would like to say (this is not Pshat in the Malbim – it is sympathy with him) – it could be that the 1st image in Perek 7 is about saving Yehudah, Perek 7 is not a Churban, if you are saved from someone else then it is a Yeshuah plane and simple. Perek 8 is a Nevuah Churban. Now we want to make a second point – what makes a symbolic act, a symbolic act. It is a Din in the Maaseh or the Totzaah? In Perek 8 there is clearly an action of approaching his wife.³ The reason the Pasuk uses the words ואקרב – it is an in your face word because it is a symbolic action. In Perek 7 there is a woman being pregnant, all we have is the effect. If you now start thinking in Perek 7 – it doesn't matter who's pregnant or how she got there – the important thing is the child. If we twist the Malbim in our direction – Perek 8 involves a general symbolic action – it is not a symbolic action. If we are talking about the theology of Nevuah we have to ask why symbolic action is important – if it is an oral

³ It is in Lashon Nekiah and it sounds very clean.

promise then the action and effect don't matter. However – if we focus from the Maaseh it is not important that we have a signed (externalized activity by God), that action is a Kinyan on the future. It is not that God performs an action but the Navi substantiates the action. The Ramban when he talks about Maaseh Avot Siman l'Banim is saying that the actions do things. Using this explanation of the Malbim we now understand why in Perek 7 she is called Almah and in Perek 8 she is called Neviah it is important that the Navi is the father doing the action and that she is part of the Nevuah.

We have 2 Nevuot because despite Achaz there will be a Yeshuah – however things won't be that great, which is what Perek 8 comes to tell us. (I think one can say that the reason we have the second Nevuah is because Achaz blows it the Yeshuah won't be that great – R' Carmy argues). One may say the economic down turn in 8 might be more positive on the level of giving a simple life and allowing for a better life.

If we switch to Ibn Ezra where we are dealing with 2 different children of the Navi – we have 2 different events but the logic will be the same logic. Even with the Radak whose says Perek 7 is the wife of Achaz and in Perek 8 it is Yeshyah's Nevuah we can still save these distinctions (the son of the king might be some what Messianic).

Further in Perek 8. This people of Yehudah have rejected the Mei Hashiloach – the river running through Yerushalayim. In so far as these people have rejected the Mei haShiloach. I will give you the big river – Melech Ashur and he will even enter Yehudah. It will flood the area of Emanuel (works well with the Radak). The Navi chose to symbolize Ashur with a river so a river symbolizes Beit David as well. The Ibn Ezra says that some say the Mei haShiloach is Yerushalayim, however he thinks it refers to Beit David. What the Ibn Ezra is saying that rejecting Beit David is not a religiously significant issue because Achaz was a Rasha. Nonetheless whatever you think about Achaz it is important to keep Beit David on religious grounds. Therefore he must introduce that most of Malchus Beit David were Tzadikim. The other view we would have to say that it must refer to the Beit haMikdash – whatever the religious aspects and it can even mean the theological aspects of Malchus Beit David – but we end up that rejecting political Beit David is a moral problem. Chazal have a Mesorah in the time of Chizkiah there was some type of rebellion. They get this from Yishayah 22:15. Elyakim will be the Yachid Neeman. The Gemarah in Sanhedrin represents Shev Nah as a charismatic leader. If there would have been an election – Shev Nah would have beaten Chizkiah, however he went to surrender to the Assyrians and he lost all his support. So we see both in the time of Achaz and Chizkiah there is a desire to reject Chizkiah. Is Perek 8 about Achaz or Chizkiah? Pshat is this refers to Achaz and by the time of Chizkiah these people are gone. Rashi sets up the opposition between Chizkiah and his opponents because it is easier to set up Chizkiah as the good guy as opposed to Achaz who is the bad guy. On a Drash level we can have this refer to Chizkiah as well. Beit David is the better aspect.

The Gemarah explains here Yishayah is Minabeh about the later generation. They saw Chizkiah was eating vegetables and studying Torah and they are reminiscing about Pekach ben Remalyahu who had these huge Fleischig deserts.

Rashi is aware about the Pshat problems. According to Rashi the word Messos means something else. Rashi combined 2 different Gemaros. One statement is the rejection of the Mei haShiloach was a rejection of Chizkiah in favor of Shev Nah. Rashi in effect combined the 2 of them. The Pshat of Mei haShiloach has to do with the dietary issue. Rashi seems to work with the explanation that a king who shows force by eating meat – he is preferred. The analogy can be taken to Louis XIV – people like to see him eat it. The same idea is with the rich Chassidishe Rebba – people like to see the royalty. An alternative is that it is like “since Jefferson died alone.” Being able to put on a good feast shows that you are able to have luxuries and you will support him as a king.

Perek 9

He sees now my children and I are living symbols of God’s presence. We don’t have the enter to the Ribono Shel Olam – then why don’t you take this shortcut. The time will come and they will curse God and the king. Times will be very very bad. The earlier one was easier. The standard interpretation is taking Malchut Yisroel into Galut by stages. In the New Testament they say that Jesus began his ministry in Galilee. After the darkness in Perek 8 – we have the lights in Perek 9. Perek is a continuation of the story in Perek 8 and they will rejoice as they will rejoice in the times of harvest. There is a son that will be born to Malchut Beit David. Is El Gibor a name of Chizkiah? There are other biblical interpretations that stay away from the Christian interpretation and say that El Gibor is God referring to Chizkiah. This boy will be function as Aviad Sar Shalom. There is plunder and in peace. Perek 7 we are now moving from Symbolic names referring to the Navi as referring to Beit David.

In terms of the transition from Perek 8 to 9 is interesting. Chapters are sometimes theologically separated. However this separation contradicts the New Testament. If you are a Frum Christian you should want to preserve their Drash. The explanation is very simple. Dividing the Perakim was not to impose Christian theology, but rather to make it easier to Darshan the Perek. The nature of Darshanim – the tendency of sermonizers is to Darshan the first Pasuk. Therefore the division of the Perakim is to make the first Pasuk the one you will want to Darshan in Church.

What we have to get to next is Perakim 9 and 10, which are pretty depressing Perakim. The major point to spend time on is the major function of Ashur – to compare it to the self-image of Bavel. Regarding this is a very important Ramban about why the Mitzarim were punished even though they were commanded. You have to look up all the Pesukim.

(New Shiur)

In Shemot the question is believing the Navi (Shemot). In Yishayah the question is guaranteeing the Nevuah will come true. When all we care about is whether the people believe the Navi then we don’t ask the question why we will need a plurality of signs. However in Yishayah since his status as a Navi Emes is clear then we have to ask why he needs more signs. Moreover Yishayah’s signs would not have accomplished the goal of Moshe’s signs. The Malbim says the symbolic action serves to indicate not only what the

Navi is saying but that it will actually come true. In this case the point is the irreversibility.

We see the beginning of Perek 9 and on to us a child is born. The Meforshim say that this child is Chizkiah. If you say it is chronological then it can't be Chizkiah. Rashi explains this means that Chizkiah has been born already. You can say further that a Melech that becomes a king is like being born. This might be a song for the inauguration of Chizkiah. You have these Messianic ideas. This is about a future king – we are not explicitly referring to Beit David. We have him described as a child – moving into the kingship from being a pre-kingly childhood. Obviously the Christians make the connection. The baby in the cradle theme is very important for many Americans. This is reminiscent of Chazal saying that in the time of Chizkiah new Tumaah and Taharah – a sense that Chizkiah is the time of the child. This is part of the idea that Chizkiah represents a new beginning. There is one Eklog of Virgil that discusses the birth of a child – some people at the time said it referred to the emperor Augustus. What we learn from the Eklog of Virgil – if based on Pshat the Navi of Jesus and therefore Yishayah is not the Navi of Jesus – 2 poets can use the image of a child being born as a renewal of nature and the fact that 2 people make it doesn't mean they are Mechaven to a 3rd event. He is associated both with the military framework also as someone who is the bringer of peace and Tzedakah and Mishpat.

(This goes into Perek 10)

We next have a less pleasant Nevuah; he addresses Ephraim and says that they are trying to rebuild things that have fallen down – however the enemies from all around will attack you. We keep building to the Assyrians coming in and Ephraim and Aram are vanquished. The first stanza people are being surrounded from all sides. There will be civil war, Ephraim against Menashe – this probably refers to the war of succession when Pekach comes to power. The stanza comes back to the refrain that God's hand is still outstretched.

There is a clear bird image – this parallels Sancheirev's own account where he puts Chizkiah in a cage. The falsehood of Ashur is that they think they are in their own hands – but they are really in God's hands. He says that instead this time Am Yisroel will believe and return to God.

He tells Am Yisroel not to be scared about Ashur even if they lift their hand against you like God raised his hand against the Egyptians. God will come against them like he did with Midyan and Mitzraim (both of these have been mentioned before in a negative light⁴). Both of these use the imagery of light and the staff – the idea of Midyan and Mitzraim are echoed at the beginning and the end. He says that Assyria will slip off like oil.

⁴ I think it is significant the change to being positive

With all these Nevuot he is going over the same historical ground. Aram and Ephraim attack Yehudah – Ashur comes and breaks both of them and then somehow the Assyrians will pass as well. The endings are different:

- 1) This new time of simplicity
- 2) A Messianic vision
- 3) The easing off of the yoke of Ashur

Each time we repeat the same basic history – each time we arrive at a more comprehensive illumination of the Assyrian threat. The main idea at the end of 10 is this idea of Hoi Ashur Shevet Api – Ashur thinks it is the architect of its own achievement.

This leads us to the Ramban in Bereishit. Why is it if the Egyptians are doing what God wanted them to do – then why are they punished. The Rambam says each individual Egyptian had the freedom to be part of it or not. A question is what does this say about Paroh – did he have freedom; could they have been afflicted without Paroh? (Good question). One could postulate that Paroh (in contrast to other Egyptians) was not punished for the original enslavement for not freeing the Jews right away – during the 1st 5 Makot. The Ramban explains that the reason Paroh and the Egyptians were punished was because they didn't have to do it in as cruel a manner as they did. There is also a question of how active Paroh is in the various Gezeirot. There is an article about the Ramban by a person named Muak – in a journal called Spunot vol. 22 – the extent to which the Ramban's commentary about Yetziat Mitzraim may reflect monarchy in Spain. It is not that Paroh is Gozer but that they through the children into the Yam. The Ramban's quotes Pesukim in Zecharyah and later in Bavel – not our Pesukim in Yeshayah at this point. The Ramban disagrees with the Rambam on Pshat and more importantly philosophical grounds. If God wants it done then why should anyone else be lazy and evasive. The Pashtut in the Ramban if something is God's will – that doesn't mean that you have to do it. The Rambam would say God's will is not your business. Then the Ramban goes on the Pasuk also wrote about Sancheirev. He is punished because he thought he did this on his own. Is this the same thing or something different? The Ramban implies it is the same thing – however the difference is that Ashur's problem is their motive not their actions. Either they did it for their own reasons not because God said so – or what is stated in the Pesukim is that they did it on their own reasons. There are many examples in Tanach where a problem in outlook can have such an extreme effect.⁵ In effect Bavel is both different from Sancheirev and like Sancheirev – they did too much and they had the wrong motive.⁶

There is a movement among historians among the scholars of the Ancient Near East to talk about Assyrian culture. At a certain level Assyrian religion is almost

⁵ When R' Lichtenstien wrote the letter in Hatzofeh to Begin – that discussed this issue. The Rav called Begin's office and demanded an inquiry.

⁶ R' Dessler adds the issue of how this works with theodacy – if they give Am Yisroel a worse punishment then they deserve. R' Dessler believes there is some flexibility here. A person can deserve more than one punishment – even though one if worse than the other. Like the example with how bad an accident can be. This way anything within a certain range fulfills God's will – then if you are not the center attention then the narrative will be shaped around that person and not you.

monotheistic. Why do you believe the Assyrian pantheon is equal to the Greek pantheon? What if you think if the sub-gods are angels? Ashur might be central in a way that Zeus is not central. Some scholars will now talk about dating the monotheism in Chumash. If Assyrian religion is more aggressive than the other religions in the region – which works with their speech to Yerushalayim at the wall, this might have an effect here as well. How do you define God from that point?

At the end of perek 10 here we have Ashur coming to Yerushalayim and basically conquering it and then they fall like a tree, which is clearly a reference to their Gavah getting cut down. Gavah getting cut down. Ashur is cut down instead of the Mikdash. (I missed a bit of the beginning of this class)

Perek 11

Here we have a root growing (in stead of the tree of Ashur). We have a sprout from Yishay. He doesn't do much it is more who he is and what he was.

We have to ask over here what is the difference between this Perek 11 and Perek 9. In perek 9 there is mention of war not in 11. Also in 9 the end is to get Tzedek and the end point is that. In Perek 11 there is the idea of spirit, which is there from the beginning (there is an idea of Ruach Chachmah, etc.). It is a much more inspired type of judgment – there is no interference with his judgment and he doesn't have to resort to force.

The lion and lamb has of recently becoming a subject of humor. People don't take it completely seriously. There is a Machlokes in the Rishonim how to look at this. The Rambam says this should not be taken literally. The Raavad says that it should be taken seriously. The Raavad is really coming from a Pasuk in Chumash at the beginning of Bechukotai, he thinks this must be literal.

There is the image going back to the Mikdash here and we have the image of peace, which is so important here.

Classically there are 2 extreme positions on this Perek one is that this is about Mashiach and we have not seen this amount of peace so far. The other possibility is that this is discussing Chizkiyah. Among various Rishonim there is a general Machlokes how we see various eschatological Nevuot to refer to IAtid Lavo. Abarbanel wants everything to be about Mashiach. R' Moshe in the Ibn Ezra wants it to be more natural. There is a Hillel in Chazal who wants these Nevuot to refer to Chizkiah. Does R' Hillel mean there is no doctrine of Chizkiah and now they are defunct? Or does he say there is no reference to Mashiach in Nach? As we point out the Gemarah says may God forgive him for saying this. There is a 3rd option we can have the doctrine of Mashiach without Mashiach doing the work, God does all the work. The Sefer haKharim of R' Yosef Albo – some people grab for the messianic interpretation or the short-range interpretation.

The Malbim develops the synthetic position – you can very well say that a certain Nevuah is aimed for a certain time – that their own period could appreciate. This Nevuah could have been fulfilled through Chizkiah – but if he doesn't fulfill it then it gets deferred later on. The support for this is the Gemarah in Chelek that says Hashem wanted to make Chizkiah Mashiach but he blew it because he didn't say Shirah.

We might want to ask why is Chizkiah possibly Mashiach? First of all he is a worthy person – a Tzadik. Furthermore Chizkiah succeeded in bringing the people of the North back to Yerushalayim. What we have said up to now anyone would have said. There is the other side of the Gemarah – that Hashem wanted to make Sancheirov Gog uMagog – one of the reasons Chizkiah is Mashiach is because Sancheirev is a good candidate for Gog uMagog. It is not so much that Sancheirev is Gog uMagog – but in Trei Assar (like in Yoel and Zecharyah) – Gog uMagog is a continuation of Sancheirev. What it takes to be a Gog uMagog (as a theological concept, not just the Nevuah in Yechezkal) is the idea of a Kiddush Hashem in the face of a super power. How one relates to the super figure – Ashur was the first super power that fits the figure, on 2 levels, as a political power and theologically if in fact you have a great theological confrontation with Ashur as well. Rather Ashur is a powerful theological concept. They (in their minds) are parallel to the Ribono Shel Olam himself and they claimed overall superiority – not only do we have a candidate for Mashiach – because we have a good candidate for this job.

We might want to ask if this is always existing and just mentioned here or is it introduced new here. R' Elchanan Wasserman said that Moshe being the greatest Navi came in when Miriam spoke against Moshe.

We can say conversely that there are certain synapses in the neuro-system that become tied together through a historical event and then this become the template for Geulah in the future (like what we do with Mitzraim).

Kibutz Galot is described in imagery that is reminiscent of Yetziat Mitzraim and there is language of Shirat haYam.

Nevuot laGoyim

From Perekim 13 – 27 there is a series of Nevuot for the Goyim. Many Neviim have a unit dedicated to the separate nations. In Yishayah these are the Perakim that are set off in this way. He is treating Yisrael as an outside nation for the purpose of that Nevuah.

In perek 20 we have Yishayah running around barefoot and naked – he has been running around naked for 3 years. The Assyrians will take their captives and they will be street thieves and captives. The Rambam says this was all symbolic. In order to make a

point he doesn't have to be naked 24/7 just occasionally for 3 years he has to show up naked.

The first Nevuah here is a Nevuah for Bavel. It starts out with Yishayah's name – this could be just to make a new section or to point out that Yishayah and not someone else said it (it is very similar to what the Nevuot of Yirmiah).

The Perakim of 27 – 33 is almost a review of 7 – 12 and then we have an actual review of how the story historically progressed. The Nevuot haGoyim nicely interrupt that 1st Sancheirev Nevuot and the second ones. The Abarbanel sees this as a chronological progression first we dealt with Sancheirev and then we deal with Bavel. As the Abrabanel points out in passing that there is no way that he knew that the destruction of Bavel was put in astrological signs – even Rashi puts this in allegorical terms. The point is that as Bavel is destroyed – the Day of Judgment arrives and people sense the sky falls in. This means literally they will be very few people around. There is no king here mentioned by name and even Bavel was only mentioned in the superscript – but Madai clearly is talking about what happens to Bavel.

Wild animals will be all around. When you are at peace you will sing a song about Melech Bavel. Some of these Nevuot for the Goyim have multiple Nevuot. We finish a Nevuah and then we have a new Nevuah – it is not the Navi speaking it is the Navi saying what the people have to say. Everyone is happy that this person has been vanquished. All the dead kings who are down in the underworld – they are saying you are dead just like us. In Western literature this is the image of Satan being thrown down. Nevuchanetzar's body had to be dug up to prove to everyone he was dead.

Finally in 14:24 we jump back to Sancheirev again.

Perek 14

Perek 14 is a bit of a problem because it is a repetition of the earlier Nevuot. A little bit of a problem is that to find answers you have to know a lot of Ancient Near East history. Here there are 2 separate Nevuot in Perek 14 we have Bavel and the Kibutz Galiot. It says that when this happens you will sing this song. This is very interesting from a literary point of view.

#2 what is the role of Bavel versus Ashur here? The Nevuah begins with Bavel – there is a Nevuah about Bavel – had the Nevuah been about someone else – you wouldn't know that well. Then there is a 2nd Nevuah, which is about the king of Bavel. Here we have all the comments about Hussein. Then at the end of the Nevuah the Navi says this is what is going to happen to Ashur. There is a jump from Bavel to Ashur that we are not prepared for. Among the Bible critics some say that if it was about Bavel it must have been stated later. There are some who want to say about Bavel in the time of the future itself. Even Amos Chacham will say that you may say Ashur and mean Bavel and vice versa – this happens clearly in Ezra and Nehemiah both ways as well. There is a certain amount

of slipperiness. Within Sefer Yishayah the difference between Ashur and Bavel should be clear enough that there shouldn't be editorial indifference. There is a strange situation we have here. There are answers about the relationship between Bavel and Ashur.

Obviously in the time of Yishayah the real problem is Ashur. The fact that Yishayah has a Nevuah about Bavel is not a problem if we are Frum. There is nothing there that raises any problems. And if we look at the content of Perek 13 – there is nothing that makes it particular Ashur like.

Bible critics call vaticinio post-eventum, which is a prophecy after the event (they use this to describe any Nevuah that comes true – because they can't assume any prophecy will predict the future).⁷

In perek 14 when there is a song the people have to sing – the oppressor has been silenced the earth is now quite. If you would listen to the song it would fit the Assyrian's above the Babylonians. If there are candidates that you know are Babylonians – you would really say it fits Sancheirev better. It does fit Sancheirev better. In 14 you will sing a song about Bavel, which will blend together Bavel and Assyria – you will think of Bavel the way you think about Assyria. It might not be if not for Hitler you wouldn't compare Hussein to Hitler. What we really are getting is a Nevuchanetzar model after Sancheirev to a degree. It might be without that model of Assyria Bavel wouldn't be viewed in that way. The predominant element here would be the oppressiveness. There are 2 Dinim in Nevuchanetzar and Sancheirev himself – this explains why there is an abrupt shift from Bavel to Ashur. He cannot let go of Ashur and he ends up making Ashur like Bavel. This is very much supported by the Ramban.

It is important here to put the Nevuot in somewhat of an historical context.

In Yishayah 47 (Deutero-Isaiah) Bavel is treated as oppressive. What is being pointed out here no matter which way you are seeing the Perek develop – he realizes what is going on and 14 is still distinct. In 47 it is just like the Ramban – the only problem with Bavel is that they are too oppressive. The only way you equate Nevuchanetzar with Sancheirev is from 14 and this is being done intentionally.

Perek 22

It is a strange thing that in the middle of Nevuot for the Goyim there is a Nevuah about Yerushalayim. There is an implication people are killed not through regular war. You saw the breaks in the walls of Beit David. This seems to refer to directly – it seems to refer to an episode chronicled in Divrei Hayamim – that Chizkiyah haMelech shut off the waters from the outside – so the king of Assyria will not get there water. As much as you want water you don't want the enemy to get in – so you build a wall and dam it in to

⁷ If you ask this to Paul Johnson (from Notre Dame) he'll ask why he had to come to YU and they couldn't send a Jew instead (joke).

Yerushalayim without the enemy seeing it. There is archeological evidence of this. The inscription recalls how the people on one side heard the digging from the other side.

Additional information there is a discussion in Chazal – it is in the Mishnah in Pesachim Perek 4. 6 things Chizkiah did – 3 things they endorsed, 3 things they endorsed and 3 they didn't. He got rid of the Nachash Nechoshes, Sefer Refuot and embarrassed his father's bones. He was Meaber Nissan in Nissan. On a Pshat level it is clear he wants to drag in people from the North. It is clear that he put off Pesach to bring people from the north to come (after the northern kingdom was destroyed). However the Gemarah assumes this is the first Pesach of Chizkiyah as king. This will go along with the Gemarah that the last king of Yisrael took down roadblocks to keep from being Oleh Regel.

Clearly the issue here is Bitachon – there is ambivalence in the nature of Bitachon. The issue is clearly going on here. He does certain things that are at least practical. This seems to be a practical way to get ready for war. One can see recycling the doors of the Heichel that doesn't count as Bitachon. However stopping the spring gets only condemned if either you took a very hard act on Bitachon – or there is some downside as well. If you see that this threat from Ashur is not enough to cause an entire engineering work. In Yishayah you are not really supposed to prepare for the war. It is not all that clear that Chizkiah will listen to Yishayah. If you want a detailed discussion then we have to look at the Mishnayot with Chanoch Albek.

The Pesukim we are looking at he says that you have seen the cave of David – they are trying to make a pool. There is another Pasuk that is relevant to the Perek – you have counted the homes in Yerushalayim and you have smashed down houses to fortify the wall. It seems he is sacrificing the future for the current wall. Instead of people doing Teshuvah they are saying eat drink and be merry because tomorrow we shall die. This is a carpe diem notion – seize the day (live for today). When people despair they really live for today. At the same time there is a mood of merrymaking. This goes with the arrogance of Yishayah – Achaz doesn't want to put himself into God's hands. The next Pesukim are about Shev Nah – the party that wants to get rid of Malchus Beis David. The theme is that people with no children are preoccupied with setting up a monument to themselves in that way. The way Chazal understand this Shevna is a threat to Malchus Beis David – these are the people identified with cowardice – these are the people running away and partying because they thought it is all done anyway.

There are a few major things to say about the Perek. There is the combination of powerless, panic and hedonism at the same time. We are learning that this is a criticism of what people are doing at the time of Chizkiah including Chizkiah himself. Rashi has a different approach the people went up on the roof to return to the kings of the Beit haMikdash. This means we are talking about the Churban habayit and not about the period of Sancheirev. He says the Pasuk about the spring is contrasting Chizkiah to the Churban beit hamikdash (with Chizkiah they believed in Hashem but in the times of Elyakim and Tzidkiahu they didn't). Rashi either followed the other view in Chazal that Chizkiah didn't do anything wrong or that he thought this Nevuah was too harsh. One

could say on a Pshat level this was said in the time of Sancheirev and then they repeated it by Nevuchanetzar – however this is very tough. However reading this Perek the obvious way will explain why Chazal criticize Chizkiahu about the spring.

In Perek 30 – we have Nevuot that relate to Sancheirev and they focus on not trusting Egypt.

In all these Perakim there is nothing about Malchut Beit David. A king is not a participant. God is the king and the human king doesn't stand out in the matter.

Conquest by Ashur

(I missed the historical intro to this class)

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Ashur</u> | <u>Yehudah</u> |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Sargon goes into power | |
| 713 | | Chizkiahu takes power |
| 705 | Sancheirev goes into power | |
| 701 | 3 rd campaign of Sancheirev | |
| | | |
| 698 | | |

How do the years work out?

How does the Pasuk in Malchim II that says there was a conquest of Sancheirev in the 14th year of Chizkiahu, even though this was before Sancheirev took power?

Answers:

- 1) Tanach isn't careful with years
 - a. Either the non-Frum version the years are completely off
 - b. That Chizkiahu took power in later (721 - this contradicts Pesukim in Tanach that Chizkiahu was around for Churban in Yisroel)
- 2) Frum version: Chizkiahu's count starts a second time when he becomes king of all of Am Yisroel, with his K"p after the Churban
- 3) We don't differentiate between different kings in Tanach they are all called Sancheirev. Gemorah that says Sancheirev was 5 people backs this up. Therefore Sargon = Sancheirev.
 - a. This will then posit that there are 2 campaigns by Ashur against Chizkiahu.

In Sancheirev's annals we get the picture of a very successful Sancheirev. This has lead some near Eastern scholars to say that Sancheirev must have campaigned twice. So the annals describe the first campaign and the Bibles describe the second campaign. One could say alternately that there was one campaign and the Bible is bending the truth

(for some reason he doesn't take over Yerushalayim and then the Jews make it in to a big victory). The other version is that Sancheirev is bending the truth. This is clearly what the Assyrians would have done if that were the case.

To sum up we have a tough discussion without Sancheirev's annals and with Sancheirev's annals it is even more difficult. The question of one campaign or 2 campaigns will answer the other questions before we get to the annals.

In any event Tanach tells us that Ashur demands a tribute of Chizkiah. Chizkiah tells the king of Ashur I am sorry I offended you and he takes all the money about the Beis Hashem and gives it to Sancheirev. After this point the Assyrians continue to advance to Yerushalayim. The Ralbag in Melachim suggests the 2-campaign theory based on the Pesukim in Melachim that there were 2 campaigns (first Chizkiah gives in and the second one where he rebels). The Abarbanel was Cholek on this.

Now if we turn to Yishayah 36 – the opening Pesukim about the first invasion or the first part of the invasion does not appear in Yishayah. It is possible in Yishayah there is no room for that incident because Yishayah is not interested in history, just how the original Nevuot were fulfilled. (Therefore the picture of Chizkiah in Yishayah is much more positive than the version in Melachim).

Amos Chacham says that everything else is written in the mystery Divrei Hayamim book, however we can answer this just as easily by saying he is relying on Melachim.

Chazal say that Rav Shaked was a Meshumad probably because he knows about Jewish ways and speaks Hebrew really well. This probably means Sar haMashkeh. He asks them whom are you relying – you can't trust Mitzraim because they are like a weak reed that won't hold you up and it will pierce you? You can't rely on Hashem because you got rid of the Bamos (example: make a law against driving on Shabos that keep people from going to Reform Temple). He then says that even Hashem said I will win, this sounds like a reference to Yishayah Perek 10. The people on the wall tell him to please speak Aramaic – because they understand it – they don't want the plain people on the wall to understand him. He then says that I came to talk to the people on the wall – because these people will eat their excrement and drink their urine when the siege gets tough. He then says come put you will eat and drink and there will be a resettlement and you will get just as good a land. At this point he is being much more abusive than before – he says what happened to the Gods of the other nations? They didn't respond because they were under orders not to respond. The ministers on the wall tore Keirah (this supports the idea he was a Jew) and this seems to be Kriah for blasphemy. There are some that say we are stuck like a pregnant woman who can't give birth. They say maybe this blasphemy might happen.

Chizkiah asks Yishayah. Yishayah says that he will go home and he will die at home. Rav Shaked returns to Laksih and the Assyrian army starts a march on Yerushalayim. Chizkiah has his famous Tefilah to Hashem. He says that these aren't

real gods that were killed but Hashem is the real God. Hashem answers that he will take the waters and he will dry up the waters. He says that this year you will not be able to eat – eat what is leftover and next year eat what is leftover from the trees and the next year you will be OK. There will be no battle at all.

With regards to Pasuk 35 the questioned that the smugness in the time of Yirmiahu was clearly influenced by this victory, this theology of invincibility. This could be that we are referring to blasphemy and Lmaani and Lmaan David Avdi – we could say that Malchus Beis David is secure no matter what.

There is a story by a Greek historian that the mice come and eat the weapons of the Assyrians and therefore they can't march on Yerushalayim. One thing that rodents do better than eating weapons (wood ones maybe – but metal ones too) is carrying the plague. It is clear that historically people knew that the rodents died before people died when there was a plague.⁸ On a naturalistic level this makes sense as well because there is an army on the move and there is a siege so the rats are looking for food.⁹

Sancheirev returns to Ninveh – lives for a few years and is then killed by his children.

There are now 2 different stories that end of the narrative here. First of all they say that Chizkiahu became ill in those days. In the Gemarah this is a story about Chizkiahu not having children. This is problematic if we assume this is happening in the campaign because Menashe will not have enough time to hit 12 by the end of Chizkiahu's reign. One can say that **בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם** isn't literal and it is earlier in his reign. But no matter what we probably have to say this because there is a difficulty with his extra 15 years. Chizkiahu davens and Yishayah answers that he will live and the city will be saved from Ashur. The sign is that the time will come back. There is then a Mizmor Tehilim that Chizkiahu says when he finds out he will live. This is a common theme that the dead cannot praise God – this works with the idea in Halachik man that the dead cannot praise God. This incident is found in Melachim earlier.

In Melachim it is a little better because Chizkiahu asks for a sign. The Abarbanel claims the version in Melachim is superior and then they use this Nevuah to fill out the story. Amos Chacham says in our Sefer how Chizkiah will be saved is not that important for us.

Chizkiahu receives a message from Melech Bavel and they come to wish Chizkiah well because he recovered from his disease. Bavel is clearly not a big fan of Assyria and they would like this alliance. He is very happy that his fame has reached so far that they hear about him in Bavel. Yishayah asks Chizkiah what did they see? He replies that I didn't leave anything back from them. Yishayah says that this wealth will

⁸ There are 2 books in the last year for anyone who is a bubonic plague fan

⁹ This then doesn't work out that great – but it is interesting.

all go to the kings of Bavel – and your descendants will be unich in his court. Chizkiah answers well this is good at least there will be peace in my time.

This is very problematic – how can Chizkiah die in peace if everything else will be destroyed? Amos Chacham it does mean something that at least in the short run things will be good. It is important to realize, as important as the long run might be the short run is important as well. In Divrei haYamim it assumes we know the story and it says that it alludes to this incident as a Nissayon.