

7 of Tre Asar

Rav Shalom Carmy

- Micah should be discussed at the same time as Yeshayahu
- Theological - primary focus of our study is Dvar Hashem as opposed to grammar or history of ancient near east - Jewish theological reading: attention to chazzal and mepharshim
- literary - we read Tanakh with at least as much of the attention we pay to general literature - pay attention not just to content but also to what really is important to the text - what is said between the lines - we pay attention to this in real life - important interview, did the interviewer say this in a certain way? When we read Tanakh, we give it the same attention as we do for a serious conversation
 - not poetics just as an adornment, but as a means of communicating messages
- secular scholarship - important for understanding the history of the period, as well as hebrew word translation which ancient texts can help with
- we are living in western culture - that some- in every gan eden there is a serpent and if you want to overcome the serpent it might be useful to understand something about a kind of psychology ~ Rav Lichtenstein
- Very often, the best commentary on Tanakh is Tanakh - can explain puzzling passages - יום ה' - Nevuot about Edom
- Rav Eliezer of Beaugance - Rav Yosef Kara (younger contemporary of Rashi)
- Tre Asar
 - Canonized in Bayit Sheini by the Anshei Knesset Hagedolah
 - first chronologically is Hosea, Amos is third, Yona is also around the 8th century BCE, Micah is a little after Hosea Amos and Yona, then Tzeephania, then Chabakuk - so it pretty much seems to be in order except for Yoel which is second and Ovadiah is fifth even though there is no indication of date and they will be dated very late for Rav Carmy - Abarbenel: the Neviim are chronologically ordered
 - Some want to read them all as one work which develops certain ideas throughout and thus darshin smichut parshiot - Chazzal seem to pay attention to the order of

the perakim in Tehillim - we certainly say this by Tehillim - or, it could be that modern scholars just have to publish so they say things like this

- Yona
 - Ninvei is capital of Assyria
 - says nothing about when Yona lived
 - Melakhim bet perek 24
 - Yerovam ben Yoash - he was wicked, yet successful - how could he have been successful - passuk says he was successful because of the words of Yona the Navi from Gat Cheifer because God saw the misery of Israel - in other words, God gave Israel this success out of Rachmanus - kidvar Yona Ben Amitai (interesting I think because Yona is all about din and can't understand Rachamim.) Pshat is that they did not deserve it, but God gave it to them anyway
 - Assyrians are an important power in the ancient near east at that time
 - in 722 they destroy the northern kingdom
 - after Yerovom be Yoash dies everything goes down hill as Assyria gains power
 - So when Yona is speaking about ninvei, he is speaking about the capital city of the empire which 30-40 years later destroys the northern kingdom - in his time, their threat was not yet obvious
 - Most Neviim have superscriptions with dates attached, which kings were ruling, etc. but Yona begins with no date, perhaps that is because we can figure it out based on Melakhim bet
 - Why don't we hear what their sin is? Literary question
 - Reporter's question: What is there sin?
 - In Noach, Ninvei is described as העיר הגדולה, so anyone reading Yona should know that this phrased appeared in Chumash
 - You could read all of sefer Yona without knowing where ninvei is - you would not know that it is part of an empire - like someone can write about New York without emphasizing that it is part of the United States - New York is the financial capital of the USA but not the political capital - Paris is the center of everything, as is

London - United States was not built that way, the capital was built a little away from everything

- God tells Yona קום and then ויקם Yona sets up the expectation that he will go to Ninvei and he does not - that's much of literature, we expect and then our expectations are disappointed
- אניות תרשיש ועציון גבר is mentioned in Tarshish - so there was a point where ships were wrecked near Eilat
 - Tarshish might be related to the greek word Talisos which means ocean - so it is somewhere across the ocean - he wants a long sea voyage - to go far away
- If he is a navi, then how could he think that he can run away - standard answer: perhaps he believes he can escape Nevuah once outside of Israel - Mechiltah DR Yishmael says this in Parshat Bo - Moshe wants to go outside of the city to daven to God - Gemara in Moed Katan 25 says that generally Neviim do not have Nevuah in Chutz Laaretz unless they start in Eretz Yisrael
- Why did he run away? Why wasn't he willing to do what God told him to do
 - Approach 1 - derived from Chazzal - Yona was not willing to encourage the people of Ninvei to do Tshuva because it looked bad for the Jews - Gemara in Pesachim - Yona tava kevod haben and not the av - it was more important to him to make the Jews look good, than to obey God - Ninvei's Tshuva would be embarrassing for the Jews who were not doing Tshuva - Jews are the chosen people who get Neviim day in day out, and they don't do tshuva, whereas Ninvei gets a Navi to say four words and they do intense Tshuva - Luke makes this comment in the new testament
 - Approach 2 - Abarbenel - if Yona goes to Ninvei and the people of Ninvei do Tshuva, then who is going to destroy Malkhus Yisrael - the Assyrians! - if they don't do Tshuva and they rot in their own corruption and are destroyed, then there will be no one to help Am Yisrael - so Yona was trying to subvert not just God's command, but God's whole plan
- Dean Berger - if you take a big jar of jelly beans and have people guess how many beans are in the jar, Yeshayahu won't have an advantage
- Why does God have to destroy Ninvei? Just hold out the anger 40 years longer and punish them only then - If my surgeon is convicted for a capital crime, if I could put it off, then I would so I can have surgery - but apparently

God would not do that - or if their crime was a lack of justice, then there is no way to prevent its self destruction - if you are a drunkard and your liver is gone, then there is no rachamim which is going to save you - just like the mabul was chamas, social injustice, so too was ninvei's sin, so their society was going to self destruct - but it weakens the abarbenels argument that the text does not emphasize that Ninvei is part of Ashur

- Rav Saadiah Gaon in Emunot VeDeot - Yona was concerned for Kevod Shamayim because he would tell them to repent, they would not get punished and then it would seem like the Nevuah was baseless - others say that Yona was concerned about his own Kavod
 - Rav Soloveitchik - does it really make sense to say Yona was concerned about God's kavod so much that he decided to disobey God?
- Each of these approaches was its weakness, but the passuk says none of these
 - is there a reason that no reason is given? reading the pshat, we are not thinking about why he ran away
- 1/28
 - Two reasons Yona ran away - concerned about Am Yisrael, or concerned about God - either way, it seems like disobedience, but they make Yona's actions more understandable
 - literary point of view - should be a) true and b) what the text is saying - these opinions may be very true, but they are not pshat in the text
 - news reel - hitler is petting a dog - I might say look it shows he is manipulative etc. but that might not actually be why he is petting the dog
 - why doesn't the passuk tell us more?
 - Why mention that he bought a ticket? Biographies documenting an important day in someone's life would not mention that the person payed for his subway ticket
 - Pirkei DiRebbi Eliezer - edited late - after Islam came into being - doesn't have a clear cut theme - not on one particular sefer - there is a long chapter dealing with Yona - Radak quotes most of what we would want to know from there
 - says on here - he payed for the entire boat - Rav Carmy: Pshat is really that he was so eager to get away, he just ran and payed up - if you go out of your way to say that, it means he was nervous, he wanted to get out of there - if you are an escaping fugitive, you are going to be there at five in the morning, you

exaggerate it to make it more dramatic in midrashim, midrashim often brings you back to pshat - on a pshat level it means he was very eager to get away - paying for the whole boat is not as odd as you might think - shipping schedules in the Biblical period - generally, these boats were not there for passengers, why then would they take a boat? (It wasn't like a boat cruise today for the fancy) They stayed very close to the shore - so why go by boat at all? To ship merchandise because it's heavy - so shipping is commercial - you move on when you get more cargo, until then you stay put - so it makes sense to pay extra for an early get away - a bystander might wonder why he is in such a hurry - medrish is also making this point - he is anxious in such a way that it is noticeable - not many people then would just get in a boat for a voyage. (Yehuda Goldfetter: maybe that is why he seems to be the only passenger while everyone else is מלאכים, (sailors?))

- Moby Dick - Captain obsessed with a whale - before they leave to hunt, they go to church and hear a sermon from a pastor on Yona from a former sailor - "what a pregnant lesson" "guilty eyes" no cargo - no hat box - no friends - struggles to look confident - wretched smile - "Jack, he's robbed a widow"
- Medrish seems to capture both that he is eager to get away and that others are suspicious
- Many things are גדול in Yona
- throw off furniture: assumption - the lighter the boat, the better
- goes inside the boat - not a great place - drown faster there than if you were on deck - not exactly what we would think of as a situation where someone would go to sleep, but policeman would tell you that a sign of a guilty person is going to sleep - they are able to relax -
- ולא נאבד - reminds of a few psukim in Chumash (?)
- Sailors: Very much dependent of chance - so they tend to think in these terms - like ballplayers and gamblers - from point of view: assuming they read what I've read - Halakha, to what extent can we rely on Goral
- פשוט - they cast lots and it fell on Yona
 - Midrahs - they did multiple goralot - why the change? A Goral will always choose one person - but if you do it over and over and the same person is tapped ten times in a row then that person really is guilty - the sailors were not

will to scapegoat Yona based on just one trial - who else should they tap? He looks suspicious anyway - he is a stranger, no one's friend, if you throw him overboard, no one will notice - murderers try to go after people who are completely isolated - etinburrow 1830s - wanted dead bodies so he could use them in medical school - it was against the law - med schools hired people to dig up graves for them - etinburrow had a lodging - an old man died there, so they brought the dead body to the med school - the cadaver was fresher than it would be from a grave, so they got more from it - so they started finding people who had no connection, no one who would care, and they would bring them to the hotel and that would be that - the word to "Berk" in the dictionary

- They don't straight out accuse him, just say to him, "do you have anything to say on the subject?" You want to get someone to talk, you try to relax that person first
- Does Yona answer the questions in order? Last question is his first answer, connects it directly to his religion - and that God created the sea and dry land - pagans may have thought at that time that gods specialized - Who thought that the God of Israel was localized - it is one way of reading Pharaoh - Ben Hadad King of Aram said that the God of Israel is אלהי הרים - Yona closes that door
- At this point, the sailors still have not been explicitly told why Yona was running away
- The sailors try to get back to dry land again before throwing Yona overboard - they are exceedingly patient
- Medrish - they saw other ships sailing by with no problem - it's the idea that they understood something unusual was going on
- very rare that Goyim should say sheim havayah - until now, they seem considerate, but now they seem even religiously healthy - Rambam: sheim havayah is God's personal name
- If he ran away because he did not want to help the Goyim, either way, whether he likes it or not, he ends up helping these Goyim
 - Graham Greene - has an image often of a person trying to break away from religion, but can't get away, like someone who is carrying a disease and no matter what he does keeps spreading it to other people
 - Yona is trying to suppress his nevuah, but whether he likes it or not, he is inspiring these sailors

- Sailors: אֶל־נָא נֹאבְדָה - similar to the language from before
- They don't just throw him into the sea, but they daven, try to go back - Medrish: they dip him and take him out - it really is pshat, but presented in an exaggerated way
- The sailors make nedarim - zevach - does not sound feasible to say that they had animals on the ship, so the simple pshat might be that they resolved to bring them
- so Yona ran away - we are not sure why - the sailors come across as good people both in pshat and in the way chazzal emphasize things - they are restrained instead of panicked and end up on the road to Giyur
- הדגה - the fish - generic - like the wood, fish in general
- Most don't pay attention to the tfillah of Perek Bet - but if you do, you have to wonder
 - Josephus - Jewish military leader - went over to the Romans, wrote several books in greek - History of Jewish War - Antiquities and Jews - he put together what he had available, made changes- shows us some of how Jews thought about Tanakh in the time of bayit Sheini - puts the tfillah after Yona emerges from the fish - could be he misremembered - or perhaps that seems to make more sense - being in a fish is not the most pleasant thing in the world - like working in a fish store, but way worse - the humidity, the acid - story quoted in Daat Mikra on Yona - originally printed in the Princeton theological journal - trying to show that Yona could be historical - story of a sailor who swallowed by a fish, they caught the fish and cut it up and found the man alive , but his skin and hair was completely white from the acid - so what was Yona praising God for?
 - In the real world, when a person prays from the heart, it is not limited to a certain amount of words, like a child who gets up at a play and says the few lines - so if someone was in a hospital and technically speaking could not daven because of what a hospital could be, especially if they are not cleaning out what they should - would you say, such a person could not daven in some way?
 - so what is he thankful for?
 - clearly a break after ה - the last two verses are about what Yona experienced

- I called out to God, God answered me - You cast men into the heart of the sea, the current surrounded me - I thought I was expelled, but I will yet again gaze at your presence - this is developed twice - once in ח-ג and then in ח-ו - true, its poetry, but the repetition is not exact - I am King Henry the Eighth - the words suggest this point - I am king henry the eight I am - at the end of the song Henry the eighth I am means that I am her eight henry, not the king - but that's not here - this is serious literature, but you still expect repetition to add something - it should deepen
- Repentance is absent - shouldn't Yona have done tshuva at this point for running away? Mobi Dick preacher fails to notice this
 - a cowardly person pleads for forgiveness - if you or I were swallowed by a whale, we would say oh please forgive me, I'll go to Ninve, but Yona does not do that - preacher says that real tshuva is taking your punishment like a man - if you are preacher to a bunch of sailors, you don't want to present in an effeminate kind of thing, but rather something you don't regret and just do what's right - google Rav Carmy and Mobi Dick to learn more
- Why is Yona thankful inside the fish instead of desperately pleading and why no tshuva - no willingness expressed to go to ninvei
 - many have avoided these questions like Josephus by placing the tfillah after Yona emerges
 - Mobi Dick - if you had to make a choice between being remorseful (which does not determine your future) more important is to resolve to do better
 - ignores the most important issue of obeying God in the future
- How does the second stanza add to the first - good poetry is not merely repetition
- nahar means current - not river
- the assumption here is that mountains go down to the sea
- often in Tanakh things are repeated in the opposite order - Ibn Ezra points this out often explicitly in Yoel - this is called chiasmic structure - in German it is pronounced Kee'ahzmoos
- direct parallelism is also done sometimes abab
- why do chiasmic opposed to direct

- conventions are used for real purposes not just an adornment - it does make it more aesthetic so why not - but here, why begin with tfillah and end with tilla - poets often have a good reason why they begin where they begin and end where they end - could be it was important for the start or for the end - When you write a composition, the first sentence has to hit the reader right between the eyes - how you open is important - he also said the last sentence is important this professor said - he was correct - that's how you write - if it's chiasmic then you are mechanical how you begin and end - so it serves an element of content - he wants tfillah to play an important role
- begins saying G-d is the agent, but fails to mention that the second time
 - get drunk hurt someone and pay for the hospital bills - bad because you put me here in the first place or good because you paid my bills - so Yona might not really repent - he likes God to help him, but he does not like to think of God as ordering him to do something he does not want to do
- connection to תהילים קז
 - the dinnim of Birkhat HaGomel are from there - one of the dangers is בים באניות
 - what makes something a parallelism
 - scholars have a mania towards parallelism - but now they are skeptical - how do you really know - is someone imitating another person who cried out or just crying out - if you say please stop it, are you imitating someone else 200 years ago who said that or just saying please stop it because it makes sense - if you say something unusual then it could be parallelism
- which section is more severe
 - ו-ח - the language seems to be more extreme - not just drawing, but closed in on - makes sense, you move mikal lichomer - in a crescendo - it doesn't make sense the other way (i was drawing, closed in upon, and I didn't feel too well either - this way builds up the tension - it's how people speak and how poetry works)
- Malbim - doesn't seem to be pshat - according to Chazzal, the medrash, Yona is identified with the child Eliyahu brought back to life (maybe pirkei DiRebbe Eliezer) יונה בן אמיטי ואליהו is a book that explores this connection from מכללה - Medrash makes this point because of their personalities and it is possible - but if you really ride that medrash and make a big deal out of it, then this is not the first time Yona faced death, so Malbim thinks there are two stanzas because the first is Yona

reminiscing about the first time he died and the imagery of water is a metaphor - explains why Yona is thanking God and not pleading, then passuk 6 on describes the present - clever, but assumes something which is not made explicit in the pesukim - but Malbim seems to be noticing the same issues as Rav Carmy

- But why does Yona thank instead of pleading (if you don't learn like the Malbim?)
 - Simplest answer: אין הכא נמי - not a kashe, but an observation - inside the fish is not a pleasant place to be - for Yona, the fish is a kind of solution - what's the alternative? Drowning! As long as he is in the fish, he is not drowning. Whatever the objections are to being in the fish, it is still better than being dead.
 - Agnon: important writer - Klausner lived across the street, did not like each other - Klausner died, the street was renamed רחוב קלוסנר - he was upset until someone pointed out, isn't that better than the alternative (that Agnon would have died) - since then, Agnon died and the street is named rehov agnon - there are characters clearly modeled after Klausner
 - so not complete nonsense for Yona to be thankful that his life was saved
 - if he was swallowed by the fish, that means that God was still willing to save his life
 - if you were to ask Yona at this point, "do you believe you can stay in the fish forever? The answer would probably be no. If God says, "You are going out of the fish and I am sending you to Ninvei again." Yona could not really refuse, but probably would not want to agree either - probably would hope that God would let him out and then later forget about it - that happens in life. Logically it doesn't make sense - if God wanted it to begin with, then why would He forget about it
 - Years ago, someone did not show up to the exam, didn't think there was an exam - but every class has an exam! He responded I know, but I hoped against that
 - God saved him and is invested in him, so maybe...
 - Yona does not do Tshuva because he is not committing
 - in 1983 the chancellor of Germany was supposed to visit Israel, but it was somewhat awkward given how Menachem Begin expressed his view about Germany's past - Begin resigned 2 days before the visit - the visit was canceled and rescheduled - אתה רואה גם הבעיה הזאת נפטרה - had he been

prime minister, it would not have been enough for him to resign - its like an exam you didn't prepare for, you know you are going to have that surgery, but you put it off, maybe there will be no need for it. Maybe you'll die and there will be no need for it. But eventually, you can't put it off. People work that way. So maybe that is why he didn't do tshuva

- Billy Graym - wonderful evangelist - Just the other day, I was standing at a ... and a man came up to me and said Billy, I drink, gamble, and womenize, and I am alive, how do you as a christian explain that - and that man was walking with a cane, trembling and not able to walk - how old are you? Billy, I'll be 26 next week. Billy, I don't feel so well. I'm goign to a club for a carbinated beverage. Half an hour later, he was dead.
- he spoke to George W Bush and got him to stop drinking when he was young
- scholars say this has nothing to do with Yona - you have a story and someone wanted to adda mizmor becaue you like to add tfillot - for little kids tfillot may be boring - for a little kid, the romance in westers are boring, you want to see more action - lihavdil but similar - some bayit sheini writers put tfillot into Megillat Esther to make it more spiritual - what did Esther say, what did Mordechai say - and that is why it is thanksgiving and nothing about Ninvei - Rav Carmy's interpretation can work but what about heichal kodshecha, fits in hallel בתוככי בית ה' - but apparently, for Yona, the Heichal is important - he ran awy from Israel, but spiritually he belongs there, he dreams of overcoming that difference - tells you something about him - he is pious - it was a real sacrifice for Yona to leave the heichal - in more recent scholarly writing, there has been more of an effort for a united reading - why use the word נגרשתי? That would be for kicking someone out of a building. If someone wanted to be in oxford is whole life but now is being kicked out. But for someone pleaing for his life - On the other hand תהילים לא - Dovid says I thought I would die and I would be cut off נגרזתי, but I prayed to you and you responded to me - in Yona, we get essentially the same passuk with an important change. In place of נגרזתי you have נגרשתי - sounds similar - similar roots - change of one letter which makes it go from routine to sounding odd - what does this change signify - If we are talking about someone for whom the worst possibility is being separated from the Beis Hamikdash, then he would use נגרשתי and not נגרזתי - the lashon he uses makes sense

- What does מְשֻׁמְרֵי הַבְּלִיָּה mean - clearly people who do avodah zara who follow the wrong direction - what about יַעֲזֹבוּ חֶסֶד - usually means kindness - so the מְשֻׁמְרֵי הַבְּלִיָּה really are untrustworthy in their chessed - even when they commit themselves to good things, they cannot be relied on - Rashi reads that way - so Yona is saying to God, don't trust the Ovdei Avodah Zara, but trust me when I say I will offer korbanot
- Ibn Ezra thinks chessed means excessive transition - the Torah says חֶסֶד הוּא by the Arayos - Rashi there is VaYikra says that marrying one's sister is חֶסֶד because it means loving kindness and it refers to the kindness God extended to the first human beings which allowed humans to get off the ground - Ibn Ezra says it means excess and that is describing the issur - Rambam says that it means excess for good or bad - so excess tzidkus is beyond the call of duty but not good the other way - seems similar to the Rambam - our passuk - the ovdei avodah zara will abandon their abominations - they will do Tshuva - opposite of Rashi (people who seem to do tshuva are really not, or people who seem bad are really capable of tshuva)
- כִּי אִם הָיָה קוֹנֵן - if there is a connection between these two mizmorim - then it supports Rashi - שְׁנֵי הַבְּלִיָּה - Ibn Ezra would have to say that they are just two separate people who are expressing different views. The mizmor has ש, מ, ר and הַבְּלִיָּה which
- הַבְּלִיָּה is something which is empty - שוֹא is something which is false - "worthless vanities"
- Rashi seems closer to pshat
- Why is Yona talking about these הַבְּלִיָּה? How does this fit in the context of Yona? Who are the שְׁנֵי הַבְּלִיָּה? Maybe Anshei Ninvei - they seem to repent, but does not really count for anything. Also, the sailors. Until last week, they seem to be nice people - but Yona is saying, yah, but they are not going to last
- Rashi is working from Pirkei DeRebbe Eliezer - For Rav Carmy, this makes sense - Yona does not want to go to Ninvei still.
- so scholars would say this is a mizmor which is not about Yona and someone just threw in - but if I was putting in filler I would have put in קִלְט - Where can I escape from you? I go across the seas. If I wanted a good mizmor which would express a good message - you can't run away from God is the message - but

for Rav Carmy's sheetah, we understand why it is this mizmor instead of קלט - Yona really does not want to go to Ninvei, and he does not want to present the sailors as exemplars of piety

- for Ibn Ezra, Yona is ending on a more positive note. Might not be simplest pshat in the word chessed - it means Yona is recognizing that whatever his intentions may be, he is bringing people closer to God - He can't help influencing people towards יראת שמים - running away from God, yet still bearing the Divine message to the people even though he is trying not to
- The scholars would say that these are generic psukim which you could put into a variety of mizmorim - in many mizmorei Tehillim you have contrast between the good guys and bad guys - first perek in tehillim על כן, - even better known passuk - שומר ה' את כל אוהביו ואת כל הרשעים ישמיד - the scholars would say this is the same thing - Rav Carmy in response would say, alright, but go through Tehillim. Every time you find this contrast in Tehillim there is one of two situations - either the wisdom psalm, which are mizmorim which talk about what the world is - what the world is about - the first mizmor is like that - the speaker is not asking for anything or discussing his personal situation - just saying that the way the world is is this way. You want to understand the world? Tzaddikim are better off. Ashrei is a wisdom psalm. Its about how the world is. If you want to explain how the world is, at some point you have to include the Resha'im - the other type of mizmor is where the speaker in the mizmor has enemies - bad guys, he is suffering - cries out against the oppressors - המיזמור הבלי שוא לא - the Yona mizmor does not fit either - so there something unusual about these last two pesukim in this mizmor - it is particular to Yona, something about bringing Resha'im closer to God - struggling against Anshei Ninvei - so it fits Yona- he is saying, even if they do repent, it is not for real
- in Moby Dick, it would seem that there is no continuation of the sefer, but in Tanakh we have two more perakim

- Perek 3

- Gemara in Yevamot - God spoke a second time - and not a third time. That is why the Gemara edits out the nevuah that is mentioned in Melakhim to Yeravam - pshat is that he is referring to the two Nevuot in Sefer Yona
- nevuah - someone sent to send message to people - Daniel a navi or not? Not in Neviim - does not have a message to deliver to the people - Divrei Kabbalah

means from Neviim - Reb Chaim - Kivalah: complaining - delivering messages - not necessarily pshat in Chazzal

- Dag Daga

- pshat is that in Egypt the דגה stank
 - Chazzal say that he first was in a male and did not daven (Chazzal noticed that Yona did not pray until the third day - similar to how Rav Carmy noticed that he did not pray in the proper way - Chazzal are onto this) they say he had to go to a female fish so that it would be more crowded because of the eggs and so he was less comfortable
- text switches from ויאמר to וימן - appointing the fish to speaking to the fish
- end of cheilek 2 in moreh nevuchim - Rambam says that God does not directly relate to animals - animals cannot have nevuah so ויאמר ה' does not mean ה' spoke to the fish, but rather God ordained that the fish should do that - this is what we would expect from Rambam to defuse an anthropomorphic term
 - but why did the Navi use that term anyway? If the fish swallowed Yona without אמר why did it need אמר to spit out Yona? What does the word ויאמר imply at a poetic level - more intimate - arranging for something to happen is less personal than saying it yourself
- If God is answer the prayer, why doesn't God speak to Yona - the point here seems to be, until Yona arrives on dry land, God does not speak to Yona, subtle snub here - I am upset at you, you try everything to make up, we meet in the street as you are walking the dog, and I talk to the dog instead of you -
 - Asidunda, Elliot - Sadistic passage, man humiliates his wife by petting his dog - only a really sadistic english ward behaves that way - tremendous scene - not going on here, but... God speaks to Yona and ignores the fish - intensifies our sense of alienation of God towards Yona
 - aside from this - in this perek there is a Navi and a fish - one obeys God, one does not - where else in Tanakh is there similar - Bilaam - he is a navi who looks for his own way to do what he wants to do anyway - how is brought up short - the malach appears to the donkey, not him - Chazzal: He claims to know daat elyon, but does not even see what the donkey sees - donkey says did I ever do anything to deserve this beating - Bilaam's answer is no in chumash - seems amusing - his donkey is talking and treats it normally - comic scene - woman

went to synagogue on Balak and when it came to this part - why are you beating me have I ever done anything to you - she was so moved she burst into tears and had to leave the room

- third case in Tanakh - Melakhim 1 perek 13 - navi from Yeuda went to speak to Yerovam - God said when you come back, don't speak to anyone on your way back - no interruption - but there was an old dried up Navi on his way who said God told me that you should have lunch at my home - while at the house he is told that since he disobeyed GOd his life was over - attacked my lion - found the lion standing there, had not eaten the navi - donkey was untouched - clearly the lion did this because it was sent to do it, not because it was hungry or upset - The lion did exactly what it was supposed to do - the lion obeyed, the Navi did not obey - its a notable pattern that fits what we said - whether or not the animals get schar is not the point, rather
- Rav Yosef Ibn Caspy - the first two perakim of Yona are allegorical - gets rid of scientific problem - but also theological problem - why did the fish swallow Yona - kriat yam suf makes sense - spectacular - brings home the message of triumph of Hashem over Pharoah - but this is less majestic - Sure, God can do it, but it is not God's minhag - God could arrange for your dog to be miraculously fed, but miracles only make sense within a certain frame work
- CS Lewis in Miracles - painter: certain rules for how painting should look - natural law - but a great painter might deviate - but will deviate at a point where it is really important - you don't simply violate conventions for no reasons
- with the exception of Yona and Elisha (who come off as chassidishe rebbes) they - so this takes care of that
- also takes care of the problem, how could Yona disobey - it was an allegory
- The Gra has a similar sounding opinion which belongs more in a class on Kabbalah - but there is a lot in kabbalah connected to the fish
- Perek 3
 - Sheinit - Gemara - Sheinit but not SHlishit - implies that GOd is annoyed at Yona
 - how do these words differ from Perek Aleph
 - Vayihyeh negative? Medrashim make something out of that word, but it will not work out going through Tanakh as a pashtan - that medrash is only relevant for the

pesukim mentioned in that medrash - sometimes the medrash is not doing scholarship, but making a point in a dramatic way

- In perek Aleph Yona is on his own - Yona seems to have a certain amount of freedom about what will happen - but now God says, you will do exactly what I tell you - not surprising given how Yona responded the last time
- Now the perek continues the way we would have expected
- Three days
 - Ninvei was excavated in the 19th century - it is not that big to take three days - but going through a city is different than going across it - Manhattan: going from north to south takes a couple of hours - but if you want to preech through manhattan street by street could take three days -
- why is Ninvei called עיר הגדולה לא-לוקים ?
 - reminds us of passuk in Noach
 - Most mepharshim says that לא-לקים is a term of exageration - it was a really great city - Radak says this - as does Ramban(?) That's simple pshat
 - Ibn Ezra: it was a city of great tzadikim - how does Ibn Ezra learn Nimrod that way? He does - the same way - he holds that Nimrod served God - against Chazzal - city of God fearing people
 - this would mean that the people of Ninvei were tzaddikim - why would God send a Navi to Goyim? Abarbenel would say as a tool to destroy am Yisrael - Ibn Ezra would say it is beacause they were better than other goyim - does the seffer ever mention that the anshei ninvei worshipped avodah zarah? No - they may have had other sins for which they had to do teshuvah - so for Abarbenel, why doesn't it mention that they served avodah zara - he would say it is a proof for his shittah - Yona was not sent to get rid of their Avodah Zara - if it was only a concern of Avodah Zara, then let nature take its course - but if it was injustice, chammas, then there is no room for mercy, such a society will collapse on its own - it cannot continue
 - ibn ezra sometimes gets his source wrong - mixes up medrashim and kara'ites - he wasn't sitting in Gottesman when writing his peirush - he was on the move

Tuesday, January 21, 2020

- Nehpechet - Rashi - could mean turned over destroyed, or turned over transformed - Rashi wants to make sure that everything the Navi says turns out true - the alternative is to say that Nevuot of that sort are always qualified - if they do tshuva it will be suspended - that seems to be simple pshat
- Anshei Ninvei Immediately respond
- If you ever wore sackcloth you would understand why it is mourning clothes - not comfortable
- animals also fast and where sackcloth
- how does Ibn Ezra make sense given that Assyria was a pagan nation - maybe this was one instance of piety in their history given that in Tanakh they are generally bad - Assyriologists may tell you that they were more monotheistic, but still they would say don't put too much weight on that chiddush - Ibn Ezra was not an Assyriologist
- Mishna in Taanit - routine for fasting- in the afternoon they get mussar - examples of that mussar - first example is from Yona - elder says to the people - it does not say that God saw their sackcloth and fasting, but rather, God saw their actions - the mishna is quite willing to use these pesukim as a model for how people should be
 - Parallel Tosefta - reference to Ninvei disappears - could mean nothing or something
 - Yerushalmi in Taanit - Reish Lakish: people in Ninvei did a deceitful tshuva - they separated the animals from their mothers and they cried out, if you have no mercy on us, then we have no mercy on them - they seem to be holding the animals hostage to force God to relent - theatrical tshuva - Reish Lakish could not deny that God saw their actions - but there are also the pesukim before, does not see the whole scene of tshuva as genuine - rather he reads the pesukim as displaying something phony - why the shift from the mishna to the Yerushalmi
 - Professor Urbach - Reish Lakish's comment is driven by polemical factors - New Testament says that Jesus said that Ninvei did Tshuva right away, but the Jews did not - in the time of the Mishna, they were not so concerned about christianity - the tosefta was already aware of the issue so was silent - Yerushalmi was worried at that point
- another argument in support he adds - Reish Lakish appears in Yerushalmi - put in the mouth of an Eretz Yisrael amora - but not in the Bavli - why? In Eretz Yisrael christianity was a major challenge - but first perek of chullin says there

were no minnim in Bavel - no christians there - protect against christian polemic that non Jews can be good

- 1) does this really help us with pshat? 2) Is the article compelling?
- How many sources support Urbach? One - just the Yerushalmi - Historically speaking, it may not be compelling to build so much off of one statement - we can also dispute that nothing similar is in the Bavli - argument from silence - silence doesn't necessarily mean anything - there is more agaditah in Bavli, than Yerushalmi - but more amoraim in aggaditah are Yerushalmi Amoraim -
Urinbacher אגדות אמוראים - anthologies of aggadot with discussion - the eretz Yisrael are four small volumes - the Bavli Amoraim got only one volume that was never translated
- If you would ask, why is there no medrash on Esther in Chullin - that's not what its about - so argument from silence is not so great - there is also a Bavli in Taanit who quotes Shmuel who is a Bavli Amora, which says that the Tshuva of Ninvei was such that they returned מריש שגזול - stolen board - the din in the mishna is that if you steal wood and build it into that building, you have to require the destruction of the house to return the board - but that is unrealistic, people will probably rather not repent at all, so even though min Hadin it is required, it is impractical for a society to operate along orderly moral lines - so they were so frum that they returned מריש שגזול - maybe a criticism that their tshuva was the kind of tshuva one would do when one is desperate, but not the kind of tshuva which enables that to be part of everyday life
- If Reish Lakish is not pshat in the passuk, then why would someone come up with such an explanation - if it is good pshat, then there is no reason to raise an eyebrow - GW had wooden teeth - even though it is true, do you really have to say it? It might even lead people to have less respect for him!
 - so is there really evidence of polemic - maybe - second question: if it is pshat then at least he has an excuse for saying it
 - so what did animals do in those days in terms of fasting? Modern context: if you had a day of fasting and you put sackcloth on an animal, people would laugh - why is the animal at fault, but was it as funny to them as it is for us? We have a case in Apocrepha Judith where Jews do this - Assyrians (probably euphemism for persians) town is attacked, starving, ready to give up - Judith says, "Don't give up. God is testing us." She goes to general - sweet talks him, gives him blintzes - (story was known to baalei tosfos - so we have a

minhag on channukah - it was known) - she then kills him - they then include the animals in the fast- presented as positive tshuva, not negative like Reish Lakish reads it in Yona - Judish may not be historical, but it may have been copied from Yona - the author may have borrowed some color from Yona - Other cases: Breisheet Rabbah, Egyptians dressed their animals in mourning when Yaakov died, so it is not something ridiculous - Heroditus: when one persian king died, they dressed the animals in mourning - doesn't mean the animals do tshuva - in america this would sound ridiculous, but maybe not, At president kenedy's funeral, his horse was dressed in sackcloth

- Rambam - no schar viOnesh for animals - Rashba: no room for debate about this
- if the king just does what the people are doing anyway, what makes him a king? "Very good, keep on doing it." Rather, he has to come up with his own addition so that you are not just doing it on your own, but officials are getting you to do it.
- Who knows? Maybe God will relent - Implies uncertainty on the part of the king - implies humility on the king's part
- First perek - Yona and the sailors
- Second Perek - Melvil said it could have been the end of the book - but we don't hold like him - stop at the end of perek 3 - its a story of tshuva - mishna in Taanit does not go beyond perek 3 - that is sufficient to give us encouragement on Yom Kippur - ask majority of poskim and ask why we read Yona on Yom Kippur, the answer would be, in order to show us that Tshuva is possible, desireable and so forth - this is the answer of the nosei keilim on Shulchan Aruch - for this up until end of perek 3 would be sufficient
- Perek Four
 - Rav Eliezar Beganzgi - why did Yona take a sea voyage? He was an old man so he took a boat instead of a donkey - but that's not pshat - pshat is that he was running away from God - you don't get to Ninvei by boat -
 - some later rishonim after Rashbam osolate from radical pshat to radical drush - you can't read them the same way as Rashi - so we can dismiss him (to learn more, read the intro to Rav Behanzgi peirush to Yechezkel and trei Asar)
 - or say that what he really means that there is no evidence that Yona would really have said that he was running away from God had you asked him - maybe he

would have said, "I am taking my time." - delaying fulfilling a nevuah is different than rebelling - in real life, sometimes we put things off because they are unpleasant and maybe we hope that if we delay it long enough God will forget about it, or change his mind - so maybe Rav Beganzgi captures an important psychological insight - just the opposite of what he should be - of Avraham's וישכם אברהם בבקר

- So Yona might have said he was taking his time, but his psychologists would have said, ok but you are really just avoiding your task
- so it didn't have to be a boat ride, it could have been, I'll do it after my nephew's bar mitzvah
- we still don't know why Yona is unhappy because we don't know pshat in perek 1
- I ran away because you are ...רחום וחנון - until now, the text didn't give us a reason, so we had others - but at least they made sense - but now the text gives us a reason that seems odd
- if he really wanted to die - he could have committed suicide -halakhic problems - and psychologically, just because one is ready to die, doesn't mean one is ready to commit suicide - suicide is hard work
- he seems to have wanted to die before as well - he went down to the bottom of the boat and just slept there - sounds like someone who is depressed, yet does not commit suicide - one needs some energy to commit suicide which is often lacking when depressed - he does not jump off the boat, but tells others to throw him off
- Rav Carmy knows people who have done this - they want to die, but they did not actively kill themselves because that's not how they were brought up, they were old and sick - so they just stop eating - they don't go at it with a passion
- Dorothy Parker
 - razors pain you - are damped - acids stain you - drugs cause - guns aren't lawful - nooses give - gas smells awful - you might as well live
- many said they would leave Israel if Netanyahu was elected, yet they didn't - same with Trump and Canada
- 13 middot are quoted a few times in Tanakh - Moshe is the first to quote it and he leaves out a few words - also happens in Neviim and Ketuvim

- here one can say that Emet is not such a pleasant word if one is a sinner - so Yona is focusing on the softer aspects - that is fairly pashut - in all these places in Tanakh we should look - we also do this, we stop before לא ינקח - Rosh in fourth perek of Rosh Hashana - Lebovecher Rebbe has a piece on the various ways of interpreting the 13 middot
- The Ribbono Shel Olam may have had the same problem we did of not being sure why Yona was upset - alternative Pshat: why are you upset about me being good? Chossom Sofer
- moves to Hashem Elokim
 - appoints a kikayon - וימן is parallel to dag
 - symmetrical - Yona confronts sailors who repent - Yona confronts Ninvei and they repent - God appoints fish and Yona prays - God appoints kikayon and Yona prays to God
 - Kikayon - either a gourd or a castard plant
 - history of christian interpretation there is a big nafka minah - greek translation translates it one way- when Jerome translated it to latin directly from hebrew, he differed from the greek - one day a priest translated it in a drasha and did it from the Jerome - makhloket in the congregation - like a child when you change one word in a bed time story, they go wild - so there was a riot and the whole church service broke up - some of the christians went to the Jews, they saw what was going on and they gave contradictory messages to do things different - Saint Augustine wrote to Jerome that you see what happens when you make new translations, clearly the greek was ruach hakodesh - like makhloket academics and hashkafics who are interested in ideas
 - Dick Gregory's Bible story - he translates it as castor - to hint that YOna should take castor oil and purge himself - if he cleaned out his system, he would not be as depressed - he was into purging as purification
 - להציל - to provide shade and to save
 - but why did he need shade if he already had a succah - what God gave him was extra - he didn't really need, but there are circumstances where you want extra shade - pulling down the shade and turning on the ac
 - maybe symbolic gesture more than practical

- shift from Hashem Elokim to Elokim
- seems from continuation that the sun was so hot, the succah alone was not enough
- the first time seemed like psychological pain, now it is physical
- God is more specific in this time - are you upset BY THE KIKAYON
- They don't know right from left - they don't know what they are doing (off hand the significance of that is that they are more excusable, so God would not want to kill them - not that they were reshaim - so why did God want to kill them to begin with - God might have said, true לא אחפץ במות המת, so they did - Taanit, Zaken says, read Yona, it does not say God saw their sackcloth, but God saw their actions - Rav Carmy: but a parody mishna could end, but God responded to the fact that they were idiots, so on a Taanit people should become idiots, but there is not mitzvah anywhere to do that, even as an act of tshuva - Yona might respond: big difference - kal vachomer doesn't work - the kikayon never harmed anyone, but ninvei did something for which they deserved to be destroyed
- Perek 18 in Melakhim, Eliyahu confronts Neviiei Habaal followed by a massacre of Niviiei habaal - Izevel then sends a messenger saying I will kill you the way you killed them - Eliyahu is out in the desert and wants to die - says I am better off dead no better than my forefathers - sleeps under a bush - malakh comes, Eliyahu eats and drinks - he marches all the way to Har Sinai - goes to המערה - THE cave - the same cave where Hashem revealed to Moshe the 13 middot - Eliyahu says: I am a knai - Your children abandoned the brit - my life is in danger - response: go out on the mountain - great wind, Hashem not there, also noise, and fire - after all the thunder and the fire was a still voice of silence which is the presence of God - After all this he is asked the same question of what are you doing here? Hashem says, go back where you came from - Eliyahu is given three missions - annoint chazael as king of aram - elisha does as messenger - chazael will make war against Yisrael - second mission: annoint Yehu as king over Israel (this was also done by Elisha - annoint Elisha as a Navi instead of you - one way of reading this is that Hashem is giving Eliyahu the pink slip - you are no longer the Navi, you will be replaced by Elisha
- what are the similarities - Navi wants to die - he expresses that desire - God speaks to the Navi twice, once where he does answer and once where he does not

- in both cases, there is a failure of the prophetic mission - Yona does not resign, but he expresses unhappiness - so anyone reading these would make the connection - Yehoshua Bachrach wrote about this יונה בן אמיתי ואליהו - he drew these parallels and claimed that both are dealing with failed Neviim - Eliyahu went against God - God was pro rachamim and Eliyahu was not - so another very important parallel - they both insist about middat hadin opposed to midat harachamim - קנא קינתי - Eliyahu brings a drought against israel for three years, does not say that God brought that drought, it was a gezeira of Eliyahu - both against rachamim, both punished, excluded from Nevuah at a later point
- is his approach to Eliyahu self evident? There are some problems with it - it means reading Eliyahu in a slightly negative light - his strong argument from Chazzal is that in Pirkei Derebbe Eliezer it says God wrapped Eliyahu on the knuckles -they abandoned your Brit, so God forces Eliyahu to go to every bris to see that we are keeping the Brit - one can debate whether or not that is knockout point - Rav Binyamin Benedict - Rav near Chayfa - lamdan and scholar - very charismatic - gave a shiur and people enjoyed - women and children - Rav Carmy enjoyed it - well organized - his big thing was trying to show that every psak in the Rambam was based on the Gemara - published a book about רמבם and תלמוד where he implicitly attacks Bachrach - you have P D R Eliezer - but the mainstream - the nosei keilim on hilkhos mila - assume that Eliyahu appears at a brit for more positive reasons - don't take one maamar chazzal and make too much out of it - Rav Carmy - the fact that Eliyahu is sent to Har Chorev, to the same cave parallels Eliyahu to Moshe - that's a big kavod - Rav Carmy would say: assuming Bachrach is right, Chazzal say Yona was the child that Eliyahu reserected, so the comparison is there - but the comparison may not be as simple - what does Yona object to - I know you are merciful - he objects to midat harachamim - reads ki tissa and says I don't agree - Does Eliyahu object to middat harachamim? He says he is a קנאי - not exactly the same thing really - one is critisizing the way God chooses to be - but Eliyahu is not askinga kashe on the Ribbono Shel Olam, just saying he is a kanay - he seems to think that is a virtue - it has its downsides, but upsides as well- not telling the Ribono shel Olam what to do - not saying why did You relent visa vi achav, just I am a Kanay - a kanay is something to be - The Ribono Shel Olam may hold that with all do respect to kana'im, that is not what He is looking for in a Navi - that does not mean that he is rejected, Hashem might

still have great respect for Eliyahu - so you could say that Yona is trying to be something like Eliyahu, but it is not clear he succeeds in that - he ends up being sharper than a kanai - comes across as a complainer opposed to someone who affirms a certain outlook

- Recent view which takes this discussion without mentioning it explicitly - but takes it in a new direction - Eliyahu is being replaced by Elisha, but Eliyahu is still functioning for a few perakim - why isn't he replaced immediately - Rav Carmy at first would think ok, so he is on the way out, he still has things to do - like a sitting duck - Rav Elchanan Samet: teaches in Malei Adumim (also wrote works on Talmud - best known for works on Parshat HaShavuah - also wrote on Eliyahu and Elisha - verbose, but if you want to study these topics its good - he quotes a lot of mepharshim - his book on Eliyahu: why assume Eliyahu did not get the message? Maybe the chapters after are not the chastised rebuked Eliyahu of Bachrach, but rather someone who was affected by the mussar
- It is clear to Rav Carmy that there is a Makhlokes God and Yona - what about the Kal Vachomer
- kikayon - maybe Yona appreciates it for the symbolic value - it means God did something for him - sometimes we appreciate that even more when it is something we don't absolutely need - you have a birthday as a child and your parents give you as a present a new pair of pants, its really not a gift - its a necessity - but if you get something extra that's not a necessity, they might appreciate that even more - someone took this course schav (made out of soral rass - stores ou can buy it today - highly salty, so maybe not recommended - eastern european people like it generally) Rav Carmy's mother's sister who lived in Boro Park was a very hard worker, lived alone - one day, it was very hot in the summer, Rav Carmy's mother made Schav, took two jars full, shlept to boro park, let herself in and put the two bottles in the fridge - When her sister came home and saw it - she lived 30 more years, mostly in a nursing home - paralyzed, all those 30 years, she never forgot about that Schav - she didn't need it - Kikayon came from nowhere - symbolism more than anything else - when Rav Carmy was sitting Shiva, multiple students said that I never met your mother, but I know that 50 years ago she shlept to Boro Park and gave her sister Schav - you never know how your actions will affect people 60 years later - the kikayon was not a necessity,

may have been symbolic more than anything else - he gets a simcha gedolah
- he does not even know that it is going to be a very hot day the next day

- Yona was concerned about the kikayon for emotional reasons, he wanted shade
- greedy for unnecessary shade, upset for having lost that limited benefit - for human we could say how much work you put into something might affect how much you care, but for God? Is it hard for God to create a city full of idiots? So now we read the kal vachomer not as a calculation of benefits but rather a more general point about the joy someone has in being - in creation - you took joy in something being in existence without constantly calculating, is it good or bad, did I deserve it or not deserve it? God does not justify Ninvei as something which is necessary for some plan, but rather ישמח ה' במעשיו - the basis of midat harachamim is a sense that God is in favor of the world, God is not neutral about the world existing or not existing, God is committed - God's view is not to justify the existence of Ninvei because they do tshuva, there is rather a new perhaps deeper concept of God being in favor midat harachamim of the world existing opposed to being blotted out - not about hard work, but rather an affirmation of being - the reference to all these people who are not great tzadikim or that God needs them to destroy Yisrael - that is not what is being said at the end of the sefer - animals make sense as well - humans animals, they are all creations of God - so the kal vachomer works at this point
- Reading like this, go back to the animals in perek 3 - we know the yerushalmi that the utilization of the animals in 3 implies something phony about it - but now we see the animals play a role in our reading - God saves also the animals - the difference between the people and the animals is not as great as we thought - so it ties in with the end of the ebook
- why is Yona read on Yom Kippur? Its because you see the power of tshuva (nosei Keilim) - One rishon adds something - a talmid of the Rashba who is like Rabbeinu Bachyeh - drashot on the parsha - R Yehoshua ben Sheleib - drasha on Yom Kippur- at the end gives two reasons why we read Yona on Yom Kippur - second reason - to show that God wants tshuva - perek 3 tells you God accepts Tshuva - but the additional chiddush is to teach us that God seeks out and likes tshuva - we get that when we see there are considerations more than getting what one deserves, but that God takes pleasure in Tshuva

- Yoel

- Yoel

- Yoel
 - No dating - no king mentioned
 - christians have 3 perakim - we have four
 - first two perakim - invasion and famine
 - what's the relationship between the first and second perek? Attack of locust and rescue from locust
 - last two perakim are invasion of an enemy into Yerushalayim which also ends well
 - what is important about this invasion that it fits into Tanakh
 - dating
 - locust - when was there locust - don't know - ok, so when was there famine - locust and famine go together like horse and carriage - Rashi quotes this view - but Rav Carmy is not convinced
 - Melakhim bet perakim 6 and 7 - northern kingdom - Yehoram, Achav's grandson - tremendous famine - really bad - so maybe tie these two famines together - 800 bce - north is destroyed 722
 - Why don't we have a king mentioned - maybe since the king was a rasha the navi did not want to mention his name
 - Seder Olam - in the time of Menashe - this would make it in malchut Yehuda and much later - famous as a rasha - model of a rasha - Seder Olam - his name is not mentioned because he was a rasha
 - saying this happened in the time of king x could just be information, but often in literature information carries more of a heavy load - if you say this poet published in the time of James Buchanan - that's somewhat of a dis - in the time of Lincoln - makes a much different impression because we admire Lincoln
 - Jed Updike - talented novelist - so worth reading - some has too much nivul peh and towards the end he felt responsibility to keep writing and repeats - Memories of the Ford Administration - if you have a novel taking place during the Ford administration, it can't be taken as so heroic people don't think of Ford with such thunder and lightning - you don't want to mention the name of the evil king in the beginning of a Navi

- Melakhim is different - bad kings are essential to the story - but you can skip William Harrison if it is going to detract from a book somehow - but if you write a book about Germany in the 30s and 40, it has to say Germany in the era of Hitler
- During Bayit Sheini - that's how we will hold - universal among academic scholars - despite that, probably true - no king is mentioned because there is no king - Chazzal don't mention him as living then in lists of Nevi'im during Bayit Sheini perhaps because it is not essential to the work - if a poet was heavily influenced by the civil war and wrote during the civil war... so Chazzal make a point of listing Chaggai during Bayit Sheini -
- Chazzal: Yoel is the son of Shmuel - why say this? Shmuel has a son named Yoel - Ibn Ezra: no reason to assume this is pshat - just because two people in Tanakh have the same name does not mean they are the same person - they are multiple Shmuels
- Perek נ
 - Four different kinds of locust, or synonyms - what one leaves over, the other will finish
 - one result of the locust in the shortage of wine - if you were a drunkard, that is something you would notice right away
 - nation with sharp teeth - comparing locust to army
 - in Shoftim with Gideon - it says the Mideanim encamped like locust
 - teeth: an army can have teeth, but that is not what you are afraid of - we don't realize what locust can do - they invade and in a few hours, an entire area can be desolate - stripped bare - they eat very quickly and come in large numbers
 - in Eretz Yisrael they generally come from the south - if there is a drought the locust don't have what to eat in Africa so they move on to Eretz Yisrael to look for food - the last time this happened was WW1, which was not a good time in general...
 - Abarbenel takes the passuk literally - teeth is the army - the comparison goes the other way - army is compared to locust - Assyrian army - minority Shittah
 - in the time of Chizkiyah (701 BCE) - the Assyrians invaded and were quite successful until they were not successful - close call - plague broke out

among the Assyrian troops, so they went home - we view this as a tremendous Yeshua - ויהי בחצי הלילה at the end of the seder - but it was not happily ever after post that salvation - the Assyrians continued to be very powerful - in Divrei Hayamim it says that Menashe was captured by the Assyrians -

- trees are turned bare -the locust can eat the bark so the trees turn white
- בית ה' - strongly indicates that the Beit Hamikdash was around at this time
- Now Kohanim as well as drunkards are upset - along with farmers and others
- Right now - the situation is not good
- Howard Goldman - humorist journalist- Only in America - made it very big - worked in a hat shop - one man there would sing the same Yiddish song over and over again - it meant, there will come a time when there will be nothing to eat- bad times are coming - but can we be more percise
- Why does the Nevuah begin with the drunkards - you want a good famine: Melakhim Bet says that when people are good and hungry, the price of a donkey's head was some extraordinary amount of money - the head is not the tastiest part of the donkey - you ahve to be very hungry to chew on that - a small amount of dove excrament was also very expensive - that's what it means to be desperate - says in Melakhim bet that the melech yisrael was walking by the wall of the city and a woman cried out to him - whats wrong - she said, me and my neighbor both had boys and decided that to survive, we have to eat them - so first I killed my son and we baked him, now she has hidden her son - she is not playing fair - melekh yisrael tore his clothing - that is what famine is like - here we talk about drunkards - why start there? If you want to show how terrible things are, do you start with the people who are down to only two three pounds of meat a day?
- There could be something satirical - starting with the people you have least respect for
- Could be figurative - the whole nation is drunk - conveys teh image of a whole society which is not sober - Alshich - so at least one traditional commentator was bothered by this point of beginning with the drunkard
- Satire - documentary about a famine - first interview you screen is a drunkard - how is this famine affecting you? Is that what you expect?

Unless its sarcastic or satirical - or it is talking about luxuries being cut off - otherwise it should start off like chumash and Melakhim with talking about eating children

- Rav Carmy: If we are starting with drunkards - what happens with a chronic drunkard who stops getting alcohol - DTs - delirious tremors - when people are drunk, it depresses the imagery - you don't dream - when the alcohol is gone they then have a lively imagination to point of going crazy - every smallest amount of light - they fantasize that there are pink mice running around the room - they exaggerate visual stimulus - a sensation - mild breeze - and they feel like there are ravenous insects across their skins - Lost Weekend - movie about alcoholic who suffers withdrawal and has DTs - someone drank too much and friends took him to see this movie - guy was so harrowed by what he was on the screen that he never went to a movie again but kept on drinking - this helps us see how they can imagine the locust with sharp teeth etc. as part of their DTs.
- Geffen Suffers, Te'edah suffers, and trees are stripped bare - is this where we would start? OK, so it's not describing mothers eating babies, but is this still what we would expect? The important food stuff is grain! Why not talk about grain? Start from fruits??? When you think about starvation, you think about grain
- Malbim - the tree being stripped of bark flows into the next imagery - makes sense in his setting - in cold climates, the fruit tree can be attacked and then you cover the tree to protect it against predators - you see this in Florida when the weather is cold, citrus growers put blankets on trees - so this fits the image of trees covered with sackcloth, so we should also be covered in sackcloth
- immediate effect is religious - again we could ask where are the staple things
 - seems to be focusing on the Beit Hamikdash - mincha nesekh, mishartei Beit Hashem
- What's missing? Who is not suffering? The people. Sure, in society most people are farmers, but he has not yet spoken about human beings in general - statistically maybe they are covered by the subgroups, but literally they are not - the idea of people starving, back to the documentary, after interviewing the drunkards, you go to various unions, kohein union, farmer union, but where are the people who are eating their children? - being drunk is not a sign of

being wealthy, rather, it is a sign of having nothing to live for - they want to be unconscious - politician in the 19th century was asked about his view on alcohol - well it depends, if by alcohol you mean deamon rum which destroys family and leads men to stay in the saloon leaving starving wives and children waiting for their return and when they do they beat their wives - but to what brings wit to a conversation and sparkle to your grandmother's cheek I am all for it - יין ישמח לבב אנוש vs. descriptions in Neviim about the wealthy being indifferent to the plight of the poor

- The word רעב is not used in these pesukim - הוֹבִישׁ שֶׁשׁוֹן מִבְּנֵי אָדָם - strange to say that what is missing during a famine - joy - life is not so fun - is that how do - you have a famine where you do not really see people starving and you don't see people as desperate as you might expect - as you find in Melakhim and Eicha
- Multiple Neviim talk about יוֹם ה' - what is it?
 - usual explanation - in the Biblical period in Eretz Yisrael, in the Ancient near east- the Jews believed in a day of God which would be good for the Jews and bad for their enemies - common terminology
 - but is yom Hashem really good for the Jews and bad for their enemies?
 - Amos 5 is the earliest reference to Yom Hashem probably
 - Woe onto those who want Yom Hashem - it is a day of darkness, not light - like someone who is running away from a lion and bumps into a bear, finally gets home, leans back against a wall and a snake bites him - its a dark day
 - hava aminah - Yom Hashem is good for Jews, bad for enemies - so they looked forward - Navi: not true that it is good for the Jews and bad for their enemies, really, it is bad for *reshaim* - popular image is fairly smug and Amos throws cold water on that
 - but in other Neviim, there are nevuot labeled Yom Hashem - is there one Yom Hashem, or many Yom Hashem? Shittah of woman in the subway: one Yom Hashem - there is one day of the Lord where everything is taken care of, some are rewarded and others will be very sorry- al pee pshat, no reason to assume that - you have a certain eschatology - then it makes sense to have one Yom Hashem - Professor Cassuto has an article on יוֹם ה' which

makes this point - appears that there are multiple 'ה' which mean different things

- Yoel's Yom Hashem - does not speak about famine, rather, loss of joy - everything is dry - locust plague and draught go together - the locust come because of a lack of water in general so they had nowhere to go
 - drought is discussed elsewhere in Tanakh - Yirmiyahu 14 - standing up on the hills of cliffs, animals are looking down to see any place where there is water, but they do not see any - here, the animals are dying of thirst, in Yirmiyahu, the people are also sent to look for water and they come back empty handed
 - (When we think about war, we tend to think about bloodshed, but really a lot of it is economic - army invades and they eat off of the land - this is how the Abarbenel would see it - the army themselves impoverished the land by eating much of the food - very important in military history - 30 years war - the army strips the land like locust - Napoleon: The army marches on its stomach - a good general has to think of the food as much as killing people - some armies made good names for themselves because they knew how to take care of the rationing - How did William McKinley become a politician - many presidents were generals, then McKinley was elected - he ran a kitchen - he was a captain and he made sure that when you went to the battle field, you had a cup of coffee, something to eat, became very popular that way - Abarbanel: no descriptions of people getting killed in perek aleph, but there is much about poverty - according to most mefarshim, its because locust don't kill, they eat a lot

פרק ב -

- call for everyone to come to Har Kodshi - another description of Yom Hashem
- Frequently in Tanakh - Yom Hashem is described as a day of darkness
 - we could treat that as literal day of darkness - an eclipse - pashut if you know what I'm talking about
 - or metaphorical - depression
 - often associated with darkness of sun and moon - so sounds like eclipse

- here we have choshech anan vaArafel - but it keeps going to describe locust - so the conventional imagery is turned around - darkness is coming because locust fill the sky
- locust look like horses - clearly not referring to size - but they do resemble horses in that they have legs and a face in a certain direction - the locust is being compared to any army here - which makes sense - Abarbenel - army compared to locust - others: reversed analogy - the idea is that it feels like they are being invaded by an army - that's the horse analogy
- פרור - Rashi - dark - in Bamidbar the man is cooked in a פרור - inside an oven is dark - they used to have large stoves that they did a lot of baking in at once and the ash would accumulate - Grandfather of one of Rav Carmy's teachers who was so concentrated on trying to figure out a sugya that he went into a stove to concentrate and when he came out his whole face was blackened - Reb Chayim
- Ibn Ezra - the majesty of the face fell - people sometimes look happy and then when something bad happens it is as if someone turned the light off inside - views נ as part of the shoresh, not like Rashi who thinks it just indicates the sound
- typical yom Hashem imagery except the darkness is coming from locust, not an eclipse
- Was this an exceptional locust storm? I don't know, but the important thing is how does it feel to the people experiencing it
- For Abarbenel, what does it mean that the army looks like horses? Either they have horses, or they do not? His pshat is very interesting, doesn't mean it is correct, but interesting - you have to know something about ancient warfare - he thought that the introduction of the horseback rider into war was a relatively late phenomenon - what's his proof? Centor, from Greek mythology - he was half man and half horse - top half is man - asks, where do centors come from - the first time you see man riding horseback, it's a real kashe, from afar, it looks like one strange animal - so maybe the myth of the centor evolved from when man first had to confront horseback riders - Sisra's men are described as riding chariots, not horses specifically - someone was brought to Rav Carmy - in Queens College after a yeshivish high school - professor said that the Bible is all wrong because we know that horses were not used in warfare until after Yam Suf - Rav Carmy answered that there is a big difference between horses and chariots - riding on the back of the horse itself was late, but chariots were early - the first horseback riders

were the Assyrians in the ancient near east - so here, in Yoel, there were horseback riders and it was confusing - it looks like horses, like dancing chariots - chariots are not usefull in the mountains, only in plains - had he known that the first horseback in the ancient near east was the assyrians in the times of Menashe, he would have been even happier - works out nicely - clear in Shmot that there was a breakdown because of the mud and the wheels of the chariots - we have no reason to assume that the Egyptians were on top of horses themselves

- Why the need for two separate perakim on a literary level?
- Description and then assembly - here too, there is a description and then assembly - what is new here from what we had in perek aleph
 - what were people expected to do in Perek Aleph - צעקה - but in bet there is the expectation for תשובה - in masechet taanit, one of the calls for tshuva comes from here, קראו לבבכם ואל בגדכם
 - מי ידע ישוב ויחם - Rashi - whoever knows they sinned should do tshuva - or maybe the locust will turn around and go away
- What is different in Perek Bet than what happened in Perek Aleph - we saw tshuva
 - what about the difference between the locust themselves in each perek - sum of their actions in Aleph: They eat - they cause economic harm - in bet they attack/invade - Most mepharshim: there can be an invasion which leads to economic suffering, but bet is not that so what is it? Discomfort? Terror? Something like that
 - there is more fear - we see the effect is different - perhaps it is more condusive to tshuva - but not percise enough yet
 - Abarbenel - in war there are two types of damage - economic damage (not focused on in the movies, but in WW1 the economic factors were more crucial than the bloody features) so perek 1 is more about the army eating like locust, but in perek 2 the army is attacking like an army - you don't have the bloody aspect, or people breaking into houses, or shooting arrows, yet perek bet is still more like the armies people see in movies - economic harm vs. direct military harm - you still don't see people dying - similar to how in perek aleph you have a famine without the word רעב - here, there is invasion without description of corpses
 - Rov Mepharshim - what's the difference between perek aleph and perek bet? What ability does an army have which invading locust do not? A commander. In Perek Bet there is a commander - Hashem - there is someone directing the

locust/enemy - Yom Hashem imagery culminates with the information that this swarm has a commander - once you say this, then you can say that perek Bet is more religious - tshuva is a more religious response than merely זעקה - Rav Soloveitchik - זעקה can be done by an animal as well - its not a sign of great intelligence - if you have an animal in great pain, it will likely call out - when losing food or joy, both humans and animals will cry out - in Perek Bet, in addition to these other unpleasant animals, there is this sense that the enemy/locust is guided by the Ribbono Shel Olam

- there is a call for tshuva - tshuva for what? People normally repent for sin - what sin? Its not mentioned. Rav Carmy: I believe if you go through all of Tanakh, there is no other place where there is a call to tshuva without sin, usually there is a specific sin - so you have famine without רעב , army without corpses, and tshuva without mention of חטא.
- What precipitates the obligation to do tshuva halakhically - Rambam definitely thinks it is a mitzvah - Rav Soloveitchik - the mitzvah is tshuva and the external manifestation of it is vidui - Hakarat HaChet is the impetus conventionally - seems that way in Hilkhos Tshuva - But there is another Rambam in הלכות תעניות פרק א - there is a mitzvah aseil to cry out with chatzotzirot on public tzaros אתכם על הצר הצורר - any tzara - including ארבע - this is a kiyum in tshuva - Rambam says according to the Rav- When there is an awareness of tzara, that engenders an obligation of tshuva, not just hakarat HaChet - so even if there is no Hakarat Hachet, we have an obligation to turn to God - if people say we will not do this, just whatever happens is happenstance, the way of the world - that is אחריות - like בקרי - והלכת עמי בקרי - so God will act that way to you
- From this Rambam we see that there are two impetuses for tshuva - one is eit tzara which does not presuppose prior knowledge of sin - you still have to turn to God - It seems that we can always find something for which to repent upon reflection
- What does לשוב actually mean - return vs. repent - repent presupposes Hakarat Hachet, but not return. The word turn literally: I can either turn away from something - turn away from chet - but you can also turn towards something - turning towards God - mimeila if you are turning towards God, you are turning away from something else, but essentially it is about the positive notion of turning towards a relationship with God - so we can still

examine ourselves and say one thing I am obligated to do is enhance our relationship with God - even general sins are not mentioned here because the basic impetus is to turn towards God, not stopping specific sins - what persipitates this kind of tshuva: עת צרה - what prevents that kind of tshuva - saying nature is taking its course and therefore these troubles do not impose upon us an obligation of tshuva, then you won't - the pesukim fit perfectly - the clincher in passuk 11 is that all the events which are happening have to be understood as something guided by the Ribbono Shel Olam - so everything works out according to this approach - You have an et tzara - you examine yourself - everything is perfect -probably means you are not looking hard enough - but theoretically ok, its Yissurin Shel Ahava, so then you say there is an obligation to enhance my relationship with God - if I fail to do that, then it is a failure to take advantage of that opportunity - when people talk about suffering which is perceived to be unfair or disproportionate - like the holocaust - certainly many of the people what they went through was disproportionate to any failings they might have had - the Rav said this in the context of after the holocaust - we don't have the obligation to say what did this one get punished for or that one, rather the impetus is to do tshuva -

- why davka Yoel and noot other neviim talk in this way
- if Yoel comes from bayit sheini - then we may understand this - their religious state - what stopped happening in bayit sheini? Avodah Zara stopped. Obviously then, I'm sure there were people who had issues ben adam lichaveiro, Nechemia talks about issues of chillul Shabbos - but Avodah Zara is a line that can determine if someone is a sinner or not - on one side or the other - Chazzal say Avodah Zara is like nullifying the whole Torah - if that stopped, then mussar is going to look different - additional proof: Judith - describes seige, people being besieged were about to give up - she goes out, give the enemy general blintzes, then cuts his head off - that was the Yeshuah, when the people were getting ready to give up or not give up they don sackcloth and put on their animals - Judith says don't give up, God is testing us to see whether we will remain steadfast and fight till the end - her proof that it is not a gezeira is that we are not like our forefathers, we are not Ovdei Avodah Zara - so there was a consciousness among some in the Bayit Sheini period that there is a fundamental difference between them and their predecesors because of the lack of idolotrous practice - so makes sense no sin is mentioned in Yoel - first perek - economic, second is more military, Abarbenel says the important part of the second perek is that hashgacha

plays a role - it is not happenstance - rather, it is directed - in aleph they take away joy, in bet they march like an army and that is frightening - but more important is that they are marching because they have leader who is Hashem - also, Yoel seems generic at first, but really he has this unique message for us that you might not get from other Neviim.

- Dating: this point is unique to Rav Carmy - others: there is no date given - no king mentioned - population seems to be concentrated around the Bait Hamikdash (also works for time of Menashe) - Bar Ilan professor Eli Assis - wrote book on Yoel - he wants the later dating for the scholar's reasons - he thought it was during the 70 years between Bayit Rishon and Bayit Sheini - what about mentions of the mikdash? The makom Hamikdash was still important - Rav Carmy doesn't buy that - Scholars want to have their unique opinion - some people also want to tie Tanakh to Jewish history, so they don't like to have such gaps - they want to have a fuller palette - so maybe some want to not have an empty 70 year period
- Everyone has to come - chattan and Kallah - Raiyah in Sotah that even chattanim have to be drafted in times of danger - zionists say that kallah also goes out of her chupah so we can draft women in times of danger as well - others say that if there is no chattan at the wedding, so the kallah leaves as well
- you start out with the awareness you did something wrong, not that you did x wrong - Judith expresses this kind of tshuva/hakarat hachet
- at what point did the yetzer hara for avodah zara go away? All I know about this is what the Gemara says - but how long did the Anshei Knesset HaGedolah go for - historians - some say it was a short period - when did Shimon Hatzadik live - some say as late as alexander the great - if Yoel is bayit sheini and in zechariah and malakhi - there does not seem to be avodah zara there - why? Discussed in the Rav Kook class - MEShech Chochma talks about this in Bamidbar
- Whatever the problem was - it wasn't the corona virus - otherwise the Navi would not call on them to get together
- פסוק ב - mashal - word meaning - Rashi makhlokes Ibn Ezra - is chillul Hashem the goyim dominating us or making fun of us
- passuk ה - why is צפוני used to describe the locust? Makes sense for Abarbanel because the enemy is from the north

- but really its north east - in Tanakh north is more than just a direction - it has ominous connotations - left in latin is “sinister” - in a semetic world , the basic semite faces east , east is called קדם because it is facing you - sometimes אחר is used for west מאחור ופלישתים מקדם - right hand would then be stretched to the south left hand facing north - תימן means right hand and south so צפון would also have the left associatin of being an ominous place so we can understand very well why the navi would want to describe the enemy as coming from the north
 - Yehuda Goldfetter - orient means east in english so this kind of survives
- Gemara in Succa talks about the Yetzer Hara - it has seven different names and one of them is צפוני - this fits teh previous point that צפוני is an ominous direction - Chazzal seems to have understood Rav Carmies point - so then it would be a messianic promise of getting rid of the yetzer hara
- half will go to this sea, half to the other - locust go to the sea and stink - armies dont really go into the sea -
- Rashi - once you get to God’s response to making everything good, the nevuah is expanded beyond locust to the messianic - like saying not only will the virus recede, but Mashiach will come
- perek aleph began with fruit trees and finally reached dagan vitirosh - in perek bet began with most urgent then moved on to joyful issues
- word מורה - most would say it means rain like יורה ומלקוש - it means to shoot and then מ would be a prefix and it would mean rain here - but that is difficult in pshat here - but then why say it twice - so simplest pshat might be this but there is this stumbling block - so Rashi says teacher from targum
- in some dead sea scrolls there is a figure actually called מורה לצדקה - teacher of righteousness - so not jsut targum, but there were people in the bayit sheini period who thought of this passuk as teacher - they were not necessarily darshanim
- Mishna in Taanit - when they had that particular plague, the locust ate what tehy did and there was drought, so really getting rid of locust late in teh growing season may be too late - burnt out case in leprosy- disease is no longer active ubut I lost fingers and toes - the earth may be a burnt out case - so the locust may be gone but it might be too late to grow anything , but they

get the exact rain they need at that point - Chazzal assume that early in the growing season you need hard rain - earth is bare - need a lot to get things going - but late in the growing season heavy rain is bad can destroy the plants יורה is appropriate for the early season and מלקוש is good for late

- יבושו - really disappointment, things not working out - not necessarily shame
- the Rambam in Taanit is saying that we start from the notion that what is happening to us is part of a relationship with God - once you start asking is there anything we should do tshuva for, most of us can find something wrong - whether tshuva involves chet or not does not depend on whether it began with hakarat hachet or et tzara - also does not depend on God sending a punishment - most of the time in Tanakh, when there is punishment the Navi or Torah says so - but here it is not stated - analogy: person that you are friendly with and that person is not as warm as before - if it happened today one may say it's corona virus but let's say not - talks in monosyllables - you can draw a couple of conclusions - bad mood - a rush - when Rav Carmy was trying to figure out Zoom, there were emails Rav Carmy was brief about and perhaps ignored some completely because of rush - you could say the person is punishing me - let's say you see me committing a murder and from that point on, or if a professor makes sexual advance of student, student will drop the course - you did something you are being punished for it - but sometimes punishment is too strong and really it's a cooling in the relationship - not clear that it's a punishment - the person who is being cool might not even be sure why - I just don't feel the way I did before -
- ואחרי כן - perek 3
 - some scholars say different author - navis only get one yom Hashem - ay but it says ויהי אחרי כן, yah but it's just to get you read them together so they think they know better than Tanakh so we can go on without the scholars
 - Rashi and Radak - it means acharit hayamim - Ibn Ezra quotes karaite and Ibn Katilah - Acharit Hayamim - for some particular historical episode - Rav Moshe Ibn Katila - generally tended to interpret Nevuot in Tanakh as being short range - if you say they are long range as people like Abarbenel tend to do as well as Radak - Ibn Ezra less so - Katila is extreme as trying to say it is immediate future and not where we are today - Sefer Ikkarim chelek aleph perek bet - mentions opinion in Gemara that taken literally says someone

held there is no mashiach anymore because they had the chance at that time but blew it or you could read it as saying that the proofs from Tanakh only refer to its own time

- כל בשר - off hand that would mean goyim, the ignorant, that would be very strange
 - Radak - means human beings - ויברך כל בשר שם קדשו - not animals
 - is everyone really worthy of Nevuah? Depends - two extreme views of Nevuah - One associated with R Yehuda HaLevi - Nevuah is about an act of God - God makes people Neviim - not about if you deserve it, but God wanting you to have - Jewish people are apt for Nevuah, but essentially it is an act of God - according to the Rambam Lamed Bet in Moreh - Person should prepare philosophically - it all depends on you - how rationally prepared you are - but even if you have that, you still need Divine will - but if you need philosophical training, כל בשר is a little difficult - Radak is closest to Rambam - Radak was influenced by moreh nevuchim - Radak - Nevuah is a lower level - Ruchi is a higher level - inspiration could be available to a lot of people - but real Nevuah is davka for special people - so those who are in Eretz Yisrael and serving the Jewish people will have this ואשפוך את רוחי - why is this found davka in Yoel? three years ago Rav Carmy tried to work this out, but is not satisfied with it
- There will be signs in heaven and earth דם ואש ותמרות עשן - next passuk sounds like the heavens - sun will be darkened (sound like solar eclipse) - moon will turn to blood (sounds like lunar eclipse) before Yom Hashem comes
 - we saw yom Hashem imagery in the first two perakim as well - and in Amos 5 and Yeshaya 13 and Tzeephania and so forth - among those images of Yom Hashem frequently have imagery of eclipse and darkness - basic makhlokes between Rambam and “frumer” position - Yom Hashem is really associated with eclipses -if you think eclipses are ominous (many throughout the world were frightened by eclipses - Mark Twain ...In King Arthur’s court - about a thousand years ago, wanted to kill someone, but he had an almanac with him, tells them if you threaten me again the sun will go out - and it does, so they all think he is some sort of Navi - time travel - many think in those terms - if there is an eclipse that shows God

Tuesday, January 21, 2020

is angry - Gemara in Succah kifshuto implies in the literal level that if there is an eclipse it is a simman rah for the Jews, so too by Yom Hashem it is a sign of Divine wrath - but Rambam was not concerned about that kind of things so he holds eclipse imagery is metaphorical - like people say I walked out and everything was dark - my world turned dark - all these images throughout Tanakh - one view views it as Divine anger, while the Rambam says it is a metaphor - where is the Rambam? Chelek bet perek 29 in the Moreh give or take - naturally, people don't like darkness, they don't like to be in the dark - street lighting mitigates this feeling among people today - for Rambam, an eclipse is a way of talking about that - about unpleasant, the other view is that eclipses are a slap in the face - in the middle ages, they did not think much about it so predictability was not much discussed - Lebavecher Rebbe: there is no contradiction - it can be predicatable and a bad thing - if I gave you a smack in the face every two weeks, or a more complicated iteration - we would still regard it as a bad thing and sign of anger - we just know that there are certain times which are ominous, bad times - we think מי שנכנס אדר שדס similar - its predictable - Menachem Begin - his first appearance on meet the press was on Tisha Bav and began by telling them what it is about - but he asked the shailah before hand that maybe he should push it off - so the Rebbe works it out that way - some people know they have hay fever in August - doesn't make it any better

- in Yoel the imagery is more complicated - in Perek Bet we interpreted it as the real life experience of darkness when locust fills the sky

- The eclipse Yom Hashem mentioned in Perek 3 is unusual - לפני - but for the Rambam, the imagery of eclipse is part of Yom Hashem itself, not a harbinger - 2) all other places outside of Yoel - imagery of eclipse is imagery of darkness - we know astronomy, so we immediately jump to eclipse - the imagery in Perek 3 is more specific - moon will turn to blood - lunar eclipse - closer to reality than the normal imagery - for Rambam its very general imagery, but in Yoel its more realistic - not clear how the lunar and solar eclipses could happen at the same time - Radak deviated from Rambam here - Radak is bothered by the imagery's specificity

- 3/24

- first half of the sefer is locust

- the second half is ויהי אחרי כן
- the same navi can talk about יום ה' more than once because there can be multiple סיום ה'
- clearly implies it is one sefer ויהי אחרי כן
- There is almost always eclipse imagery by יום ה' - Yoel 2 is a little different because it is tailored to locust
 - Rambam: the eclipse is all metaphorical
 - Ibn Ezra: Eclipses are literally a bad omen
 - Ibn Ezra believed in astrology, while Rambam thought it was close to Avodah ZZara
- Navi is being very specific with the eclipse imagery - almost like an astronomy class
- Radak: the eclipse really is an omen - might not be so according to the Rambam, but not everyone hearing the nevuah holds like the Rambam- if you see an eclipse and don't know the moreh nevuchim - someone may very well be scared - but perhaps it scared people before the יום ה', not that it was יום ה' itself
- דם ואש ותמרות עשן
 - דם: not supposed to make us think of the makos because the people hearing the nevuah did not have a haggadah - plague - perhaps - perhaps red moon - Makes a lot of sense to say as Ibn Ezra and Radak: Blood is what happens on earth and smoke is what happens in heaven - Problem: what about fire? Radak puts in heaven - Rav Carmy would say ארץ means affliction on earth and שמים means spiritual - there is the notion in Chazzal and Tanakh, that there are heavenly representations of different nations - definitely in Daniel - Yeshaya 24:21 (imagery of Yom Hashem and in passuk 20 there is an earthquake - what is tzvah hamarom - Rambam: eclipses - but if we adopt the notion from Daniel that tzvah marom bamarom means that God will settle accounts in heaven and earth
 - but the order seems off-Ibn Ezra: could be style abba Cheeahzmus - so Ibn Ezra knew something that is taken on by modern scholarship
 - ויתן יעקב ,,, ויעקב ובניו ירדו מצרים - kee'ahzmus

Tuesday, January 21, 2020

- Rav Carmy listened to a missionary who was quoting pesukim from perek dalet in Yoel and he was quoting from chapter 3 and Rav Carmy took out a Jewish english translation and it was not there and he was confused
- The people who call in God's name will escape - that's a Yom Hashem - its threatening , but here the Navi is being a little more gentle
- Gog UMagog - The terms come from elsewhere in Tanakh- Magog originally appears in Noach - he is one of the descendants of Yefet - Yefet is in Asia minor / Greece - so Turkey Greece, so forth - Gog: mentioned in Yechezkel 38-39 - Gog is in Eretz Hamagog and the leader of meshech and tuval - so he seems to be the leader of Magog and connected nations - Because of Yechezkel , there is a tendency to use the phrase Gog UMagog to refer to other prophetic visions as well that are similar to the Gog and Magog nevuah , so the many mepharshim put a bunch in that basket - Rav Carmy: Zecharia 14, Yoel, and Yekhezkel are the only nevuot which should be put in that basket.
- Many Mepharshim say that leading up to Mashiach there will be a war of Gog UMagog
- Martin Buber - wrote a novel called גוג ומגוג - english translation For Heaven's Sake - debate of Hassidic Rebbeim if Napoleon wars were milkhemet Gog Umagog
- Does there have to be such a war before Mashiach al pee pshat - I don't know, but the Navi describes the possibility
- What happens in Milkhemet Gog Umagog
 - There is an invasion - the Goyim come into Eretz Yisrael - these Goyim are defeated
 - other phenomena:
 - In Yechezkel they are coming to an unprotected land to collect plunder - but there is no explicit motivation in Yoel
 - Yechezkel and Yoel both have an earthquake - in Yoel it is just one passuk, but Yechezkel really emphasizes it - there is an invasion of many Goyim (Yoel all and Yechezkel large coalition) Yoel is more peaceful (no weaponry around or corpses left over) - In Yoel, the invasion is Yerushalayim and mikdash, and in Yechezkel its the land as a whole - Yoel has water flowing through the mikdash and in Yechezkel מ, there is a series of perakim about

the Mikdash - in נח, the Navi is in the gate of the Beit Hamikdash, there is a stream and he is walking and the water gets higher and higher, the water flows down the east to the point that the dead sea is ___ the story of sodom viAmora is reversed - it is no longer desolate, but rather full of lush vegetation

- Why do the neviim use Gog Umagog imagery instead of just saying Moshiach will come but it won't be easy
- Seems to be that we need to be in Eretz Yisrael in order for there to be a milkhemet Gog Umagog (also in Yechezkel) - many Robbonim did not make this inference - perhaps they were not thinking literarily , but rather about the many nevuot associated with this nevuah - Many lomdanim know Tanakh largely through the Gemara, not through the kind of literary analysis we do here - its not identicle to having headaches from goyim - when we read haftorot about this nation and that nation - for most people its all the saem - its goyim and nothing good comes from them - but Rav Carmy is saying that we have to differentiate - there is a difference between what the navi says about assyria and bavel vs. Egypt
- Large scale Gallut and return - second bayit - earlier neviim who talk about Jews being in gallut talk about the ten tribes - like Yeshaya
- all the goyim come, not just Gog Umagog - I will bring them to the valley of Yehoshafat - early 8th century - emek Yehoshafat does not appear anywhere else in Tanakh - One possibility is that this Nevuah goes back to that time - if you put Yoel very early - Rav Moshe Ibn Jatilah held that the breaking out of naviim makes sense in the time of Eliyahu who had many student Neviim - or you could hold that this is refering to a different place but it is a play on words because God is literally goign to judge the goyim יהושפט literally means that broken into two
- Jews were auctioned off at the slave market very cheap - to most of us, we would not want to be sold as a slave - if you are goign to be a slave anyway, you might as well fetch a good price - its a funny thing, I'm not getting the money anyway, but you still want ot be a respected slave - to get a good price on the market- God will judge you for that
- two groups tzar visidom and pleshet - what do they have in common? They are coastal - why is that relevant here? You're in the slave trade - ...The Abscure - pig farmer buying pig - pig escapes, realizes the pig is goign home -

mistake: should not have brought it home by wagon, but rather by cart - similar by slaves - kidnap guy and sell to next door neighbor, not a good idea because the slave can just go home - but if you sell over seas, then it is not so easy to escape and go home

- bring your possessions to palaces - could be referring to Beis Hamikdash
- Time of no Monarchy
- Third group that comes in are Greeks - same thing: overseas - Navi is not just adding some malice to the passuk - rather emphasizing that you are selling them somewhere where they can't come back
- handed over a gallut shleima to Edom and did not remember brit achim that tzor and Israel worked together to build the Beit Hamikdash - what is the meaning of shleima and what about Edom
 - Bible critics: 1) Edom is not a very important nation in Bayit Rishon - they are vassals of Yehuda, not powerful (even during bayit sheini) 2) sending slaves that are not powerful 3) if tzor is on the coast and edom is on the east then the transportation of the slaves is not really effective - some would just change the text to ארם, but then you have to knock out הַיָּם - Yehoshua Grintz - scholar shomer mitzvot - specialized in ancient near east literature - said there was an island אִדּוֹן in eijeer - which fits perfectly with needing to export the slaves far away overseas - sometimes you are tempted to change texts in Tanakh and then you learn more and the temptation goes away
 - Tanakh and slaves overseas - Yekhezkel 27 and Tokhakha in Ki Tavo 28:68 בְּאֵינִי is how God will return you to Egypt - why by ship? Some people like to go on a cruise, but that's not this - you will be sold there for slaves and no one will buy - why emphasize go back **by boat** - its like the pig that got away - if you go there by wagon, you may try to escape back, but by sea it is much harder
 - What is being singled out among the punishments bnai Yisrael will encounter is the slave trade - very emphasized
- כִּבְשׁוּ מִלְחָמָה and now כִּבְשׁוּ צֶאֱן
- turn your plowshares into swords and pruning hooks into daggers

- reminds us of Yeshaya Perek 2 - Messianic prophesy - ולא ילמדו עוד מלחמה - aint goign to study no war no more - turn war inot agrecultural implements - Isiah wall
- Yoel is the exact opposite - which nevuah is earlier? Zack Orenshein: Perhaps Yeshayahu because there there is no need for war implements - but in Yoel, there is still a need for war implements even during war time, so why are you transforming them - Rav Carmy: Yoel is a sarcastic passuk - one passuk is a parody of the other passuk - if a is a parody of b, then b comes first - the idea of taking your weapons and turning them into plowshares is optomistic and happy - “The day will come when people will take their asthma inhalers and will use them to inhale cocane - that’s optomistic - Yemot Hamoshiach, people will take asthma inhalers and inhale marijuana and whatever they prefer” ~ Rav Carmy - the other way around sounds like a bad nevuah - turn your factories into military expenditures (the way they did in WW2 - that’s a parody.
- Navi compares enemy to grain which is to be harvested - grapes which will be trodden and made into wine - why are grapes could for military image here - color - they look like blood - ישעיה סג - Navi speaking about Edom מי זה בא מאדום חמוץ בגדים מאוצרה - Edom is also a play on the color red - speaker then addresses God - why is Your clothing red like you were trodding upon grapes - I trod all alone and teh juice shpritzed on my clothes -image of revenge (clothing stained with grapes) - song from 1860s mine eyes have seen the coming of the glory of the Lord - marching through the vineyard where the grapes of wrath are stored.
- Multitudes in the valley where the decision will be made
- Son and moon are dark, stars have ingathered their light - reminds us of the image of eclipsing - look back at perek ב passuk י - before the locust, everything shakes - the Navi used exactly the same language in Perek Bet as here
- God roars from Tzion and Yerushalayim - scholars suggest that Amos is put right after Yoel because one ends with such a passuk and the other begins in this way - also a passuk like this in Yirmiyahu
- God protects Bnai Yisrael
- we don’t really see what goes on in this war

- Mountains will drip juice or wine - and milk from the hilltops - Birkat Yaakov: cholov is really white wine
 - ample water in Yehuda - fountain from Beit Hamikdash will reach nachal shittim - don't know where that is - some mepharshim thinks it is an area named after an avoda zara (even there the water goes? Is that the point?)
 - Just as perek bet ended the story of the locust which was a story of depression - but perek dalet was not talking about economic down turn, but rather military violence, so that is the resolution that it ends with
- half way through the shiur
- Yoel is a more happy version of these other nevuot (Gog umagog nevuot) - it is quiet at the end - it doesn't say ה' מציון ישאג and everyone drops dead or starts killing each other - that God's appearance leaves to civil war or destruction.
- passuk 19 is what will happen at אחרית הימים, not what God will do
- Two parts to the book of Yoel
- locust plague
 - injustice - jews were sold into slavery - how will that be corrected - it is corrected at the end of the book- they will be punished for the innocent blood they shed -but not part of what God is actually doing - it is after everything is settled there - it is not God acting directly: I am angry at someone, I can walk up to them and slap them in the face : direct action - or I can do nothing at all except that five years later, that person doesn't get a job, somehow behind the scenes I manipulated against him , either case it is my work, but how you experience it is very different - taking a very clear position in a quarrel, or I stay back and don't get directly involved even though at a later point I assert myself - in the real world we often don't make distinction on these grounds as much as we should - someone not my friend who is cold to me or not my friend and does something against me I don't know about - whatever happens to אדום is separate from the גוג ומגוג story - the historical account to be settled with Mitzraim and Edom is separate - I could say it more sharply - someone once said - if at Yoel you want a happy ending , why should anyone be punished -that is polianish way of thinking - in Tanakh even if you are looking for a peaceful outcome - that comes through justice
 - Eclipse - ה' מציון ישאג - appearance of God - earthquake

- typical YOM Hashem imagery - however, go back to perek bet - YOel is symmetrical - pesukim 10-11 - locust - word for word what happens in 14 but different order - is that significant? Someone could say the order is not the same order because chiastic structure abc and then when quoting them again, change the order - not exactly chiastic, but close enough if you want to just get rid of the question with biblical style - but what if I ask, what do these three components do in each perek - fundamental point - the fact that certain stylistic convention exists, does not mean these elements are being used in the stereotypical way - Ibn Ezra and Malbim are both right - Ibn Ezra: that's how Bible works stylistically, Malbim: everything has meaning - there is a convention, but in each case there may be a way it is molded to that particular context
- Who is causing the shaking of the earth? The locust - so it's the a - you begin the locust, you continue with the locust - then darkness, further consequence of locust when they darken the sky - just because it is classic imagery of Yom Hashem does not mean it has to have the same meaning every place - then God enters the picture - why only at the end does God enter the picture - if you hold like Rav Carmy that Bet is recognition that adversity that occurs to you are acts of God, then it is to tell you that this locust is not accidental mikreh, but acts of God - locust marched in such an organized way, not because they have a general, but because God is guiding them - if the order was different, Rav Carmy's pshat would not be as strong because why do we have the two descriptions of locust - perek bet switches to describing them in military formation - what is the point of perek bet - the recognition that the locust are not simply a source of bad economics, but they are also acting under instruction of God to Yoel - the introduction is a culminating punch line, so it is at the end, not to be lost somewhere in the middle - if you get passuk 11 the Navi can say this is it, then you are ready for the call to tshuva in the next passuk - the locust appears to be a natural phenomenon, but it is in fact driven by God - in other neviim it is more obvious, but the thing about Yoel is that it is not obvious - there is tshuva without specific sins
- to get more complicated: true that other Neviim there is a possibility of people being tone deaf - Yirmiyah perek bet - מוסר לא לקחו - the Navi is saying I punished you and you didn't respond - Yechezkel says things and people ignore him - but the difference is that in these other cases, the people would say, yah, you are giving us mussar and we are ignoring you - we don't respond to you - the same way without neviim, someone can warn

you and say that terrible things will happen and people ignore it - people say to Yirmiyahu what you are saying bisheim Hashem, we aren't listening to you - not claiming that he is lying - the important thing in Yoel is to educate people that when you are in tzara, the tzara should not be regarded as pure accident - that's Yoel perek bet

- poem: how do I love thee, let me count the ways - term paper: How do I ignore thee, let me count the ways. In Yoel, they are not fully ignoring, just not fully appreciating the events they encounter
- order in perek Dalet - standard Yom Hashem imagery - next step - Hashem roars from tzion - why is God roaring after the eclipse - interesting pshat: Meyer Weiss (at one time taught at Bar Ilan very early then political blow up in Bar Ilan and he was pushed out - at the same time there was another member of the Bible department who left as well, he and Nechama Leibowitz were friendly - so probably why she left - he is very important: people claim that you should read Tanakh like ordinary literature and if you have a good sense of literature, you should not want to amend texts as much as Bible critics do - dangerous in poetry because it is not written like newspaper, there should be surprising turn of phrase - so he had a pro orthodox approach - he would say davka the fact that the psukim are a little odd shows what they - The Well Bought(?) Urn - example from Macbeth, some scholars wanted to change the text and he shows it captures certain points you would otherwise miss) - what happens in everyday world darkness - we did not grow up in the right environment - what do you hear when everything is dark - owls. How do we know this? Passuk in Tehillim קד passuk 19 Barchi Nafshi יער כל חיתו יער - when God makes darkness, animals come out - lions roar in the nighttime - Meir Weiss - once you have the image of darkness, you have God roaring like a lion ה' מציין ישאג - one might say, what else would God roar like other than a lion - in our world it is almost a cliché - if you are roaring, you are roaring like a lion - Sophie Tucker Jewish rapper, young woman becomes pregnant, telling the guy he has to marry her - Mr. Siegle - Mr. Siegle, you'll have to make it legal - if you don't make it legal I'll be screaming like a legal - but that was davka to make the rhyme - It's a natural progression from darkness to God's roaring, it is built up from the previous passuk, once God roars, the world comes to a stand still - slows down - the world is paralyzed - that is a point about perek dalet- unlike the other gog umagog lot of bloodshed and war - in Yoel the appearance of God is enough to bring things to an end - psukim are in a

particular order - alteration is not accidental in the same sefer - once you emphasize the passuk in bet as a third component and supports RavCarney's reading - also supports that it is a calmer gog umagog than other nevuot - the war is paralyzed - you don't have all the dead people rotting, it appears that everything quiets down

- This idea of a large coalition of nations attacking eretz yisrael, being defeated in a bloody battle and/or in a mageifa/plague - where would such an image come from - what historical model - when we today talk about a churban willy nilly we tend to describe along the lines of bayit rishon and sheini - it is natural to describe events in light of paradigms - Mitzrayim, the Egyptians do not invade Eretz Yisrael - the model that you may be thinking about is dalet malkhiot - that is a model that comes directly from Doniel - who exactly the kings are is a makhlokes - greeks, romans, greeks, do you include islam - essentially there are four world empires - I could put Mitzraim there as well - but the Gog Umagog is a little more differentiated - Really it seems closer to model of Ashur - world empire (assyrians) - Gog Umagog nations do not have prior antagonizing israel - on a march, invade eretz yisrael - unclear why they invade - yechezkel says they invade because they want to plunder but in Yoel and Zechariah it is not clear - technically the assyrians invaded because they did not get their tax - they march up to Yerushalayim, devastated country side - they drove people to concentrate in Yerushalayim - other economic hardship and general devastation - nevuot in Yeshaya describe devastation on economy - they woke up the next morning and they were dead - very important Yeshua - part of the way of the Jews thinking about the world from then until the churban is the inviolability of Zion - God will not let the Beit Hamikdash be destroyed - very important to them - that model of Gog Umagog might have developed in resonance of the war of Sanherib - Gemara: Chizkiyah could have been moshiach, but he did not say Hallel - but another aspect of Gemara: that places Sanheireb in the role of Gog Umagog - so he seems to be the original model for Gog Umagog

- Ovadiah

- in Navi earlier there is another who is ירא אלקים and works for אכאב

- Sanhedrin לט

- identifies Ovadiah as fairly early in Neviim

- Chazzal take the description 'ירא את ה' to mean he is a גר - why would they say that - normally we would just think this means a respectable high level Jew
 - maybe the term really hints to someone being a גר - someone could work very hard to be a talmid chochom - probably means that such a person did not grow up in a Rabbinic household - so Chazzal might have read in Tanakh that the phrase 'ירא means גר similarly - 'יאמרו נא יראי ה' - why should it be its own category? Must be a separate group within עם ישראל
 - in halakha גר in chumash means full FLEDGED גר - About five times in chumash however, Ibn Ezra says I would like to say were it not for Chazzal I would say this refers to גר תושב - Yaakov Gushtwein - if you hold like Ibn Ezra that pshat is really גר תושב, should that have any hashkafic ramifications
- The nevuah of Ovadiah is entirely devoted to Edom - highly unusual for a navi to be totally devoted to the destruction of other nations - Take Yeshaya, there are Nevuot about the GOyim until כג from יג - other than that it is about the Jews - Yirmiyahu has such a unit from נא - מו - Greek places it earlier - יחזקאל its from לב - כה - in עמוס there is a perek and a half - נחום is entirely about אשור, but there you can say that destroying ננוה is about protecting am yisrael - Chazzal say that Ovadiah as a Ger was particularly suited to give Nevuah against Edom - making a handle for an ax from the very tree the ax chopped down
 - Chazzal are applying the term 'ירא from the Ovadiah in Sefer Melakhim
- Ibn Ezra - We don't know when Ovadiah lived - 'ירא in Melakhim means davka that that Ovadiah was not a Navi, otherwise call him a Navi - Once a Rabbi made a contravertial statement - Rav Soloveitchik was on the phone and whoever was speaking to the Rav was very upset about the statement- REALLY upset- he could hear the yelling - the Rav was trying to calm him down - said - Come on now if he would come to your shul, you wouldn't give him an aliyah would you?
- Kuzari - only Jews can get Nevuah, not Geirim - problem with this Gemara in bava Batra though - part of his view of being children of Avraham Yitzchak and Yaakov
- Is there something in Jews Edom history that would justify this nevuah
- Historically, in the bayit rishon period, Edom is not an important part of the picture
 - continuously subjugated to Yehudah - Shmuel Bet Perek 8
- Archeological records do not show it to be a big nation

- פושע עד היום הזה - does that mean until the time Melakhim was written, which would mean about 150 years - or until the time this particular record was composed, which includes earlier documents in our Sefer Melakhim, so whatever stage that generations history was written down
 - שישק - invaded Yehuda write after the death of Shlomo 950 - did a lot of damage - how do you know that Edom did not participate in this invasion as well
 - this was 150 years before Ovadiah, so maybe its about that - but these candidates are not explicitly in Tanakh - Daat Mikrah on Ovadiah as a full list of the options
- Or you can date Ovadiah later and say that Edom participated in the Churban - its an event which is something that stands out - seems to fit that period
- There are Mefarshim that hold that the nevuot of Ovadiah do not relate to churban bayit rishon, or anything in Ovadiah's time, but rather its about Churban Bayit Sheini - its far into the future - a messianic Nevuah - why would he talk about things so far in the future - that is a general question in Neviim - the more secular a scholar is, the less likely to believe it is about thousands of years later - for the religious its a question, it really could be - but on average, is it really what Neviim generally do to speak about not their time - Ibn Jakatila vs. Ibn Ezra about Yoel - Ibn Ezra generally comes out more "secular" and Radak and Abarbenel more "frum."
- From the first perek in Bava Batra, it is clear thta there was Edom at that time - Josephus speaks about how the Hasmoneans invaded Edom and converted forcibly Edomim - if you want to ask, but they are not so important - not a superpower like Ashur, and its not like he is Yechezkel or Yeshaya that he is giving Nevuah about a whole bunch of ations
 - some identify Edom with Rome - Midrashim speak about Gallut Edom - christian
 - not that we are in gallus in the south east of dead sea
 - ליבי ובשרי לקל חי - Ibn Ezra speaks about Edom and Yishmael - clear it means christain - often code word for Rome - should we learn pshat in Ovadiah like this? How did this identification happen
- No indication that Ovadiah is in the time of bayit sheini, but it seems he is at least after the destruction of Bayit Rishon
- Edom, You are a small nation

- simple pshat: this was true at the time - not so if you hold Ovadiah is talking about Rome - Gemara responds to this: Rome/Edom is small because they don't have their own language or script - Kashe: what about latin? Roman script is really based on Greek script - Greek script is based on Ktav Ivri - the frumer you are, the more likely you are to not like the opinion that the Torah was really given in Ktav Ivri - those amoraim would not have been popular probably in certain circles in Brooklyn - Lashon: educated Romans spoke and wrote Greek - among the educated, Latin was like Yiddish among certain maskilim - exaggeration - Romans felt inferior to the Greeks - Romans won militarily, but the Greeks won culturally - Roman writers many continued to write Greek - That is presumably what the Gemara means, the Romans conquered the world, but they lost culturally
 - Meshech Chochma - the Edomites do not have Melekh ben Melekh - the position is not inherited
- You think you are so great up in the high mountains - mountains are well protected
 - invading armies are hesitant to invade mountains - Edom is saying we are invulnerable - we are great - and part of that greatness is we are up in the mountains - Navi says,
- Sarcastic comment - Edom is a vineyard - thieves come in at night and you are completely wiped out - Edom will continue to be betrayed by people who they perceive as their allies -
- Shlomo's wisdom is said to be greater than the bnei kedem, so they were known to be smart
- Compare this to Yirmiyahu 9 later
- Next section
 - goes into detail about relationship between Eisav and Yaakov
 - be ashamed the way you behaved towards your brother Yaakov
 - when the enemies attacked Yerushalayim, you were together with them - sarcastically says -don't you dare rejoice at their debocel - do not hand over remnants of Yehuda to their enemies
 - fits very well if it is about the churban at that point they probably enslaved and tried to sell the refugees - if you want you can say the same things happened other times

- Why is the Navi so focused on Edom? Why is Edom so important? Moav and Amon don't have such a special standing??
- Karov Yom Hashem
- you drank on Har Kodshi - sounds like Chorban Bayit
- ערפת וספרד does not al pee pshat mean france and spain - in Melakhim 1 ז - Eliyahu spent time in the home of a widow in ערפת - seems like a local place in the Negev
- יחזקאל מח describes reunification of ten tribes with the rest of Israel, also earlier in yechezkel in haftarah for Vayigash - also in halakh, what was the din of shmittah in bayit sheini - was shmittah deOraitah or deRabanan - in Masechet Gittin, there is a machlokes Rashi and Rabbeinu Tam on a similar question - did the Jewish people really return to Eretz Yisrael - for more on this, look at Ramban in the beginning of Megillah, raises this question - if they did return then it resolves this problem - maybe there was enough representation of all the shvatim to state that there will be a reunification of all the Jewish people
 - Gemara in Perek Cheilek - discusses whether or not the aseret shvatim will come back - one view in Chazzal says they are never coming back - so either you can hold like the other opinion that they are coming back - or you can say the above
- Melakhim bet perek bet - found a Torah, went to a woman prophphet - why not go to Yirmiyahu - one answer: thought that a woman would intercede more sincerely the people to God - Navis are also supposed to do that - other opinion: Yirmiyahu had gone off to get the other shvatim to reunite the people
- Two qs
 - Middle section of the Nevuah - why does the Navi go into such detail - why are those details important
 - Why is Edom treated specially - if you read other neviim, you can be medayek unique aspects of one goy verses another, but not chossing one in particular like this - there are other nevuot in Tanakh which are uniquely focused on Edom
- Amos
 - speaks of 7 nations - one is Edom sin of Edom is
 - its skipped for much of the book though

- Yeshaya לך
 - its only spoken about in the Messianic section and the part about edom is very different
- Yeshaya מג
- Yimriyahu - מט in the middle of the perek - about passuk נ or ח
- Yechezkel - Edom appears twice - right at the beginnign with Amon and Moav and then in the Nechama of Yechezkel, once the worst happened already
- Malakhi - Haftarah - Yaakov and Eisav were brothers - you see my love for Yaakov in that I chose him - this fits bayit sheini period
- Tehillim: יום אדום - קלז - sounds like Ovadiah - Edom is celebrating - egging on destruction
- Eicha - שמחי בת אדום - ד - - sarcastic - גם עליך עבר כוס - same image of drinking from the כוס which is in Ovadiah (also in Yirmiyahu)
- Chumash
 - Parshat Chukat perek כ passuk יד - You know what we went through- we won't harm your land or drink your water, but the king of Edom was very belacose - unpleasant encounter
 - Devarim - Moshe telling this story - God says to Moshe, we are passing Eisav who is in Edom - they will be afraid of you, don't be afraid of them - I gave Har Seir to Eisav - seems different than Bamidbar
 - Ki Tetzei - third generation can marry - don't be too hard on them because they are your brothers - but Amon and Moav don't even marry dor asiri because they did not offer you lechem and mayim when you left Egypt - and they hired Bilaam (only applies to Moav, but not for now)
 - so Edom seems to be an enemy in Bamidbar
 - in Devarim, nothing about their behavior, but we are told that the Edomites were very much afraid, so therefore, be nice to them
 - seems to be tension between the presentation in bamidbar and Devarim
 - one approach in pshat - rishonim some - both are true , Edom was very militant and threatening - refused to let them come in, built a wall on teh

border - but when they passed by the boarder, the Edomites sold them goods - so they were good to them a little, by very begrudging, like if you would say no immigration into the United States, but they may hand out care packages at the boarder - makes sense in a way

- Rashbam: in Bamidbar, the melekh Edom was a tough guy, in Devarim, there is no mention of Melekh Edom - just says you are going among בני אדום - there are two areas in Edom - one which is consistently called בני עשו היושבים בשעיר and there is another place called מלך אדום - works out nicely - especially since the melekh Edom may have been in the mountains, so he thought he could be militant, but the בני עשו might have been in a lower place where they were more worried
 - Similar thing with Moav
- Even if you accept these answers - the question is interesting- why do we have this problem which causes Bamidbar and Devarim to speak in different voices
- (Is Ovadiah grouped with Gog Umagog or is it different - Gog Umagog is many nations invading Eretz Yisrael)
- Bamidbar - Melekh Edom is a tough guy
 - Devarim - don't invade them because they are your brothers
 - Teirutzim - Kind of Edom refused them passage through the land but beyond that they cooperated - they sold food along the border - to go, not to stay, not to eat in the restaurant (Carona)
 - Rashbam: maybe two different groups - a militant Melekh and a fearful but cooperative bnei Eisav
 - Moav - Rashbam: its not called that in Devarim but rather המואבים היושבים בער - Rav Carmy - the Melekh Edom might have felt more secure due to being in the mountains
 - Rav Carmy: why do Bamidbar and Devarim present the stories so differently on a literary level - A) Devarim is not much of a problem because mefarshim address the issue, their question is why does Devarim spend time on this - why do we have to know that these nations were afraid and we were not allowed to invade them - good answers in Rashbam and Sforno - Torah wanted to tell us these stories so we should not think that the reason we could not conquer them was the inability or

lack of interest of God, rather it is because God said don't start up with them - the hava amina is that here would be Israelites who would lose courage - obviously it is not so secure - answer: don't worry about it, there is a reason you did not act against them - other answer: Devarim - לבני לוט ... לירושלם לבני עשו - that has the effect of encouraging the Jews because the message is that there are different nations and God provides for them Ramban : specifically these are nations that relate to Avraham - Chosson Sofer- Shevel - God has allotted territory to various nations and just as God did for all these nations, so has God done for you - so important message for the people about to enter Eretz Yisrael

- in Bamidbar though, there are not many mefarshim who discuss the issue - but there is one: Rav Soloveitchik - Chukat: published by Reuven Ziegler called something like Wilderness - it is drush that solves pshat problems as well - why do the parsha begin with para aduma? The Gemara: Gittin daf samech: the parsha was given the day the mishkan was erected - forty years earlier - how else would they deal with tumat meat - Parshat Emor - Eliyah Rabbah - talks about tumat meat before talking about para aduma - what's it doing in Bamidbar - Rav Soloveitchik: answer: from a literary point of view: there is a gap between the second year and the fortieth year - Torah could have made a whole speech about it saying for 38 years they wandered in the desert as it does in Devarim when it says רב לכם שבת ההר הזה - but the Torah puts the Para Aduma in the middle - its as if it describes people dying - every year group by group the original yotzei mitzraim died - it represents the tragedy of death (Rav Soloveitchik had a very negative view of being dead - against death on principle - Reb Chaim was also against death - maybe a little because of Tolstoy) - What happens next in the story of Melekh Edom - death refuses the Parsha - Moshe is told he is not going to enter the land - the encounter is a tragic one - Jews are ready to Enter the land of Israel , they ask a favor, Melekh Edom spits in their face - this tin pot king slaps them around - they can't do what they want to do - Rav Soloveitchik: there is an aspect of Edom: they are associated with עמלק - at a drash level people constantly evoke this - עמלק did not dwell together with אדום - al pei halakha one can ask if עמלק have the same din as אדום about marriage - Rambam says you can accept גרים from עמלק - can you be both an amaleki and edomi - War with 7 Umot and amalek - article by Rav Carmy - so the encounter with Melekh Edom was not simply a frustrating experience - in the same way para aduma reflects the tragedy of death - with any other tuma you can take care of your self and immerse in the mikveh - but for tumat meat you need the kohen - uniqueness because death is a terrible tragedy - Edom Amalek

is an irredeemable enemy and there is nothing you can do with him until acharit hayamim - someday there will be triumph but not now - major theme of parshat chukat is tragedy in the midbar so the encounter with melekh edom is also an encounter with an ultimate evil - Bamidbar the theme of entering eretz yisrael and everything being good forever fails, but that is not a relevant theme in Devarim - Is Edom just one nation among the others as implicit from yechezkel and yirmiyahu or is it very different from among the goyim as ovadiah being preoccupied with edom and יחזקאל לה and some perakim in Yehshaya which are extra severe and focused on Edom

- or the world is a funny place - stalin and hitler made a pact - Balak is more easy to understand - not wanting to go to war, but making trouble behind their back - but sometimes people make alliances with a nation for something but hate each other for others
- Yirmiyahu מט makes similar point to Ovadiah
- What is this cup of woe - in Yirmiyah כה - there is a nevuah in which God tells Yirmiyahu - woe to all the nations - cup of wrath - ששך is atbash code word for בבל - fall down and not get up - they will be forced to drink - Divine punishment of all Goyim is associated with drinking from the cup of wrath -
- Edom being foolish is towards the end of Ovadiah
- ירמיהו around passuk 16 is very much like the first two pesukim in Ovadiah - people will walk by and will whistle at what happened to edom - echo of Devarim about Sdom
- who are these weak and minor of the flock צעירי הצאן - the babylonians??? They were mighty at the time! - The Jews? perhaps. they were viewed as weak at the time, yet they will be the ones who will take revenge against edom - that's Radak - makes sense theologically
- Rashi did not want to accept that view - he said they are goyim who are not respected - Edom will not be destroyed by a major nation - if you are going to be vanquished, you at least want to be vanquished by a respectable nation
 - or the Persians - before becoming an empire, not considered so important
- Yirmiyahu נ - passuk מד - king of Bavel will be shaking, same things which were said about edom are now said about Bavel - very similar -

- Three parts of Yirmiyah on Edom - first is parallel to 678 of Ovadiah - the middle of ovadiah - it culminates in God swearing to vanquish edom which is not in ovadiah - then second is similar to first couple pesukim in Ovadiah - then ending in unique to Yirmiyahu but parallel to Yirmiyahu נ which Radak says is about Bnai Yisrael vanquishing Edom
- Ibn Ezra: plural in Ovadiah refers to many other neviim - שמועה שמענו me, Yeshayahu, Yirmiyahu...
- who is supposed to get together to fight Edom? Apparently all the goyim - its not just something for Jews, but for the world - mobilizing the Goyim
- Which passuk is good for opening - שמועה שמענו? Yes - I heard there is a call to war - sounds good, so why is the order different in Yirmiyahu - why is passuk י not a normal opening passuk - sounds like beginning of a speech, not the end of a speech -
- In Yirmiyahu they are two separate Nevuot - not one organized nevuah against Edom - one begins לאדום and the second begins שמועה שמעתי - Why are they in the order they are in - maybe because that was the order in which they were delivered - first Nevuah talks about Edom being wiped out - then passuk י - take a look at Ovadiah pasuk ו - look at what happened to עשו - in Yirmiyahu and important word is added אני - what is Yirmiyahu emphasizing about the destruction of Edom? Who - It is God who is doing that - in Hebrew, you don't need the pronoun - why don't we see God swearing in one of them - Yirmiyahu: great deal of emphasis on Divine agency - God is doing the work - in Ovadiah, maybe God is not playing this larger role - שמועה שמעתי - there he talks about how Edom is overly secure - you thought I was invulnerable - destruction of Edom - **emphasis on God's action - only at the end at passuk כ is there human agency - צירי הצאן - not very impressive agents at that** - **Rashi says they are not even the Jews - Rav Carmy's way of reading: based on order of the pesukim - story between the lines of Yirmiyahu is a nevuah in which Bnai Yisrael does not act against Edom - its God acting almost unilaterally - Navi does not bang on the table and shout this but it seems to be between the lines -**
- Opening pesukim of Ovadiah - parallel to Yirmiyahu but do not emphasize Divine unilateral action - all the parallels are in the opening pesukim - once you get to passuk י - Ovadiah is on his own - what do we have in Ovadiah that we don't have in Yirmiyahu in this section - מחמס אחיך יעקב - is Edom a nation like all the others - no, they are related to us - one point could be: Rav: edom represents metaphysical

evil like amalek - or you could still say that Edom is special because of its shameful treatment of Yaakov

- in the first nevuah - God acts totally alone - later there is some element of human participation - isn't שמעתי שמוע a better opening line - but they are two separate Nevuot so its the opening of the second nevuah
- Ovadiah passuk י - the history between Am Yisrael and Edom becomes important - in Yirmiyah- Edom is a nation like all other nations - in Ovadiah, by passuk י, Edom is special. Why? Could say because they are amalek, but we see here because of how they behaved toward their brother Yaakov
- Where is there insadence of Goyim entering and conquering Yerushalayim famously? Churban is a good candidate - in Yirmiyahu, no reference to the churban - began in 626 bce - forty years before churban habayit- his nevuah about Edom is not about churban habayit, so makes it seem earlier than the Nevuah in Ovadiah - seems to be delivered after the churban taken most simply that its not about a minor instance noone knows about - so now we understand the greater severity in Ovadiah - hurt Am Yisrael severely even though they should be kin to Yaakov
- (Abarbanel said the thing about Yirmiyahu not being so medakdek about kri uchtiv, and Malbim was very upset at Abarbanel for saying this - and Rav Lichtenstein was upset at the Abarbenel for this - not sophisticated because the Navi's language wasn't smooth??? Abarbenel would have rethought this if he read modern literature, its value is not about being smooth, or rhyming - important when talking to bible critics - just because the text doesn't look right to you - maybe you should think about the text more rather than rearranging it - this may even be important when studying english lit like shakespeare - the text we have in shakespeare might be more meduyak than what the scholar tried to smooth out - when you have two nevuot, do you leave them where they are? sometimes something is not reedited because the author did not get around to it- Worship of the Heart: there was a passage which was not clear where it belonged, the Rav never made a decision about it - Rav Carmy had ot make the decision, so he reordered it in a way which was most user friendly - allerted the reader - but to say that the whole thing was not edited and smoothed out, and that means the navi did not know what he was doing... ok, you could have done differently, but our bias is that the text should be understood as it is - as we have it, it is going from God acting unilaterlly ot human involvement and that is meaningful development - Yirmiyahu is before the churban and describign a situation whre the peopled are paralyzed - God acts alone because the people are not there - but in Ovadiah the very beginning is Let us go to war - beginging has nothing about

God acting alone, so it is after the chorbán and the people are more collected so the navi can speak to them about them playing a significant role in revenge and not completely dependant on God - could be amalek - two parshiot of amalek - one in Shmot and one in Devarim - shmot ends **מַחָה אֶמְלֶכְךָ** - opposed to Devarim **מַחָה תִּמְחָה** - the mitzvah for us appears in Devarim - Parshat Zachor is read from Devarim - corresponds to our discussion - by the time we get to Devarim it is possible for God to turn to the people and say, you should do it -

- Edom and Rome - Why Edom Rome - if Chazzal realized that the nevuot in tanakh about edom are more than that about other nations regardless if it is because of Yaakov or Amalek - Chazzal noticed it and said they are not just this small nation by the dead sea but more than that - so they say they are Rome - how does this happen at a technical level - Bialek once said someone quoted to him Yerushalmi that one who eats matzah erev pesach is like someone who sleeps with his fiancé prematurely - Bialek remarked I treid both and there is no comparison at all between the two - clever joke - take a roman and edomite - I have seen both and they do not seem alike at all - how did this develop - The last kings of Yehuda were descendants of Edomite geirim - so the people representing the Romans in Judea were Edomites - could be part of it - or it could be a literary conceit and zehu - or Edom is Rome because the edomites and romans really are the same people - how? Radak - Roman empire was founded by Edomites - where did he get this from ? Maybe from other information about the founding of Rome - how was it founded according to the legend? There was a trojan named anius - when troy was sacked, he left and eventually got to Rome and founded Rome - big poem called aniad about his - so Rome was founded by people who came from the east - a little tweaking gets you that edomites founded Rome - that's the Radak's move - like saying the original founders of the US were Englishman - the alternative is Ibn Ezra who holds that Edom and Rome are identified not because of Rome but because of the christian church - christianity came from Eretz Yisra'el - and these early christians were highly represented by the edomites - so then it is natural to refer to Rome as Edom - if you hold like Ibn Ezra, then is this identification relevant to the chorbán? No, it would have occurred hundreds of years later - you can't blame the christians for destroying the beit hamikdash - you did not help, you were bystanders - does not fit Rome who were very involved in the chorbán - Radak realized this problem with his peirush - so he says Edom is Rome and is not Rome - two dinim in Edom - if you really want to say the two are identical, then you have a problem because then one seems to be a bystander - so originally there was no gap between edom and rome but by the chorbán there was in bayit sheini - just because englishman founded some colonies

does not mean that today america is the same as england - when Rav Carmy was in college, there were two required semesters of english literature - why not french literature, because we are not french - so why not american literature - part was a lack of respect for it and part was that we are somewhat englishman - if you think in those terms then you can say that even though edom is identical with Rome, when he is talking about Edom, he is talking about the edomites south east of Eretz Yisrael, not the edomites which are rom - there are Italian Americans who make a big deal out of their heritage, but they think of themselves as Americans - Yogi Berra would say he is American - Radak works very hard to keep the Bayit Sheini - it is valuable religiously - we don't want these nevuot to be limited to one period, we want it also to have messianic energy - Abarbenel was aware of the same problem - the nevuah seems to be about edom be a bystander and not a major agent - in addition at a pshat level does it really make sense that Ovadiah would be ignoring bayit rishon and focusing ONLY about bayit sheini - Neviim don't ignore what is going on under their nose - - Abarbenel goes to great length to make nevuot messianic so he was moser nefesh on this point because of what Christians were doing - so he says the pesukim were talking about both bayit rishon and sheini - bystanders talks about rishon - don't tell me like the Radka that bystanders refers to the south east edomites - ikker chasei min hasefer

- (Yeshaya how many authors) - if someone says this can't be Yeshaya because he can't know the future - that's denying nevuah - if says that it's not the inbag of neviim to talk about the future so far in advance like that - that we can discuss - if one wants to say that Bava Batra says nothing about multiple authors, that depends on how seriously you take the attributions of Chazal - some say it's very important - Rav Tzadok HaKohen - said Abarbenel was treating the amoraim like they are his friend - not a compliment - As far as we can tell, Dead Sea scrolls and others do not split it into two, so why would we - Bueber (good reader of Tanakh - Rav Spoke well of him in that area but maybe not in philosophy) - held that even though there are multiple authors, it is a unified book - scholars today who believe in multiple authorship write books where they see it as a unified text - sound from: talmidim of Yeshaya... or Anshei Haknesset Hagedolah wrote the asar does not mean Hosea did not exist - if you believe in the unique agency of Moshe...

ישעיהו לד -

- Is this the judgement of all the nations, or Edom?
- sefer Hashem - Torah - go read the Torah and you see that all the animals are there - what does this mean - Rashi and Radak say that the navi is directing you to read

particular pesukim in Chumash which describe manajery of animals - Radak: Shimini - Rashi: read parshat Noach (maybe not a list, but still a sense of an entire Biblical zoo - Seems a little funny to Rav Carmy - Why would the Navi want to be clever at this point? There is another relevant passuk in the Torah to here - כתב בספר Hashem - refering to Amalek - not just sefer Hashem, but also something Hashem told Yehoshua to write - so then here the Navi is hinting broadly that nevah to Edom picks up some of its ___ from its hidden connection to Amalek - some want to find Rome even in Yirmiyahu - but these really seem to hint to Amalek - gives them cosmic importance more than a small people east of the dead sea should

- In Ovadiah and Yeshayah there is a call to all the Goyim
- Yeshaya סג - part of a string of happy nevuot
 - comes out of nowhere -
 - why are clothes described as sour חמוץ - later they are adom - clearly they were just treading grapes - grapes and edom are related: their color - also ambiguity here whether it is about other nations or Edom
- Ovadiah - last pesukim
 - nevuah is about edom, yet passuk טו - says על כל הגוים - third nevuah which is ambiguous about who is being judged between edom and the other nations
 - As you drank על הר קדשי
 - Yirmiyahu 45 and 29 - was drinking on har kodshi myrth or woe - woe - everyone will drink from the cup and if they say we wont drink tell them no you will drink and melekh sheishak will also - in מט - Edom is drinking and it seems bad - what about here? Did Edom drink from the cup of woe on har kodshi -not yet - Ovadiah seems to say all the nation s will drink but they have not drunk yet -so it seems this isa happy drink - Rashi: rejoice! You rejoiced and drank, but the way you drank, so will they, but they will not enjoy it so much - very often you have some alcohol and then more and then by the time you get up to eight or nine drinks, you may not be feeling so good, get sick, vomit - or maybe the positive drinking is addressed to Bnai Yisrael
 - Rav Carmy: Har Kodshi is the beit hamikdash since this is post chorban
 - Radak: tamid- they will drink continually until they get drunk and vomit

- Beit Yosef - could be synechdecy for all of Bnai Yisrael - used that way in Tehillim - Chazzal see Bnei Yosef as essential in defeating Amalek - like Mordechai defeats haman and is from Binyamin
 - The onus is on Bnai Yisrael to do this - sounds like the obligation to destroy Amalek - its going to be the founding of God's kingship - כי יד על כס י-ה - the throne of Hashem is not complete (chazzal say(?)) until Amalek is wiped out
 - ...ששי ושמחי בת ציון... - Edom is the major enemy
- Why is there is ambiguity if God is judging all the nations, or Edom or both?
- Ein hacha nami - Edom/amalek represents a kind of metaphysical evil - opposition to the Ribono shel olam - that is why e/a is special - not so contraversial at htis point - but then let me ask - is Edom only amalek - over the coarse of history is edom the only evil nation - who rejoiced in the chorbam - not true - certain kinds of people will say its not just the germans they are all anti semitan - certain truth to that - the germans did not act completely separate from the rest - so why does it fall on them Germans or amalek - what do you want ot do - if you want ot say pierce through a mountain - God should wipe out the whole world - another mabul - to quote measure for measure - treat every man according to his deserts and who escapes a whipping - we all deserve judgement - but if God exhausted midat hadin agaisnt all then the world would be destroyed - go back to Yona - if you want only ideal tshuva or overall decency then who would escape destruction - so in effect, edom becomes a kindof representative of a tendency that belongs to the whole world - if you say that then you understand why in the theme of hte nevuot we wsaw - there is a blurring of th line betwee nedom and everyone else - you expect the sword in Yeshaya t o come down on everyone else - Amalek becomes the representative for the purging of all of humanity - Rav Medan has a book length essay where he goes through everything on Amalek - Rav Carmy has a essay on ethics of war - when it came to Amalek two points - the ethnic element - they are bnai Eisav - two ; the attack by Amalek did not satisfy any selfish motivatino - gog umagagog attack for blunder - Amalek was unbidden uncalled for and unmotivated (ויזנב בך) - Ramban gives these two reasons - and they really seem to be in the pesukim - also fits the elements in Neviim which fits the metaphysical edom - חמס אחיך יעקב - and that there is no sense that Edom had a practical motive in terms of regular international politics for its enmity towards Yehuda - Rivka's Nevuah ולאום - when one goes up, the other goes down - might be what comes out of

chumash really - Did the brother relationship have to end up that way - book to honor Rabbi Lamm - Rav Carmy wrote about how could it have continued - if you have this notion, then you understand why all these nevuot are both all goyim, but then really end up being about Edom

- one kashe: what do you call when you are really angry about a bunch of people but then take it out on one - scape goat - we generally view that as unfair - decent people often may make an effort not to single out one person to make them feel like they are the enemy - Edom or amalek really really really deserved it - so you single out the most egregious offender - people congregating on the street police don't like it - police want to make an example of someone so they make an example out of the person who is being most obnoxious - the greatest offender - another thing possible to say: there are things we don't understand - there are mitzvot in mechiyas amalek which do not agree with our ethical intuitions - but we should understand what we don't understand - we should have a clear idea of where we have to give - saying we don't understand anything about it is the lazy way out - we should analyze properly so we know clearly - orthodox forum volume on war - google Rav Carmy amalek war and tradition - we stop at צריך עיון, but there is a value to make sense out of what you have before you despite the צריך עיון
- look at chumash: you have the relationship between Yaakov and Eisav which ends rather nicely - in Breishis you can make one judgement - then there is Melekh Edom in bamidbar - most of Neviim, Edom is just one among the nations - then זכר מאדום, it seems that יואב thought he was involved in wiping away amalek - so then why are there Neviim who develop this notion of Edom being like Amalek - where are they coming from, why did they go towards this association which you would not get from other pesukim - Makhlokes whether or not Amalek are the same as Edomites, or if they went separate ways - is there a historical point in which this association became more?
 - One Passuk may be relevant here - when did Yeshaya live? Who are the kings - חזקיהו - Gemara in Brakhot י describes conversation between them - Divrei Hayamim 1 - not widely read by our people - Rashash has notes in the back of Mishnayos Avot - he says when it comes to Divrei Hayamim there are people who say anything they please as pshat - the first part is open - Yichus - most of us not so interested in it - but if you

Tuesday, January 21, 2020

go through the yuchsin, there is a section dealing with yichus of shevet shimon - we hear little about them generally because their nachala is in Yehuda, so they become secondary to Yehuda - but here there are places where they were - then you get to נח - which says the people are written down, during the time of Chizkiyah - (which is the time of Yeshaya) - but others of Bnei Shimon went to Har Seir - 500 men - they wiped out Amalek - they were mekayem the mitzvah - they did it on Har Seir - historically, Amalek and Edom did not live in the same place, regardless of their shared grandfather - but this last mechiyas zecher amalek, finds them on Har seir - they tend to be nomads in neviim, but here they are on Har Seir - so whatever they were way back, the identification with amalek is reintroduced by the times of chizkiyah, so not surprising that when Yeshaya is describing the ultimate evil which has to be overcome - so they come together at that point and then we are not surprised if it turns up in Ovadiah or elsewhere

- Rav Carmy will be here regular time next tuesday for chazzara
- for those curious, this may be the article rebbe referred to
- https://www.jstor.org/stable/23263023?read-now=1&refreqid=excelsior%3A3f4f232847d04a8dba866471118b7d6d&seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents
- The Origin of Nations and the Shadow of Violence: Theological Perspectives on Canaan and Amalek
- but why did they start to associate Edom with Amalek by Chizkiyah's time??