**8/30/07**

* **Gemara** – Trei Asar is authored by the Anshei K’nesses Ha’Gdolah, who were the last editorial agents. They needed to put all of these niviim together because they’re so short. The order is set, and it’s roughly in chronological order. The Christians reorder it, and they therefore get a different literary experience.
* **YONAH–** the basic story line is dealing with Ninveh and teshuvah
* Some sefarim in Tanach get historical data, but Yonah doesn’t. He lived at the time when Ashur was around.
* In Melachim Beis, around the time of Yeravam ben Yoash, there was a navi named Yonah mentioned. The dating of this is roughly 8th century BCE. He was living at the end of the dynasty of Malchus Yisroel, and was a rasha. Yeravam achieves a number of military successes because Hashem saw the weakness of B’nei Yisroel and wanted to save them, and not let B’nei Yisroel get wiped out. Hashem had pity, and B’nei Yisroel didn’t deserve it. Either (a) Yonah had a nevuah about Yeravam’s military successes, or (b) the nevuah of Yonah was that support given to Yeravam because of the pity of Hashem, which connects to the sefer of Yonah.
* Chazal say that Hashem speaks to Yonah twice in this sefer, which implies that he only spoke twice. This might be disputed because it seems that he also speaks in Melachim! However, they connect the two nevuos in Sefer Yonah and consider it to be two nevuos.
* By the 8th century, Ashur was a major power. They destroyed Jewish independence in Eretz Yisroel at Yeravam’s time. There don’t seem to be any ties between Nineveh and Ashur in Sefer Yonah.
* **Gemara Pesachim**- Eliyahu insisted on the kavod of the father (Hashem), and not the kavod of the son (B’nei Yisroel), i.e. he acted with strict justice towards B’nei Yisroel, Yonah was concerned with the kavod of B’nei Yisroel as opposed to Hashem, and Yirmiyahu was concerned with both.
* **Gospel of Luke**- the Jews don’t listen to their neviim; Nineveh listened to Yonah, but the Jews didn’t.
* **Perek Aleph**
* There seems to be an element of surprise with the wording used, e.g. “Vayakam Yonah”, and then “livroach Tarshisha”. Why is this? (a) it would look bad for the Jews if the goyim do teshuvah, (b) Abarbanel – if Nineveh isn’t destroyed, then Ashur will destroy Malchus Yisroel. If their teshuvah is prevented, Ashur will be destroyed and no one will be around to destroy Malchus Yisroel.
* “Milifnei Hashem” – Why did Yonah want to run away? People do things instinctively, so Yonah knew that there was no nevuah outside of Eretz Yisroel. But, that isn’t entirely true, since people can still get nevuah in the Diaspora if it starts in Eretz Yisroel.
* **Ibn Ezra** quotes the Rasag, that Yonah was concerned about being laughed at by Ashur: either for personal reasons, or for Hashem’s sake. Either Yonah chickens out and is afraid, or his idea of Hashem’s interests is different than Hashem’s actual interests. This may be a flaw inherent in Yonah’s character. It’s also possible that he was running away because he didn’t want to face the situation, not because he was rebelling.
* What is Yonah supposed to tell them? Either a reason or a quote. There’s no precise script written in Perek Aleph. He finds a ship in Yafo and hires it. The wore “Vayeired” can either mean that he went down to leave Israel, or that he went down to the shore.
* **Pirkei D’Rebbe Eliezer**- he hired the entire boat, which clearly costs a lot of money. He was seemingly very anxious to get away. This calls attention to Yonah, which is why the people on the ship are suspicious of him. Oftentimes, guilty people fall asleep.

**9/6/07**

* **R’ Elazar Belgantzi**- Yonah didn’t really run away, he was an old man so traveling was difficult for him, so instead he took a boat. He didn’t disobey Hashem! This seems rather farfetched, because it doesn’t fit the text, or really make any sense. This might’ve been Yonah’s perspective and he thought he was doing the correct thing. Or maybe he didn’t know what he was doing.
* “Vayitain sechara” – according to Rashi, he paid for the entire boat. This behavior is highly suspicious and very odd.
* At first it says “goralos”, and then it switches to “goral”. They drew lots several times and it kept falling on Yonah. The people on the boat weren’t quick to judge, or accusatory.

**Perek Beis**

* According to 14th century parshan, the first two perakim of Yonah aren’t meant to be taken literally. The Vilna Gaon describes Yonah allegorically. There’s no element of bakasha, except at the end of his prayer when he says “yeshuasa l’Hashem”. If he disobeyed Hashem, why is there acknowledgment of it? Where’s the teshuva?
* **Josephus**- claims that Yonah davened when he was already out of the fish. He claims the mizmor doesn’t fit. Some people say that a generic mizmor in Tehillim was plugged into this sefer, and that it wasn’t originally there. We need to know that this mizmor fits into Yonah to disprove Bible critics. For that, we need to examine the structure. The words “heichal kadshecha” are mentioned in passuk 5 and 8, so that must be important. Yonah says that he was in trouble, and that Hashem saved him twice. The **Malbim** claims that Yonah was the boy that Eliyahu resurrected, so the two stanzas are referring to two different incidents.
* **Why is there no bakasha**? Maybe Yonah feels like he doesn’t have any zechus, so he’s compromising. The fish is the solution for him. Yonah failed and doesn’t want to deal with the repercussions. Hashem saved his life, and it’s remarkable that he didn’t drown. He already pleaded, and he has already been saved, so he’s not yet ready to plead for anything else at this point in the story. He is satisfied with where he is; thanksgiving would make sense if he was already out of the fish.
* **“**Heichel kadshecha” – Yonah wants to go to the Beis HaMikdash.
* **“**Mishamrim hevlei shav” – this is in reference to the people on the boat, they make nedarim and don’t fulfill them, but Yonah says that he will fulfill his neder. This could be referring to three things: (a) something nice, (b) something nasty (Rashi), or (c) something nasty about the shipmates. IF you go by Rashi’s interpretation, the mizmor fits the sefer, because you don’t say nasty things in a bakasha. A bakasha is usually said if (a) a person has enemies or (b) wisdom psalms – reshaim vs. tzadikkim in terms of the way the world works.

**10/11/07**

* There are two types of tefillah : tefillah and tziakah. Spontaneous tefillah doesn’t necessarily reflect the pattern of bakasha, hodaah, or shevach. Yonah seems to have no bakasha, and doesn’t express any remorse.
* Chazal noticed that the lashon changed from “dag” to “dagah”. On a peshat level, there is no different between these two words. According to the medrash, he was in the belly of a male fish originally, but he was too comfortable. He was spit out and put into a female fish that was full of eggs. The uncomfortable situation pushed him to daven to Hashem. Hashem speaks to the fish, and not to Yonah, because Yonah isn’t a good messenger at this present time. Hashem sometimes does talk to animals when the navi doesn’t listen, e.g. Bilaam and in Melachim Aleph.

Perek Gimmel

* “Ir Gedolah L’Elokim” – **Ibn Ezra –** it’s a city of tzadikkim, which explains why Yonah was sent to Nineveh. There is no mention of avodah zarah because they were good people. This is why they deserved to get a warning to do teshuva. **Radak/Ramban**- it was a really big city, this is using Hashem’s name in a profane way. **Abarbanel**- avodah zarah is irrelevant here, the issue was whether the city self-destructs or not. Can they survive? A society can’t survive with injustice and bad interpersonal relationships.
* **Gemara Taanis**- The mishnah describes the routine on a public fast day. In the second part of the day, an elder gives a speech about teshuvah. It says “Vayar Elokim Es Maaseihem”; Nineveh is a model of what teshuvah is all about. The Tosefta omits the mention of Yonah. Resh Lakish says that the teshuvah of Nineveh was deceitful. They took the animals and separated the calves from cows. Animals don’t know why they’re fasting. The people of Nineveh said “if you have no mercy on us, we have no mercy on our animals”. There’s a problem with dragging animals into teshuva.
* **Auerbach-** Hashem accepts the teshuvah. The story was a rebuke to the Jews, according the Christians. It shows how neviim come and the Jews don’t listen, but the goyim immediately respond, and this makes the Jews look bad. However, the teshuvah of Nineveh wasn’t a perfect one. The king of Nineveh pretended to be pious, while secretly wanting recognition. He drags the animals into the whole teshuvah process in order to make something new.

**10/18/07**

* There is a complaint of negativism regarding the people of Nineveh in Talmud Yerushalmi. It would therefore make sense to put something meant to be anti-Christian in the Yerushalmi since there were Christians in Israel. But (a) the evidence is thin – there’s only one source and the Yerushalmi doesn’t have so much agadita. Most of the agadita originates in Israel. (b) Bavli comments in Ta’anis about Nineveh – Shmuel says that the people of Nineveh returned the “meirish hagazul”. The Mishnah says that in terms of halacha, a thief has to return a “meirish hagazul” if he repents. He has to tear down the house and return the board. This is a halacha which shouldn’t be done, rather you should do a realistic teshuva. Shmuel says that it was an extreme and panicky teshuvah which won’t have long-lasting results. The lesson of Sefer Yonah is that teshuvah works.

Perek Daled

* “Kikayon” – castor plant or a gourd, according to Ibn Ezra
* Yonah has a death wish in this perek. Eliyahu also has a death wish in Melachim Aleph when Izevel wants to kill him. He runs away into the desert, and tells Hashem to take his life because he has failed. He reaches Har Choreiv, goes to the cave and sleeps there. Hashem asks him what he’s doing there, and Eliyahu says that I’m zealous for Hashem and B’nei Yisroel abandoned your bris and only I remain. Hahsem sends a wind, an earthquake, a fire, and a “kol dimama dakah”. Eliyahu covers his face and goes out of the cave. Hashem gives Eliyahu 3 tasks. The connection between Eliyahu and Yonah is the desire for death and the running away. This shows a type of symmetry between the two of them. **R’ Yehoshua Bachrach**- Eliyahu is wrong because he stands for kinaus, and Hashem tries to educate him. Eliyahu fails to understand how to use midas harachamim, so he gets replaced by Elisha. Yonah refuses to learn the lesson of midas harachamim, but we aren’t told how the story of Yonah ends in that sense. Yonah and Elisha don’t care for Hashem and B’nei Yisroel equally. Yonah has two stages: he’s upset and asks for death because he knows Hashem is merciful, and in the second stage he’s silent. After the second time, he asks for death because of the kikayon. Eliyahu uses the same answer twice, doesn’t say he doesn’t agree with Hashem’s ways; rather he just calls himself a kinaee for Hashem. Eliyahu doesn’t disobey Hashem like Yonah does. Kinaus is legitimate, but rejecting the midas harchamim is a challenge between Yonah and Hashem. Yonah thinks that he’s Eliyahu. There is a connection regarding limitations between Yonah and Eliyahu.

**10/25/07**

* Yonah rejects the midas hadin, in contrast to Eliyahu. Hashem seems to be disparaging Nineveh at the end of the sefer as well. This has to do with Hashem’s connection to the world – Hashem is committed to Nineveh because he created it. Yonah likes the kikayon because it gives him shade, but just how important is it? He already has a sukkah, so really the kikayon is just extra. Yonah appreciates it even if he doesn’t need it. He is irrationally depressed when Hashem takes it away from him. Hashem didn’t work very hard for Nineveh, but it still means something to Him. Hashem bases his answer simply on the fact that He created them. They aren’t that impressive; there are 120,000 idiots and animals. This doesn’t seem to justify the salvation of Nineveh because of their teshuva; it’s merely because of the fact that Hashem created it and that He cares about it.
* There are two apparent lessons from Yonah: (a) the importance of teshuva and (b) Hashem wants to forgive.
* “Mikom mikdashecha” and “admasi” – Yonah mentions Eretz Yisroel and the Beis HaMikdash a lot, and it’s clearly very important to him. He doesn’t seem to care that much about the nation s much. According to Chazal, there is barely a reference to Eretz Yisroel, but there’s a lot about b’nei Yisroel.
* **Yerushalmi/Sukkah**- talking about the Simchas Beis HaShoeivah, and that Yonah was there. This is the only reference made by Chazal to Yonah and Eretz Yisroel. Am Yisroel and Ahavas Yisroel connect to each other. There will only be a distinction between them if something happens to make you distinguish them from each other. Which plays a larger role? You could argue either way, or say you care for them both the same. Yonah cares about both, Chazal show him as caring about Ahavas Yisroel a lot. If this is so, why do the pesukim focus on the land? If he’s very disappointed in the people, it might focus on the land more because it’s a unifying factor regardless.
* **Melachim Beis, Perek Hey**- Na’aman has tzaraas and no one can do anything about it. He gets told to consult Elisha, who tells him to bathe in the Yarden. Na’aman asked why he needs the Yarden and not a river in Syria. He does it anyway, and is consequently healed. This shows that the land of Israel can heal.

**YOEL**

* There are no dates attached to Yoel. Why, and can we supply the date from somewhere else? 1. There is another character in Tanach named Yoel, who is the son of Shmuel. The Tanach says that they didn’t follow in his ways, but that Yoel changed his ways and became a navi. He is called Pesuel because Shmuel was a good davener. 2. Stories about locusts in this book. Yoel lived during a famine, and there’s a famine mentioned at the time of Elisha. There is no king mentioned in Melachim Beis because the kings were generally bad, and the author didn’t want to give unnecessary kavod to them. 3. Yoel is also identified with the period of Menashe; he wasn’t mentioned because Menashe was a rasha. 4. Yoel’s nevuah is at the time of bayis sheni. There is no king mentioned because there was no king to speak of.

**11/1/07**

* It may not be an actual famine; rather it might just be a lack of joy among the people. **Alshich**- the image of drunkards is a metaphor for the whole nation. They aren’t necessarily drunk from wine.
* In pasuk 10, oil and bread is added in addition to wine and figs. Bread is a lot more essential but is only mentioned after wine and figs. It mentions drunkards, kohanim, and farmers – but where is the rest of the nation? B’nei Adam is mentioned after and only that they’re unhappy, without mentioning the word famine. In pasuk 13, it says “ki nimna mibeis Elokeichem”, as opposed to “beis Hashem”, which is more intimate. In pasuk 16, it says “ki karov yom Hashem”. What is a Yom Hashem? It’s a day of Divine Judgment. The first mention of Yom Hashem is in Amos. People assume that it’s going to be great for us, but that’s not true; it isn’t something to look forward to. Fire and water is added in at the end of perek Aleph. Perek Beis- Yom Hashem is also associated with darkness. The locusts are associated with the darkness; they come like an invading army. Locusts spread out on the mountains. **Abarbanel**- shachar means darkness here, as opposed to daybreak. The locusts are compared to horses. Abarbanel believes that this is describing a real army, as opposed to locusts. In Shoftim, Midian is compared to locusts as well.

**11/6/07**

* **Abarbanel**- there are lots of uses of the prefix “like”. If it really is, why is there so much of that? If onlookers are confused by what they’re being attacked by, it could use that prefix. They didn’t know if it was a horse or not, this was the first time they were seeing horseback riders. According to the **Abarbanel**, there are two different explanations because there are different prophecies: (a) economic effect and (b) attack terms description. Most meforshim are of the opinion that there are 2 plagues of locusts. Perek beis describes them as an army; they’re organized, relentless, and unstoppable. This description engenders more fear.
* “Yom Hashem” – there are images of darkness described, because when locusts swarm, they darken the sky.
* “v’Hashem nasan kolo lifnei chaylo” – it’s an army commanded and lead by Hashem. What are they supposed to do teshuva for? There’s no reference to the evil that needs to be fixed! What is teshuva? It’s when you turn away from something or turn towards something. It usually involves turning away from sin, but you don’t necessarily need to turn away in order to turn to Hashem. The **Rambam** says that when you’re in trouble, you’re chayav b’teshuvah, it isn’t dependent on a specific sin. If Yoel is indeed a bayis sheni work, then it makes sense that this is a teshuvah bli chayt, because there was no avodah zarah at the time of the second beis hamikdash. According to **R’ Soloveitchik**, the malaise felt at this time causes everyone to feel a need to turn to Hashem. This malaise is caused by a lack of closeness to Hashem.
* There’s no king at this time, but we do have a Beis HaMikdash, so the kohanim cry out to Hashem. “Limshal bam goyim” – (a) could mean a byword to the nations or (b) to be ruled over by goyim. “Cherpah” – (a) economic downturn (b) people will leave Israel and be ruled over by goyim. “Moreh” – rain, or as a teacher.

**11/8/07**

* Usually when yom Hashem is referred to, it includes imagery of darkness, and the sun and moon being stopped and darkened. We can either take this literally or not. According to the **Rambam**, we’re dealing with a metaphor here. Everything will be dark and this is a figure of speech. It’s a bad sign for the Jews. Even if it’s predictable, it’s still bad. Some people claim that yom Hashem is one day and that it’s final. There’s no need to assume this, it could happen again because it’s a day of Divine Judgment.

Perek Gimmel

* **Ibn Ezra-**  frequently in Tanach, you end with what you start with, so that’s why it’s in reverse order (re: shamayim v’aretz, and dam, v’aish, v’simros ashan)
* Pasuk daled seems to be describing a solar eclipse. It uses the word “lifnei”, so it’ll happen before yom Hashem, which makes the Rambam’s opinion a problem. The **Radak** says that it has to a literal eclipse, because it is a preparation for the yom Hashem. “Eimek Yehoshafat” – could be a pun with the word mishpat, or at the time of Melachim Beis. Pasuk gimmel talks about slaves and how degraded they are. If they’re sold to Greece, you can’t get them back because it’s overseas and far away. There was a lot of slave trade, so if you go overseas, the assumption is that you can’t ever get back to Israel. Pasuk yud is a parody of the passuk in Yeshayahu about turning agricultural tools into weapons, this might be evidence that Yoel came after Yeshayahu.
* Yoel seems to be similar to Yechezkel perek 38 – they’re both in Israel, every nation is showing up in both of them. Both are happening after kibbutz galios. Both have earthquakes, and water flowing eastward. There is also a similar type of thing in Zechariah perek 14: there’s a coalition of enemies that go to Yerushalayim. There’s an earthquake, and Har HaZaisim splits into two. There’s also yom Hashem imagery. There’s also water mentioned as going east and west.

**11/15/07**

* Gog and Magog- a large number of nations come to Israel and they fall on the mountains there. It’s hard to find graves for them. The water got salty because of Sodom and the topography changed. The body of water changes to a living body of water. In Zechariah, there is detail of water coming out of Yerushalayim, and traveling east and west. Yoel has a lot of the same imagery, but it’s different in the sense that the yom Hashem imagery is really just preparation. There isn’t a famine mentioned either, it’s just a lack of joy among the people. Everyone’s ready to go to war, but there was no war. The threats didn’t come true, and the famine never came. It’s possible that these details are a sort of a road map to the days of Moshiach. It could also be a common theme of all neviim, i.e. all goyim invading. This attack is doomed to failure, whether through Hashem intervening or the other nations dying. Yoel presents the most pleasant alternative.
* **Gemara Sanhedrin**- discusses the date of Moshiach. There are alternative dates. Yeshayahu says “bi’eeta achishena”. This passuk is a contradiction…it’s either “bi’eeta”, or “achishena”. Rather, if the Jews merit it, it’ll be early, if not, then it’ll be at the last moment.
* The imagery of Yoel is presented in the peaceful way of describing the yom Hashem. It’s not a crisis of avodah zarah, or widespread evil: it’s people who are joyless because of an economic downfall. These people are zocheh to a threat that’s not even realized.
* Neviim used Torah when they wrote, because Tanach is one continuous book. **Mayer Weiss**- It says “Hashem miZion shag” three times in Tanach; Yoel, Amos, and Yirmiyahu. It gets dark and Hashem roars. All wild animals come out at night, and that’s why darkness is associated with the emergence and roaring of animals. What’s the difference between the two of them? One threat is economic and the other is war. There are two crises: 1st crisis’s remedy is teshuvah – if you’re in trouble, you need to turn to Hashem, because troubles aren’t just happenstance. In perakim gimmel and daled, there’s no call to teshuvah, you just need to believe. Perek beis and daled have different brachos.

**OVADIAH**

* **Gemara**- Ovadiah worked for Achav, he hid and fed the neviim who were being persecuted by Achav. He was sent by Eliyahu to tell Achav that he has arrived. Ovadiah begs him not to, because he’s a G-d fearing man. Chazal suggest that these two Ovadiahs are one and the same. He’s a convert, because “yiray Hashem” usually refers to geirim. The entire sefer is dedicated to Edom, which is why they say that Ovadiah was a ger from Edom, and it uses him to describe their ultimate downfall. This would place him very early time-wise. Others say that Ovadiah lived in the post-churban time period, and is describing the Churban ex post facto.

**11/29/07**

* **Ibn Ezra**- questioned whether Ovadiah was a ger Edomi or not, we don’t know what time period Ovadiah is from, and he isn’t the one from Melachim Beis, because if he was a navi, he wouldn’t be referred to as a “yiray Hashem” – this isn’t enough of a shevach. He could be living at the time when the melachim were reshaim, or at bayis sheni when there were no kings. It’s likely that he was living right after Churban bayis rishon.
* **“**Shmua shamanu”- Ovadiah and the other neviim, or a large group of people, e.g. Bnei Yisroel.
* Passuk gimmel – (a) an arrogant people or (b) situated geographically on a mountain, and therefore they feel secure and invulnerable.
* Passuk hey- “botzrim” – people who harvest vineyards, also the name of a town in Edom. There’s a connection between Edom and red grapes.
* Passuk yud beis- Yehuda’s sin was being a bystander during war without doing anything to help, and Edom is compared to them as well.
* Passuk tes vav- mentions Yom Hashem and other goyim. Drinking- could be for good or for bad.
* Structure – the first speech to Edom is about arrogance, and then what Edom did to Yaakov, then Yom Hashem with Edom and the other goyim. Dating – if it’s after Churban, it was done by Bavel and Edom helped. The Churban is referred to as “yom Yerushalayim”. We have to go back and look for an occasion during which Yerushalayim was in danger and then just insert Edom into it. The earliest date is the invasion of Sheishak, which took place right after the death of Shlomo, by the time of Rechavam. There is no reference here to Edom or refugees, but maybe Edom participated even if they’re not mentioned. The first mention of Edom in Tanach is in Toldos: Yaakov and Eisav have a perpetual tension, when one goes up, the other goes down. Edom’s descendant is Amalek. Is Amalek considered Edom? It’s unclear from a halachic perspective. It seems that we separate them from each other. There are three important references to Edom in the midbar: (a) Chukas – Bnei Yisroel want to pass through the land to get to the West Bank. Edom says no, lest I come out and fight with you, (b) Balak, (c) Devarim- Moshe describes what happened in the midbar. He tells Bnei Yisroel not to provoke them, and to pay for what you take since they’re your brothers. In Ki Seitzei it says “lo yavo amoni v’moavi b’khal Hashem” – but there’s no mention of Edom, because they’re our brothers. The Rishonim have many answers about how to deal with these inconsistencies. The **Rashbamb** divides Edom and Eisav into separate groups because they’re called different things in Bamidbar and Devarim.
* **Rav Soloveitchik**- why is Parah Adumah mentioned in the middle of Parshas Chukas? The halacha of tumas meis is also literary. 38 years passes between the end of Parshas Chukas and Korach, we just know that people died, but that’s pretty much it. This is an important halachic interlude at this junction. Why is the Parah Adumah paradoxical? Because it makes those who impure, pure, and those who are pure, impure. All impurities can be eliminated by going to the mikvah except for tumas meis. Death is irreversible – hakol bidei shamayim. All human accomplishment comes to an end. When B’nei Yisroel wants to pass through Edom, Edom doesn’t let because of their eternal animosity. Melech Edom represents death and evil, and it is impossible for man to eradicate evil. B’nei Yisroel come to Edom and go around, instead of going through. In Devarim, we can’t start up with Edom because Hashem said so. Every nation has their own land. It’s possible that there is a more metaphysical way to look at Edom, not just as a small nation somewhere.
* Throughout the Tanach, there are various mentions of Edom: amos, Yechezkel, and neviim rishonim.
* Therefore, we can come to three different explanations regarding Edom: (a) a little duchy in Southeast Yehuda (b) history – brotherhood and time of Churban, (c) metaphysical Edom – they represent something.

**12/6/07**

* Structurally, many nevuos of Edom are in sections of nevuos about other nations, sometimes it occurs outside of the general clump and stands alone. This shows that there’s something very significant about its placement, because it’s not with other nevuos. Edom is mentioned in Yirmiyahu in the section about other nations. In Perek 26, it says that the goyim submit to them. There’s an image of a cup of wrath that the goyim have to drink from. Yerushalayim, Yehuda, and a bunch of other goyim drink from it and puke. The Greeks appended the nevuos l’goyim to this perek, but in the Hebrew version, it’s put in one lump at the end of the sefer. There are several similarities between perek 49 of Yirmiyahu and Ovadiah. “Shmua Shamanu” appears at the beginning of Ovadiah, but in Yirmiyahu it turns up in the middle, why? In Yirmiyahu, they’re two separate nevuos. In Yirmiyahu, it’s “Shmua shamati”, and in Ovadiah it’s “Shmua shamanu” (1st person singular vs. 1st person plural). In Yirmiyahu, it’s him saying the nevuah alone, and by Ovadiah, it’s all the nations or all the neviim along with Ovadiah. “Halo yashiru olaylos” vs. “lo yashiru olaylos” – a thief doesn’t usually take everything, in this case, they’ll take everything. Ovadiah is more sarcastic with his wording than Yirmiyahu is.
* In Yirmiyahu, Hashem plays a more active role than he does in Ovadiah. There’s a shevuah in Yirmiyahu, as opposed to in Ovadiah.
* Edom= Rome, according to Rabbinic sources. We can’t intermarry Edom until the third generation. Today, most of these goyim don’t have an identity, so it’s no longer halacha l’maaseh. We don’t take the association between Edom and Rome literally. **Ibn Ezra** correlates Edom and the Christian Church. There can also be a connection between Edom and Rome because neither of them had their own alphabet. Ovadiah should be coming after the Churban because he does have accounts of what Edom actually does, as opposed to Yirmiyahu, who doesn’t mention any details.
* “Tzieerai hatzon” – Persians took over the Babylonian Empire, according to **Rashi. Radak/R’Karo** both think that it’s referring to Bnei Yisroel, because they were the smallest and weakest of all nations.
* “Kaasher shiseesem al har kadshi” – implies happiness. The **Targum** says that you celebrated at the time of the Churban, therefore everyone will drink and be out of it. **Ibn Ezra** translates the word as well. **Rashi** says that this refers to Edom, and **Ibn Ezra** says that it’s referring to Bnei Yisroel. Edom is treated as one unit, but “shiseesem” refers to plural in second person. The Jews drank on “har kadshi” at the time of the Churban. In Eichah, it says “sisi v’simchi bas Edom” and also mentions the cup, identifies Edom with the entire Churban. In Tehillim, it says “al naharos bavel”, mentions Edom as well. Edom and Bavel are the two greatest enemies at the Churban.

**12/13/07**

* The **Ibn Ezra** identifies Edom with Rome because of the Christian Church. At the time of the Chashmonaim, the Jews converted Edomites to Judaism, therefore Christianity = Edom and Edom = Roman Empire. The **Radak** says that Rome was founded by Edom, because they came from the East and ended up in Italy.
* The Romans destroyed the Beis HaMikdash, so then Edom destroyed the Beis HaMikdash, so according to the Ibn Ezra, Edom didn’t destroy the Beis HaMikdash. If Edom is ethnically Rome, then it could be relevant to Ovadiah, and the pesukim in Ovadiah regarding the Churban.
* “Biyom amadcha mineged”- they weren’t just bystanders! This passuk works fine according to the Ibn Ezra, but it might be a problem because didn’t they destroy the Beis HaMikdash? Radak’s solution is that there are 2 different Edoms – Edom is Rome and also the southeast duchy. Edom is Rome, but also still just Edom. They could be both bystanders and also active destroyers – related to each other but different people.
* **Abarbanel**- this refers to both Churbanos. At the first Churban, Edom was a bystander, and during the second Churban, they were the active destroyers. One half of the perek is bayis rishon, and the other half is bayis sheni. This would cause a problem as far as dating is concerned though. If the Navi is talking about the 1st churban, the Navi probably was living at that time. If others feel that something is important, they’ll talk about Moshiach, or the second churban. It’s also possible that Ovadiah could be talking about 2 different time periods. It is doesn’t happen now, it could happen later.
* **Gemara Sanhedrin**- Hashem wanted to make Chizkiyahu the Moshiach, and Sancheirev to be Gog U’Magog, but it didn’t happen.
* **Yeshayahu**- Perek 21 may be talking about Edom, but it may also be about Dumah. In Perek 34, there is call to the goyim (like in Ovadiah). This might be an indication of a “metaphysical Edom”. It talks about the destruction of Edom, and all the animals that will inhabit Edom. In perek 63, Edom is used to stand for international evil as a whole. Hashem’s anger is against all the goyim, or it may be their responsibility to destroy Edom. The **Ramban** says that Amalek is a brother to Yaakov, and he performs an unnecessary attack. **R’ Soloveitchik** identifies Nazi Germany with Amalek. There is a mitzvah to destroy Edom.

**12/20/07**

Tzefaniah

* There is actually a date attached to this; at the time of Yoshiahu, the king of Yehuda. He was the grandson of Menashe, but he was a tzaddik regardless. He became king at the age of 8. He found a sefer Torah in his 18th year, and all of Yehuda did teshuvah. Chazal hold that there was a tension between Yehuda and Yoshiyahu, and the teshuva wasn’t so good. There was a general lack of compliance, and people still served avodah zarah. Yirmiyahu and Tzefaniah were neviim at the time of Yoshiyahu. There was a third neviah named Chuldah at this time. The **Gemara** says that people went to Chuldan at this time because Yirmiyahu was busy at this time with the Aseres HaShevatim, and because it was easier because she was a woman, and she therefore might be more compassionate. The **Pesikta** says that there were three neviim, Yirmiyahu was in the shuk, Chuldah gave nevuah to the woman, and Tzefaniah spoke in the shuls.
* Pasuk aleph- Tzefaniah was the great grandson of Chizkiyahu, so he was part of the royal family. **Ibn Ezra** claims that it was the same Chizkiyahu because if you have a navi with the father’s name mentioned, you assume that his father was also a navi and that there’s some relevance to mentioning Chizkiyahu’s name. It goes back four generations, so you assume that if it goes back that far, it’s important. It would therefore make sense that Tzefaniah would speak in the shuls, if he was from the zerah hamelucha (since people who were in the shuls were the more elite class.
* Passuk hey- “malkam”- G-d and king are equal, or it’s referring to malchon, who was the god of Amon.
* Pasuk ches- “lovshim malbush nachri” – who are these people? Elites are more likely to wear foreign clothing.
* Pasuk tes- “jumping over the threshold” – assimilation with the Plishtim (dagon fell on the threshold, so the kohanim don’t step over the threshold). This may also be referring to the stragglers with the elite, as opposed to just the elite.
* Pasuk yud aleph- Canaanim could refer to Jews who behaved like Canaanim, or just merchants.
* Perek beis – pasuk beis starts to talk about other goyim.
* There are four nations mentioned here, but no Edom mentioned. Also, why is this nevuos hagoyim stuck in the middle?
* Perek aleph and gimmel have to do with Yerushalayim and Perek Beis has the nevuos hagoyim. What’s different about Edom that would warrant them to not be mentioned in Tzefaniah? Edom is a small and insignificant nation – no hereditary kingship, and didn’t even have their own language. Assimilation is stressed in Perek Aleph, and how they imitate the goyim. Edom is left out and mentions the list of goyim that elites in Yehuda were imitating, not a random list of goyim like in other neviim.