**NOTE TO READER: You do not necessarily need to write everything given by each answer. More information is given in order that things are clearer. On some sections, there is repetition because two sets of notes were put on. This is usually indicated by different fonts. If you are having trouble, then it is a good idea to speak to the smart people in your class and get their notes and ask questions. The goal of this final review is to help us do well on the final, but also for us to grow as thinking individuals. Hatzalacha.**

**-The Redactor**

**6. Rashbam's view on the stories about Edom during Israel's desert period and our literary analysis. Briefly indicate our knowledge of Edom during the First Temple period and its  
relevance to the appearance of Edom in Zephaniah.**

In Chukas, the Jews want to go through Edom land and promise not to take anything and pay for everything but are told they cannot enter. The Jews go onward and have the same experience with Sichon and Og but conquer it.

In devarim, the story is repeated, the Jews are told not to conquer the land of edom (or Sayir) because it has been given to them. It is then recounted that they went to Moav (or Ar) and a similar thing happened.

Q: The last thing is this section is the similar story with Amon called Zamzumim. The pesukim specifically say here that Edom is afraid of the Jews while we had only hostility before

A: . Many Rishonim answer that Jew did not enter Edom but Edomites stood on the border and sold them stuff. The simpler approach in the Rishomin developed by the **Rashbam** is that there are different groups of Edomites and there are different interactions with each group. He says the same about Moabites

* . **R’Dovid Zvi Hoffman** says based on this that some parts of Edom may have been weaker and thus were more cooperative with the Jews while other parts are more defensible and so they could afford to be hostile. Part of the reason Moshe is repeating these things in Devarim is because he is telling them why they happened and that you didn’t conquer these territories because Hashem told you not to. The scary nations are not being attacked because Hashem gave them a nachalah and so too Hashem has given you the Jews a nachalah (See Seforno and Ramban).

During bayis rishon, Edom is not a powerful country. The first mentioned we have of him is in Bereshis, then again by yetzias mitzrayim. He plays a very minor role during neviem rishonim and he plays a subservient role to Yehuda. Shmuel II describes a war against Edom where they are completely decimated. In Melachim II they come along with Moab as satellite country to attack Jews and it was not clear they had any say in the matter. In Melachim II 8, they rebelled against Yehuda and satyed that way ad hayom hazeh which could mean until the writing of Melachim (during the time of the churban) or some earlier date. Either way, they are not a major player. If you were a bible critic, this is embarrassing because Edom plays a very significant role in the chumash and has certain ideological roles and do not seem to be that important in Neviem Rishonim. Some nevuot do make Edom seem significant.

**In Sefer Tzefaniah** - edom is not even mentioned in the discussion of assimilation . Thus Edom was intentinally embarrassed since he is so weak that no jews want to imitate him.

Bible Questions for Final

**Jonah-**

**Q1: why did Jonah Flee? Discuss Views based on Hazal; Ibn Ezra; Abarbanel and R. Eliezer of Beaugance and anlyze in light of the book as a whole ( including chapter 4)**

There is a **Pikray Der’elezar** (a late medrash that has 2 perakim on Yonah and is often quoted by Radak) that says the Yonah paid for the entire boat’s fee out of his eagerness to go. This makes sense since at this time boats were not really for passengers but for trade and it left when it needed to go. Boats hugged the shore since they did not want to go out to sea but they used it for transport of cargo.

* He knew the kuzari that nevuah is only in Yisroel so he left to avoid receiving the nevua

a)**traditional chazal view:** Chazal compare Eliyahu who insisted on kavod of Hashem but didnt care about kavod of Yisroel while Yonah cared about kavod of yisroel but not God. So Yonah refused to go to avoid yisroel being embarrassed by Ninveh’s doing teshuva while Bnei Yisroe wasn’t doing teshuva.

b) **Ibn Ezra-** The alternative is that Yonah just didn’t want to go because it was inconvenient. There are two possibilities why people don’t do something right according to Aristotle. Either they have the wrong information on the manner (like people who ate radium thinking they would glow with heath and not just glow), or because a person can’t help himself (like the poor people who produced the radium). So maybe Yonah was afraid of embarrassment or afraid he’d be killed or just chillul Hashem that people will say Hashem never really meant it.

C) **Abarbane**l- a varying view of chazal as to why Yonah doesn’t listen to Hashem- yonah was worried about the direct harm that would be inflicted on the Jews. If he doesn’t go to ninveh, those people sin and die, and therefore aren’t able to go and defeat malchus yisrael after doing teshuva (as ends up happening). This is a complicated cheshbon. It assumes that he already knows malchos yisrael is going to be destroyed (which he could only have learnt al pi nevuah). And why couldn’t Hashem just carry out this destruction through some other nation.

d) **R’ Eliezer of Beaugance-** Yonah went on a boat because he didn’t want to go on a donkey since it would be uncomfortable

e)**Rav Carmy explained** that were you to ask Yonah why he ran away, he wouldn’t necessarily answer. People don’t always have all their shitos worked out in everything and don’t know why they do everything they do. Some people will keep sleeping in the morning for no reason. We want everything to always work out logically but on a human level we don’t always know how things will end. So were we to ask Yonah if he is ignoring God, he might not answer yes and then be forced to look at meforshim to figure out why. This may be peshat in R’Elazar in Beaugance and why the Navi doesn’t given any reason for Yonah running since he had not yet planned out down the road what he would do.

Q2: Discuss structure + content of Jonah 2, noting unexpected omissions + oddities + their significance Also discuss implications of Rashi vs. Ibn Ezra regarding verse 9.

**Shrier’s notes-**

When analyzing the תפלה, two things to take note of.

1. the structure of the תפלה.

* In תנ"ך we don’t have rigid formalities like stanza breaks that make structure easy to the eye. Nonetheless, if we can find certain developments, this may be helpful to us. May help us divide the פרק into units that may help us understand the פרק

1. we should pay attention to the content of the תפילה.

Question as to why it takes יונה three days to pray. One could have claimed that this is not sequential. It’s not that he is there for three days and then prays; he is in the fish for three days and he prays. The מפרשים do address this question, however.

In the תפילה, some describing what he suffered, others describing his salvation. If we take this approach, ג' and ד' go together, as describing his state. ה' is independent. Next stanza, ו' and ז' go together and ח' stands independently. ט' and י' are separate. Suggestion that there is alternating structure in פסוקים regarding subject and object. פסוקים alternate between יונה being the subject and being the object. Problem is that ז' doesn’t fit so well, and when the subject is not יונה, it switches between G-d, the earth, and the water.

Greater relationship between פסוקים ה' and ח': they both end with היכל קדשיך. היכל קדשיך seems to be important here. יונה is really looking forward to returning to the בית המקדש. Why it is important to him we do not yet know. We don’t know how משמרים הבלי שוא חסדם יעזבו fits. פסוק י' seems to fit. It is about bringing קרבנות, which again brings us back to היכל קדשיך. The theme of מקדש is rather important, beyond what we would expect. We would have expected themes of crying out, salvation, etc. If a ראש ישיבה were swallowed by a fish, we can imagine that he would think about giving שיעור. What a person thinks about in extreme circumstances reflects something about what is important to him.

\* there is no תשובה, and there is no בקשה to be taken out of the fish. This definitely stands out. יונה seems to be comfortable in the fish.

(nteresting that on פסוק ח', the רד"ק says that היכל refers to שמים. In פסוק ה', רד"ק says it refers to the מקדש. There, יונה says he will see היכל קדשיך, which must mean the מקדש. In פסוק ח', where we are talking about תפילה, the תפילה goes to a more figurative place. אבן עזרא, on פסוק ה', interprets מנגד עיניך as referring to שמים; יונה was expelled from under the heavens. It would be interesting to see how רד"ק understands מעון קדשיך. We have השקיפה ממעון קדשיך. That must be referring to the שמים. We also have a reference in חבקוק פרק ב' to היכל ה'. רד"ק there again says הוא השמים. אבן עזרא also interprets as the שמים. In חבקוק we have the contrast between heaven and earth. תרגום in חבק

This tefillah really sounds more like hodah then bekasha, even if you except that this is common to tehillim or that he is grateful for being saved from drowning in the belly of a fish...

it is interesting to note:

1)Yona never asks to leave the fish.

2) there is nothing said here about the fact that he messed up, regrets his mistake and will now listen to Hashem and go to ninveh.

Pesukim 9+10: what do they mean? Why is he discussing how other people who are vain, will abandon their chesed. Who is he knocking? Why is he doing this?

There are a couple of approaches.

Traditional approaches:

1. Simple pshat- rashi/pirkai d’rav eliezer- **Rashi Says-** Yona is insulting the sailors. This comes in contrast to the praise for the sailors found earlier in pirkai d’rav eliezer. This contrast in the two pshats of pirkai d’rav eliezer makes Yona not come out looking so great. He seems to be ungrateful/unrecognizing of the sailors goodness and is using this opportunity to rip on the sailors.

* This view is so pungent, that it forces the ibn ezra to interpret the word “chesed” as the opposite of chesed So the pasuk is saying that the people will do teshuva and stop their excess of avoda zara

1. That this perek doesn’t really reflect Yonah at all. If you find a tefillah in tanach, it means that someone else wrote it and it was floating around. And then we see that Yonah prayed so some editor grabbed a tefillah from tehillim and throw it into Sefer Yonah because it would be nice to have the text of Yonah’s tefillah. The bible scholars would respond to the fact that the tefillah doesn’t fit so well because there is no bakasha, by saying that whomever grabbed this mizmor and through it in, chose randomly and did a bad job. But Rav Carmy points out that if you were looking for mizmorim to throw in, mizmor 139 would have been a lot more shaiyach.

In conclusion (ie- why Yonah didn’t ask Hashem to take him out of the fish in his tefillah)- Yonah hasn’t settled the issue about whether to go to ninveh or not. He is at peace slightly because he has been saved and therefore realizes Hashem is still with him (Yonah had risked losing this by disobeying Hashem). Yonah knows that he can’t live the rest of his life in the fish, but doesn’t necessarily feel like he is ready to do teshuva and go to ninveh (being ready to be thrown into the sea is an acknowledgment of his mistake, but that doesn’t necessarily mean he wants to do teshuva- we see people in regular day life wanting to hear mussar, but not necessarily wanting to change).

**Q3:** is the repentene of the Ninveites Authentic? Note all the relevant verses in ch. 3 and the Rabbinic commentaries Discuss Urbach’s Thesis: you are not reqruiered to examine in detail class analysis ?

Pasuk 3- says that ninveh is very big and would take three days to walk through. The archeologists have excavated ninveh and it isn’t close to that big. This poses a kasha.

Rav Carmy answers this kasha by saying that it would take 3 days to go through the whole city, door to door, neighborhood to neighborhood telling everyone what Hashem wanted him to relate.

Pasuk 8- a mishna in ta’anis speaks about this same thing; that to do teshuva you need to change your actions, fasting and putting ashes on you might not be enough. We see this same idea in Yeshaiyahu 58, the haftorah for yom kippur. In this perek we see the people being surprised that they fasted and still aren’t forgiven.

Pasuk 7+8- why does the king say that animals had to fast and wear sack cloth?

Maybe the king wants to make this his project, and psychologically for him to feel like this is his project, he has to feel like he is adding something, and not that he is just following what the navi said to do. If this is true, then his decree to add the animals might be superfluous and ridiculous. This might seem stupid but it is human nature.

[my ha’ara🡪 this would fit in well with the fact that Yona doesn’t go to the king 1st (seemingly a sign of disrespecting his authority, so for the king to regain his authority…]

Chazal take a slightly different approach.

Yerushalmi (Raish L’akish) in tanis says that the people of ninveh were engaged in a deceptive kind of teshuva (it was flawed/imperfect in some way). The people of ninveh separated the baby animals from their mothers and said “Hashem, if you don’t have mercy on us, then we have no mercy on them.” This shows that Raish L’akish is saying that he isn’t so impressed with their teshuva.

There is an interesting stira in chazal. The mishna seems to respect the people of ninveh for doing real teshuva- iyan first mishna of the second perek of ta’anis. The tosefta in ta’anis echoes the theme of the mishna but the example of ninveh is taken out. Is this a random variation or was this purposely dropped?

Now you come to the yerushalmi, and chazal are frowning at the people of ninveh.

Orbach (looking at the story through only one dimension- of intellectual history)- something happened to change the attitude of chazal. Ans- Christianity. This means that if you are reading the pesukim k’pshuto, ninveh looks good. But if you are under the pressure of the Christians (who are claiming that the jews aren’t listening to the latest navi), then chazal is forced to look for cheesronos in the people of ninveh, saying that goyim also didn’t listen to naviyim sometimes

Q4: Discuss the role of the land of Israel + the people of Israel in Jonah both as it is reflected in careful analysis of the text and as refracted through chazal.

We said in perek 2 that yonah keeps mentioning haicahl kodshecha. In perek 4- yonah mentions sitting on his land.

One has to conclude that (from the pesukim) eretz yisrael is very important to Yonah. If you read chazal, they don’t mention him being preoccupied with eretz yisrael, rather they read him as being pre-occupied with am yisrael.

Why is there a difference between chazal’s view and the pesukim’s view?

1. your average Zionist would say that they love am yisrael and eretz yisrael. Am yisrael would play a secondary role. When could you imagine a Zionist who is focusing more on eretz yisrael? When am yisrael is very disappointing. In the period of yona, am yisrael is very disappointing. This period also happens to be one in which the people aren’t very impressive. So that is why yona is focusing his life on eretz yisrael instead of am yisrael.

Melachim 2, perek 5- a story about a military leader (na’aman) who had tzara’as. He goes to see Elisha who says to go bathe in the nahar yarden. He is skeptical but goes anyways and is cured. This is a place in tanach that eretz yisrael performs miracles, because am yisrael is in such a bad place.

So chazal are interpreting the normal pshat- that a navi would care about the am more, but the pesukim are speaking in historical context, that we care more about the eretz.

Q5: Discuss salient similarities + difference b/w texts describing Eliajah and Jonah. How does this analysis affect our anlyssis of the book as a whole?

There is a connection between the two times Yonah wish he was dead. To understand this we need to look at Melachim 9. Eliyahu had just killed neviay habaal and then Izevel warns him that she will come to kill him. Eliyahu then says he wishes he was dead since he has nothing and has failed in his mission. He goes to sleep, wakes up, is fed by maalach, goes back to sleep, eats more and then goes to cave where Moshe had recited 13 midos harachamim. Then you have the conversation between Hashem and Eliyahu about the Jews and you have visions of the earthquake and stuff and the God is found in the silence. Eliyahu is then asked the same question and he gives the same answers as before all the visions. We often focus on the difference between passages in Tanach, but sometimes when things are the same, it is even more significant. Hashem then tells him to appoint Elisha in his place which is a polite way of saying he is being retired.

There are many parallels between Yonah and Elisha in this regard**. Bachrach** one argued that they are the same personality since they represent Midas Hadin and reject midas Harachamim and Hashem tries to change their opinion but fails. The rayah from chazal is the **pirkey derabbi eliezer** that says because Eliyahu said Jews don’t keep the Bris, he must now go to every Bris milah to testify that Jews do keep it. This is interesting but there are many more positive statements about Eliyahu in Chazal than this one negative comment. There are also major differences between the two. Binyamin Benedict noted that Eliyahu is saying he is a kanayui and is not criticizing Hashem and His methods so you can't really say he is a failure and he is simply affirming the way he is which is not altogether a bad thing since Hashem himself is a kanayui. Yonah is actually critical of Hashem and does not want to die for his own failures but for the way things are in the world and because he is miserable. There may be a connection between the two (and possibly a conscious one) but Hashem is really rejecting what Yonah says while Eliyahu is merely being dismissed for who he is since he can't serve as the navi anymore.

**Joel**

Q1: Analyze structure of Joel 1: 5-13 in detail. Show significance of this analysis for the content of the prophecy .

Q1:5- strange lashon of “hakitzu shikorim”

Q2: 6- “ ki go ala artzi” + end with lions?

Q3: 8- people putting sackcloth?

5- Q: The lashon of hakitzu shikorim is also strange since who cares about the drunkards being abandoned- why is that first.

A: 1 The **Alshich** (16th century eretz yisroel mekubal and darshan) says that drunkards is figurative- meaning people who are intoxicated from drunken stupor.

6- Q: The goi ala artzi could be describing the locusts as if they were a mighty nations and that fits with image of lions with teeth. If the year is good, the locusts have what to eat in Africa but if dry year, they come up to Israel to eat everything.

Delirium tremens (or the DTs) are when people are intoxicated, they don’t dream and when they wake up, it catches up with them with hallucinations of different stuff. So maybe the drunkards will see the locusts and think of them like lions and that is the metaphor. This is cute but not too good.

8- The **Malbim** tries to bring posuk ches with sackcloth back into reality by saying that people would put sackcloth over trees to avoid locusts in the same way that trees are covered to avoid them being frozen so the image of aveylus matches what trees would actually look like.

**First half of perek 1-** Who is affected by locus?

1. drunkards
2. cohanim
3. farmers and vineyard people

the regular guy seems to be left out. Although in that time, you have covered most of the people with these categories. It is interesting that the navi seems to be viewing everyone based on the way the famine effects their job. The navi doesn’t really focus on the fact that the people will starve to death.

**In melachim 2- perek 6 and 7**—

* There was a famine, and they were very hungry. They were so hungry that a donkey’s head yet the head was expensive .Two women eat their sons.
  + This gives us a taste of what a real famine is like. It is also called a ra’av.

**1: 12- In yoel-**  the word ra’av is not used. The expression “they are lacking in joy” is used. This is not the kind of lashon you would find appropriate by the famine in malachim. (you wouldn’t say life isn’t fun if you have cancer.-

**All perek aleph amounts to is that we are not dealing with a normal famine.**

**Yoel: 1: 13-**

Pasuk 13- starts a new section, because they are being called to do something.

the kohanim are called upon to gird their loins and be mafsid and cry. This continues from what was happening in ches and you have sleeping in sackcloth here which echoes what we had earlier. Professional kohanim here represent the people and they are also not doing well.

**l**

Q2:Discuss structure of Joel 2; include development of the imagery, the implicit narrative, and the theological (and halakhic) significance of the literary structure, in line with our analysis

To sum up: we have יום ה', we have an invading army of locusts. שיטת יחיד on this פרק, which is interesting in itself and may shed light on the mainstream approach. The אברבנל held that what we have been reading so far is not about locusts. It is really about an invading army. The imagery is so military that אברבנל was convinced that this is an actual military. What do we do with פרק א'? The answer is that in פרק א' we are describing an army, and comparing an army to locusts. Some comparisons only go one way. You can say that Churchill was a bulldog, but it probably wouldn’t make sense to say that a bulldog is Churchill. However, in this case, the comparison can work in two ways. An army can be compared to locusts, just as locusts can be compared to an army. One question we can raise is why we have two descriptions. If I already have a description of the invading army in פרק א', what does פרק ב' add? When I talk about an invading army, there are צוי דינים in what an army does. An army attacks and eats. We lose sight of that, firstly because most of us have never experienced a serious invasion, and because the way war works nowadays, you don’t have that element to the same degree. In old fashioned war, you had serious spoils. Napoleon supposedly said that an army marches on its stomach. In ספר שופטים, the Midianite army was compared to locusts because they plundered like locusts. So we have two separate issues. In פרק א', we have a description of the economic effects of war, in terms of spoils, while פרק ב' focuses on the military aspect.

This question presumably comes up for the other view as well; why do we need two descriptions of the locusts? This is a more difficult question. When we are dealing with a literal army, it is easy to distinguish between economic damage and bloodshed. If we are talking about locusts, one may think that there is only one form of damage. We’ll get back to this question.

If this is a real army, why aren’t we told who exactly the enemy is? Could be that it is not important. Alternatively, it could be that the enemy is unknown. For example, despite the fact that the enemy in ירמיהו is בבל, the identification of בבל does not appear until פרק כ"ג. Before then, we have references to the north. It could be that the נביא didn’t know the exact identification of the attacker. This is a particularly interesting הערה in light of biblical criticism, which claims that the נביאים were all written after the actual attack from בבל. Why didn’t the editor mention בבל for the first 22 פרקים?

For אברבנל, how do we deal with the כ' הדמין’s in פרק כ'? If they really are horses then why are we comparing them to horses? אברבנל offers an interesting explanation of the כ' הדמין. This comes from his knowledge of Greek mythology. אברבנל discusses centaurs. Why would people believe in the existence of centaurs? Sometimes, you see someone riding on a horse, you don’t know whether it is a horse or a man. The myth of the centaur develops from seeing people riding in horses, by people who are not accustomed to horseback riding. אברבנל assumes that horseback riding enters human civilization at a specific point. In the Ancient Near East, you don’t have horseback riding until around the time of מנשה and the Assyrians; the אברבנל guessed correctly. Professor in Queens College suggests that horseback riding comes in very late, and therefore the references to horses in חומש are anachronistic. Obvious problem is that in the תורה, every reference to horses relates to chariots. In פסוק ה' we have a reference to chariots on top of mountains. Chariots don’t do well on mountains; the verse is strange. In שופטים, the כנענים were stronger in the valleys than they were in the mountains because they had chariots. Also, how do we explain in פרק according to the mainstream opinion? If in פרק א' we are describing locusts and the damage they do, in פרק ב' we are describing the same locusts in a metaphorical sense. How does the imagery of פרק ב' add to this נבואה?

Major question that concerned us last week and today: why isn’t this famine the kind of famine where people are starving? Why isn’t the word רעב used? Third question. What happened between the description in פרק א' and the description in פרק ב'? In פרק א' we have זעקה and in פרק ב' we have תפילה. What is moving them from זעקה to תפילה? One could claim that the passage of time itself justifies this progression. However, this is not fully satisfying. בקיצור, we have three questions that have accumulated

-

Summary-

**Imagery=** pasuk 2- day of darkness + thick darkeness 3- fire= 4- horses-5 chariot-

**Implicit narrative-** 2 descriptions of locutst- 1- all about destroying 2- all about army - everything leads up to pasuk 11

**Theological significance** = Keeping in mind that Yoel is talking about a teshuva facilitated by es tzara and that in hilchos ta’anis the Rambam discusses doing teshuva in an es tzara

1. In perek 2- we have a second description of locus. Why do we need a second one?

Before we answer that question, lets look at a minority view in the rishonim (abarbanel, rav gantzi), that this image of locus is just imagery, but we are really discussing an army.

So why does the Navi talk about locus if he means an army? Because there are armies that eat like locus and this is seen in shoftim perek 6, where a big army is referred to as ‘as numerous as locus’.

According to both shitahs, what is happening in perek 2 that didn’t happen in perek 1?

The fact that in perek 1 there is no Yom Hashem, but now, in perek 2, there is a Yom Hashem.

According to the **abarbanel,** there are two dinim in war.

1. The classic things of war is invading, killing other people, shooting…
2. how much food the army eats as they go along. This is a real thing, how much food an army eats
3. Pasuk 4- according to the majority of mepharshim, the ‘locusts-(looks like horses) make a lot of sense. Locus can look like horses.

* However, **abarbanel**- , why would you say an army of men look like horses? It is not a scary image, I would be more scared on men. The Abarbanel answers that once upon a time people were not accustomed to horse back riding. So if you’re not accustomed to this, and you see horse back riding, particularly in war, it would be weird. Also, in chumash, we see chariots pulled by horses, but we don’t see people riding horses. So a person who sees someone horse back riding for the first time, would be a little shocked and might not really know what he is seeing.

Pasuk 13 and 14:What are the people doing teshuva for? -There is no sin mentioned here and the word ‘chet’ isn’t even mentioned.

Q: We need to investigate why people do teshuva?

**14** There is an ambiguity in the text of who the posuk means and it might mean the locusts will turn away or could just mean the people will do teshuva. The pesukim are vague as to what the teshuva is for and this is a unusual thing that you have a call to teshuva without mention of sin. The word teshuva means turning and Rav Kook and the Rav both emphasized a not just a turn away from sin but also a turn towards God so the latter may be happening here but still strange that pessukim are different.

* In **hilchos teshuva** of the rambam, the mechayaiv of tehusva is the awareness of sin.
* **hilchos taanis**, he writes that whenever there is trouble, you blow trumpets and troubles like drought or famine or locusts, and you should be engaged in zeakah and there should be an awareness of the need for teshuva. You should not just think this is the way of the world since that leads you remain in your state of sin. So this is another mechayav for teshuva.

It is not simply getting out of punishment for sin but rather if you are in trouble you are chayav to do teshuva perhaps the zeakah element here is relevant-

A: the people are doing teshuva due to an es tzara.

Theological level, it says something about hasgacha:

* + Keeping in mind that Yoel is talking about a teshuva facilitated by es tzara and that in hilchos ta’anis the Rambam discusses doing teshuva in an es tzara (because these are not happenstance, they are acts of divine intervention).

So returning to the locus, we asked why do you need two descriptions of the same locus (according to the majority of mepharshim). We said that in perek alef they eat a lot and in perek bet they behave like an army.

BUT WHAT DO WE LEARN FROM THAT?

**ANSWER:**

In perek 2, everything leads up to pasuk 11. **Hashem leads the army, NOTHING IS** **HAPPENSTANCE.** The punch line of the development of the first half of perek 2, is to lead to the idea of hashgacha. So if Yoel would have known the Rambam in hilchos ta’anis, he couldn’t have produced a more perfect imagery of that Rambam.

* So from this approach, the first two perakim are extremely well organized.

Conceptually, you get the same picture the Rambam is saying. Teshuva doesn’t necessarily start from feeling bad about a chet, and an es tzara comes as part of our relationship with Hashem, not as something separate from our relationship with Hashem.

Q3: Compare in detail Joel 2: 10-11 with the parallel verses in chapter 4: how does the imagery in each chapter fit the content? Also discuss the Yom Hashem imagery in Zephaniah 1. -

**15-16**- the language here with son going dark parallels the language from 2:10 with similar imagery.

1. This is typical yom Hashem imagery and the order doesn’t really matter.( But this is not the way we are going to learn. )
   * If the order from perek bais was abc, then the order in 4 is bca. According to Zeidel’s law (see Rav Kook notes), when one text in Tanach quotes another text in Tanach, changing the order is the norm and not the exception, possibly for aesthetic reasons to make it more pleasant or entertaining. (

* Within a posuk, we call it chiasmus but Zeidel is saying it works between texts. He formulated this idea for frum reasons to show that if consistent pattern in moving between seforim, then it means the neviem had the Torah and later neveim had earlier ones and this shows the Biblical books were available to Jews. Even most apikorsim accept Zeidel’s law nowadays. Even if this is the literary convention being used here, we have to consider the way it is being utilized.

Meir Weiss was a professor at Bar Ilan who moved to Hebrew University after something with human relations. He developed the use of new criticism for the Bible and had a certain amount of religious concern where he was challenging people who liked to change the text left and right. So we will utilize his stuff and Rav Carmy’s chiddush.

In perek bais, the sky goes dark and then we have locusts that are causing this and then yom Hashem line. In perek daled, we have direct quote from earlier with sky going dark and then Hashem responding by roaring which is usually associated with a lion.

* In tehillim 104 (borchi Nafshi), it say it is darkness and all the wild animals come out and then lions roar

Weiss posited that after the description of night, the navi davkah uses language of roaring because you associate darkness with animals coming out. The affect of God roaring is the trembling or the earthquake.

* This would explain why there was no war and all the aftermath here like we had in Zechariah and Yechezkel. Once God roars, everything else is silent so the differences between the books fit.

1. If we assume that perek bais was one of teshuva like Rambam in hilchos Taanis, driven not necessarily by hakaras hachait but by awareness of hashgacha, then perek bais works well. You start with locusts and explain it is aprt of army and one that is led by God which shows the idea of hashgacha.
2. In Daled, if you follow Weiss, then you have started with typical Yom Hashem imagery, and you lead up to the appearance of Hashem with does not cause the kind of earthquake you have in other neviem but rather the complete silence.

Q4: Discuss content + structure of Joel 1-2 acc. 2 Abarabanel, and other rishonim. Why are there two separate prophecies according to both views? Pay special attention to theme of repentance in chapter 2.

A: See above.

Q5: Note Salient features of Gog- Umagog prophecies. How is Joel distinctive? Explain a few of the difference b/w the imagery in Joel + that of either Zachariah or Ezekiel

**Explanation**

1. In all these nevuos, we have an invasion of Eretz Yisroel by nations who are not major ones and have little history with Israel.
2. They all have an earthquake, and something about water (**Yechezkel** is a little hard to find this but you do have description of lots of water and dead sea will have fish and curse of Sedom will reversed).

* We can therefore say that we have this type of gog umagog type nevuah where there is this **ultimate confrontation** with the goyim and they are dealt with however they are dealt with. Their differences mean that they are describing different scenarios.
* Rav Carmy believes that all three nevuos all come from the same source and that is Sancherev which is very similar to the scenarios we looked at. It is one superpower, namely Assyria although he boasts as having brought together different nations.
  + You have A siege…> and then a plague that wiped out all his troops
  + . You have a world power and then a breakdown.

The **gemara in Sanhedrin** has Hashem saying that He wanted to make Chizkiyahu messiah and Sancherev as gog umagog so it fits.

. It may be that in Yoel, we lack severity because the scenario of gog umagog is a more painless one and this fits with us not being fully aware of the sins that caused all this. T

* there is not starvation, just a loss of joy brought upon by poor economic welfare and that can be cured by the proper response of fixing relationship with God and this is not so much saying we were wrong before but by saying we want connection with God
  + . The issue is less how many fruits you have but rather a lack of sameach bechelko and a turn towards God can bring that simcha.
* This is perek aleph-bais that once there is turn towards God, there is blessing.

The next two perakim are a later crisis (acharay chain). The evil that is described here is one that is difficult to cure on you own without divine intervention (i.e. slavery). Here, the navi tells the people to have bitachon against an external enemy. The problem is the injustice of people being sold far away from their people and not being able to do anything about it (nazi told jews in camps that even if they escaped, their people would never believe what is going on). The issue is thus more of meaningless and evil that little can be done about. Yoel’s resolution is that there is trembling and that is it. Hashem has intervened and evil is paralyzed. The parallels end with the dam naki in posuk 19.

Q6: Discuss in detail the eclipse imagery in chapters 2 and 4 and in chapter 3. Include distinctiveness of imagery in each case and significance for the book as a whole.

-

Prek 2-

פסוק ב' says יום חשך ואפילה. As we noted, this is a common phrase, but that does not dismiss us from raising questions pertaining to the particular application that exists here. This is highlighted by the next, atypical phrase in the פסוק: כשחר פרש על ההרים.

פסוק י' says that on the יום ה' it will be dark. We could say that this is literal, or that this is a figure of speech. The רמב"ם, in the מורה, says that the darkness is figurative. This may allegorically refer to something unknown. Some ראשונים think that the יום ה' is literally a dark day.

Perek 3 - פרק ג'. In פסוק ד' we have more יום ה' imagery. However, the imagery we have here is different than the imagery we have in פרק ב'. Here, we have ירח לדם. The moon is not just dark, it is red. What is the blood reference? Red could be a reference to an eclipse. In a solar eclipse, it is dark. In cases of a lunar eclipse, the moon looks red. This means that even though in פרק ב' we are dealing with imagery that relates to darkness, פרק ג' is much closer to the actual imagery of an eclipse. An astronomer would recognize פרק ג' as being far more scientific than פרק ב'. One of the questions we should raise, if we are dealing with יום ה' imagery, is why in other cases יום ה' is purely darkness, while in פרק ג' we have imagery that is much closer to an eclipse

Perek gimel- 1- we have vision of darkness again but the color is now red like blood which is a strange image. It could refer to an solar eclipse where it is dark and a lunar eclipse where it looks red. Thus even though in perek bais we had the darkness imagery, in **gimmel the clipse imagery is much stronger. Why the switch in the nature of yom Hashem**?

We have two nevuos right after the other that are clearly tied in sequence. Everything is dark before but now the moon has turned to blood like an eclipse. Elsewhere, the imagery of the eclipse is not interested in being scientifically accurate and just describes everything as dark while this perek is making thing more conform to reality as opposed to poetry. We have the **option of taking eclipses literally and interpreting them as bad omens. If you believing is astrology then this is most certainly the case and therefore eclipse and yom Hashem go to together** If you don’t believe in astrology then you can say like the rambam in the moreh that it is just an imagery of darkness. I

the Radak interprets the eclipse as literal due to the darkness, and in general the imager is accurate. Also, the lifney Yom Hashem makes less sense if this is all symbolic since it should just be the actual Yom Hashem. In terms of why we would care about a literal eclipse, the people in Tanach didn’t read the Moren Nevuchim and thus don’t know that this is a purely scientific phenomenon that has no real astrological meaning and they were scared. Why do we care about their fear? More on this later.

The **Ibn** **Ezra** noted that the style of pesukim is to finish second idea and then go back to original idea; in other words a chiastic structure, aish goes with shamayim and dam goes with aretz- ayim sham.

In terms of Chazal’s description of eclipse, you may run into a problem of science and halacha since eclipses are normal predictable event so why would that predict anything.

**The Lubavitcher Rebbe** pointed out that there is no contradiction between eclipses being natural and being a bad omen. Compare to Av being a bad month for Jews despite its regular occurrence and certain seasons being bad for hay fever despite predictability so it could be bad and natural.

**Mesorah**

Perek 2-

The Yom Hashem is discussed and the imagery of darkness comes up. Darkness is a common theme related to the Yom Hashem. This is not a literal darkness, rather it is imagery.

(yet it is still productive to for the student of the tanach to figure out how that imagery plays itself out).

An interesting, unique image in pasuk 1 of perek 2 is ‘the day break spread over the mountains’. This seems to be a happy image that doesn’t fit in.

**Abarbanel-** says that word ‘shachar’- means blackness spread over the mountains. This is his way out of the problem. But he is a das yachid as translating the word ‘shachar’ as darkenss.

Second interpretation- The army that is approaching is an army of locus. So the image is that you are in a valley. The locus are massed upon the mountains, like daybreak. So when the locus are sleeping at night, but we know that when the day will break, the locus will spread over the land and create their own darkness. (this is how we translate the conventional use of the darkness related to Yom Hashem and apply it to our specific example).

Perek 3-

Pasuk 4- is speaking about an eclipse. In the medieval period they thought that an eclipse was a bad sign (this is seen in gemara and goyish sources).

**Ibn Ezra** was an astronomer and an astrologer, so he believed that these signs were very important.

* Could be it was a bad sign

**Rambam** on the other hand didn’t think that it meant anything.

* the use of an eclipse was purely figurative; it was part of the Yom Hashem imagery, part of everything going dark. The problem with the Rambam is that in pasuk 4 it clearly says “before yom Hashem”.
  + Therefore, the **RADAK** here he says it must be a literal eclipse.

If you believe that an eclipse is a bad sign, how does that shtim with the science that an eclipse happens on a schedule?

* **The Lubavicher Rebbe** says that just because something is predictable, doesn’t mean that this isn’t a bad time. This can be seen in shulchan orech, that when chodesh AV comes, it is a bad/unlucky time.

Q7: Discuss in detail the meaning of the word *nahala* in Joel 2. Be sure to include both the literary evidence in Joel and relevant passages elsewhere in Tankh.

**Obadiah**

Q1 Compare Obadiah with Jeremiah 49. Note matters of structure and content + our chronological + theological inferences

We have nevuah in Yirmiyahu 49:7 that is very similar to Obadiah. (You may want a Tanach for this).

1. There is a parallel between Yirmiyahu 7 and Ovadiah 8 as well as between
2. yirmiyahu 9-10 and Obadiah 5-6, although there is a difference in who is stripping Edom bare.
3. The parallel continues with Yir 12 and Ova 16. Yir 13 doesn’t match. Yir 14 fits with the beginning of Ova. The last 3 pessukim of Ovadiah don’t match at all.

The order in Yirmiyahu is different than in Ovadiah. We have pesukim that relate to Churban in avodaia that don’t relate to yirmiyahu and pesukim in Yirmiyahu about that aren’t in Ovadiah. **Ovadiah’s order is the more logical order because it starts with shimua shamati while Yirmiyahu has it in a weird order**.

Q: What difference is created by the different order in Yirmiyahu? The call to arms not appearing till later means the speaker is different and that changes everything (you haven’t just shuffled the deck, you’ve changed the game

* The use of a pronoun in Hebrew is not necessary and when employed, it means emphasis (toramti dam hayom). What we can conclude is that as the nevuah continues, there is more of a demand that people help bring about whatever is being described while in Ovadiah, it is taken for granted. We have to consider if Edom is presented differently than the way other nations are presented by Yirmiyahu. It doesn’t seem that they are but we will have to look at some other pessukim.

We noted that in Yirmiyahu there is great emphasis on God acting alone while in

* Ovadiah the nations are called to work together with God.

Certain people called tzeiei hatzon are brought at the end of yirmiyahu but not at the beginning.

In yechezkel, the nevuah about Edom is about brotherhood and it is in a different place than other goyim. There does not appear to be a metaphysical Edom that goes beyond the actual people of Edom and there is different treatment of Edom as opposed to nations in Ovadiah. We also lack amalek connection.

In yirmiyahu, there is mention of tzeirei hatzon and then posuk that giborim will be made like women

* there is no parallel of this in Ovadiah.

The next two perakim (50-51) talk about Bavel and the end of 50, you have a bunch of pesukim that are identical to the Edom description with tzierey hatzon. By bavel, the tzierey hazon would seem to be the Persian since they caused the downfall of Bavel. You could say that the tzierey tzon by Edom refers to the Persians as well and Rashi quoting the gemara in Yoma indeed says this which may fit into Chazal’s general conception of Persia especially in light of them being an antagonist to Rome which is Edom. Other possibilities for tzierey hazon are the Jews and they bring downfall of Edom and the Radak indeed says this. He also explains the tzirey tzon by Bavel in perek 50 as referring to the Jews and they caused downfall of Bavel through prayer mitzvos etc. Two other places where Edom and bavel are brought together are in tehillim 137- al naharas bavel who destroyed the first mikdash and Edom is referenced as being bystanders in the churban as well or as being Rome referring to the second churban. The other place is in eichah 4:21 where Edom is somehow treated in association with Bavel. This makes Edom seem more important than a simple military power. THIS LAST PART MIGHT NOT BE RELEVANT

Q2: what feature distinguish the “ metaphysical Edom” theme in prophecies about Edom? How did we interpret the signfiicane of this theme? Why does it appear, where, and when it does?

Chazal identify Edom with Rome and see the churban as golus Edom.

* This association is based on the amalek point and it can be traced and this might help us in peshat. You can ask why should Edom be given so much attention if they are not that important?
  + that Edom must be important and you therefore identify them with a superpower to get more mileage out of them and aggrandize their role.
    - Herod was an Edomite and he became aking of Judea after the Choshmanim so it could be Chazal saw him a go-between the Bayis Rishon Edomites and the later Romans and so that is how connected got started
    - . Edom was also indentified as the Christian Church and in Daniel’s vision of the 4 bests representing the 4 superpowers or exiles, Rome/the church may have matched the 4th one.

We looked at various perakim in Isaiah and examined where edom comes up. In Isiah 34, which is one of the perakim of nechama, the navi addresses himself at the nations as a whole which is similar to what is presented in Isiah 63 and in Ovadiah and says that God is angry at all the nations.

* The people are predicted as being slaughtered and there will be blood and the bodies will smell very bad. The heavenly hosts will rot away, meaning it will be like time has stopped.
* In general, in Isaiah 4 and elsewhere different nations are spoken as having heavenly representatives. The heavens will be like a book or scroll stretched out. The sword is brought down from heaven to the Earth and comes down on Edom so we have the question again (like Ovadiah) of what the other nations are doing here- are they being called to attack or to be punished.
  + You have animals being slaughtered and things being burned.

Q: Wild animals will nest there and take over their land. All these other animals will be out there. . The navi goes and says read the chumash and see. What is this referring to?

**Radak** says this means that all the treif animals in Shemini are listed here and that is what the navi is referring to. Shemini is being used as a zoology and Edom becomes a Biblical zoo where we see every animals is where it is supposed to be. The only problem with this is that there isn’t **much theological significance to that.**

**Rashi** references Noach- meaning all the animals that were there are here. You have more animals there but fewer names. This is also clever but no real significance. The alternative approach is that the focus is on *The* sefer of God, the written nature of things.

* By **amalek,** there is emphasis on writing the memory his name at the end of beshalach and it is important that the divine promise is in writing. So maybe the navi is referring to that. If this is true, then the link between amalek and edom is here.
  + the earlier image of the stretched out book fits better with this notion of a written prophecy being fulfilled. The problem with this that the context seems to indicate it relates something to the animals. It could be both interpretations are correct and the rishonim are talking on a peshat level and there is another deeper meaning.

We now have seen other symptoms of this ambiguity about edom and the other nations. In real life, someone can be angry at everyone and can take it out on everyone, like a teacher who throws one kid out when he is angry at the whole class.

* YOUcan't attack everyone so you pick who you are going to fight .Complete consistency would require complete annihilation.
  + This is called scapegoating that maybe have some positive aspects but also raises moral issues as to why that guy deserves more than anything else. We have this issue by Amalek of why they are so the ones singled out. Y

1. you could take ratial approach that there is something in their genes, but there is nothing in the pesukim that support this nor does science show that and it is not morally comfortable.
2. Another approach is to talk about how amalek embodies evil and Rav Medan collected all these references in Chazal but they are not all so peshat oriented. Rav Carmy in his article focused on the brotherly aspect (assuming Edom is one wit amalek) and the nature of the sneak attack which had no real goal.

* The wars of God uMagog are to conquer Eretz yisroel so there are territorial purposes there. If you yehsivsish then all goyim are the same and Zol zei bren- let them burn, but there are real differences in the pessukim about the different nations.

So in this group of nations, you are going to have one that is the worse like a group of students. Why should the lowest one be treated worse? Because if the entire world is sinful and corrupt then you could just get rid of the entire world, but instead the sword comes down on Edom.

* Thus God is indeed angry at all the nations but he has singled out Amalek for punishment as a scapegoat, like being angry at Germany instead of all of Europe
* The first commentary on mechiyas Amalek is really thus not in the rishonim, not in the navi.

As an explanation for God acting alone in nach, sometime Gods acts alone in the destruction and sometimes man participates. This is expressed in the language used by the two times the commandment to destroy amalek is presented, **one is Hashem declaring and the other is mans taking part.**

Q3: Discuss factors pertinent to the dating of Obadiah, noting both our discussion and the rabbinic material. What historical events are referred to according to radak and Abarbanel ( explain)?

Ovadiah is the shortest navi and in undated. Chazal says he is the Ovadiah from Melachim 8 where he is described as a yireh Hashem who hid neviem and respected Eliyahu etc. The posuk calling him yireh Hashem is strange if he a navi. Chazal in general call gerim yireh Hashem and this is from the Greek. This may not be peshat in Tanach since other usages of yireh Hashem don’t fit this. Chazal is equating him not just because of conservation of Biblical personalities but more because he only has one nevuah and it is about edom and since he describes himself as a yireh elokim, we want him to be a gari from Edom so he can talk about them**. Rashi quotes** this on the first posuk. This is probably not peshat but it is important. So when might he have lived? According to chazal, he would be during Achavs times which is early. He will describe Edom having done certain things to Yerushalayim already so we have to look for things Edom has done already and put him after that. If he lives during the churban, (which Rav Carmy thinks is peshat), then we can find historical association easier. Then we have to consider if he is only talking about contemporary things or is also referring to things in the future.

**Ibn Ezra** says we don’t know when he lived and he cannot be the same one as from Melachim since called yireh elokim. You could answer this by saying he hadn’t gotten a nevuah yet, or by saying the yireh elokim idea from above with gerim, or you could say it is more important to tell Eliyahu that he is yireh elokim than a navi. (analogy of telling someone you can eat in my house because I wrote a sefer on zevachim as oppsed to saying yireh shamayim, ironic posuk of navi kamocha said by navi sheker). If you accept Chazal, then you have to consider the issue of a ger being a navi.

If Edom is identified with Rome ethnically, then you can easily say a nevuah about Edom is really about Rome using the above idea and that is good. If there is no ethnic question, then it is much more complicated as to why the connection would be there. **Ibn Ezra** says that Edom is not Rome al pi peshat, but rather Edom is identified as Christianity and that got linked to Rome. Christianity arises out of the Jews and specifically among those who had recently been forced to convert from Edom. The Rome connections came only much later when Christians took over the empire so in peshat Edom is not Rome and the nevuos are about Churban.

The **Radak** (who was very messianic) argued and said that they are ethnically related and he got this from Virgil or someone similar who says that Rome came from the Trojans and guy was carried by his son to Rome (which fits with kibud vaem aspect of Esav). The problems with this is that Edom is only a bystander in the desctuction and according to Radak’s peshat, this is Rome who were the main ones who destroyed the bayis sheni. Radak deals with by saying that there are 2 dinim in Edom. You have the Edom which is Rome and the Edom which is ancestor of Rome. Thus Edom qua Rome is destroying bayis sheni while Edom qua edom is a bystander in Bayis Rishon. This is a stretch. **Abarbanel** was even “frummer” than the Radak in this regard, tried very hard to find Roman-Edomite connection partly because of his own experience and because of Christian claims otherwide. He solved this problem by saying that pesukim describing Edom is a bystander are bayis rishon and pesukim describing major role are bayis sheni.

Q4: Discuss in detail the imagery of the “ cup” in Jeremiah 25, in Jeremiah 49 and Eikaha with special attention to the passage in Obadia as interpreted by rashi, Ibn Ezra + others + omplications of this debate for our approach to Edom prophecies.

**Zephaniah**

Q1: Discuss structure of Zephaniah , including our analysis of the place and contetnt of chapter 2. Include also the exegetical questions about the Ethipoa references + our comments on Rashi’s approach

WE DID NOT DISCUSS ALL THIS IN CLASS. I WILL PUT MY NOTES ON WHAT WE DID DISCUSS

The jews are accused of copying goyim on things and this is presumabely the upper class. This fits with tzefainah coming from royalty as midrash says that the chizkiyahu mentioned in his lineage is the king. The rich are called out for assimilating and stuff. Then the different nations are described as being destroyed. Edom is left out to embarrass them because nobody is copying them.

**Other notes**

**Zephaniah**

צפניה. צפניה begins with a date; he lives at the time of יאשיהו מלך יהודה. פסקתא is a style of מדרש that will follow the סדר of קריאת התורה, as opposed to full ספרים. The פסיקתא on דברי ירמיהו, the תורה before תשעה באב, says that there were three נביאים at that time: צפניה, חלדה הנביאה and ירמיהו. The מדרש adds that צפניה used to speak in the בתי מדרש, חולדה spoke to the women, and ירמיהו spoke in the streets. The middle one we understand. Why צפניה is דוקא in the בתי מדרש and ירמיהו in the streets sounds arbitrary.

The ייחוס of צפניה goes back five generations. This is highly unusual. The important point seems to be that the ייחוס goes back to חזקיה. Assumption is that this חזקיה refers to חזקיה מלך יהודה.

אבן עזרא holds this way. First, you have conservation of personalities. If there are multiple names, they should be the same person. Additionally, if the פסוק is going back so far, in the ייחוס, presumably there is a purpose. If צפניה really was a great grandson of חזקיה, this may be behind the notion that צפניה only spoke in the בתי מדרש; he spoke to upper class people. We may find that the נבואות as well have an upper class orientation.

The נבואה begins with אסף אסף כל מעל פני האדמה נאם ה'. Similar פסוקים at the beginning of ירמיהו, which makes sense if their נבואות came at the same time. The נביא speaks about the remnants of the worship of בעל; this is the period of יאשיהו, when there was widespread תשובה. Those who swear in the name of מלכם (which may be a reference to the god of מואב) will be destroyed.

In פסוק ז' we have a reference to יום ה'. יום ה' here has the barbecue elements. פסוק ח' says that the שרים and the בני המלך will be punished; we are talking about the upper class. בן המלך presumably doesn’t literally mean the son of a king; it may mean nobleman. Much pottery found that makes reference to בני המלך. We also have a reference to לבשים מלבוש נכרי in this פסוק. This may also be a reference to the upper class; the upper class follows the most recent trends in Paris. פסוק ט' we have כל הדולג על המפתן. We have a similar practice in שמואל, by the כהני דגן. Again, people following Philistine practices. We also have reference to ממלאים בית אדניהם חמס ומרמה; we have reference to the butlers, and the retainers of nobility. פסוק י"א. נדמה כל עם כנען. רש"י and תרגום say that this refers to the בני ישראל who act like כנענים. אבן עזרא says that this refers to a merchant. תרגום, in בראשית, translates איש כנעני as תגרא, in the context of יהודה and his marriage. פסוק י"ח. All of their money will not save them in the day of יום ה'. Again, upper class.

פרק ב'. פסוק ב'. בקשוא את ה' כל ענוי הארץ. The simple people seek G-d; the evil people are the nobility.

We next have a couple of פסוקים that address the גויים. Unclear what they are doing here. נבואות הגויים are introduced suddenly, in the middle of the פרק.

What are these פסוקים doing here? פסוק ד'. עזה עזובה תהיה, a nice play on words. אשקלון לשממה may have a small play on words in the "ש". עקרון תעקר also is a pun. We have אשדוד בצהרים יגרשוה, which is not a play on words. However, it could be that the נביא expects us to be familiar with תהלים, which says מקטב ישוד בצהרים. רד"ק makes this parallel.

First גויים mentioned are the פלשתים, who would be in the west. We then have עמון and מואב, in the east. אדום isn’t mentioned. In the south, we have כושים, in פסוק י"א. At this period, Egypt was dominated by Ethiopians. And finally, we have reference to נינוה in the north. This is the climax, because נינוה was a superpower. At the beginning of פרק ג', the נביא comes back to talk about ירושלים.

Two questions.

1. why are the נבואות הגויים here?
2. why is אדום left out?

A: Regarding אדום, in ירמיהו we have בזוי אתה מאד. There is an element of contempt. However, other נביאים give significant attention to אדום, so why does צפניה express contempt about אדום by ignoring them?

A: If the issue at hand is assimilation, as we suggested in פרק א', then everything works out perfectly. We understand why the נבואות הגויים jump in somewhat suddenly. Additionally, the contempt of אדום is expressed by ignoring them, because the Jews aren’t interesting in adopting the culture of אדום.

פרק ג'. There is again an attack on the people. פסוק ה'. G-d will search out משפט לאור. Contrast between light and darkness, between this פרק and the first פרק. Enlightenment for all the nations; they will all call in the name of G-d. Some פסוקים here that nobody really understands. פסוק י', for example. In פסוק י"ג, we have a reversal of מגדל בבל. Everyone is speaking the same language. There is no longer deceptive speech. Last couple of פסוקים are נבואות נחמה connected to קבוץ גלויות.