

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
New York School

INSTRUCTIONS TO LIBRARY

Statement
by Referee

The Senior Thesis of

Nan Dorfman

Entitled; _____

- 1) May (with revisions) be considered for publication (☒) (☐)
yes no
- 2) May be circulated (☐) (☐) (☐) (☒)
to faculty to students to alumni no restriction
- 3) May be consulted in Library only (☐) (☐)
by faculty by students
(☐) (☐)
by alumni no restriction

5/9/76
(date)

Isaac Dorfman
(signature of referee)

Statement
by Author

I hereby give permission to the Library to circulate my thesis

(☒) (☐)
yes no

The Library may sell positive microfilm copies of my thesis

(☒) (☐)
yes no

5 April 1976
(date)

Nan Dorfman
(signature of author)

Library
Record

The above-named thesis was microfilmed on

8/9/76
(date)

For the Library

(signature of staff member)

**SOME ASPECTS OF FAITH IN THE RABBINIC LITERATURE:
A STUDY OF THE TERMS אֱמוּנָה AND אֱמוּנָה**

Dan Dorfman

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
for Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
New York, N. Y.

5 April 1976

Advisor: Professor Eugene B. Borowitz

Acknowledgements

I must express my warm thanks and loving gratitude to my parents, whose love and support have sustained me through the many years of my education.

Thanks to Mr. Phil Miller, Mrs. Susan Tabor, Mrs. Catherine Markush, and other members of the Library staff, who have helped make the library like a second home for me.

My thanks also go to Rabbis Norman Cohen, Michael Chernick, and Manny Gold, who offered helpful suggestions on the interpretation of several passages.

I cannot truly express the depth of my gratitude to Rabbi Eugene Borowitz. As a scholar and teacher of Jewish religious thought, he is without peer. More than any other professor I have studied with, Rabbi Borowitz has challenged me to think clearly and critically, and to write precisely. Many thanks are due for his insightful guidance of my work on this thesis and for the model of perceptive, committed scholarship he embodies to his students.

A special place in my heart is reserved for a warm and wise man I had the privilege to study with. His example of dedicated scholarship, profound love for the Jewish tradition, and sensitive interest in his students has profoundly influenced my years at rabbinic school. It is with deep respect and abiding affection that I dedicate this thesis to Dr. Julius Kravetz.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: יֵדָא AND בְּטָח IN THE BIBLE	15
CHAPTER 3: יֵדָא AS A CHARACTERISTIC OF HUMAN INTERACTION	30
CHAPTER 4: יֵדָא AS A CHARACTERISTIC OF GOD	48
CHAPTER 5: יֵדָא AS A CHARACTERISTIC OF THE HUMAN- DIVINE RELATIONSHIP -- THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL	66
CHAPTER 6: יֵדָא AS A CHARACTERISTIC OF THE HUMAN- DIVINE RELATIONSHIP -- INDIVIDUAL PERSONS	90
CHAPTER 7: USAGES OF בְּטָח	121
PART I: Promises and Certainty	123
PART II: בְּטָח as Reliance on God	131
PART III: בְּטָח as an Inner Sense of Security	148
CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS	164
APPENDIX I: Hebrew Sources Cited	185
APPENDIX II: Hebrew Sources Concerning Rewards for בְּטָח... 215	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	219

Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

Concern about faith in God is very prominent in modern Jewish religious thought. Along with such traditional concerns as halachah and ethics, the problem of whether and what to believe about God must be considered of major importance to contemporary Jews. The outpouring of books of theology and analysis of theology testifies to the fervor of the concern -- Martin Buber's I and Thou, Abraham Heschel's God in Search of Man, Mordechai Kaplan's The Meaning of God in Modern Jewish Religion, Louis Jacob's Faith, Eugene B. Borowitz's How Can a Jew Speak of Faith Today?, Emil Fackenheim's God's Presence in History, among many others.

Although as this study will show, speculation of the nature of faith is not foreign to Judaism, the current concern probably has much of its origin in Christian and modern Western thought. As Louis Jacobs writes, "The vast majority of contemporary volumes on belief in God are written either from a Christian standpoint, or as a direct reaction to it."¹ This is one reason for the title of Borowitz's book cited above. He begins the book with a cogent argument that modern Jews must develop an authentically Jewish form for their beliefs about God, if the beliefs themselves are to be authentically Jewish.²

To help us in that task, I intend in this study to examine some of the views and concepts of the early Rabbis

on the question of faith in God. My aim is to find out the extent to which conceptions of religious faith have in fact been formulated in Judaism. Louis Jacobs gives some encouragement to this task: "Jewish thinkers throughout the ages have been no less passionately concerned, as sincerely dedicated, as daringly speculative, as their Christian counterparts."³

A further aim is to examine some of these conceptions, as possible guides and standards for our own contemporary views of faith. I turn to the Aggadah, for, as Borowitz writes, "Judaism invented the aggada as the proper vehicle for Jewish religious ideas"⁴ The Aggadah is the home of rabbinic religious thought -- speculation, fables, ethics, "theology," etc. -- the whole gamut of human concerns, both mundane and profound, in this universe and in realms beyond. In this complex, contradictory, free-flowing speculative literature, we must begin our search for Jewish conceptions of religious faith.

This search has excited curiously little interest on the part of scholars of the rabbinic literature. Solomon Schechter virtually ignores the question⁵ and Kaufmann Kohler gives it scant attention.⁶ G. F. Moore, Max Kadushin, and Ephraim Urbach give it slightly more consideration. This failure to thoroughly examine "faith" in rabbinic thought probably reflects the stereotyped view of Judaism as a religion of "deeds," while Christianity is considered the religion of

"faith/belief." There has been an a priori assumption that faith was not a major rabbinic concern.

A goal of this study, then, is to demonstrate that "faith" is indeed a topic that attracted considerable rabbinic interest. How central a concept it was in relationship to other religious concepts is beyond the scope of the current study. Any comparison to early Christian thought also cannot be undertaken here. This study is intended to be part of a larger study of rabbinic conceptions of the broad range of human attitudes towards God, which will hopefully provide a basis to initiate such a comparison.

Methodology

A methodology for the analysis of rabbinic thought must fulfil two criteria. It must enable us to draw some conclusions about rabbinic ideas on a given subject, but without imposing external, modern categories onto the material. The difficulty for the modern scholar was aptly described by Solomon Schechter:

The old Rabbis seem to have thought that the true health of a religion is to have a theology without being aware of it; and thus they hardly ever made -- not could they make -- any attempt towards working their theology into a formal system, or giving us a full exposition of it. . . . The Rabbis, moreover, show a carelessness and sluggishness in the application of theological principles which must be most astonishing to certain minds which seem to mistake merciless logic for God-given truth.⁷

Yet, as Max Kadushin points out, the Aggadah is a religious

literature which seeks to teach values and impart ideas.

This necessitates some kind of coherence, some context for ideas to relate to each other, without which they are uncommunicable.⁸ The challenge is to find a way for delineating these rabbinic ideas, without imposing a false unity or distorting the material to fit modern conceptualizations.

One way to do this is to choose words from the rabbinic vocabulary itself and examine how they are used, what the Rabbis mean by them, what their nuances and connotations are. By doing so, we get a picture of what the Rabbis thought about the area of human experience encompassed by the term. This is the methodology utilized in this study; I call it a "linguistic-conceptual approach."⁹

This approach has obvious roots in Max Kadushin's analysis of rabbinic thought. Kadushin's importance for my purposes lies not in his notion of the "organismic coherence" of rabbinic thought,¹⁰ but in his concept of the "value-term." Kadushin summarizes well the starting point of the linguistic-conceptual approach: "The only authentic way to express abstractly a rabbinic value is by means of the term found for it in rabbinic literature."¹¹

Kadushin's analysis tells us that rabbinic terms, their connotations and meanings in context, inform us about rabbinic ideas and values. The linguistic-conceptual method has the advantage, then, of giving us a handle of considerable value into the vast, apparently boundless rabbinic intellectual

world. It gives us a way to manage the material, which otherwise would be too vast and complex to study coherently. It gives us ready access into the material by means of the linguistically arranged indices and concordances. It also gives us the assurance that we are indeed examining rabbinic thought on its own, rather than modern terms. For what Mark Golub writes concerning the topic of his thesis ("love") is true of mine as well: "It is logical to assume that the vast majority of rabbinic discussions and opinions of love will somewhere include a word for 'love.'" ¹²

There are some limitations. One concerns the question of the terms chosen. For reasons I will shortly discuss, I chose the words אמן and בטח as a way to examine rabbinic ideas of religious faith. There are, however, other terms which bear directly on this subject, such as קדושת ה', Kadushin's idea of "organismic coherence," with all its severe drawbacks, does cogently argue that a single term cannot be fully understood isolated from the matrix of rabbinic value-terms, which combine to lend different meanings to each other. ¹³ Even without Kadushin, we can see that a complete view of rabbinic ideas on religious faith would dictate a broader inquiry than this study encompasses. For what is at the root of this subject is the basic question of how the Rabbis conceived human attitudes towards God. These other terms are, therefore, quite important for delineating what religious faith might

have meant for the Rabbis. This study must, therefore, be considered a preliminary phase of a larger examination of rabbinic views on faith.

The second problem is that choosing particular terms to examine may, in fact, too rigidly narrow the scope of inquiry. The Rabbis may, in fact, discuss faith extensively in aggadot that do not use the terms I have chosen. The thoughts, attitude, and actions indicative of faith, as well as related issues, may be described without the terms being used. This seems to be the assumption of R. J. Zwi Werblowsky and Louis Jacobs in their discussions of bittahon.¹⁴ Both give examples of what they assert to be bittahon, e.g. reliance on God for healing and for sustenance, as well as countervailing rabbinic views on these matters, none of which use the root נבט. These scholars seem to be assuming that rabbinic thought exhibits a rather modern conceptual, logical unity, within which associations and comparisons of ideas may be made.

Werblowsky's and Jacob's juxtaposition of the themes of aggadot may, in fact, reflect rabbinic thought on the subject; the associations certainly seem logical to us. But the linguistic-conceptual approach, with its significant limitations, yet avoids the crucial danger inherent in the alternative -- namely, the tendency to read our own views and biases into the rabbinic material. This is a particular failing of Christian scholars who study "Old Testament theology"

who, for example, focus on those Biblical verses which contain, in their opinion, the "most profound" concepts of faith.¹⁵

By taking the linguistic-conceptual approach we may be missing rabbinical ideas relevant to our subject, but we can be reasonably sure that the passages we study do contain authentic rabbinic views centered on our concern.

With the guidance of various dictionaries (Jastrow, Even Shoshan, Alkali), Max Kadushin and other scholars,¹⁶ M. Gross's Otzar Ha-aggadah, and a knowledge of modern Hebrew, I chose to examine rabbinic usages of the two Hebrew roots most clearly associated with the English word "faith" -- אָמַן ("faith/trust") and נָאֵם ("trust/reliance"). Aggadot using these terms were first located by the use of indices and concordances to the rabbinic literature. Particularly helpful were Otzar Ha-aggadah and the concordances by the Kossovskys to the Talmud, Sifra, Sifrei, and Mekilta. Indices to English translations and discussions in the secondary literature were also helpful in locating passages. With the latter, however, it was not uncommon for such works to apply the word "faith" to passages which did not contain either of my two terms. With the secondary literature, special care had to be exercised, for the word "faith" is often used in the modern sense of "religion" rather than in the more precise meaning I am investigating.

My aim was to be as extensive and comprehensive as possible -- to examine as many instances of the use of my terms that I could in the major sources of the Aggadah. The Rabbinic collections I examined included: the two Talmuds, Midrash Rabbah, Sifra, Sifrei, Tanhuma, Yalkut Shimoni, Mekilta, Midrash Psalms, plus several minor collections (See Appendix 3).

I sought sources by tracking down all the major forms of my terms found in the indices. I found that, as Kadushin says, aggadic statements should be treated as "independent entities, containing ideas or describing situations that are complete in themselves."¹⁷ It was always important, however, to examine the context of a statement, for several relevant statements might appear in succession or the context might, in some other way, illuminate the aggadah at hand. In each case, I tried to determine from the passage, on its own terms, the meanings and nuances of my terms. Gradually, certain common connotations emerged -- as well as relationships between them -- and these groupings form the units of the chapters of this study.

The structure of the thesis

After briefly discussing the usages of לֵב and נֶפֶשׁ in the Bible, I examine לֵב as used in the course of human interaction. I then discuss לֵב as applied to God and to the human partner in the divine-human relationship, corporately

as the people of Israel and individually as persons.

The subject and placement of the first chapter deserve some explanation, especially in view of the stated goal of this thesis to study rabbinic views on "religious faith." Since I decided to go about this by means of a linguistic-conceptual approach, I could not ignore this level, because there is extensive usage of יָדָא in this sense in both Halachah and Aggadah.

By beginning with this aspect, an assumption is being made. The assumption, borne out by this study, is that the Rabbis made inferences from the everyday realms of human behavior and interaction to the attributes of God and to the divine-human relationship. By examining aggadot dealing with יָדָא between people, we can gain an understanding of some of the basic connotations of the term. We can then more accurately grasp what the Rabbis meant -- and did not mean -- when ascribing יָדָא to God and to the relationship of human beings to Him. This assumption receives support from the Aggadah itself, in the common literary device called מָשָׁל ("parable"). In a מָשָׁל, divine behavior or human-divine interactions are directly likened to a human situation to help illuminate them. Common reference points are a king and his sons, servants, or subjects, for example, or, in this study, a banker/trustee and the residents of his village.

The level of human interaction is placed first, then, because the range of connotations, through which יָדָא may be

seen to move, is also found, with some modifications, at the other levels discussed. The ascription of *emunah* to God has also been given little scholarly attention. It is significant, though, and is placed where it is because the perception of God as faithful/reliable (*הוא אמונה*) underlies human faith and faithfulness, for both the people and individuals.

Both national and individual *emunah* are extensively discussed by the Rabbis; I examine the nation's first for one reason. Although the forms and content of individual *emunah* are, in several respects, quite different from the corporate, the national historic experiences of God's saving power underlie human *emunah* at both levels.

The usages and connotations of *emunah* are then discussed. Though a range of usage may be discerned, it is less coherent a spectrum than is true for *emunah*. In the Conclusions, I summarize my findings, compare the two terms, and discuss some of the implications of this study for an understanding of rabbinic views of faith.

Some technical concerns

Translation. -- "I have tried to be as accurate and consistent in my translations as I can, while seeking to render the aggadot in colloquial, readable English. All the translations of rabbinic passages are my own, except where otherwise noted. Existing translations were, of course, consulted.

Translations of Biblical verses were taken from the old and new JPS versions, with some rephrasing.

Sources. -- Critical editions were generally, but not exclusively, consulted (See Bibliography). Citations were given as follows:

Talmud Bavli -- Tractate, folio page number, side.

Talmud Jerusalmi -- Seder:halachah number.

Midrash Rabbah -- Book, parashah: paragraph number.

Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes Rabbah are cited by chapter and verse, according to the Romm edition (Jerusalem, 1970).

Mekilta, Sifrei d'bei Rav -- parashah, paragraph number. (Page number in Horowitz-Rabin and Horowitz editions, respectively.)

Sifra, Sifrei D'varim -- parashah, paragraph. (Page reference to Finkelstein editions.)

Tanchuma, Yalkut Shimoni -- parashah, paragraph.

Midrash Psalms -- Psalm number, paragraph number.

Terminology. -- Throughout the body of my text, I generally use the root forms of my terms, rather than the noun forms usually used in scholarly discussions. This is deliberate. It has proved beyond the scope of this study to determine what precisely is the characteristic noun forms for these terms in rabbinic literature.

All of the scholars I consulted use the noun form emunah (אמונה) in describing rabbinic views. However, a form which

appears at least as frequently is amanah (אַמְנָה). As a tentative hypothesis, I believe that אַמְנָה refers to the act of "placing trust" and אִמְּוֶנָה to "faithfulness/reliability." But to be as precise as possible, I generally in my text use the root to describe the attitude delineated by the term, rather than the grammatically correct noun form. When referring back to a usage in a particular aggadah, I will utilize the noun form cited in the passage itself.

With the root נָטַח, I have felt freer to use the noun form נִטְחוּן. Although נָטַח, הַנְּטָחָה, and מִנְּטָח are also noun forms, נִטְחוּן does seem the characteristic noun form for the attitude of "placing reliance." It is not so clearly the noun form for the inner feeling of security that results, so again I revert to use of the root in Chapter 7, Part III. Similarly, נִטְחוּן is not explicitly associated with "promise" or "being certain," so in Chapter 7, Part I, the root is generally used in the body of my text.

In this study, I use the word "Aggadah," with a capital "a," to refer to the body of rabbinic literature described by the term. I use "aggadah," with a small "a," to refer to an individual passage.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 1

1. Louis Jacobs, Faith, New York, Basic Books, 1968, p. vii.
2. Eugene B. Borowitz, How Can a Jew Speak of Faith Today?, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1969, pp. 15-26.
3. Jacobs, op. cit., p. vii.
4. Borowitz, op. cit., p. 19.
5. Solomon Schechter, Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, New York, Schocken Books, 1961.
6. Kaufmann Kohler, Jewish Theology, New York, K'tav Publishing House, Inc., 1968.
7. Schechter, op. cit., pp. 12-14.
8. Max Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, New York, Blaisdell Publishing Co., 1965, pp. 1-2, 14-15.
9. An excellent discussion of the premises and procedures of this methodology may be found in Mark Steven Golub, The Rabbinic Connotations of אֱמוּנָה and אֱמוּנָה , unpublished rabbinic thesis, HUC-JIR, New York, 1972, pp. i-iv.
10. Kadushin, op. cit., pp. 14-34.
11. Ibid., p. 2.
12. Golub, op. cit., p. 11.
13. Kadushin, op. cit., pp. 24-26. On the one hand, Kadushin's notion of "organismic coherence" seems too rigid and formal to embrace the rather fluid, free-flowing "logic" of the Aggadah. On the other hand, it has proved itself too complex and ill-defined to actually be used to show the structure and unity of rabbinic thought by anyone other than Kadushin himself.
14. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, "Faith, Hope, and Trust: A Study in the Concept of Bittahon," in Weiss, J. G., editor, Papers of the Institute of Jewish Studies London, Jerusalem, The Magnes Press, 1964, Vol. I, pp. 95-139.

Louis Jacobs, Jewish Values, London, Valentine, Mitchell & Co., 1960, Chapter IV.

15. I would fault in this regard Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, p. 348, Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, pp. 378-379, and others.
16. Kadushin, op. cit., pp. 42-43. See also, inter alia, Jacobs, Faith, op. cit., pp. 3-10 and G. F. Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, Vol. 2, pp. 237-238.
17. Kadushin, op. cit., p. 60.

Chapter 2: מִדְּרָשׁ AND מִשְׁנָה IN THE BIBLE

Rabbinic statements are the independent creations of a particular period and set of circumstances. It might not always be necessary to examine how the Bible uses certain terms in order to understand how the Rabbis use them. This is especially true when we consider how much concepts can change with the passage of time and alterations in context. The difference in time and context which we are dealing with is anywhere from at least 200 to 400 years, depending on when one dates the origins of the Aggadah. But for our topic, the terms מִדְּרָשׁ and מִשְׁנָה, as for most rabbinic term-concepts, we find considerable conceptual similarity between the Bible and the Aggadah, which merits examination.

There is, furthermore, a formal, "literary" consideration. Although aggadah is not always midrash, i.e., exegetical homiletics on verses from the Bible, we find that in our area of concern, midrash figures prominently. It is therefore important to understand how the Bible understood our terms, that is, to acquire some sense of the conceptual and linguistic heritage the Rabbis inherited. It is clear, though, that this heritage did not rule the Rabbis; they understood these terms in their own way and read the verses through their own understanding of the terms and their conceptualization of the ideas they represented.

A useful analogy may be made to American Constitutional law. In analyzing a Supreme Court decision of, say, the 1920's, it is most important to know the political, social, economic thought of the 1920's, in order to understand how the Court is reading the Constitution. But it is also important to know how the Founding Fathers meant the words they wrote; we may then understand some of the bases the Court is operating with and we may see where the Court maintains the earlier meanings and where it extends or alters them.

There is general agreement among scholars that the Biblical writers, like the Sages, never try to prove God's existence,¹ which is considered axiomatic, an experienced, all-pervading reality, visible in every aspect of life and the universe.

יִדְּא in the Bible does not seem to explicitly connote cognitive beliefs about God or His nature: "Biblical 'emunah does not yet mean correct theological opinion, metaphysical conviction, or assent to statements about the nature and attributes of God."²

יִדְּא connotes a more basic, more comprehensive attitude and relationship. The root meaning is variously, but similarly, rendered "confirm, support,"³ "firmness, stability,"⁴ or "strong, firm."⁵ Artur Weiser believes that it may be possible to discern an original layer of meaning in the rare uses of יִדְּא in binyan kal,⁶ as "child's mother, nurse, attendant" (II Samuel 4:4; Ruth 4:6; Numbers 11:12) and as "guardian, foster-father" (II Kings 10:1,5; Esther 2:7;

Isaiah 60:4). The Brown-Driver-Briggs Lexicon cites these concrete usages, plus the usage of אִמְנוֹת as "pillars, supporters of the door" in II Kings 18:16.

Several scholars further note root associations between יָמַן and אָמַן.⁷ As Weiser notes, the paucity of usages in these root senses makes it difficult to make firm conclusions about the "original" meanings of יָמַן, or their relation to "religious" uses.⁸ The root meanings adduced are nevertheless suggestive. To a limited extent, these roots with their connotations of steadfastness, perseverance, support, and truth,⁹ may be seen in the more characteristic Biblical usages of יָמַן.

There are two basic meanings of יָמַן in the Bible:

(1) trust in, confidence in, reliance on someone or something;
 (2) trustworthiness, reliability, faithfulness, steadfastness.
 Most often the trust is (or should be) placed in God, and it is God who is most prominently praised as trustworthy. But God is not the exclusive subject of יָמַן. Let us first examine usages in the sense of "placing trust."

יָמַן in this sense is frequently seen to function in the relationship between two people (Exodus 19:9; II Chronicles 20:20; Micah 7:5; Proverbs 26:25; Job 15:15; Jeremiah 12:6; I Samuel 27:12; Proverbs 14:15). The predominant sense here is to place one's trust, one's confidence in someone. There is also an implicit sense of belief/trust in a person's word, quite explicitly in the last two verses cited: "And Achish

believed (ויאמין) David," i.e., believed his report/trusted his word concerning his raids. "And the simpleton believes (ויאמין) every word," believes/trusts whatever anyone tells him.¹⁰

The element of belief that something is true or truthfully reported predominates in other passages: the belief that something happened (Exodus 4:5) or will happen (Lamentations 4:12); belief in the truth of a report or the faithfulness of the reporters (Genesis 45:26; Jeremiah 40:14). The element of trust is more prominent in verses describing confidence placed in the character of a prophet or leader (Isaiah 43:10) or the lack of such trust (Job 4:18).¹¹ A prime example of this trust is Exodus 14:31 (ויאמין בה' ובמשה עבדו), which is a key verse for rabbinic discussions of אמון. After the miraculous salvation of the crossing of the Sea at Moses's direction, the people have confidence in Moses's leadership, about which they were previously uncertain. (They also now trust God as He who has redeemed them from bondage.)¹² A related usage of אמון at the human level is "integrity, honesty," and/or "truth" (Jeremiah 5:1; Proverbs 12:17, 22; Isaiah 59:4; II Chronicles 34:12).^{12a}

The premier usage of אמון in the Bible is trust and confidence placed in God -- in His promises, His word, His faithfulness, His beneficent protection. The context of this faith is the covenant relationship, in which God pledged himself to be the God of Israel, to guide and protect them,

if they would worship Him and keep His commandments. Sometimes Israel's faith focuses on specific covenantal promises God makes, which they trust Him to carry out (Genesis 15:6; Psalm 106:12,24).¹³ Often, their faith is a response to examples of God's might, His saving power, and His love for Israel, which they witness or experience (Exodus 4:1,8,31; 14:31; Numbers 14:11; Psalm 78:32).¹⁴ Sometimes, the trust (or lack of it) is simply mentioned, without specific reference point (Deuteronomy 1:32; II Kings 17:14; Isaiah 7:9; Psalm 78:22; II Chronicles 20:20).¹⁵

Whether explicitly related to promises and signs (אִתּוֹת) or not, this trust in God is fundamentally rooted in confidence in God's faithfulness to His covenanted people. As Louis Jacobs writes, "Man is justified in placing his confidence in God because He can be relied upon."¹⁶ הַאֱמִינָה, the major form of אֱמָנָה applied to human beings, thus usually means to regard God as faithful, steadfast, trustworthy.¹⁷

This is made explicit in the Bible by frequent application to God of אֱמִינָה (and sometimes נֶאֱמָן), meaning faithfulness/reliability/trustworthiness. God's faithfulness is a common subject of praise and adoration (Psalms 33:4; 36:6-7; 40:11; 92:3; 98:3; 100:5; 119:90).¹⁸ Deuteronomy 7:9 explicitly praises God as the faithful God (הָאֱלֹהִים הַנֶּאֱמָן), because He "keeps His covenant and shows steadfast love (חֶסֶד) to those who love Him and keep His commandments." This verse is central to rabbinic discussions of God's אֱמָנָה. The covenantal

relationship is itself the embodiment of God's faithfulness (אמונה), His justice (משפט), His love (חסד), and His compassion (רחמים) (Hosea 2:22).¹⁹ God's faithfulness to His people in fulfillment of the covenant will be manifest when He brings Israel final salvation (Isaiah 49:7-8; Psalm 89:25, 34-35).²⁰

Another fundamental verse for the Rabbis is Deuteronomy 32:4, in which God's אמן is more broadly conceived: God is trustworthy because He is just, honest, fair, and righteous. This broad conception of God's reliability and uprightness is expressed by אמן in other verses as well. God is אמונה אל because all His deeds in governing the world (Psalm 33:4-5) and in ruling His followers (Psalm 119:75) are right, just, and fair. He is true to the pledges He makes to those who obey His laws (Psalm 89:34) and faithfully shows His steadfast love (חסד) to His people (Psalm 89:50).²¹

Faithfulness (אמונה) also characterizes Israel's response to the covenant (Jeremiah 7:28), primarily as obedience to His word and His laws (II Chronicles 19:19).²² The verses which apply the term אמן directly to the people are few. More common are verses which depict Israel as lacking trust (לא האמינו) in God, which is manifested in their failure to obey His commandments (Numbers 14:11; Deuteronomy 1:32; 9:23; Psalms 78:8, 32; 106:24)²³ or is explicitly expressed as faithlessness to the covenant (Psalm 78:37).

While we will see that in rabbinic literature there is substantial discussion of the faith of both individuals and the people Israel, in the Bible it is the corporate faith exhibited by the nation which overwhelmingly predominates.²⁴ The context of **אֱמוּנָה** in the Bible is generally the covenant between God and Israel and its working out in events of history. God's covenantal promises and the manifestations of His faithfulness are, therefore, almost always described in relation to the people. Furthermore, as can be seen in the verses cited so far, most of the uses of **אֱמוּנָה** are attributed to the nation (where they concern God, that is).

There are, however, several examples of individual **אֱמוּנָה**, and of God's **אֱמוּנָה** directed at individuals, particularly in the Books of Job (9:16, 15:22) and Psalms (116:10; 119:30, 75, 138; 142:1). These verses reveal an intense personal trust in God.²⁵ Although trust in God is usually rooted in experiences of God's saving power, individual **אֱמוּנָה**, as trust and/or faithfulness, is sometimes maintained despite suffering, trials, or times of political danger (Isaiah 7:9; Habakkuk 2:4; Psalm 116:10).²⁶ In these verses, **אֱמוּנָה** is generally described; in others, it is clearly faithfulness as obedience to God's commandments (Psalm 119:30).

Isaac Heinemann believes, however, that some scholars have exaggerated the importance of obedience as an element of **אֱמוּנָה**. These scholars claim that, in the time of the prophets, faith and hope were more important than obedience to commandments,

but that by the time of the Second Temple אמונה was interpreted primarily as such obedience, Heinemann disagrees: "According to Biblical thought, there is no fundamental difference between faith and good deeds."²⁷ There is no proof, for example, that Abraham's faith in God's promised blessings, without accompanying deed (Genesis 15:6), is considered superior (or inferior) to that of the citizens of Nineveh, who make repentance because they believed Jonah's message (Jonah 3:5), or to Abraham's own obedience, for which God blesses him (Genesis 12:2+, 22:16+).²⁸ Heinemann believes that אמן in the Bible has a broader, more subjective, inner sense than "faithful," perhaps with a view towards the root meanings we discussed earlier צדיק באמונתו יחיה (Habakkuk 2:4) does not mean that the righteous man assents to the word of God, but that his soul is calm, settled; מאמין in Isaiah 7:9 and 28:16 expresses that the person feels tranquil inside, with a sense of security.²⁹ R. J. Zwi Werblowsky similarly describes אמונה as a state of "hopeful reliance."³⁰

Another scholar's unusual approach to this root should be mentioned. Artur Weiser asserts that the usual translation of אמן (in the form נאמן) as "firm, certain, reliable" is not quite correct. אמן has a formal, general meaning, he believes, and does not express a specific quality applicable to a person or thing. The specific quality is filled in by an accompanying term. אמן "declares that in any given instance the qualities to be attributed to the subject in

question are actually present."³¹ That is to say, אֱמֻנָה means that certain qualities held to be characteristic of a subject and embodied in other terms are perceived to be present. Using a formulation which Weiser does not, we might say that אֱמֻנָה means that a subject is "true to its conceived/observed nature." When the Bible speaks of God's אֱמוּנָה, then, this is a general statement that God is living up to His "essential" nature. The precise meaning depends on the specific case, on that aspect of God which is being related to. Thus in the phrase חֶסֶד וְאֱמוּנָה, חֶסֶד provides the precise content for the formal element אֱמוּנָה -- "faithfulness and constancy in the disposition and expression of His love."³²

I think Weiser overstates his case. We have seen that in the Bible, אֱמֻנָה can almost always be understood as some variation on the idea of firmness, trust, and reliability, even when there is no other term directly associated with it. God's אֱמוּנָה always relates to covenantal promises and/or actions. Weiser's formulation, however, does give some additional flexibility and subtlety to the term, which we will find useful in analyzing the rabbinic material. We will see, for example, several aggadot in which God is depicted as a righteous Judge, true to His standard of justice, which is related to, but not coterminous with, His covenant.

Weiser's understanding is particularly helpful in one area of אֱמֻנָה we have not yet considered, the application of אֱמֻנָה to things and people involved in certain tasks.

Concerning things, B.D.B., drawing on root meanings, convincingly suggests that **יָדָן** means "made firm, sure, lasting, confirmed, established."³³ Weiser's conception of the root broadens the idea somewhat: a place is seen as suitable for its purpose (Isaiah 22:23); a dynasty won't die out (I Samuel 2:35; 25:38; II Samuel 7:16; I Kings 11:38); diseases are lasting and grievous (Deuteronomy 28:59). Concerning people, B.D.B. renders **יָדָן** as "reliable, faithful, trustworthy." Weiser's understanding suggests a broader meaning, that the people are considered to fulfil the described roles well, properly, fully: servants (Numbers 12:7; I Samuel 22:14), witnesses (Isaiah 8:2; Jeremiah 42:5), messengers (Proverbs 25:13), a priest (I Samuel 2:35), and officers (Nehemiah 13:13).³⁴ By and large, however, the broader conception of Weiser is not necessary to understand the term.

Let us now examine the Biblical usages of the term **בָּטָח**. The root meaning of **בָּטָח** is "to be in a state of security (**בָּטָח**)." It is used both to describe an objective state of security, sometimes in a military sense (Judges 18:7, 27; Proverbs 11:15; Job 40:23) and also a subjective feeling of security and calm, usually contrasted with fear (Isaiah 32:9-11; Jeremiah 12:5; Psalm 27:3; Proverbs 14:16; 28:1; Job 6:20; 11:18). Unlike **יָדָן**, **בָּטָח** does not denote a reciprocal relationship, but rather a condition of "feeling secure by reason of . . ." or "basing one's security on . . ." The sense of relationship is missing even when it is a person

or God who is the object of the reliance or the cause of the sense of security.³⁵

The epitome of בטחון in a religious sense may be seen in Jeremiah 17:5-8. The two chief aspects of בטחון are present here: rejection of the help of human beings (and human creations) and sole reliance on God and His assistance.³⁶ We should trust in the help of God alone (Psalm 119:42), for He blesses the works of our hands, both economic and political. We should rely on God rather than on: men, armies, weapons, nations, human rulers (Judges 20:36; II Kings 18:19-25; Jeremiah 7:4, 8; 46:25; Psalms 44:6, 146:3; Hosea 10:13; Zechariah 4:6; Isaiah 31:1); walls, cities (Deuteronomy 28:52; Jeremiah 5:17; Amos 6:1); our own resources, wealth, righteousness (Jeremiah 48:7; 49:4; Ezekiel 33:13; Habakkuk 2:18; Psalms 49:6; 52:7; Proverbs 11:28; 28:26); oppression and wickedness (Isaiah 30:12; 48:10; Psalm 62:10).³⁷ Such reliance is urged because it is both meritorious and practical.

בטח is rarely used in the sense of "cause to trust, make secure" (II Kings 18:30; Jeremiah 28:15; Isaiah 36:15). It is applied to God only once (Psalm 22:10) and is never used in the sense of "promise," which is a common usage in the rabbinic literature.³⁸

Gerhard von Rad has an interesting theory about the origins of the idea of concrete reliance on God as a religious virtue. He believes it stems from the time of the Judges, when God was felt to battle on behalf of His people in the

holy wars of conquest fought by the Israelite Amphictyony. This image of God as warrior is appealed to, for example, by Isaiah in 31:1-8.³⁹ Whether von Rad is correct or not, it is clear that **בטח** has very concrete connotations, as a sense of physical security, in the Bible.

The Rabbis in the Aggadah utilize many of these Biblical aspects of **ימן** and **בטח**. But, as we shall see, they place different emphases on the various elements involved, while also developing some usages of their own.

39. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
40. Balaban and Aron Weiser, *Yiddish*, 1953, Chap. I, Chapter 1, p. 10.
41. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
42. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
43. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
44. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
45. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
46. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
47. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
48. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
49. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
50. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
51. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
52. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
53. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
54. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
55. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
56. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
57. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
58. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
59. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
60. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
61. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
62. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
63. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
64. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
65. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
66. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
67. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
68. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
69. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
70. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
71. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
72. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
73. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
74. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
75. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
76. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
77. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
78. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
79. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
80. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
81. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
82. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
83. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
84. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
85. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
86. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
87. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
88. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
89. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
90. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
91. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
92. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
93. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
94. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
95. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
96. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
97. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
98. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
99. *ibid.* 31:1-8.
100. *ibid.* 31:1-8.

14. Ibid.; Blackman, op. cit.
15. Bultmann and Weiser, op. cit.; Solomon Mandelkern, קונקוריאציה לתנ"ך, p. 108.
16. Louis Jacobs, op. cit., p. 6.
17. Th. C. Vriezen, op. cit.
18. Louis Jacobs, op. cit., p. 7; Blackman, op. cit.; Mandelkern, op. cit.
19. Isaac Heinemann, op. cit., p. 426.
20. Bultmann and Weiser, op. cit. H. H. Rowley (The Faith of Israel, London, S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1956) dissents from the view presented here. אמונה applied to God, he says, does not mean His loyalty to the people or the covenant; for this the term חסד is used. אמונה is cognate with אמת and both tell us that "God is not arbitrary in character, but self-consistent and to be relied on." (p. 67). We may not question the exercise of God's power, for He is never feeble or arbitrary in His acts, though we may not recognize this. If He changes His mind, it is usually due to a failure by human beings or, on the other hand, human repentance. Although I concede that this view seems applicable to the אמונה of God towards individuals and the corresponding individual faith (e.g. Psalms 33:4 and 116:18), the association of God's אמונה to the covenant with the people is too apparent to dispute.
21. Isaac Heinemann, op. cit., p. 426.
22. E. C. Blackman, op. cit.
23. Isaac Heinemann, op. cit.
24. Blackman, op. cit.
25. Ibid.; Mandelkern, op. cit.
26. Vriezen, op. cit.; Heinemann, op. cit.; Blackman, op. cit.
27. Heinemann, ibid., p. 428:
לפי דעה המקרא אין הפרש של עיקר בין האמונה ובין המעשים הטובים.
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid., p. 426.

30. Werblowsky, op. cit.
31. Bultmann and Weiser, op. cit., p. 5.
32. Ibid., p. 7.
33. B.D.B., op. cit., p. 52.
34. Bultmann and Weiser, op. cit., p. 5.
35. Ibid., Chap. I; B.D.B., op. cit., p. 105; Blackman, op. cit.
36. Isaac Heinemann, "בסחור", אנציקלופדיה המקראית, כרך ב', עמ' 50.
37. Ibid.; Bultmann and Weiser, op. cit.
38. B.D.B., op. cit.
39. Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1962, pp. 171, 378.

CHAPTER 3: יֵדָא AS A CHARACTERISTIC OF HUMAN INTERACTION

The usages and connotations of יֵדָא at the level of human interaction may be seen to arrange themselves into a spectrum. Though it is useful for analytic purposes to describe this spectrum as linear and progressive, it should be kept in mind that this is a construct imposed on, not inherent to, the rabbinic material. With that caveat, we can see usages of יֵדָא move from belief in a cognitive sense, to trust combined with cognitive belief, to trust in a general, abstract sense, and finally trust in the sense of behavioral expectations. We will see, in somewhat different forms, similar spectra in the connotations of יֵדָא as applied to God and to the divine-human relationship.

A common usage of יֵדָא at the human level is "belief that," cognitive belief in the trust of a statement. This sense is particularly frequent in halachic passages, often in regards to testimony in court or other kinds of statements which create legally binding situations. For example, in Gittin 28b we learn that if one hears the report of a man's death from gentile jailers, their testimony is not accepted and the man's wife is still not allowed to remarry. We don't believe the gentile despite the normal legal rule that "the word of a heathen speaking without ulterior motive is 'to be accepted.'"¹ A man who claims to hold a שטר אִמְנָה, a bill of

indebtedness signed in expectation of a later loan, is not believed, because the prohibition against such bills is so clear and so strict that no one can be expected to have violated it.² In Ketubot 24a the Sages teach that if a man asserts that he and his friend are kohanim, they are believed to the extent that they are allowed to partake of terumah, but when it comes to questions of marriage, they need witnesses. R. Judah holds that for either matter witnesses are required. There are many other such halachic passages where אמן, especially in the forms אמן and אמן, is used in the sense of the acceptance of the truth of a statement.³

There are aggadic uses of אמן in this sense as well. There is, for example, R. Yitzkah's aphoristic advice in Megillah 6b:

If a man says to you, "I've worked hard, but haven't gotten anywhere," don't believe him. If he says, "I haven't worked, but I've acquired (wealth)," don't believe him. But if he says, "I've worked hard and acquired (wealth)," then believe him.

Similarly (Megillah 6a) you should only believe someone who tells you with that Caesarea (Rome) is destroyed and Jerusalem secure or that Rome is secure and Jerusalem destroyed, but don't believe him if he says that both are secure or both are destroyed.⁴

In these passages, the connotations of אמן begin to shift from the realm of cognitive belief into the "belief in" realm of trust; the truth of a statement is evaluated in conjunction with a sense of the reliability of the statement's

author. In the two aggadic passages, the truth of a statement in the light of other accepted truths affects one's sense of the reliability of the speaker.

In other passages, the converse occurs: one's sense of the reliability of a speaker, as determined by certain traits or relationships, affects one's judgment of the truth of his statement. The people of Israel, for example, believe the reports of the spies sent into Canaan because they are kin.⁵ On the other hand, they refuse to believe Moses when he says that God has taken Aaron to the world to come. "We know that you are a cruel man," they say to him. "Perhaps he said something improper to you and you punished him with death." To show that Moses spoke the truth, God has to show the people Aaron's death-bed suspended in the upper heavens, with He Himself standing in mourning over him.⁶ Their failure to believe Moses's statement is related to their lack of trust in him, in their low estimate of the kind of person he is.

In addition to "believing a person's statement," then,

יִדְּנָה also has connotations of trusting someone, because of who the person is, what kind of person, or our relationship to him. This connotation of personal trust becomes more prominent and more explicit in certain aggadot describing the relationship between a teacher and his student. יִדְּנָה in these aggadot certainly connotes accepting the truth of a teaching. But it also implies trust in the teacher, in his

authority, learning, judgment, and guidance.

In Baba Batra 75a, R. Johanan interprets Isaiah 54:12 to mean that when Jerusalem is restored, God will carve her gates out of giant gems and pearls. His student Raca doesn't believe him until, while sailing on the sea, he sees angels engaged in cutting such stones. But because he doubted his master's teaching and required such proof, Raca is punished with the Medusa-like gaze of R. Johanan, which turns him into a pile of bones.⁷ The trust in the teacher here is still primarily directed towards the truth of his teaching. The severity of the punishment on Raca, however, indicates that something more comprehensive is involved. The student is being urged to trust in the master himself and rely on his authority as much as to believe his teaching because of the merits of his scholarship.

This element of ~~DK~~ as trust in a person, accompanying cognitive belief, is quite prominent in the famous Baraita about the potential convert who comes to Shammai and Hillel:

A certain gentile once came to Shammai. He said to him, "How many Torahs do you have?" Shammai replied, "Two: the Written Torah and the Oral Torah." The gentile said, "I believe you concerning the Written Torah, but concerning the Oral Torah I do not believe you. Convert me on the condition that you will teach me (only) the Written Torah." Shammai rebuked him and angrily threw him out. He came before Hillel (and said), "Convert me (on the same condition)." One day Hillel taught him the alphabet, a, b, c, d; the next day he switched (the order) on him. The gentile said, "Yesterday you taught me the opposite." (Hillel replied,) "You relied on me concerning that (the Written Torah); concerning the Oral Torah you must also rely on me." (Shabbat 31a)⁸

מאמין clearly has the sense of a "belief that"; the gentile accepts the doctrine of חורר שבעל פה, but does not accept חורר שבעל פה. But it is clear from the subsequent encounter with Hillel, with its linguistic parallel of סמך to מאמין in the Shammai encounter, that מאמין also implies trust in the teacher and his judgment, and reliance on his guidance. The student even believes a statement the teacher makes which is patently untrue, so complete is his trust in his ray. The master is counted on to be guiding the student in the best manner possible, whether this is apparent to the student or not. Borrowing Artur Weiser's notion of the function of the root אמן, the master acts in a manner "truest" to his proper role as teacher in the given situation. אמין in this sense, then, means to affirm that the teacher is so functioning and to declare one's trust in the master.⁹

In a passage from Numbers Rabbah, the aspect of אמן as cognitive belief begins to diminish and the element of personal trust begins to grow more prominent. The people of Israel want to send the spies into Canaan because they don't believe God's glowing descriptions of the land. This is likened to a king and his son:

The king had arranged a match for his son with an attractive and wealthy young woman. The son said to his father: "I am going to go take a look at her," because he did not trust his father. This seemed to the father like a harsh and wicked thing to do. He said to himself, "What should I do? If I say to him, 'I won't show her to you,' he'll think that I don't want him to see her because she is ugly!" So he said to the son, "Go, look at her and know if I deceived you. However, because you did not trust me, I swear that you will never see her in your own house, for I will give her to your son instead."¹⁰

There is a small element here of the son's disbelief in the accuracy of his father's report. The king, however, interprets his son's actions as total lack of trust in him, in his judgment, his promise, his word, his concern for the son's well-being. The king is right; the son does not trust his father, does not believe that he is acting in the son's best interests.

The sense of *ḥan* as trust grows even larger in a Mekilta passage on Exodus 12:36. The Egyptians believe the Israelites when they say that they merely wish to "borrow" the clothing and objects of silver and gold. "They trusted them because of the three days of darkness. They said to themselves, 'We didn't suspect them (of treachery) during the darkness, why should we be suspicious of them now.' " They trusted the Israelites with their possessions, believing they would not keep or destroy them.¹¹

In the passages we have examined so far, the sense of *ḥan* as "believing" or "placing trust" may be described as "subjective." The attitude described by the root is largely internal; it moves from the person out towards the object believed or trusted. In passages we will now examine, the Rabbis use *ḥan* in what may be termed an "objective" sense. The root in this sense describes how a person (or object) and/or his actions are observed or conceived to be. *ḥan* in this sense means "reliability, trustedness, trustworthiness."

In the passages we will now discuss, which largely feature

the objective usage, the explicit element of cognitive belief almost disappears, as the connotation of personal trust grows. Furthermore, "trust" now moves from the somewhat general, abstract sense we have seen so far to a sense of expectations placed in regards to actions, i.e., trust that someone will do certain things, fulfil certain obligations.

אמן is used in this sense of reliability in many halachic passages concerned with religious/ritual/legal obligations.

אמן in this context refers to someone who may be counted on to fulfil such an obligation fully and correctly. Others who may be dependent on his proper functioning may be confident that we will perform as is necessary and expected. (Weiser's linguistic analysis again seems apt.) R. Nahman b. Yitzhak, for example, teaches (Pesachim 4a) that all Jews may be trusted in regards to בעור חמץ, even women, servants, and minors. In Demai 2:2, there is a discussion of the man who obligates himself to be אמן in regards to תרומה; Herbert Danby translates this as "trustworthy, i.e., scrupulous in giving Tithes."¹² There follows a dispute between R. Judah and the Sages whether he is still trustworthy if he allows himself to be a guest of an am ha-aretz.

Religious matters of personal status are similarly treated. For example, two sages are sent to accompany a husband bringing a suspected adulteress to the High Priest, because he is not trusted to refrain from having sexual relations with her during the journey.¹³ This usage of אמן as

reliable to properly carry out obligations is common in halachic discussions.¹⁴

Trust and trustworthiness become the dominant sense of אמנה in the large body of material dealing with the conduct of economic affairs. In commercial transactions and the earning of a livelihood, the noun אמנה is frequently used, reflecting an "objective" usage implying honesty (reflecting the linguistic association of אמנה to אמון), integrity, trustworthiness, and reliability. The "subjective" sense in these passages describes a person having faith/trust in someone else, which leads to relying and/or depending on him.

The halachic passages emphasize the subjective usage, i.e., trust between parties to a business transaction. One party to the deal expects certain actions by the other party. These expectations are usually either implicit or made explicit only verbally. Thus the term שטר אמנה, mentioned earlier, refers to a bill of indebtedness signed on trust, in the expectation that the loan, which is stated on the bill as having already been advanced, will, in fact, be advanced at a later date; the debtor trusts the creditor.¹⁵ Another example comes from Baba Metzieh 49a: Rab tells R. Kahana that, though he was prepaid for some flax at a time when the price was lower, the amount of flax R. Kahana delivers should be the amount which that money would buy at the current price, because verbal transactions do not involve a "breach of faith" (מחוסרי אמנה).¹⁶

Conducting one's business (and other tasks as well)

"כאמורה" is praised in general terms in several passages. Thus Rava teaches (Shabbat 31a) that when a man comes to final judgment, he will be asked, among other questions, whether he did business באמורה. Samuel advises the man who wants to get rich that he should engage extensively in commerce and do business באמורה (Niddah 70b). The Mekilta says that doing business באמורה counts as much as fulfilling the entire Torah¹⁷ and Midrash Tanhuma teaches similarly that if one hasn't learned as much Torah as he ought, he should at least conduct himself in business and in general באמורה.¹⁸ In a yet more general vein, Leviticus Rabbah 9:2 interprets "he who orders his way" (Psalm 50:23), to whom God will show salvation, as the scribes and teachers who instruct little children באמורה.

It is difficult to fix the precise meaning of the term. It seems most likely to me that באמורה is being used in an objective sense, referring to the observed manner in which the man conducts his business or carries out his responsibilities. If the term is an abstract adverb without precise content (following Weiser's reading), it would mean doing something as it ought to be done, regularly, and/or properly. A person conducts his affairs as we would expect him to do, and therefore we are willing to place our trust in him. This sense would suit the non-business related passages well, including passages, to be discussed in Chapter 6, which describe mitzvot being accepted or performed באמורה. Passages we will now examine,

however, suggest that the most likely reading of **אֱמוּנָה** is conducting one's business fairly, honestly, with integrity, in a trustworthy fashion.

There are quite a number of aggadot which seek to describe God's **אֱמוּנָה** by reference to parables describing human **אֱמוּנָה**. As the first such aggadah I will cite says: **מֵאֱמוּנָתוֹ שֶׁל בָּשָׂר וְדָם** . By examining these parables ^{הוא} closely, we can discern some of the qualities of **אֱמוּנָה** between people. Let us look in detail at two such examples:

R. Shimon ben Shetach once bought a donkey from a certain Ishmaelite. His students went and found a precious stone hanging from its neck. They said to him, "Master, 'The blessing of the Lord makes one rich.' (Proverbs 10:22)." R. Shimon ben Shetach replied, "I purchased a donkey, I did not purchase a precious stone." He went and returned the jewel to the Ishmaelite, who responded by saying, "Blessed be the Lord, the God of Shimon ben Shetach." Thus from the trustworthiness (**אֱמוּנָה**) of man you learn about the trustworthiness of God, who faithfully (**אֱמוּנָה**) rewards Israel for the commandments they perform. (Deuteronomy Rabbah 3:3).¹⁹

This is like a man who was trusted (**אֱמוּנָה**) in his city. All the residents of the city used to leave deposits with him without witnesses. It was the practice of one certain man to leave his deposit in the presence of witnesses. One time he forgot and left his deposit without witnesses. The banker/trustee's wife said to him, "Come, let us deny (that he left a deposit)." He replied, "Because this fool acted improperly, we should lose our integrity?!" (Avodah Zarah 55a).²⁰

The meaning of **אֱמוּנָה** here is clear. It involves scrupulous honesty and strict integrity; one lives up to the precise letter of an obligation or a deal and does not seek to dishonestly acquire gain. R. Shimon ben Shetach is a particularly powerful model of personal integrity. By the strict letter

of the law he could have kept the precious stone. His trustworthiness observes a transcendent standard, beyond the letter of the specific agreement. אמן is used here in the objective sense, referring to a man who is perceived as honest and can be depended on to deal fairly, who is trusted and trust-worthy, who is relied on and reliable. He is reliable because he fulfils his obligations and keeps his word, often his implied word.

A common image is the banker/trustee, with whom people entrust objects of value or money for safekeeping or, possibly, investment. People have faith in his honesty and integrity; they feel sure that their deposit will be safe with him. The reliability of the banker/trustee involves doing his job well, scrupulously, in such a manner that people trust valuable things to his care. In one aggadah, R. Pinhas ben Yair is praised as a particularly scrupulous trustee. Certain men entrust R. Pinhas with some barley, forget about it, and leave town. Each year, R. Pinhas plants and harvests the barley and when the men return seven years later, he gives them all that has accumulated.²¹ In another aggadah from the same passage, God is likened to a king whose friend leaves a deposit with him. When the friend dies, his son comes to claim the deposit, and the king objects, "Have you found a trustee better than me? Have I not guarded the deposit well and doubled (its value)?"²²

In both these cases, there is an important element of

time. **אמנה** implies that a person keeps his word, his pledge, over a period of time; in this sense, **אמנה** involves the scrupulous and persistent fulfilment of obligations. Time is a test for **אמנה**, for over a period of time there are many ways to avoid one's obligations. The obligations may be set by the formal business agreement, but R. Pinhas's **אמנה** does not consist merely in his commitment to them but in his maintaining his commitment over a period of time, beyond conventional expectations. **אמנה** as the durability of one's integrity and one's commitments also underlies the common usage of the banker/trustee, whose trustworthiness often operates over an indefinite period of time.

A second aspect of time and **אמנה** may be seen in the aggadah of the king and his friend's son. A man of **אמנה** is trusted because he has demonstrated his trustworthiness and reliability in repeated acts over time.

Two other aspects of **אמנה** are worth mentioning here. A complex passage in Hagigah 14a relates a dispute between Rava and R. Katina about whether "men of faith" (**בעלי אמנה**) ceased to dwell in Jerusalem when the Babylonians destroyed it. This passage seems to indicate that one element of **אמנה** is honesty, speaking the truth even in the face of threatening circumstances.²³

The strong integrity and trustworthiness implied by **אמנה** may be seen in a Baraita found in Baba Batra 9a: "The collectors for charity are not required to give an account of the moneys

entrusted to them for charity, nor the treasurers of the Sanctuary of the moneys given for holy purposes." (Soncino translation.) A hint (פסוק) for this interpretation, says the Baraita, is found in II Kings 12:16.²⁴ Here all the elements of אֱמֻנָה come together; we get a clear picture of what is meant by integrity and reliability. The treasurers are completely trusted, to the extent that no supervision or accounting are considered necessary. They seem to be considered men of honesty (their accounts are believed and trusted), of integrity (there seems no hint of suspicion they might steal the money), of reliability and trustworthiness (they can be counted on to honestly, faithfully, and competently fulfil their obligations).²⁵

אֱמֻנָה is used in a similar sense of reliable, dependable, trustworthy, in reference to a servant,²⁶ to Moses (אֱמֻנָה מֹשֶׁה),²⁷ and indirectly to Joshua as leader of the people:³⁰ the servant faithfully obeys instructions, Moses faithfully obeys God and shepherds the people, Joshua is a leader the people can count on. Artur Weiser's somewhat broader understanding of

אֱמֻנָה may be applicable here. In each case, the role is filled according to proper expectations -- the servant is faithful and obedient, Moses a skilled, patient shepherd, Joshua a reliable, just leader.

In this chapter, we have seen two ways to categorize and describe rabbinic usages of the root אֱמֻנָה, which will be useful in later analysis. The connotations of אֱמֻנָה may

be seen to arrange themselves in a spectrum. The usage of יֵדָא may be understood by determining where along the spectrum of shifting connotations the usage may be placed. Viewed progressively, יֵדָא has the sense of cognitive belief, of belief related to personal trust, of trust in a general, abstract sense, and of trust (and trustedness) in regards to the fulfilment of specific obligations.

The usage of יֵדָא in a given aggadah may also be understood by determining whether the sense intended is "objective" or "subjective" in nature. A given aggadah usually contains a form of יֵדָא in only one of these senses, although the corresponding attitude may be present without the formal verbal expression. יֵדָא used in the "objective" sense refers to the observed quality of being reliable, trustworthy, faithful, often to specific obligations. The forms most commonly associated with this sense are the noun יֵדָא and the nipha'al יֵדָא. יֵדָא in the "subjective" sense refers to the act of "believing" or "placing trust" in someone or something.

These two analytic spectra, of course, intersect in any given usage. Both will be helpful in analyzing usages of in the other two realms we will now consider. The first spectrum, more in its general outlines than in specific details, helps us to perceive the shifting nuances of יֵדָא, particularly in the human-divine relationship. The second helps us to understand the reciprocal, relational nature of יֵדָא, which gives us some insight into the relationship between

God's perceived faithfulness and reliability and human trust
in (and faithfulness to) Him.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 3

1. Translation is from Soncino. דכל מסיח לפי תורמו הימנוי מהימני
2. Ketubot 19b.
3. See, inter alia, Baba Batra 70b, Hullin 10b, Kiddushin 66a, Yebamot 47a, Sifrei Ki Tetzeh 217 (Finkelstein ed., p. 350), Baba Batra 64a, Baba Metziah 128b.

A somewhat fanciful aggadic usage in this sense may be found in Yoma 72b: The Torah may be relied upon to testify as to those who study her (presumably by their deeds).
4. A similar, but more general, usage is the ancient Palestinian folksaying, "Slaves are not to be believed," (Soncino translation) found in an aggadah concerning Abraham and Eliezar in Baba Metziah 86b.
5. Sifrei Devarim 25 (Finkelstein ed., pp. 34-35). (III-16)*
6. Sifrei Nitzavim 305 (Finkelstein ed., p. 326). (III-18)*
7. Raca's skepticism has religious overtones beyond his doubt of an authoritative drash; he seems to place himself among those "of little faith" who doubt or place limits on God's power. This may be part of the explanation of the severity of Raca's punishment, hyperbole though it may be. This aspect will be examined in a later chapter. (III-9)*

A similar criticism of the search for empirical evidence for a religious teaching is found in a somewhat fanciful passage in Hullin 57b. R. Simeon b. Halafta, a notorious experimenter (עסקן ניכרים), is criticized for trying to test out the teaching in Proverbs 6:6-8 that ants are industrious without a king or overseer. R. Simeon should have trusted Solomon's reliable teaching.
8. See Appendix I (III-4)*
9. A similar usage is found in the Mekilta interpretation of Exodus 19:9. God tells Moses the people יאמינו in him and in the prophets, i.e., they will believe their teachings and depend on them as reliable leaders and prophets, who will act consistent with their roles. Mekilta Yitro 2 (Horowitz ed., p. 210).
10. Numbers Rabbah 16:7. (III-35bc)*

11. Mekilta Bo 13 (Horowitz ed., p. 47). (III-22)*
12. Herbert Danby, translator, The Mishnah, p. 21.
13. Sifrei Naso 8 (Horowitz ed., p. 13). See also Sotah 1:3.
14. See, inter alia, Pesahim 55b, Kiddushin 63b, Baba Batra 52b, Gittin 23b.
15. Ketubot 19a. The definition comes from notes in Soncino translation.
16. See also Bab Metzia 51b and Bab Batra 10:8. תנא is used in a more general and objective fashion in a complex discussion on sacrifices, priests, and gentiles in Hullin 133a-133b תנא אמר ר' חנינא בר' חסדא-- which either means the gentile is not trusted to guard the butcher's till (Soncino) or he is assumed not to have business integrity and therefore could not be presumed to be the butcher's partner.
17. Mekilta Va-yissa 1 (Horowitz ed., p. 158). (V-24)*
18. Midrash Tanhuma Va-yelech 2. (V-25)*
19. (V-10d)*
20. (IV-27)*
21. Deuteronomy Rabbah 3:3. (V-10a)*
22. Ibid. (IV-7a)*

A rather poor mashal likening God to a תופא לז is found in the following passage from Sifrei V'zot ha-br'achah 357 (Finkelstein ed., p. 428). It is a poor analogy because in order to depict God as righteously punishing the wicked, the trustee is made to act in a rather careless and untrustworthy manner quite inconsistent with other pictures of such a trustee. (IV-10)*
23. An almost identical passage occurs in Shabbat 119b-120a.
24. II Kings 12:16: "They reckoned not with the men into whose hand they delivered the money, to give to them that did the work, for they dealt faithfully." (Soncino translation).
25. A similar, if hyperbolic, usage may be seen in Berachot 29a. There even a righteous man is warned not to trust himself until the day he dies, i.e., he may turn into a sinner at any moment.

26. איש טוב ונאמן Berachot 16b.
27. Mekilta Beshalach 6 (Horowitz ed., p. 114). See Chapter 5, p. 67.
28. Sifrei Nitzavim 304 (Finkelstein ed., p. 323).

*Passages indicated with an asterisk appear in Appendix I.
They are listed according to the number in parentheses.

CHAPTER 4: אֱמוּנָה AS A CHARACTERISTIC OF GOD

There is almost no discussion in the secondary literature about אֱמוּנָה as a characteristic of God.¹ It does seem from the material I have found that the Rabbis were far more concerned with אֱמוּנָה as a human attitude towards God and as a quality of human interaction. Nevertheless, the Rabbis do explore God's faithfulness and trustworthiness to a considerable extent, particularly by attention to two verses from Deuteronomy, 7:9 and 32:4. Furthermore, the Rabbis see the trust which individuals and the people of Israel place in God as substantially a response to the faithfulness God shows towards them. This aspect of the rabbinic use of the root אֱמוּנָה is therefore important to examine.

God's faithfulness is perceived as one of His primary attributes. Midrash Megillat Esther, for example, says that like God's other positive attributes, his lovingkindness (חַסֵּד), his compassion (רַחֲמִים), his righteousness (צְדָקָה), etc., God's faithfulness (אֱמוּנָה) is abundant.² That He is trustworthy (נֶאֱמָן) is what inspires Moses to sing His praises in the Song of the Sea,³ and His faithfulness (אֱמוּנָה) is seen as one of the foundations of heaven and earth.⁴ There is very little discussion of אֱמוּנָה as such a general characteristic of God, so it seems that in rabbinic thought, אֱמוּנָה did not have the same settled, defined character as an attribute (מִידָה) of God that חַסֵּד, רַחֲמִים, יִי, etc., had.

God manifests his faithfulness towards human beings, both in regards to their individual fates, and in regards to the corporate destiny of the people of Israel. Interestingly, there is a somewhat greater concentration on the *אמונה* God shows towards individuals, in contrast to the Biblical emphasis on the nation. His faithfulness operates primarily in the area of reward and punishment in one's life and in the world to come. The main theme the Rabbis address is the problem of the operation of God's justice in the world. They seek to demonstrate that He in fact may be counted on to fulfil His promises of reward for the righteous and punishment for the wicked. From assertions of God's faithfulness in rewarding righteousness, the passages move to the broader problem of theodicy. The reliability of God's justice, the Rabbis teach, is still to be trusted despite an apparently contradictory reality.

Several passages directly associate God's *אמונה* with the reward for the performance of good deeds and/or *mitzvot*. The most general statement of this idea is in *Pirkei Avot*: "Your master may be counted on (*אמונה*) to reward you for your labor," referring to the study of Torah (2:21) or to a life of good deeds (6:4). In several passages, the promise of reward is connected explicitly to performance of *mitzvot*. The phrase *אני ה'*, which ends many commandments in the Torah, is interpreted to mean *אני נאמן לשלם שכר*, i.e., I may be

relied on to grant reward. In a midrash halachah in the Sifra, for example, after some of the details of nidah are derived from Leviticus 18:19, God says, "I faithfully reward (presumably the performance of this mitzvah)."⁵ Another Sifra passage states this idea more generally:

"You shall keep My laws and My statutes, which, if a man should do, he shall live by them. I am the Lord." (Leviticus 18:5). (This verse comes) to attach observing and doing to the laws and to the statutes. "He shall live by them" -- in the world to come. For you might say, "In this world? But isn't it a man's end that he dies?" Therefore I establish (the principle) "he shall live by them"-- in the world to come. "I am the Lord" -- (who) faithfully rewards. ("אני ה' נאמן").⁶
(לשלם שכר)

A new element is found here, relevant to the later theodicy discussions. God's faithfulness and justice extend into the world to come; He may be counted on to reward in a realm none of us can see. Although it is suggested elsewhere in Biblical and rabbinic literature that the righteous receive their reward in this life (see, e.g., Psalm 37:25), here it is clear that the reward for righteous behavior is life in the world to come. In these passages, God's אמן is associated with fulfilling promises of reward for righteous behavior; punishment is not mentioned.

In other passages, His אמן relates to His rewarding, and by inference to His compassion. Punishment is discussed, but in relation to ענין חסד. This is not to imply that God's reward is seen as a gift of compassion regardless of merit; אמן is the term used, and the sense still seems to

be faithfully granting rewards as promised. An example from Sifra:

"God spoke to Moses saying, 'Speak to the children of Israel and say to them (that) I am the Lord your God.' " (Leviticus 18:1). I am the Lord, who spoke and the world came into being. I am the Judge, I am full of compassion (מלא רחמים). I am the Judge who punishes and He who faithfully rewards."

In this and other similar passages punishment is not associated with God's אמן, which here seems limited to promises of a positive nature (as was true for אמונה in human business deals). This is like when we say to someone, "Be fair to us," when, in fact, we don't want him to be strictly equitable, but rather good to us, generous, kind, etc. Similarly, what is emphasized here is God's promised care and goodness, rather than His strict standards of justice.

In other passages, however, the concept broadens to indeed embrace God's faithfulness to his absolute standard of justice, both reward and punishment. God's אמן here consists in fulfilling His word concerning both the righteous and the wicked; in Weiser's terms, God acts according to our conception of the absolutely righteous Judge. In the passage from the Sifrei cited in Footnote 22, Chapter 3, God is likened to a reliable trustee (אחר נאמן שהיה בעיר). When He comes to take the soul of a righteous man, He does it Himself, carefully, gently. When it is an evil man's turn to die, God delivers his soul over to cruel angels, who He knows will treat the soul carelessly and let it fall. This fulfils

Proverbs 17:11 "A rebellious man seeks only evil; therefore a cruel messenger (מַלְאָכִים also = angel) shall be sent against him."⁸ A similar passage also comes from Sifrei:

"A faithful God" (Deuteronomy 32:4), a depositor, "never unjust," who collects his due in the end. For the standards of human beings are not like the standards of the Holy One, Blessed be He. The standards of human beings (are as follows) -- A man entrusts his friend with a purse of 200 (zuz); he already has in his possession a maneh (100 zuz) of his friend's. When he comes to take his purse back, his friend says to him, "Deduct the maneh of mine, which you already have, and take the remainder." Similarly, a worker does a job for a householder, and already has a dinar of the householder's (from a previous job, perhaps). When he comes to collect his wages, the householder says to him, "Deduct my dinar, which you already have (from your wages), and the rest is yours." But He who spoke and the world came into being does not act like this. "A faithful God" (אֱלֹהֵינוּ הַאֵל), a depositor "(who is) never unjust," who collects His due in the end.⁹

This passage is difficult, and its meaning is hard to fix precisely. As a בַּעַל הַתְּקוּרָה, God is being likened to a depositor; I interpret the deposit to be the soul God gives human beings. A person who holds a deposit or owes a wage tries to hedge on repayment, arguing that he already has credit with the depositor or laborer. Similarly a person (probably an evil person) tries to hedge on paying God what he owes, his soul, which God is going to punish. He argues that he has credit with God, i.e., he has already been punished in this life. But God doesn't recognize such credit; He extracts what is rightly due, He delivers the punishment which He has sworn to give. God faithfully keeps His pledge as righteous judge to collect what is His, i.e., the soul

of the wicked person to be punished.

These two passages just cited continue the theme of the Deuteronomy verse (32:4) by relating God's faithfulness to His justice and His righteousness. This conception is continued in several other aggadot, in which the problem of theodicy is sharply drawn. The problem is how can God be considered just, i.e., faithful to His promises of reward and punishment, when the righteous suffer and the wicked seem to prosper. Among other rabbinic attempts to answer this ancient, complex problem,¹⁰ the bold assertion is made that, despite contrary appearances, God's justice operates fairly:

Another interpretation: "The Rock! -- His deeds are perfect." (Deuteronomy 32:4) -- When Moses descended from Mount Sinai, the people of Israel gathered about him. They said to him, "Moses, our master, tell us what the measure of justice on high is." He replied, "I cannot tell you, even to the extent of declaring the innocent absolved and the guilty condemned. But even if this standard were reversed (i.e., the innocent condemned and the guilty absolved), nevertheless, "God is reliable (אל אמונה), never unjust."¹¹

A similar notation is found in the custom of reciting צדק הדין when a loved one has died. This affirmation of God's justice in the face of tragic loss is explicitly associated with his אמן in the moving story of the martyrdom of R. Hanina ben Tardion. When his wife learns of his death by fire and of her own pending execution, her response is to affirm God's faithfulness and the fairness of His justice by reciting the verse, "God is faithful, never unjust."¹²

The Sages then try to show how God is faithfully just despite appearances. They do so by teaching that His justice

obtains not only in this world, but in the world to come as well:

"A faithful God" -- Just as God rewards a completely righteous man in the world to come for a mitzvah which he performs in this world, so He rewards a completely wicked man in this world for a minor mitzvah which he performs in this world. And just as He punishes a completely wicked man in the world to come for a transgression which he commits in this world, so He punishes a completely righteous man in this world for even a minor transgression which he commits in this world.¹³

Thus we are to be assured that, despite appearances, God's justice is reliable and we must conduct ourselves accordingly, i.e., in confident expectation that we will be rewarded if we are righteous and punished if we are wicked.

God's standard of justice and His faithfulness to it are stricter than we might have expected. The reward for even a small good deed by an evil man is rewarded in this temporary world, presumably so that the extremely high value of doing a mitzvah may be clear to all. But he is punished in the eternal world to come, so that we know God is true to His threats of punishment. A righteous man is punished in this world, to encourage strict adherence to God's laws; his punishment, however, is only temporal, while his reward is eternal, so, again, we know that God fulfils His promises. As we saw in the parable concerning R. Pinhas b. Yair and the barley (Chapter 3, Footnote 22), the element of the duration of God's faithfulness figures prominently. Though it may not be apparent to us in our time frame, God keeps his promises for a long period of time, in this case for eternity.

The crucial importance of this is that God may be considered absolutely just, faithful to His promises of reward and punishment, despite contrary evidence we see all around us. As we shall see in Chapter 6, this certainty is a significant form of the *emunah* of the individual.

We should also note that there is an intimate relationship here between God's carrying out His threatened punishments and His fulfilling His promised rewards. Belief in this relationship forms one of the foundations of Israel's trust in God and in His faithfulness.

It is the objective usage of *emunah* (faithfulness, reliability in His standard of justice) as an attribute of God towards individuals which the Rabbis overwhelmingly stress. Two examples of subjective usage deserve mentioning. In a passage from the Sifrei, God as *אל אמונה* is described as "having faith in (*האמין*) the world and (therefore) creating it." The subsequent interpretation of *עליו* indicates that God's trust lay in His confidence that the men who would be created on that world would be righteous, not evil, men.¹⁴ In another passage, the subjective usage is similar, but in this case God's trust in the righteous is more tenuous. Quoting Psalm 16:2, God tells David, "My good is not in thee." (*טובתי בל עליך*).

In whom, then, is My goodness firmly fixed? Only "in the holy that are in the earth." (Psalm 16:3). The Holy One, Blessed be He, does not call the righteous man holy until he is laid away in the earth. Why not?

Because the Inclination-to-evil keeps pressing him.
And so God does not put His trust (יִסְמַךְ) in him in
this world till the day of his death.¹⁵

God's trust seems to be directed at the righteous man's reliability, i.e., how much he can be trusted to fulfil his obligations in the covenant, the nitzvot. A broader conception may also be involved. God's lack of trust is indicated by His not calling the righteous man holy until he dies, because the עֶרֶךְ might be able to sway him. God's trust here focuses on a man's character in general, specifically on his ability to resist temptation. We saw similar instances at the human level, e.g. the Israelites and the spies, the people and Moses, in which the trust was broader than faith in someone's fulfilment of specific obligations.

A highly significant aspect of יִסְמַךְ should be noted here. יִסְמַךְ describes a relationship which is quite personal and deeply reciprocal in nature. In the Midrash Psalms passage, God's subjective trust in people is clearly a function of His evaluation of their objective reliability, here related to righteous behavior. The reciprocal nature of יִסְמַךְ becomes even more explicit when we examine, in Chapters 5 and 6, the trust human beings place in God.

The image of God as One who places trust in human beings is rare in rabbinic literature. Perhaps this is because the rabbis recognized that people are not as objectively worthy of trust as they feel God is.

God's faithfulness towards human beings is expressed towards the corporate body of the people of Israel as well as towards individuals. Here, too, God's *יְהוָה* is primarily His fulfilment of His promises of reward (and punishment). In an aggadah from Deuteronomy Rabbah 3:3, cited in Chapter 3, this is clear and explicit:

"Know, therefore, that only the Lord your God is God, the steadfast God." (Deuteronomy 7:9). R. Hiya bar Abba taught: To what may this be likened, to the beloved friend of a king who left a deposit with the king for safekeeping and then died. His son came and asked for the return of the deposit, saying to the king, "Give me the deposit which my father entrusted to you." The king replied, "Have you found a trustee better than me? Have I not guarded the deposit well and doubled (its value)?" Similarly, when Israel sinned in the days of Jeremiah, the Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Jeremiah, "Go, say to the people of Israel, 'What! Did your fathers find any wrong in Me?'" (Jeremiah 2:5)¹⁶ Did I not fulfil all that I swore to your fathers? I swore to them that I would bless their descendants, as it is written, 'I will bestow My blessing upon you (and make your descendants as numerous as the stars of heaven . . .)' (Genesis 22:17). Did I not (so) bless you through Moses, as it is written, 'The Lord your God has multiplied you (until you are today as numerous as the stars in the sky).' (Deuteronomy 1:10)! I said to (Moses) that I would take you out (of Egypt) with great wealth, as it is written, 'And in the end they shall go free with great wealth.' (Genesis 15:14). Did I not do so -- 'He led them out with silver and gold; none among their tribes faltered.' " (Psalm 105:37). Therefore Moses said, "(The Lord) kept the oath (He made to your fathers.)" (Deuteronomy 7:8). From (the fact that) "(He) rescued you from the house of bondage," (Ibid.) you know that He is "the steadfast God." (*יְהוָה יִשְׁתָּדֵק*).¹⁷

The parable here is somewhat imprecise. It is unclear, for example, just what the deposit the people are thought to have left with God. Perhaps the Torah is intended, perhaps

the people themselves. But God's **אֱמוּנָה** is clearly His faithfulness to the promises He has made to the people of Israel through their ancestors. He fulfils what He has promised by concrete actions in history evident to all.

R. Hiya develops and extends the Biblical theme. Deuteronomy 7:8 says that "it was because the Lord loved you and kept the oath He made to your fathers that the Lord freed you with a mighty hand . . ." and then verse 9 states that God is "the steadfast God who keeps His gracious covenant . . ."

R. Hiya associates God's oath not just with the Exodus, but with the growth of the nation as well. He makes explicit what is only implied in the Deuteronomy passage. God's faithfulness to the covenant (**הָאֵל הַנֶּאֱמָן**) consists in His keeping His word to the people (**שֶׁמֶלְכֵּךְ אֵת הַשְּׁבוּעָה**).

It is to this faithfulness that Moses appeals when the Israelites face the hostile Amalekites:

"Thus his hands remained steady (**וַיְהִי יָדָיו אֶמּוּנָה**)."
(Exodus 17:12). -- With one hand, (Moses) had not received anything from Israel. Concerning his other hand, Moses said to the Holy One, Blessed be He, "By my hand you brought Israel out of Egypt, by my hand you split the sea for them, by my hand you did miraculous acts of salvation. Thus by my hand, may you work miraculous acts of salvation in this hour."¹⁸

Moses here appeals to God to continue to demonstrate his faithfulness and reliability by continuing the protecting care for Israel He swore to provide. Moses implicitly invokes God's promise to take the people out of Egypt and bring them safely into the Land of Canaan, as stated, for example, in

Exodus 3:17. This promise is so integral to the heritage of Israel that in the aggadah it does not have to be explicitly stated.

In another passage, the rather bold assertion is made that God's eternal existence is due to this faithfulness to His people:

R. Yitzhak bar Merion taught: "The righteous man lives by his faith (צדיק באמונתו יחיה)." (Habakkuk 2:4). Even the Righteous One who lives forever lives by his faithfulness (אמונתו). The Holy One, Blessed be He, said, "Earlier I slew the first-born of Egypt, as it is written, 'In the middle of the night, the Lord struck down all the first-born in the land of Egypt . . .'" (Exodus 12:29), now you must sanctify to me all the first-born who are born to you, as it is written, 'Consecrate to Me every first-born.' (Ibid. 13:2). Consecrate to Me the first-born because of My faithfulness (באמונתי)." Thus, "the righteous lives by his faith."¹⁹

The reciprocal nature of the relationship of אמן is explicitly delineated here. The people are urged to demonstrate their faithfulness to God's law by fulfilling the mitzvah of the first-born, in response to God's faithfulness to His people, manifested by His slaying the Egyptian first-born and saving the Israelite first-born. God again fulfils a promise which is clear from the Biblical context,²⁰ but only implicit in the passage itself.

Indeed, I found few passages which explicitly describe the nature of God's אמן at all. What frequently occurs, as I discuss in Chapter 5, is that Israel is urged to continue to trust in God because He has repeatedly used His power to work miracles and mighty acts of salvation (נסים וגבורות) for

Israel. By reference to the aggadot cited here, we can associate this exercise of God's might on Israel's behalf with His יְדֹנָה, but the passages themselves do not make this association explicitly.

Despite the small number of passages I have found, it seems fair to conclude that God's יְדֹנָה consists primarily of His faithfully guiding and protecting His people, i.e., fulfilling His promises of reward and providential care made by virtue of His covenant with them. The small number of aggadot I found may indicate that the covenant was considered axiomatic, like God's existence, and it was understood that references to God's mighty acts for Israel were describing His faithfulness as well as His power and His love.

Since God is personified in most of these aggadot, it is useful to compare God's יְדֹנָה towards human beings, as individuals and as the corporate body of Israel, to the human level of יְדֹנָה. We saw at the human level a spectrum of usages from the subjective sense of believe and/or trust to the objective sense of reliability and integrity, with the emphasis at the objective end of the scale. There is virtually no spectrum in the descriptions of God's יְדֹנָה; overwhelmingly, the term applied to God means trustworthiness, faithfulness, and reliability.

This is not really surprising. Although יְדֹנָה describes a reciprocal relationship, and passages treat with varying emphasis the two poles of God and people, the imbalance of

emphasis in usages of יֵצֵא seems entirely appropriate. For human beings are the dependent party, and the term יֵצֵא expresses human perceptions. So, as we will see in Chapter 5, the reciprocity of the relationship consists primarily of people placing trust in a God, whom we have now seen described as reliable, worthy of trust, who acts in faithfulness to His covenantal obligations.

Several parables liken God's יֵצֵא to that found among men in various business deals, so we would expect certain similarities. At both levels, יֵצֵא means primarily fulfilling obligations to which one commits oneself. In the human sphere, the obligations arise from business transactions, at the divine level, from God's promises to human beings, individually or as a nation. For both men and God, יֵצֵא is expressed over time, either in terms of duration, as in the aggadot concerning God's justice, or in terms of demonstration by repeated acts, as in God's complaint to Jeremiah. There is also a similarity in the overall models in each case. The covenant between God and Israel, with its mutuality of obligations and promises, is similar to the kinds of business transactions described in the aggadot, deposits and purchases. In both cases, the obligations which are being fulfilled arise out of a concrete situation, which is perceived as creating these obligations.

There are, however, significant differences. The covenant is rather more one-sided than a business deal; it is God who initiates the covenant and establishes its obligations,

including the promises He binds Himself to. And while "faithful" seems an accurate translation for the quality being described in God, certain words which fit the human situation do not seem apt when applied to God.

"Integrity," for example. When God fulfils his promises of reward to the righteous or of the Exodus to the people of Israel, there is little of the sense of his "reputation" being on the line, as is the case with the trustee and his wife or R. Pinhas ben Yair. "Fairness" can be applied, but not in the same sense as "not cheating or taking advantage," as in the cases of Shimon ben Shetach and the Temple treasurers. Indeed, God's "fairness" can be deceptive; in this life, the wicked seem to prosper and the righteous seem to be punished. We have to project into the world to come to perceive God's fairness.

Similarly, though God is described in the Bible as a God of truth, "honesty" is not pointed to as a part of His אֱמֶת , as it is in the cases of Shimon ben Shetach, the Temple treasurers, and the אֲנָשֵׁי הַלֵּל of Jerusalem. Moses, for example, cannot reveal God's standard of justice, because though it may be true, it may not appear so to the people.

Finally, אֱמֶת is applied at the human level almost exclusively to obligations that are positive, helpful in nature. No one is described as being a faithful robber or a reliable murderer. But God's אֱמֶת applies to His threats of punishment as well as to His promises of reward. Furthermore,

we are urged to trust in God's faithfulness even when evident reality argues against this.

God's *אֱמוּנָה*, then, seems broader and far less easy to limit or define precisely than *אֱמוּנָה* between people. One almost gets the sense that God's *אֱמוּנָה* is being asserted as a belief, like others of His *כִּידּוּת*, and then the efforts are being made to demonstrate how it operates.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 4

1. See Jacobs, Faith, op. cit., p. 9. Interestingly, Jacobs's sole reference to נִיָּצוֹן as a quality of God is to the rare subjective usage noted in Footnote 14 below.
2. Midrash Megillat Esther 10:15 (K'tav ed., p. 28). (V-31)*
3. Mekilta Shirah 1 (Horowitz-Rabin ed., p. 120).
4. Midrash Tehillim 119:37 (Buber ed., p. 498). (V-34)*
The focus of God's faithfulness (נִיָּצוֹן) in the parables from Deuteronomy Rabbah 3:3, cited in Chapter 3, is also general.
5. Sifra Acharei Mot, Perek 13:2 (Weiss ed., p. 85d). (IV-17)*
6. Ibid., Parasha 9:10 (Weiss ed., p. 85d). (IV-18)*
See also Sifra Emor, Perek 9:3 (Weiss ed., p. 99d), Sifra Behar, Perek 9:6 (Weiss ed., p. 110d), and Sifra Kedoshim, Perek 9:11 (Weiss ed., p. 91b).
7. Sifra Acharei Mot, Parashah 9:1 (Weiss ed., p. 85c). (IV-19)*
See also Sifra Acharai Mot, Perek 13:5, 14, 15 (Weiss ed., p. 86) and Sifra Kedoshim, Perek 9:2 (Weiss ed., p. 91d).
See also Mekilta Yitro 4 (Horowitz-Rabin ed., p. 218).
8. Sifrei Ve-zot Ha-b'rachah 357 (Finkelstein ed., p. 428).
As I pointed out in the earlier note, the analogy to the human level is rather forced to make the point about God's נִיָּצוֹן. (IV-10)*
9. Sifrei Ha-azinu 307 (Finkelstein ed., pp. 344-345). I base my interpretation partly on the similar meanings of נִפְרַץ, which means collect, but also punish, and גִּבּוֹהַּ.
See, for example, the Sifrei passage marked by Footnote 14 below. (V-13)*
10. See, e.g., Max Kadushin, The Theology of Seder Eliahu, New York, Bloch Publishing Co., 1932, pp. 194-209, on "Chastisement" and "The Problem of Evil."
11. Sifrei Ha-azinu 307 (Finkelstein ed., p. 346). (V-17)*
The translation of the second half of the verse is my own.
12. Ibid. (V-16)*
13. Ibid. (V-15)* See also Ta'anit 11a. (V-1)*
14. Ibid. (Finkelstein ed., p. 344). (V-14)*

15. Midrash Tehillim 16:2 (Buber ed., p. 120). Translation is by William Braude, Midrash Psalms, Vol. 1, pp. 197-198. The idea that the righteous man cannot be completely counted on to remain righteous is also found in Berachot 39a. (See Footnote 25 to Chapter 3.) (III-44)*
16. The verse literally reads (New JPS translation): "What wrong did your fathers find in Me that they abandoned Me." I have rendered the verse in a way that clarifies the midrashic interpretation.
17. Deuteronomy Rabbah 3:3. (IV-7)*
18. Mekilta Amalek 1 (Horowitz-Rabin ed., p. 181). (V-22)*
19. Ecclesiastes Rabbah 3:9. (V-11)*
Rabbi Michael Chernick of H.U.C.-J.I.R. has suggested to me that this is a very concrete reference to God's being literally sustained by the food of the sacrifices of the first-born animals. This interpretation certainly would eliminate the hyperbolic element that must otherwise be seen here. The view that Israelite sacrifice was considered literally the food of God, however, is disputed by Roland de Vaux in Ancient Israel and by Yehezkal Kaufman in The Religion of Israel.
20. See Exodus 11:1-8.

*Passages indicated with an asterisk appear in Appendix I. They are listed according to the number in parentheses.

CHAPTER 5: ʔDN AS A CHARACTERISTIC OF THE HUMAN-DIVINE RELATIONSHIP -- THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL

In Chapter 3, we saw that rabbinic usages of ʔDN at the level of human interaction can be arranged along a spectrum, for purposes of analysis. This spectrum, we found, can be useful in delineating the shifting connotations of the term. A similar spectrum we will now find useful in examining the usages of ʔDN as applied to the people of Israel in their relationship with God.

At the inter-human level, the connotations of ʔDN moved from cognitive belief, to belief and personal trust combined, to trust in a general sense, to trust and trustedness in regards to certain actions and obligations. The spectrum of connotations of ʔDN applied to the people of Israel is similar. It is true that we find no usages of ʔDN as strictly "belief that," as we did in the aggadot concerning human interaction. George Foot Moore is basically correct when he asserts, "The words for faith (in the Rabbinic literature) are not used in the concrete sense of creed, beliefs entertained -- or to be entertained -- about God."¹

On other points along there are greater similarities. The faith of the people of Israel is at one level an elemental, general, abstract trust; sometimes, with the help of the inter-human spectrum we can see a small element of belief combined with this unfocused trust. Max Kadushin describes this sense

of אֱמוּנָה : "Emunah has the connotation of general faith or trust in God" This level is not a common theme of aggadot, for more often than this unspecific "trust in" God, we find expressed a fairly concrete "trust that" God will perform certain actions. As Kadushin writes, "Often such trust in God is related to faith in His promise or word."² Often a more extensive kind of trust is involved, trust that God will demonstrate what Ephraim Urbach terms השגחתו של האלהים His providential and beneficent care.³ In the final stage, this trust is often expressed as trust in, or rather faithfulness to, God's commandments.

Several passages describe the general, elemental trust in God of the first level. In a midrashic exposition of the verse "You are children of the Lord your God," (Deuteronomy 14:1), R. Meir teaches that even when the Israelites are foolish (סכלים), evil (משחיתים), or lack faith (לית בהו), God still calls them His children.⁴ A Mekilta passage interprets Exodus 14:31 as follows:

"The people feared the Lord: they had faith in the Lord and in His servant Moses." If they had faith in Moses, how much more fitting is it that they should trust (האמין) God! (Actually), this verse comes to teach you that one who trusts a faithful shepherd (רועה נאמן) (i.e., Moses), it is as if he were placing his trust (האמין) in He who spoke and the world came into being.⁵

As Max Kadushin points out in The Rabbinic Mind,⁶ האמין here clearly does not mean an assertion of faith in God's existence. האמין is applied to Moses, whose existence the

people clearly did not doubt; rather a general "trust" is intended.

An element of belief combined with personal trust may be seen in **אמן** as used in several passages in which Moses is depicted as doubting their faith, and God becomes their defender:

Resh Lakish taught: One who is suspicious of the blameless (כסרים) are stricken (with illness) in their own bodies. This is illustrated by the following: "(But Moses spoke up and said,) 'What if they do not believe me (and) do not listen to me, but say, 'The Lord did not appear to you.' ' (Exodus 4:1). It was (already) known to the Holy One, Blessed be He, that Israel would believe (ומהימני). So He said to (Moses), "They are believers (מאמינים), the children of believers, but (it is) you (who) will end up not believing (in Me) (אין ספק להאמין)." They are believers -- as it is written, "And the people were convinced (ויאמנו)." (Exodus 4:31). The children of believers (as it is written concerning Abraham), "And he put his trust in the Lord." (Genesis 15:6). But you in the end will not have faith, as it is written, "Because you did not trust Me enough (יין לא האמנתם בי) (to affirm My sanctity in the sight of the Israelite people . . .)." (Numbers 20:12). How do we know that he was stricken, from the verse "The Lord said to him further, 'Put your hand into your bosom'; (and when he took it out, his hand was encrusted with snowy scales)." (Exodus 4:6)."

Of particular note in this passage is that **אמן** here has components both of belief in a statement and trust in a person, in a shifting equilibrium. (This is one reason the passage is so difficult to translate precisely.) When Moses says that the people won't believe him, he means that they will not have faith in him because they will doubt his report of the theophany of the burning bush. When God accuses Moses of lacking trust in Him, He is referring both to lack of faith

in His power as well as the failure to believe His word that water will flow from the rock. When the people "believe" the signs, they express both their belief in Moses's claim that God appeared to him and their trust in him and in God. All these verses are applied to illuminate the phrase **אֱמוּנָתָם בְּנִי מִדְּבַר יְהוָה**, which thus may be rendered "believers," only if the significant element of trust is kept in mind. In fact, the balance shifts so rapidly that the distinction between belief and trust, though useful for analytic purposes, must be considered somewhat arbitrary.

What emerges from these passages is that **אֱמוּנָה** is at one level trust in God in a personal, general sense. At this point, the trust is "raw," elemental, a primal relationship. The nature of this trust, how it emerges, how it is expressed, and its value are the themes of other aggadot. With the Exodus as the paradigm, Israel's **אֱמוּנָה** is seen as trust that God will take certain action on their behalf. It consists primarily in the confidence that God will guide and protect the people on their way to the land promised to their ancestors. God's actions fulfil His promises to Moses, to the people, and to the Patriarchs. This is only implied in the aggadot, but is clear from the Biblical context.

A primary rabbinic conception of the **אֱמוּנָה** of the people of Israel, then, is trust in God's providential care. This is **אֱמוּנָה** in the subjective, active sense; the prime verbal

form is the hiphi'l, יָצַח. An excellent example is a Mekilta passage commenting on Exodus 17:11 and the battle with the Amalekites:

"Then, whenever Moses help up his hand, Israel prevailed." Did Moses's hands cause Israel to prevail or did his hands destroy Amalek?! (What the verse means is that) all the time that Moses had his hands raised upwards, Israel looked at him and had faith in (יָצַח) He who had instructed Moses to do so and the Holy One, Blessed be He, worked for them miraculous acts of salvation. Similarly, "Then the Lord said to Moses, 'Make a seraph figure (and mount it on a standard. And if anyone who is bitten looks at it, he shall recover).'" (Numbers 21:8). Can a (copper) serpent really kill and give life?! (The verse means that) all the time that Moses did this (i.e., erected the copper serpent), the Israelites would look at him and have faith in (יָצַח) He who had instructed Moses to do this, and the Holy One, Blessed be He, sent them healing.⁸

The nature of the trust is not explicitly spelled out, but is clear. The people trust God, who had commanded Moses to raise his hands and to erect the serpent. By doing so, they are expressing their confidence that he will perform certain acts for their benefit, i.e., battle the Amalekites and bring healing. Their trust is rewarded by God's acts of protective care.

In other passages, יָצַח as trust in God's word, His promises, and thus His providential protection, is expressed somewhat more explicitly. For example:

"I (Moses) said to you, 'Have no dread or fear of them (the Amorites).'" (Deuteronomy 1:29). Why? Because "none other than the Lord your God, who goes before you, (will fight for you . . .)." (Ibid. 1:30). (Moses) said to them, "He who did miracles for you in Egypt and all these miracles (in the wilderness), He will perform miracles for you as you enter the Land,"

just as he did for you in Egypt before your very eyes." (ibid.). If you do not have faith in regard to the future (אין אים מאסניס להבא), trust in that which occurred in the past (האסינו לעבר).⁹

A most remarkable and bold passage to our eyes. The implication is clear that the Israelites do not trust God or

His promises; they do not have faith in His assurances, given through Moses, that they should not be afraid. Since the usual object of אים as trust, introduced by the preposition ...ל, is missing here, God as the object seems to be understood.¹⁰ A more accurate, if less literal, translation of the last line would be, "If you cannot believe God concerning the future, trust in Him (on the basis of) past actions."

This aggadah, and the previous one, seem to be utilizing the concept of God's own אים without the term itself being used, as I mentioned in Chapter 4. The aggadah clearly expresses, then, the reciprocal nature of the relationship of אים. God has demonstrated that He is reliable, worthy of trust, faithful to His promises and to His people. In fact, Israel trusted in God in the past and that trust was vindicated by His actions. Now Israel is being urged to maintain that trust in the present, based on their past experience. God's past deeds of redemption are viewed as assurances for the fulfilment of His promises for the future; His trustworthiness should inspire trust.

Israel's trust in this aggadah is quite practical, concrete, and specific. It is concrete in the sense that they are expected to have trust in God on the basis of actions and deeds which they personally experienced. It is practical, for on the basis of that trust Israel is not supposed to fear the Amorites. And it is specific, in that it arises out of and applies to a specific situation. יְדֻנָּה is concrete also in the sense that it is rooted in and focused on events in history which affect the nation. This reinforces our understanding of one aspect of God's יְדֻנָּה, that it is revealed in history by repeated acts of Israel's behalf over time.

A similar passage is found in Yalkut Shimoni, commenting on Leviticus 26:12 --

"I will be your God, and you shall be my people." If you do not trust Me (וְאִם לֹא תִּשְׁמָעוּ) concerning these words, (then recall that) "I the Lord am your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt." (Leviticus 26:13). I, who worked miracles for you in Egypt, will perform these miracles for you (as well).¹¹

"These words" and "these miracles" seem to refer to God's promises to the people listed at the beginning of Bechukotai (Leviticus 26:3-12). יְדֻנָּה in God, then, is clearly and explicitly trust in Him to keep His word and bring His promised blessings on the people. יְדֻנָּה, again, is concrete and specific. And, once again, Israel's trust in God is rooted in experiences of acts of salvation, for they find trust in His future promises more difficult.

The nature of **יִדְּא** seems more clearly delineated in passages describing Israel's lack of faith than in those which do attribute **יִדְּא** to the people. There is, for example, the aggadah from Numbers Rabbah concerning the sending of spies into Canaan; we have already discussed the parable of the king, his son, and the promised bride, which is part of this passage (Chapter 3, p. 34):

(The Lord spoke to Moses, saying,) "Send men (to scout the land of Canaan.)" (Numbers 13:2). Even though the Holy One, Blessed be He, said, "Send men," it was not His wish for them to go. Why? Because the Holy One, Blessed be He, had already extolled the virtues of the land of Israel: "For the Lord your God is bringing you into a good land," about which He said, "For the land (which you are about to invade . . .) (is) a land of hills and valleys, (which) soaks up its water from the rains of heaven." (Ibid. 11:10-11). And while they were yet in Egypt, He said, "I have come down to rescue them from the Egyptians and to bring them out of that land to a good and spacious land." (Exodus 3:8). So why does He say, "Send the men"? Because the Israelites themselves requested this, for when they came to take possession of the borders, the Holy One, Blessed be He, said to them, "See, the Lord your God has placed the land at your disposal, Go up, take possession . . ." (deuteronomy 1:21). But at that very hour, all Israel approached Moses, as it is written, "Then all of you came to me and said, 'Let us send men ahead to reconnoiter the land for us . . .'" (Ibid. 1:22). This is what Ezra was referring to: "They hearkened not to Thy commandments . . . neither were (they) mindful of Thy wonders." (Nehemiah 9:16-17). It is similarly written, "The Ark of the Covenant of the Lord travelled in front of them . . . to seek out a resting place for them." (Numbers 10:33). Yet they said, "Let us send men ahead to reconnoiter the land," for they did not trust (God) (**לֹא אֵלֵינוּ**). And thus David said, "They believed not His word." (Psalm 106:24) and "They refused to walk in His law." (Psalm 78:10). (Parable of king, son, and bride.) Similarly, the Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Israel, "The land is good," and they did not believe Him, but (instead) replied, "Let us send men ahead to reconnoiter the land for us." The Holy One, Blessed be He, said (to Himself), "If I prevent them, they will say to themselves, 'He won't show us the land, because it

is not a good land,' so I will show them the land, but with an oath, that not one of them will enter into it, as it is written, '(As I live . . . none of the men . . . who have tried me these many times) shall see the land that I promised on oath to their fathers; none of those who spurned Me shall see it,' (Numbers 14:22-23), but (rather) I will give it to their children."¹²

Trust in God is closely associated here with belief in His word. The parable is a well-made and apt analogy. Israel is like the son who doesn't believe his father's word about the prospective bride, and who doesn't trust his father's judgment or his evaluation of what constitutes a benefit for the son. Israel doesn't believe God's word that the land is a good land; this the verse from Psalm 106 makes quite explicit. And Israel doesn't trust God to have fulfilled His promise to bring them to a prosperous land. The dogged repetition of promise and disbelief emphasizes the force of God's promises, the strength of His commitment to them, and the stubbornness of Israel's lack of faith. The idea that this lack of trust constitutes disobedience is only implicit in the parable of the son; the verses from Psalm 78 and Nehemiah make it explicit in regards to Israel. The reciprocal relationship of $\lambda\alpha\chi$ is concretized in deeds, both God's and Israel's.

One other theme is stated here, which we will discuss in greater detail below. Israel's lack of faith is demonstrated by their requiring empirical proof for God's word. We can , already see that there is something of a dialectic of views

on whether **אמן** needs concrete, empirical evidence to support it. In the earlier passages, concrete actions witnessed personally were appealed to in support of trust; here the request for empirical evidence is severely criticized, indeed punished. We will illustrate each point of view below.

First, let us look at more passages which delineate the nature of **אמן** as trust by reference to its absence. There is considerable discussion, both in regards to the people of Israel and individuals, of people who are called "people of little faith" -- either **מחוסרי אמונה** or **מקטני אמונה**. Though expressed by individuals, the lack of faith of many of these concerns promises of divine providential care towards the nation.

In one passage, the entire nation is called **מקטני אמונה** because, as they were ascending out of the dry Dead Sea, they feared that the Egyptians would similarly ascend out of the sea. This is an interpretation offered by R. Huna of Psalm 106:7 -- "(Our fathers) were rebellious . . . at the Red Sea."¹³

Another passage labels certain individuals **מקטני אמונה**, because they apparently lacked trust in God's protection of Israel during the Exodus. When the three days Israel was supposed to go into the desert were up and the horn sounded for them to return, these **מחוסרי אמונה** began to tear their hair and rend their clothes. Moses told them that by God's word they were free (**בני חורין**) to return. This is offered as a rather imaginative interpretation of Exodus 14:2 -- ("Tell

the Israelites) to turn back and encamp before Pi-hahiroth (פִּי הַחִירוֹת)¹⁴ These people are to be contrasted with the people in general who, as we shall see shortly, are depicted as following Moses into the wilderness without question.

The מַחֲסֵרֵי אֱמוּנָה lack trust that God will protect them in the wilderness. They also seem to be more concerned with Pharaoh's commands than with God's.

Another model of the מַחֲסֵרֵי אֱמוּנָה were those who collected a double portion of manna each day¹⁵ or who collected on the Sabbath,¹⁶ in violation of express commands from God. They did not believe God's promise and they did not trust Him to provide for them in the wilderness. The image, though brief, is powerful. We have a graphic picture of greedy, frightened, insecure people who do not trust the specific promise of the God of the Universe Himself to provide food. Here we see lack of trust related to specific promises, while the earlier two aggadot were directed more generally at God's protection and His care. We also see here a relationship between lack of faith and disobedience to God's word. The image of the faithless manna-eaters becomes significant when we later discuss the relationship between אֱמֶן and human effort to provide food for himself.

A natural question to raise is how this אֱמֶן, this trust in God, is expressed and how is it demonstrated? God describes Israel as אֱמֶינִים בְּנֵי אֱמֶינִים. How does He,

or Moses, or the Rabbis know that they are **מאמינים**? A primary way is by their "faithfulness." So far the aggadot discussed have dealt solely with the subjective usage of **אמן**, i.e., Israel's placing trust in God and relying on His word and His help. The emphasis of the usages of **אמן** applied to the nation in the rabbinic literature clearly lies with the subjective sense. But there is a considerable number of examples of the objective usage, for one way that Israel demonstrates her "faith" in God is by her "faithfulness" to her part of the covenant. This faithfulness is revealed partly by obedience to God's instructions and commandments, and partly in somewhat broader ways.¹⁷

Thus it is, says Song of Songs Rabbah, that Israel placed faithfulness (**אמונה**) to God before the hearing of His word, just as they placed performance of mitzvot before the hearing of the Torah.¹⁸ Obedience to God's word as a manifestation of faith and faithfulness is also the theme of a passage from Ruth Rabbah: R. Judah bar Shimon comments on Deuteronomy 32:20 -- "I will hide My countenance from them" He likens Israel to a king's son who haughtily believes he is honored and feared in the marketplace because of his own merit, while in fact it is because of his father. Similarly, Israel becomes cocky and believes that the nations fear them because of their own strength, while in fact the nations are honoring and fearing God. To chastise Israel, God allows the Amalekites and Canaanites to attack them. And he explains why to Israel:

Your trust (אמנה) has no substance, for you do not even acknowledge (אמנתם) your own words. You are a rebellious lot, as it is written, "For they are a treacherous breed, children with no loyalty (אמנה) in them. (Deuteronomy 32:20).

Soncino quotes a somewhat different translation for אמנתם אמן אמן by Radal: "You do not prove your own words true, viz. when you promised to fulfil God's commands."¹⁹ אמנת here means to say "אמן" to something, to acknowledge, assert, and commit oneself to something.²⁰ Israel's lack of faith here is clearly disobedience to God's commands, as well as the failure to place sufficient trust in Him in facing their enemies. That is, their (subjective) trust is shown to be weak by their failure to demonstrate (objective) faithfulness.

The association of אמן and obedience is similarly explicit in a passage from the Sifrei, which also is commenting on Deuteronomy 32:20:

"(For they are a treacherous breed,) children with no loyalty in them." -- You are children who have no faithfulness (אמונה) in you. You stood at Mount Sinai and said, "All that the Lord has spoken, we will faithfully do (new JPS -- literally -- we will do and obey)." (Exodus 24:7). (Therefore) I said, "Ye are godlike beings (and all of you are sons of the Most High.)" (Psalm 82:6). But when you said to the (golden) calf, "This is your god, O Israel," (Exodus 32:4), (in response) I said to you, "Nevertheless (or, therefore) ye shall die like men." (Psalm 82:7). I caused you to enter the land of your ancestors and you built the Temple for yourselves. I said to you then that you would never be exiled from the land. But when you said, "We have no portion in David," (II Samuel 20:1), I therefore said, "And Israel shall surely be led away captive out of the land." (Amos 7:17).²¹

The mutuality of faithfulness to the covenant is powerfully graphic here. Israel pledges to obey God's commandments, and He rewards this by virtually promising them immortality. When they violate their pledge by disobeying the commandment against idol worship, God punishes them with mortality. God fulfils His promise to bring the people into the Land, and in gratitude they build the Temple. In response, God promises Israel that they will never be exiled from the land; but when they reject David, His anointed one, He punishes them by decreeing their exile. The close linkage, the reciprocal interdependence, of God's and Israel's respective faithfulness is striking.

Faithfulness as the reliable carrying-out of obligations is similar to that which obtains between people in business transactions. Similar, too, is the importance of time, of duration; someone who is faithful can be counted on over a long period of time. We get a stronger sense here, though, of the obligations being actively created by the partners involved. With business deals, the standards seem to be somewhat objective and external. In the relationship between God and Israel, we seem to be looking at standards of *אמת* at a more primal and concrete stage.

On Israel's part, obedience is one element of her faithfulness, as we see in the first exchange at Mount Sinai. When Israel's *אמת* is associated with building the Temple and rejecting David, however, a broader sense is involved.

Here faithfulness to God has a very comprehensive sense, transcending obedience to specific commands. Total commitment to the covenant is involved, including loyalty to God and trust in His beneficence. With the latter, we have come full circle, for it is clear that one way Israel demonstrates her "faithfulness" is by "faith," i.e., placing trust in God's care. Their rejection of David is similar to their skepticism about the goodness of the land, and all that we noted about trust in that instance applies here as well.

The progressive spectrum described at the beginning of the chapter should now be apparent. The connotations of יָדָה applied to the people of Israel move from trust in a personal, general sense to trust that God will take certain actions to trust in and faithfulness to God's commands. We will now examine several aggadot in which the linkage between faith and faithfulness is particularly direct and comprehensive and leads to a firm, deep reliance on God's power. The aggadot concern the wanderings in the wilderness:

"Nor had they prepared any provision for themselves." (Exodus 12:29). (This verse comes) to reveal the glory of Israel, for they did not say to Moses, "How can we go out into the wilderness, for we have no provisions for the journey." But they trusted (יָדָהּ) (in God) and followed Moses. Hence tradition ascribes to them the verse, "Thus said the Lord, 'I accounted to your favor the devotion of your youth, your love as a bride -- how you followed Me in the wilderness, in a land not sown.'" (Jeremiah 2:2). What reward did they receive? Because of what they did, "Israel was holy to the Lord, the first fruits of his harvest." (Jeremiah 2:3).²²

Israel's faith is of a similar nature in a different context of the Exodus in the following aggadah:

Rabbi taught: The Holy One, Blessed be He, said, "So meritorious is the faith which Israel placed in me (האמנה שהאמינו בי) that I will divide the Sea for them. For they did not say to Moses,²³ "How can we turn back without frightening the women and children who are with us?" But rather they trusted in Me (האמינו בי) and followed Moses.²⁴

In yet another passage, a similar notion of faith is related to Moses's command to the people in Exodus 15:32, after

קרי'ת ים סוף : "Then Moses caused Israel to set out from the Sea of Reeds. They went on into the wilderness of Shur."²⁵

Israel's faith is thus related to successive stages of the Exodus -- its inception, the wanderings before crossing the Red Sea, and setting out into the wilderness afterwards. One element of their faith is certainly obedience to God's word at various points of the Exodus. What emerges even more strongly, though, is the extraordinarily deep trust in God's protective care. אמן here is total trust, confidence, and reliance on God's help. The Israelites literally place their lives in God's hands by going out in the desert without provisions. They do so unquestioningly, and their faith is seen in this unquestioning acceptance of God's word and dependence on His power. The commitment to God is total, what we might term today "existential."

אמן as this total, existential trust may also be seen in the crossing of the Red Sea. Although the root אמן is not used, the attitude and the action fit אמן as we have just seen it described:

"And the Israelites went into the sea on dry ground." (Exodus 14:21). If (they went) into the sea, how can it say "on dry ground"? Or if (they went) on dry ground, how can it say "into the sea"? (The answer is that) from this verse you learn that the sea did not split for them until they went into it up to their noses, and only then did it become dry ground for them.²⁶

It may be this, or a similar, aggadah which G. F. Moore has in mind when he writes, "Faith, in Judaism, is confidence in God. It was in this confidence that the forefathers . . . at His command marched straight toward the sea which barred their way, and their faith was justified by the cleaving of its waters before them."²⁷

Where does this trust come from? What stimulates and supports it? In many of the passages, including those concerning faith in the wilderness just discussed, the matter of source does not come up. The question may simply not be part of the aggadah's concern. After all, the Bible gives ample testimony to God's reliability and faithfulness to the covenant. Or it may be that emunah is considered most meritorious when it is expressed as a spontaneous response to God's command, without reference to past actions. But we also saw examples in which the question is raised whether faith needs to be reinforced by reference to experienced miracles and salvational acts. In passages discussed earlier, Moses seeks to stimulate the people's faith by reference to miraculous acts of God which they had witnessed. Another passage makes clear that faith is often rooted in an event or act:

Another interpretation: "Then Moses and the children of Israel sang" (Exodus 15:1). It is written, "Then they believed (וַיֵּאֱמִינוּ) His promise, and sang His praises." (Psalm 106:12). R. Abahu taught: Even though it is written that they already had faith while they were yet in Egypt, as it is written, "And the people were convinced," (Exodus 4:31) they changed and ceased to trust (וַיִּשְׁכַּח וְלֹא הֵאֱמִינוּ), as it is written, "Our forefathers in Egypt did not perceive Your wonders." (Psalm 106:7). But when they came to the Sea and saw the mighty acts of the Holy One, Blessed be He, how He exercised justice against the wicked, as it is written, "And My hand lays hold on judgment" (Deuteronomy 32:41), and drowned the Egyptians in the sea, they immediately "believed in the Lord and in Moses His servant." (Exodus 14:31).²⁸

In Exodus Rabbah 22:3, it is the splitting of the Sea which inspires their faith.²⁹ In other passages, R. Chelbo in the name of R. Johanan³⁰ and R. Yitzhak³¹ acknowledges that witnessing miraculous acts inspires faith, but they seem to criticize this fact. They argue, "When the Israelites saw all the miracles which were performed for them, should they not have faith (לֹא הָיָה לָהֶם לְהֵאֱמִין)?"³¹ R. Chelbo considers more meritorious the faith of Israel in Egypt, and R. Yitzhak prefers Abraham's faith, presumably because the aggadah does not relate these to witnessing miracles. A similar attitude may explain R. Johanan's severe punishment of his student Raca, for Raca was requiring proof not only for R. Johanan's drash, but actually for God's stone-cutting powers as well. (See Chapter 3, p. 33.) We must conclude that there are at least two attitudes towards the source of faith. According to one, human אֱמֶן is inspired by God's actions and His faithfulness, as in the Sifrei and Yalkut passages

cited in Footnotes 9 and 11. Faith in this sense, supported by reference to experienced acts of providence, predominates in describing the faith of Israel. According to the minority view, **אֱמוּנָה** is a spontaneous human response to God in a given situation.

Whatever the source and however expressed, **אֱמוּנָה** is considered by the Rabbis to be a highly meritorious virtue, treasured by God. This is clear from the extensive discussion devoted to the rewards He gives for **אֱמוּנָה**. Just as Israel's faith is expressed in concrete historical situations, so God's rewards also come in the form of historical events. Some of the rewards revolve around the Exodus, others refer to the days of the Messiah. One strong underlying theme is the redemption of the people; another theme is God's providential care.

God so values **אֱמוּנָה** that it is because of the faith Israel shows that He brings them out of Egypt³² and divides the Sea for them.³³ A major reward God gives for Israel's **אֱמוּנָה** is that He causes His spirit (**רוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ** or **שְׁכִינָה**) to rest upon them, so that they sing the Song of the Sea, which thus is considered a form of prophecy.³⁴

The final redemption in the days of the Messiah is also seen as coming as a reward for Israel's faith. As Yalkut Shimoni puts it, "In reward for the fear (of God) and the faith (**אֱמוּנָה**) which they placed (**הֶאֱמִין**) in Him from the beginning (i.e., from Jacob), the Holy One, Blessed be He,

will come and rescue them from among the nations of the world."³⁵ Israel will be privileged to sing Psalms in the end of days (again, a form of prophecy),³⁶ and the exiles will be ingathered only as a reward for Israel's faith.³⁷ Finally, in several passages we discussed earlier, describing Israel's *ṭṭ* in the wilderness, God's providential care is viewed as a reward,³⁸ in general as well as in specific acts of providence, e.g. victory over the Amalekites and the healing from the snakes.³⁹

Despite the very extensive discussion of the rewards of *ṭṭ* there is little in these passages which directly indicates why God so prizes *ṭṭ*. As we have seen, Israel's *ṭṭ* is intimately bound up with their obligations to the covenant and with obedience to God's word. The indirect exhortation is clear. God places a high value on Israel's trust in Him and their faithfulness to their covenantal obligations.

In summary, *ṭṭ* applied to Israel refers to their trust in God and His word with a small attendant element of belief, and to trust in His power and His providential care. It is expressed as their response to specific situations. That response is usually faithfulness to His commands and often involves a comprehensive, existential reliance on His beneficent aid. This trust is usually rooted in experienced examples of God's power and aid. And God so values Israel's trust and faithfulness that He rewards it abundantly.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 5

1. George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1927, Vol. 2, p. 238. Moore, and others who hold similar views, overstates the case. We will later see some examples of אמן being used in a creedal or dogmatic sense.
2. Max Kadushin, Worship and Ethics, Evanston, Ill., Northwestern University Press, 1964, p. 75. The first sentence is a quote from his The Rabbinic Mind.
3. אפרים א. אורבך, חז"ל: פרקי אמונות ודעות, הוצאת ספרים על שם י"ד מאגנס, האוניברסיטה העברית, ירושלים, חשל"א, עמ' 14.
The translation is my own. In the English version, the term is translated "Divine Providence," a translation I find too formal and too narrow.
4. Kiddushin 36a.
5. Mekilta Beshallah 6 (Horowitz-Rabin ed., p. 114). (III-19)*
6. Max Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, New York, Jewish Theological Seminary, 1952, p. 42.
7. Shabbat 97a. (III-3)* Similar aggadot may be found in Numbers Rabbah 7:5 (Mirkin ed., Vol. 9, p. 132) and in Exodus Rabbah 3:12 (Mirkin ed., Vol. 5, p. 78).
8. Mekilta Amalek 1 (Horowitz-Rabin ed., pp. 179-180). (III-25)*
9. Sifrei Devarim 25 (Finkelstein ed., p. 35). (III-17)*
10. For a discussion of a similar instance, which supports my conclusion here, see Footnote 22 below.
11. Yalkut Shimoni, Bechukotai, #672. (III-28)* An identical parallel passage occurs in Sifra, Bechukotai 3:4 (Weiss ed., p. 111b).
12. Numbers Rabbah 16:7 (HaLevi ed., pp. 707-708). (III-35)* Although the analogy of the parable to God and Israel are fairly strong, the father's holding the prospective bride in abeyance for marriage to his grandson might be considered stretching the point a little.
13. Pesachim 118b. (VI-3)*

14. Mekilta Beshallach 1 (Horowitz-Rabin ed., pp. 83-84). (VIa-3)* חֵירוֹת is being read as חֵירוֹת, "freedom."
15. Mekilta Vayissa 4 (Horowitz-Rabin ed., p. 167). (VIa-4)*
16. Ibid. (Ibid., p. 169). (VIa-5)*
See also Exodus Rabbah 25:10 (Mirkin ed., Vol. 5, p. 285).
17. I am distinguishing here between "instructions" and "commandments" for a reason. By the latter, I mean mitzvot. I distinguish these from "instructions" because often God commands Israel to do things, e.g. to go through the Sea, enter the Land, etc., which are not in the realm of mitzvot, but which, when obeyed, signify אֲמוּנָה.
18. Song of Songs Rabbah 2:3.
19. Midrash Ruth Rabbah, Proem 3 (K'tav ed., p. 2). See Soncino translation, p. 8, n. 1. (V-32ab)*
20. The continuation of the aggadah supports this interpretation. There הַנְּבִיאִים is described as saying "אֵין" to the blessings of the prophets. The people lack sufficient faith to so assent to and commit themselves to the words of the prophets; only Jeremiah has this faith. See also Sifrei Ha'azinu 320 (Finkelstein ed., p. 367).
21. Sifrei Ha'azinu 320 (Finkelstein ed., p. 366-367). (V-18)*
The context of the opening verse is the section Deuteronomy 32:19-20 -- "And the Lord saw (the Israelites worshipping other gods) and was vexed and spurned His sons and His daughters. He said: I will hide My countenance from them and see how they fare in the end. For they are a treacherous breed, children with no loyalty in them."
22. Mekilta Beshallach 14 (Horowitz-Rabin ed., p. 50). (III-23)*
J. Lauterbach in his text (Vol. 1, p. 110) has the words בֹּאֲמִי בֹּא, which he translates "believed in Moses."
The word בֹּא is absent in the Horowitz-Rabin and Weiss editions. It is also absent in the other similar Mekilta passages cited below. Max Kadushin, basing himself partly on a note in Weiss's edition (p. 19b, n. 4), states that with or without the pronoun, the object of Israel's trust is God, not Moses. (See Max Kadushin, A Conceptual Approach to the Mekilta, New York, Jewish Theological Seminary, 1969, p. 166.) As my translation shows, I agree with Kadushin. This interpretation is supported by the presense of the pronoun בִּי in the passage cited in Footnote 24. A similar passage is found in Mekilta Beshallach 3 (Horowitz-Rabin ed., pp. 99-100). (V-21)*

23. The Soncino translation says that this refers to Exodus 14:2, in which God tells Moses, "Tell the Israelites to turn back and encamp before Pi-hahiroth." Moses Mirkin, on the other hand, relates the aggadah to Exodus 13:18, "So God led the people round about, by way of the wilderness of the Sea of Reeds." Their faith, Mirkin says, consisted in the fact that they didn't worry that the long route taken would dispirit the women and children.
24. Exodus Rabbah 21:8 (Mirkin ed., Vol. 5, p. 253). (I/II-11)*
A similar passage occurs in Mekilta d'Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai 14:15 (Epstein ed., p. 58). (I/II-9)*
25. Mekilta Vayissa 1 (Horowitz-Rabin ed., p. 152).
26. Exodus Rabbah 21:6 (Mirkin ed., pp. 271-272). (V-30)*
27. Moore, op. cit., p. 237.
28. Exodus Rabbah 32:2. (III-12)*
29. (III-11a)*
30. Song of Songs Rabbah 4:8. (I/II-8)*
31. Exodus Rabbah 23:5 (III-13)*
32. Mekilta Beshallach 6. For this and subsequent passages on the rewards of הַיָּמִין, see Appendix II.
33. Ibid. See also Exodus Rabbah 21:8 (Mirkin ed., Vol. 5, p. 253), and Mekilta d'R. Shimon bar Yohai (Epstein ed., p. 58).
34. Mekilta Beshallach 6 (Horowitz-Rabin ed., p. 114); Exodus Rabbah 22:3, 23:2, 23:5; Song of Songs Rabbah 4:8; Midrash Tanhuma; Beshallach 11 (Buber ed., p. 59). There is some dispute in these passages over whose יָמִין gives Israel the merit to sing the Song of the Sea. In the Tanhuma passage, R. Nehemiah argues that it was the faith Israel had in Egypt. The Sages say that it was the faith they had when they beheld the wonders at the Sea. In the passages in Tanhuma, Mekilta, Song of Songs Rabbah, and Exodus Rabbah 23:5, the argument is put forth that Israel sang the Song not by the merit of their own faith, but by the merit of the faith their father Abraham demonstrated.
35. Yalkut Shimoni, Lech L'cah #76. A similar idea is found in Yalkut Shimoni, Song of Songs, #988.

36. Exodus Rabbah 33:5.
37. Mekilta Beshallah 6 (Horowitz-Rabin ed., p. 115).
38. See Footnote 22.
39. See Footnote 8.

*Passages indicated with an asterisk appear in Appendix I.
They are listed according to the numbers in parentheses.

CHAPTER 6: יֵדָא AS A CHARACTERISTIC OF THE HUMAN-DIVINE RELATIONSHIP -- INDIVIDUALS PERSONS

There is considerable discussion in the Aggadah and in the secondary literature about the יֵדָא of individuals in the sphere of their daily lives and in their personal fates. A spectrum of the connotations of יֵדָא similar to those we have already discussed may be seen here as well, from trust in God's word, to trust in God's actions to faithfulness. There are, however, significant differences. Unlike the faith of the people of Israel, which is substantially rooted in experienced events, the faith of the individual, viz. his trust that God is just, is frequently maintained in the face of discouraging reality. We will also see examples of יֵדָא as total reliance on God, a meaning only touched upon in reference to the people. And finally, יֵדָא is sometimes used in the sense of dogmatic belief, a usage not found in reference to Israel, but with clear roots in the inter-human realm of discourse.

Trust in God, confidence that He fulfils His word and grants providential care, is the fundamental aspect of יֵדָא and individuals, as is true of Israel. This is expressed in a rather colorful, almost folkloristic aggadah from Taanit 8a:

R. Ami taught: Rain does not fall except for the sake of the men of faith (בְּעֵלֵי אֱמוּנָה), as it is written, "Truth springs up from the earth, justice looks down from heaven." (Psalm 85:12). R. Ami said, Come and see how great are the men of faith. From what? From

(the story of) the weasel and the well. For if someone (who) trusts (*יִשְׁמַח*) in the weasel and the well (finds his trust vindicated), how much more so someone who trusts (*יִשְׁמַח*) in the Holy One, Blessed be He.¹

An earthy homily with a clear message -- we can place our trust in God because He reliably, faithfully keeps His word. In this instance, according to Rashi's interpretation, we can swear an oath with God as the witness, or rather the guarantor, of our oath, and we can be sure that God will faithfully fulfil His role. Or, from a slightly different perspective, when we swear an oath using God's name, we are making an agreement with Him, and we can be confident He will live up to His obligations, whether or not we do. This is strikingly similar to the business model at the human level.

In rabbinic aggadot concerning personal *יִשְׁמַח* in God, Biblical figures are frequently offered as models. Sarah, for example, appeals to God to save her from Pharoah because of the faith she has invested in Him:

"Pharoah's courtiers saw her and praised her to Pharoah, (and the woman was taken to Pharoah's palace.)" (Genesis 12: 15). When Abraham saw what had happened, he began to weep and pray to the Holy One, Blessed be He, saying, "Master of the Universe, I depended on You totally (*בְּחַוְיָ שְׂמַחְתִּי*) *בְּךָ*), now act according to Your compassion and Your love, and do not rob me of my hope." Similarly, Sarah cried out and said, "Master of the Universe, I did not know anything (about why we left Haran), but when (Abraham) said to me that You had told him, "Go forth," I believed in (*הִאֲמַנְתִּי*) Your words. Now I am left alone, bereft of my father, my mother, and my husband. This wicked man is going to come and mistreat me. Act for the sake of Your great name and for the sake of the trust (*בְּחַוְיָ*) I placed in Your words. The Holy One, Blessed be He, replied, "By your life, no harm will befall you or your husband, according to what is written, 'There shall no mischief befall the righteous, but the wicked are filled with evil.'" (Proverbs 12:21).²

A similar passage in Genesis Rabbah renders Sarah's plea slightly differently:

"Master of all Worlds, Abraham left (Haran) because of (Your) promise (**בְּהַסְתָּה** -- or, because of trust) and I left because of faith (in Your words) (**בְּאִמּוֹנָה**), Abraham left (to remain) outside this prison, I to go into prison!" The Holy One, Blessed be He, said to her, "All that I do, I do for your sake, and everyone (therefore) says, '(It is) on account of Sarai, the wife of Abram.' " (Genesis 13:10).³

Sarah tells God that she believed His promises to Abraham (Genesis 12:2ff.) and trusted Him to carry them out. Though inextricably bound to each other, belief and trust may both be seen here, just as we saw in some of the passages concerning Israel's faith, e.g. the passage marked by Footnote 4, Chapter 5. It was on the basis of this trust in God's word that Sarah left Haran with Abraham and journeyed to Canaan and Egypt. She appeals to God to reward her ("subjective") faith with His own ("objective") faithfulness, by protecting her in time of distress. She is also making a tacit appeal based on her own faithfulness to God's command, which she demonstrated by leaving her homeland as instructed.

The similarity to the faith of the people, e.g. in going out into the wilderness, is striking. Note, for example, the similarity between Sarah's statement **לֹא הִי יָדַע כָּלֹם** and the attitude of the people in not questioning how they would survive in the wilderness. Faith in both cases is the attitude struck in the face of uncertainty, or lack of knowledge. The faith expressed by Sarah, as by the people, is deep.

comprehensive, and leads to a thorough reliance on His power. We also see here the implicit intimate relationship between trust in God and faithfulness to His word. Furthermore, this passage exhibits the reciprocal relationship that links divine faithfulness and protective care with human trust and obedience. This reciprocity also exists in the relationship of אֱלֹהִים between God and Israel. (I will discuss the association made here between אֱלֹהִים and אֱמוּנָה in Chapter 7.)

With other Biblical figures, it is their lack of this trust (and of the corresponding faithfulness) which is emphasized. Take, for example, Jacob and his famous dream. R. Berechiah and R. Chelbo and R. Shimon ben Yochai in the name of R. Meir interpret the image of the ladder as follows:

This teaches us that the Holy One, Blessed be He, showed Jacob the Prince of Babylon ascending and descending, of Persia ascending and descending, of Greece ascending and descending, and of Edom ascending and descending. The Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Jacob, "Now you must ascend." At that moment, Jacob, our father, became afraid and said, "Perhaps just as these had their downfalls, so will I." The Holy One, Blessed be He, reassured him, "Do not fear, if you ascend, you will never have a downfall." But Jacob did not believe (לֹא אָמֵן) God and he didn't ascend. R. Berechiah and R. Chelbo taught in the name of R. Shimon ben Yochai: R. Meir used to expound thus on the verse, "Nevertheless they went on sinning and had no faith in His wonders (לֹא אָמֵנוּ בְּנִפְלְאוֹתָיו)." (Psalm 78:32) -- This (refers to) Jacob, our father, who didn't have faith (לֹא אָמֵן) and didn't ascend (the ladder). The Holy One, Blessed be He, said to him, "If you had trusted (Me) and had ascended, you would not yet have descended. But now, since you didn't trust (Me) (לֹא אָמֵנוּ) and didn't ascend, your descendants will be subjugated in this world to the four kingdoms with tribute levies, produce taxes, fines, and head taxes."⁴

Again we see the inextricable mixture of belief in God's word and trust in His protection. The association of trust and its expression as faithfulness, i.e., obedience to God's word, is also very graphic here. Another element of יֵדָא depicted here is its broad, existential character, less comprehensive than, but similar to, the Israelites in the desert.

יֵדָא is contrasted with fear; Jacob does not trust God to protect him from harm.

This passage is an example of a melding of personal and national יֵדָא. Jacob's faith, or rather his lack of it, is more focused on the fate of the nation than on his personal fate. Thus, while God responds to Sarah's faith by promising to protect her, he responds to Jacob's lack of faith by decreeing exile and subjugation for the people of Israel. Jacob is probably to be considered a metaphor for Israel. The lack of faith being ascribed to him is in fact being directed at the people in the days of R. Berechiah et. al.

Another example of lack of trust in God expressed as lack of faithfulness to His word is provided by Moses. The focus and consequences of his lack of faith are clearly personal. In Shabbat 55b, the question arises why should righteous men like Moses and Aaron die, if death comes only as a consequence of sin, as R. Ami teaches. R. Shimon b. Eleazar answers that they, too, died because of their sins. He gives as an example Numbers 20:12 -- "Because you did not trust Me enough to affirm My sanctity in the sight of the Israelite people"

to which God adds, "Had you trusted in Me (**האמנתם בי**), / your time to depart the earth would not yet have come."⁵

In another version, Moses requests God to utter this verse, so that the people will know why he is being punished.⁶ In a third treatment of this incident, Moses's lack of faith at Meribah is judged worse than an earlier example (Numbers 11:32), because the latter was strictly between Moses and God, while the former occurred before the entire people.⁷

The sense of **אמן** here is quite close to the Biblical passage. Moses's lack of faith consists in entertaining some doubt in God's word that water would flow from the rock and in his failure to trust in and depend on God's power to work the miracle. What is striking is the association, especially strong in the Shabbat passage, between lack of **אמן** and **חסא**. Since we have no examples of **אמן** being commanded as a mitzvah, what is probably being condemned as a chet here is not Moses's lack of trust per se, but rather his failure to obey God's instruction, which is a consequence of the weakness of his faith.

As we saw when discussing the faith of Israel, the Rabbis tell us a lot about how they view the faith of individuals by describing those who fail to trust God. In addition to the examples just cited, we find the image of the **מחוסר אמונה** a common one. When God created the earth, He had to swear an oath (presumably, not to destroy it) because of these men of little faith.⁸ Noah is called a **מחוסר אמונה** because he didn't

enter the ark until the water had reached his ankles.⁹ Clearly, he didn't believe God when He said He was bringing a flood ("C'mon, Lord, it's only a little shower, right?") and/or he doubted that God had the power to bring such a flood. Hagar is another Biblical figure termed מחוסרת אמונה. When she goes and fills up the water-skin (Genesis 21:19), she is implicitly doubting that God's promised beneficence will continue.¹⁰ The reciprocity of trust in God and His perceived faithfulness to His word emerges clearly in these brief passages. The broad range of concerns covered by faith in God's providence may also be seen in these negative examples.

One manifestation of faithfulness to God is the acceptance of mitzvot (קבלת עול מצוות). It cannot be considered a major form, because, despite extensive research, I found only two passages which associate אמן and mitzvot. One is found in Mekilta Beshallah 6 (See Appendix II):

R. Nehemiah taught: Anyone who accepts (even) one mitzvah in faith (באמונה), he is considered worthy to have the divine spirit (רוח הקודש) rest on him. Similarly we find in regards to our ancestors, that, as a reward for the faith (אמונה) they placed (האמינו) in the Lord, our ancestors merited to have the divine spirit rest on them, so that they proclaimed a song, as it is written, "They had faith in the Lord and in His servant Moses," which is followed by, "Then Moses and the Israelites sang (this song to the Lord)." (Exodus 14:31-15:1).

The second passage occurs in the Jerusalmi, Peah 1:1:

R. Aha in the name of R. Abba bar Kahana (taught): It is written, "Lest she should walk the even path of life, her ways wander, but she knoweth it not." (Proverbs 5:6). The Holy One, Blessed be He, transferred (to the world to come) the granting of their rewards to those who perform mitzvot, so that they would do them in faith (באמונה).¹¹

אמונה seems to be used here in the sense of an abstract noun, rather than an adverb (regularly, properly, etc.). In the first passage, there is the linguistic association with the אמונה the Israelites placed in God at the Red Sea. In the second passage, we find an interesting variation on the theodicy theme. God defers the reward for mitzvot into the next world, so that one does the mitzvot not for the reward, but because of אמונה.

There are at least three possible interpretations. אמן could be subjective here. One accepts or performs a mitzvah because of one's trust in God. In the Jerusalmi passage, we perform mitzvot trusting that we will be rewarded, even if we do not see such rewards being granted in this life. In the Mekilta passage, accepting the obligation of a mitzvah is like the trust the Israelites showed at the Red Sea. In this case, the trust seems more general, i.e., trust in God's goodness and providential care.

אמן could also be objective here. We accept and perform mitzvot because of our faithfulness to God and His commandments. We do them because they are the embodiment of our obligations in the covenant relationship. We saw a similar usage of אמונה in Ecclesiastes Rabbah. (See Chapter 4, p. 59.) God commands the Israelites to sanctify their first-born באמונה, "because of my faithfulness."

A third interpretation is that the accepting/performing of a mitzvah is a form of expression of one's אמן. We have

already discussed several passages, concerning both the people and individuals, in which יֵדָנָה is manifested as obedience to God's word. This is how Ephraim Urbach interprets the Mekilta passage. He points out that אִמְנָה is used in Nehemiah 10:1 in the sense of a covenant to keep the commandments. Whoever accepts a precept is fulfilling his אִמְנָה as one who trusts the Lord who commands and gives the Torah.¹²

Since the contexts of these passages are not helpful, in the absence of more aggadot we cannot determine how substantial a relationship exists between יֵדָנָה and mitzvot. But whichever interpretation is accurate, it is clear that there is some kind of symbiosis of faith and faithfulness being described. Accepting and doing mitzvot is the human fulfilment of covenantal obligations in the more abstract sense of the reciprocal relationship of יֵדָנָה , as well as in terms of the more specific covenant sealed at Mount Sinai.

Faithfulness to God's word, therefore, is a major way an individual's trust in Him is manifested, just as is true for the people of Israel.¹³ In fact, this faithfulness may be considered the fulfilling at the personal level of the obligations entailed in the covenant relationship of God and Israel. It should be clear at this point, however, that Rudolf Bultmann considerably overstates the case when he asserts that faith in the rabbinic literature is predominantly obedience to the law.¹⁴ Although obedience to God's word is certainly an element of Israel's faithfulness (אִמְנָה),¹⁵

we have seen that this involves more than the mitzvot, which I assume is what Bultmann has in mind. Furthermore, אמן as subjective trust in God is often delineated in the broad, general, almost existential sense of a comprehensive trust in God's goodness, beneficence, and power. This trust may stimulate obedience, but the former is clearly the more inclusive of the two ideas.

This becomes clear as we look at passages which delineate the nature and manifestations of אמן in terms other than faithfulness. Two such passages concern Abraham as a model of אמן. In Aggadat Bereshit, Abraham's אמן is manifested by his working through the trials with which God tests him.¹⁶ A similar conception of אמן is found in Baba Batra 15b:

"Now it fell upon a day, that the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them. And the Lord said unto Satan, 'Whence comest thou?' Then Satan answered the Lord and said, 'From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it.' " (Job 1:6-7). (Satan) said to Him, "Master of the Universe, I have wandered all over the earth and I have not found a man as faithful (נאמן) as Your servant, Abraham. For You said to him, 'Up, walk about the land, through its length and breadth, for I give it to you.' (Genesis 13:17). Even so, in that hour, when he could not find a place to bury Sarah until he bought (a place) for four hundred shekels of silver, he did not question Your nature (מירוהיך)." And the Lord said unto Satan, "Hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in the earth" ¹⁷

The emphasis is somewhat reversed here from what we have seen; Abraham's faith/trust is an expression of his faithfulness, rather than vice versa. His אמן consists in his maintaining

his trust in God despite severe trials. He refrains from doubting God's goodness or His faithfulness to the promises He has made, here, specifically, His promise to give the land to Abraham.

Abraham's faith consists of trusting God in the face of events that might have tended to make him doubt God's beneficent care and goodness. This theme becomes highly significant when the Rabbis discuss אמון as faith in God's standard of justice. We now move into the realm of human faith that is complementary to an important facet of God's faithfulness/reliability discussed in Chapter 4. We saw that God is considered true to His absolute standard of justice for both the righteous and the wicked, despite appearances to the contrary. As we might have expected, the reciprocity of the covenant relationship, the interdependence of divine action and human attitude, is manifest in this area of faith as in others. God's reliability in fairly dispensing justice implies that human beings should trust in His justice. A clear and powerful statement of this idea is found in Genesis Rabbah:

R. Yitzhak began (his exposition thus): "Truth is the essence of Your word." (Psalm 129:160). R. Yitzhak taught: From the beginning of the creation of the world, "truth is the essence (אמת) of Your word," (i.e.,) "In the beginning (בראשית) God created . . ." (Genesis 1:1). There is no God but (the God of truth), as it is written, "But the Lord God is truth." (Jeremiah 10:10). "Your just rules are eternal." (Psalm 129:160). Each and every decree which You make for Your creatures, they proclaim the rightness of the judgment and accept it in faith (באמונה).¹⁸

אמונה here clearly is not meant adverbally nor in the sense of "integrity" or "honesty," meanings which we discussed in Chapter 3. אמונה here is an abstract noun and means "faith" or "trust." The parallel phrase "they proclaim the rightness of the judgment" makes the meaning of אמונה explicit. We accept the judgments of God with faith in His justice, trusting that His decrees are right and fair, even though they might not appear to be so.

We discussed in Chapter 4 the wife of R. Hanina ben Tardion, who affirms the fairness of God's justice in the face of her husband's martyrdom and her own impending execution. We can now see that this is an example of נאמן, even though the root itself is not directly applied to her. We can see this form of נאמן more clearly in a Baraita concerning the near-martyrdom of another Tanna:

Our Rabbis taught: When R. Eliezar was arrested on suspicion of heresy (מינות), they brought him up to the tribunal for judgment. The governor said to him, "A sage like yourself, how can you occupy yourself with these vain things?" He replied, "I acknowledge the Judge as right." (נאמן עלי דייין). Since the governor thought R. Eliezar was talking about him, while in fact he was referring to none other than his Father in heaven, he said to him, "Because you have acknowledged me as right (האמנתני), I grant you pardon and you are acquitted."19

נאמן is used to describe God as reliably just. R. Eliezar says this when he appears condemned by the Roman court, so it is a form of צדוק דין. The Roman governor is wrong, of course; it is God whom R. Eliezar האמין,

acknowledges to be fair and just. His יִדְּוּ consists in his trust in God's faithfulness to His standard of justice, though he, a righteous man, seems about to die a martyr's death.

A significant expression of the faith of the individual, then, is trust that God's decrees and actions are just, even when they appear cruel and unfair to our eyes. Even when God seems to act unjustly, e.g. by punishing the righteous with suffering and sorrow, we continue to believe and assert that He is reliably just. As we have discussed (Chapter 4, pp. 49 - 53), the Rabbis considered God's reliable justice as the major form of His יִדְּוּ towards persons. With this in mind, we may consider trust in God's justice despite contradictory evidence a major form of individual יִדְּוּ. This conclusion is supported by the fact that trust in God despite appearances is not found ascribed to the people of Israel, whose faith is usually rooted in experiences of God's benevolence and protection. Conversely, I found no aggadot which explicitly offer us empirical evidence of God's reward of the righteous and punishment of the guilty.

There is another form of individual יִדְּוּ which is significant, but, like יִדְּוּ and the acceptance of mitzvot, not extensively discussed. In several aggadot, יִדְּוּ expresses the acceptance of certain cognitive beliefs in a fashion that must be termed dogmatic. Max Kadushin defines a rabbinic

dogma as "a belief which the Rabbis have singled out as one to which all must subscribe. A dogma is a matter of belief, not a matter of personal experience."²⁰ He identifies these dogma by examining the uses of the terms **מוודה** (acknowledge) and **כופר** (deny). In The Rabbinic Mind, Kadushin delineates three such rabbinic dogmas: **מתן תורה**, the giving of the Torah, embracing both Oral and Written Torah; **יציאת מצריים**, the Exodus from Egypt; and **תחיית המתים**, the resurrection of the dead.²¹

An example of **תחיית המתים** as rabbinic dogma may be seen in Sanhedrin 81a: A skeptic expresses doubts that those who turn to dust can live again. R. Ami cites a parable in support of the doctrine. "If you do not believe (**אם לא מאמין**)," R. Ami tells him, "go out in the valley" and observe natural examples of resurrection, the field mouse and the snail. **מאמין** may refer to the parable, but it is also likely that it refers to belief in the doctrine itself.

In a similar fashion, the dogma of **מתן תורה** is involved when the convert tells Shammai that he believes (**מאמין**) him concerning the legitimacy of the Written Torah, but not the Oral Torah (see Chapter 3, p. 33). We can see the dogmatic element in the belief in the future redemption in the Midrash Psalms passage, to be discussed shortly; Kadushin finds related dogmas in the concepts of the hereafter and the Messianic days found in several b'rachot of the Amidah.²²

The major aggadah associating אמן with creedal, dogmatic beliefs is found in Midrash Psalms:

Another interpretation -- "The Lord preserveth the faithful." (Psalm 31:24): These are the sinners of Israel, who responded amen in faith (באמונה) against their will, saying, "Blessed (be He who) revives the dead." Another interpretation -- "The Lord preserveth the faithful." -- These are Israel, who say "Blessed (be He who) revives the dead," and who respond amen in faith (באמונה), for they have faith (מאמינים) with all their strength in the Holy One, Blessed be He, (believing) that He revives the dead, even though the resurrection of the dead has not yet occurred. They say, "Redeemer of Israel," even though they have never been redeemed but for a brief period of time, after which they were subjugated again. (Nevertheless), they have faith in Me (מאמינים בי), (trusting) that I will redeem them, therefore, "The Lord preserveth the faithful."²³

First of all, אמן is clearly used here with a strong element of "belief that" mixed in with trust. We saw similar usages at the level of human interaction. Shevuot 36a has a passage of rabbinic etymology supporting this analysis:

"R. Josi b. Hanina said, 'Amen implies oath, acceptance of words (קבלת דברים), and confirmation of words (האמנת דברים).'²⁴ What is of note here is the phrase

האמנת דברים, which seems quite close to the idea of creed, i.e., affirmation of certain beliefs. Max Kadushin also points to this sense of אמן:

When the Rabbis speak of belief in God, . . . they refer to faith or trust in God, and thus to normal experience of God. The word "belief" also applies, however, to something that a person accepts as true, but that has not occurred in his own experience, and this use of the word "belief," too, is found in rabbinic literature.²⁵

Furthermore, the element of dogmatic belief in the root אמין should be clear. In the Midrash Psalms passage, Jews believe in the resurrection of the dead, even though they have never seen it, and in the final redemption, even though the only redemptions they have ever experienced have been temporary. Kadushin is quite correct when he defines a dogma as a belief in something which is not experienced. In this sense, belief in God's justice is not dogmatic, because it is felt to be largely an observed and experienced reality, though this is not explicit in aggadot we have examined.

Kadushin, however, resists applying the term "dogma" to אמין. "The verb ma'amin may at times be used in the sense of 'belief,' but the noun 'Emunah always means 'trust.' 'Emunah in the sense of 'a belief' is not rabbinic."²⁶ In the latter sense, Kadushin is quite correct. We do not find אמון used in the modern or medieval sense of a belief, as in R. Saadia Gaon's אמנות ודעות or Ephraim Urbach's חז"ל: פרקי אמנות ודעות.

But Kadushin overstates the case. When sinners answer amen to a prayer which praises God as מחיה המתים "against their will," but באמנה, when Jews "believe in the Holy One, Blessed be He, that He revives the dead," both trust and belief are being described. One sustains the other, in powerful equilibrium. The belief is so strong, that they can trust in God "with all their strength" to fulfil promises of resurrection and redemption, even though they have never

seen such things, even though what they have experienced themselves is contradictory to their hope.²⁷

We have seen a similar intermingling of belief and trust at every stage of development of the root **אמן** as a human attitude. The Israelites believed the spies, because they trusted them as kin. The people did not believe God's description of the land, thereby failing to trust His providence. Humans trust God's justice, believing it to obtain in realms beyond their experience. We have seen the balance shift between the two aspects. In the Midrash Psalms passage, and in the others just cited, **אמן** has a substantial sense of cognitive, dogmatic belief, strongly in the form **אמנתי**, but only slightly less so in the form **אמונה**.

This finding contradicts conclusions of several scholars of rabbinic thought. Max Kadushin, at least, acknowledges that **אמן** can mean "believe" as well as "trust," even if he fails to see any dogmatic sense in **אמונה**. G. F. Moore, on the other hand, categorically asserts that rabbinic words for faith never refer to a creed or beliefs about God.²⁸ Similarly, Martin Buber sharply splits off faith as belief that something is true from faith as trust in someone, which he says is epitomized by Emunah.²⁹ And Israel Abrahams, in his article on "Belief" in the Encyclopedia Judaica, writes, like Moore, that rabbinic Judaism has no articles of faith or dogma.

It is true that *emunah* never seems to refer to statements of belief concerning God's existence, which is considered an axiomatic matter of concrete experience. This accords with the views of Louis Jacobs,³⁰ Ephraim Urbach,³¹ and the various Encyclopedia articles.³² But it is clear that, though very much a minority usage, *emunah* is sometimes used to assert about God and His actions cognitive, dogmatic beliefs, beyond experience.

To this point, *emunah* as an individual attitude has been very similar to that of the people of Israel. It is primarily trust in God's word, His protection, His care, and is manifest in general terms as well as in the form of faithfulness. But in the two areas just discussed, there are significant differences. The acceptance by an individual of a mitzvah is clearly related to Israel's covenant with God. Furthermore, we saw that *emunah* as faithfulness refers to Israel's fulfilling her covenantal obligations. But there was little that explicitly related *emunah* to accepting the Torah. Obedience and righteousness as forms of *emunah* receive slightly greater emphasis at the personal level than at the national.

Furthermore, though we saw that trust in God's promises often involves a small element of "belief that," it is not nearly as prominent or explicit as in the dogmatic usages we have just examined. The paradigm for national *emunah* is the Exodus, an experienced historical event. The concrete

historical supports for national faith are important for a major focus of that faith, the Messianic redemption, which is also to be an experienced historical event. In the areas covered by dogma, there is little opportunity for a person to find such empirical support.

A similar difference in emphasis may be seen in another form of *emunah*. I described the faith with which the people of Israel followed Moses into the wilderness as "existential," in the sense that it embraced the whole of a person's life in very great depth. We find a similar comprehensive, existential form of *emunah* in an individual's life, but with somewhat greater emphasis.

The *emunah* of an individual is often described in quietistic terms, as a passive dependence on God's aid and sustenance in one's daily life. This use of *emunah* appears totally in negative terms; the relevant aggadot describe only those who lack such faith. For example, in Berachot 24b, we learn that one who unduly raises his voice in prayer is called

mekani' amona. The context does little to illuminate the meaning. The Soncino translation suggests that he raises his voice because he fears God will not otherwise hear him. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky suggests that such a person fails to trust in and rely on God to aid him in the general fortunes of his life.³³ I tend towards Werblowsky's interpretation.

More frequently, a *mevaker amona* is one who fails to trust God to provide his sustenance and his livelihood. The

foremost exponent of this point of view is R. Eleazar of Mod'im. A. Marmorstein quotes a typical teaching of R. Eleazar: "There is no need to provide for tomorrow, to gather wealth; have faith -- and God won't forsake you."³⁴ In Sotah 48b, R. Yitzhak, to give an example of the men of faith (אנשי אמונה) who disappeared with the destruction of the Temple, approvingly quotes R. Eleazar:

These (men of faith) were people who trusted (מאמינין) in the Holy One, Blessed be He, according to the teaching of R. Eleazar the Great, who said: Anyone who has a piece of bread in his sack and asks, "What am I going to eat tomorrow," he is nothing but a man of little faith (מקטני אמונה).³⁵

The model of such people are the greedy manna-eaters described earlier:

"And the people shall go out and gather each day that day's portion." (Exodus 6:4) -- R. Joshua taught: This means that a man may gather on one day a portion for the next, similarly from one erev shabbat to the next. R. Eleazar of Mod'im taught: This means that one may not gather on one day a portion for the next, nor from one erev shabbat to the next, as it is written, "each day that day's portion." He who created the day also has created its sustenance. Hence R. Eleazar used to say, "Anyone who has something to eat today and asks what he is going to eat tomorrow -- behold, he is a man of little faith (מחוסר אמונה), as it is written, "that I may prove them, whether they will walk in My law or not." (Ibid.). R. Joshua taught: If a man studies two halachot in the morning and two halachot in the evening, and busies himself the whole day with his occupation, it is accounted to him as if he had fulfilled the entire Torah. Hence R. Shimon ben Yohai taught: The Torah was given to be studied only to the eaters of manna. For how can a man sit and study if he does not know how he will eat and drink, or how he will dress and cover himself? Hence the Torah was given to be studied only to the eaters of manna.³⁶

R. Eleazar is not the only one who taught such a conception. Hillel, in Bezah 16a, seems to be following a similar teaching in regards to the Sabbath; unlike Shammai, he never sets anything aside for the Sabbath, trusting in God to provide for each day.³⁷ This kind of faith is also urged in regards to providing for a festival (Bezah 15b):

What is the meaning of "for the joy of the Lord is your strength." (Nehemiah 8:9-10).³⁸ R. Johanan in the name of R. Eleazar b. R. Shimon taught: The Holy One, Blessed be He, said to them (the people of Israel), "My children, borrow on my account and celebrate the holiness of the day. Trust in Me (אֲנִי בִי), and I will repay (your debt)."³⁹

This אֲנִי בִי is trust in a total, comprehensive way. God is to be relied on completely to provide us with livelihood and sustenance. If God has provided us with food so far, and we doubt that He will continue to do so, we are lacking in trust in His power and his beneficence. The implication is that undue effort indicates we do not sufficiently trust God to provide our food. In Chapter 3, I quoted a passage from Megillah 6b, in which we are only to believe someone who says, "I have worked hard and acquired." But this is true only for matters of Torah. For business matters, the passage says, כִּי יֵצֵא כֶּן שְׂמִיא , all depends on divine assistance.⁴⁰

But this passive, totally dependent trust on God's assistance and providence is hardly the final rabbinic word on the matter. In the Mekilta passage cited earlier, the quietist

school is related to another rabbinic trend of thought. According to this school, labor is an unworthy occupation which lures one away from the only truly valuable way to spend one's time, study of Torah. R. Joshua argues against both schools. One may indeed give effort to the acquiring of sustenance; this is the true meaning of God's command to gather a portion each day. Furthermore, if one doesn't earn a living, he will be unable to study Torah; as the well-known rabbinic dictum says, **אם אין קמח אין תורה**.

A classic statement of this dispute is found in Berachot 35b. R. Ishmael teaches that a man may combine the study of Torah with a worldly occupation. R. Simeon b. Yohai says that if one works, he will have no time to study Torah. Rather, let him study Torah; God will see that he is provided for. Then comes Abaye's wry comment: "Many have followed the advice of Ishmael, and it has worked well; others have followed R. Simeon b. Yohai, and it has not been successful."⁴¹ R. Simeon b. Yohai (and R. Eleazar), that is to say, are articulating an ideal, a high standard of "pure" faith. Trying to make this ideal a general ruling principle in one's life is unrealistic and impractical for the average person.

The more balanced view taken is that we must labor for our sustenance, but our labors will not prosper unless we acknowledge God's sustaining power by thanking and blessing Him for what we acquire. As a passage from Midrash Psalms

puts it: "A man embezzles from God whenever he makes use of the world without a blessing, for only affirmations of God's sovereignty can release the earth's fullness to man's use."⁴²

Our trust, then, is not necessarily that God will provide, but that He will bless our efforts. This more "realistic" standard of faith is associated with אמן in Numbers Rabbah:

"The testimony of the Lord is sure (וְאִמְנָה), making wise the simple." (Psalm 19:8) -- This (refers to) the Seder Zeraim (of the Mishnah), for a man trusts in (מֵאֲמִין) the life of the world and plants.⁴³

An interpretation in Tosaphot (Shabbat 31a) makes this more explicitly a reference to trust in God's providence: We should not read בְּחַיֵּינוּ שֶׁל עוֹלָם, but rather בְּחַיֵּי הָעוֹלָמִים. (אדם). מֵאֲמִין שֶׁיִּצְמִיחַ זָרְעוֹ. A man trusts, not the "life of the world," but "He who lives forever. A man has faith that He will cause his seed to grow." Even at the level of p'shat, אמן is here held compatible with active human effort. Nevertheless, אמן does have a strong passive sense of total dependence on God, even though this is at odds with other, related rabbinic views.

Having seen the various forms and manifestations of אמן, we now learn that God rewards individual faith and faithfulness, just as He does Israel's. We saw that God's אמן towards individuals is largely His faithfulness to His promises to reward the righteous in the world to come, and that individual אמן involved trust in God's reliable reward. It is not

surprising to learn, therefore, that life in the world to come is seen as a major reward for **אמן**, as in Mekilta Beshallach 6 (See Appendix II):

"This is the gate of the Lord; the righteous shall enter into it." (Psalm 118:20). What is written about men of faith (**בעלי אמונה**): "Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation that keepeth faithfulness (**שומר אמונים**) may enter." (Isaiah 26:2). All men of faith (**בעלי אמונה**) enter this gate, as it is written, "It is good to praise the Lord, to sing hymns to Your name, O most High, to proclaim Your steadfast love (**חסדך**) at day-break, Your faithfulness (**אמונתך**) each night, with the ten-stringed harp, with voice and lyre together. You have gladdened me by Your deeds, O Lord; I shout for joy at Your handiwork." (Psalm 92:2-6). Who causes us to come to this joy? It is a reward for the faith (**אמונה**) which your ancestors placed (in Me) in this world, which is all night, therefore we merited the world to come, which is all morning, hence "to proclaim Your steadfast love at daybreak (literally, in the morning), Your faithfulness each night."

There is a parallelism here between **צדיקים** and **בעלי אמונה**, which reinforces our earlier observation that trust in God is related to faithfulness, expressed as observing God's laws.⁴⁴ We further see that faith has such great value that even the descendants of the faithful merit the world to come because of their faith. In the Sotah 48a passage cited earlier, R. Eleazar teaches that lack of faith in God (**על האמין**) diminishes the reward that the righteous enjoy in the world to come.⁴⁵

Abraham's old age is considered a reward for his righteousness, the proof for which was his faith.⁴⁶ Reward is not entirely other-worldly. A passage in Exodus Rabbah points out that God brings many blessings to the man who is faithful (**נאמן**), or through his hands to others.⁴⁷

Clearly there is far less attention paid to the rewards of an individual's emunah than to rewards for Israel's faith. I believe that this is a part of a pattern which spells a fundamental difference between an individual's faith in relation to his personal fate and Israel's regarding the national destiny. The nation's emunah is far more substantially rooted in experienced miracles and acts of salvation than an individual's. In fact, we have seen that an important element in personal

emunah is that it is often maintained despite evidence that might tend to cast it into doubt. Furthermore, though belief was often mixed with trust in Israel's emunah, it is more prominent in individual emunah. Thus individuals may maintain certain dogmatic beliefs, e.g., resurrection of the dead, which are not ascribed to the nation. Now we see relatively little discussion of the rewards of personal emunah. This may be associated with the idea expressed in the Jerusalemi, quoted earlier (p. 96): God "transferred (to the world to come) the granting of their rewards to those who perform mitzvot so that they would do them in faith."

There is thus a sense that the faith of the individual is somehow "purer" and more spontaneous than the nation's. It also seems somewhat more comprehensive and more unquestioned. It is still largely a situational response, which can be seen in the many aggadot concerning the faith of Biblical figures. But there is more of a sense here than for the people of an attitude, a value which is maintained internally

and not necessarily empirically. This value is then applied to ordering one's life and facing its challenges. We see this sense even stronger in uses of the root נבא .

It seems fitting to close this chapter with a superb example of total, absolute trust, exemplified by R. Akiba. Here an individual's trust in God is directed at the fate of the nation rather than his personal fate. R. Akiba's faith is so deep that he sees in the empirical, experienced fulfilment of prophecies of God's chastizing punishment the hope and certainty for the fulfilment of His promises of reward:

One time (Rabban Gamliel and R. Eliezar b. Azariah and R. Joshua and R. Akiba) were travelling up to Jerusalem. When they arrived at Mount Scopus, they tore their clothes. When they arrived at the Temple Mount, and they saw a fox leaving the Holy of Holies, they began to weep, but R. Akiba laughed. They said to him, "Why are you laughing?" He replied, "Why are you crying?" They said to him, "When it is written about this place that 'The stranger who approaches shall die,' (Numbers 1:51), yet now foxes roam about the place, should we not cry?!" He answered, "That is precisely why I laugh, for it is written, 'I will take unto me faithful witnesses to record, Uriah the priest, and Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah.' (Isaiah 8:2)." What is the relationship between Uriah and Zechariah? Uriah (prophesied) concerning the First Temple, and Zechariah concerning the Second, but Scripture tied the prophecy of Zechariah to that of Uriah. From Uriah (the following prophecy came): "Therefore shall Zion for your sake be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become as heaps" (Micah 3:12). From Zechariah, (the following prophecy came): "Old men and old women shall yet sit in the broad places of Jerusalem" (Zechariah 8:12). Until the prophecy of Uriah had been fulfilled, I was afraid that the prophecy of Zechariah would not be established. Now that the prophecy of Uriah is fulfilled, it is certain that the prophecy of Zechariah will come to pass." "With these words," they said to him, "you have comforted us, Akiba, you have comforted us, Akiba."⁴⁸

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 6

1. (II-2)* Rashi explains the fable of the weasel and the well thus: "A certain young man gave his pledge (אמנותו) to a certain maiden that he would marry her. She said to him, 'Who will attest (to your promise)?' A certain well and a certain weasel happened to be where they were. The youth said, 'The weasel and the well will be my witnesses to the matter.' After a time, he violated his oath (אמנותו) and married another. She gave birth to two sons. One fell into the well and died; the weasel bit the other son and he died. The wife said to her husband, 'What kind of thing is this to happen, both our sons dying such strange deaths?' So he explained to her how this came to happen.// 'One who trusts in the Holy One, Blessed be He,' . . . who makes Him a witness between himself and his friend, how much more so (i.e., how much more reliable a witness will He be)."

My interpretation of the last phrase differs slightly from Rashi's. I believe that the trust is more direct. The young man, as it were, is making an agreement directly with the weasel and the well; thus, in the nimshal, a person making an oath by God's name is making a direct agreement with Him. This is how Ephraim Urbach seems to interpret the passage. See Urbach, The Sages, op. cit., p. 36.

2. Midrash Tanhuma, Lech L'cah 5. (XXIII-10a)*
 3. Genesis Rabbah 41:2 (Mirkin ed., Vol. 2, p. 110). (XXIII-31)*
 4. Leviticus Rabbah 29:2 (Mirkin ed., Vol. 8, p. 109). (III-31)*
 5. (III-2)* A striking contrast may be seen in Yoma 87a (III-41)*, where Moses's death is seen as a reward. In an example of rabbinic theodicy, the wicked are favored in this life, while the righteous are not, so it is to Moses's benefit that his time has come. Though understandable from the point of theodicy, this passage goes against the grain of other Moses passages cited here, in which his lack of faith is punished. It also seems to imply that had Moses been faithful, he would not have died and not gone to his reward, a view of faith completely at odds with other rabbinic discussions of אמן.
- In a passage cited earlier (See Chapter 5, Footnote 4), the punishment for Moses's lack of faith is a leprous hand, not death.

6. Numbers Rabbah 19:12 (Ha Levi ed., Vol. 7, pp. 800-801). (III-37)* The punishment here follows the Biblical verse. It consists of Moses's not being allowed to lead the people into the Land.
7. Numbers Rabbah 19:10 (Ibid., pp. 799-800). (III-36)*
8. Sifrei Ha-azinu 330 (Finkelstein ed., p. 380). (VIa-2)*
9. Genesis Rabbah 32:6 (Mirkin ed., Vol. 1, p. 31). (VIa-1)* This passage also seems to represent that school of thought which disparaged the need for empirical supports for faith. See discussion on this matter in Chapter 5. A parallel passage is found in Yalkut Shimoni 56.
10. Ibid. 53:15 (Ibid., Vol. 2, p. 248). (VIa-6)*
11. (V-27)*
12. Urbach, op. cit., p. 35.
13. Two passages (Makot 24a and Tamid 28a) use אֱמוּנָה in a very general, undefined sense. They are so elliptic, however, that they provide no information on the meaning of the term. They are most likely to be considered general, homiletic exhortations to people to maintain their faithfulness to God. (V-4, 6)*
14. Rudolf Bultmann and Arthur Weiser, Faith, London, Adam & Charles Black, 1961, Chapter 3.
15. See, for example, Ecclesiastes Rabbah 3:11, cited in Chapter 4, Footnote 19. Here, clearly, a mitzvah is involved, several in fact -- bikurim, pidyon ha-ben, etc. But the passage is ambiguous. Performance by the people of Israel of these mitzvot is seen explicitly as a response to God's faithfulness, but is not directly associated with their own faithfulness.
16. Aggadat Bereshit, Chapter 80:1. (III-29)*
17. (IV-25)*
18. Genesis Rabbah 1:7 (Mirkin ed., Vol. 1, p. 9). The Jeremiah verse is literally translated, "But the Lord God is the true God." (V-28)*
19. Avodah Zarah 16b. (III-38)* מִיִּנְוּהָ, the Soncino translation explains, refers to suspected Christians. During the Roman persecution of Christians in Palestine in 109 C.E. under Trajan, R. Eliezar b. Hyrcanus was arrested on suspicion of being a member of that sect.

20. Max Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, op. cit., p. 347.
21. Ibid., pp. 340-367. Kadushin is distinguishing between dogma and a "value-concept," which is why mattan torah and the Exodus are included, though we usually tend to think of them as events which draw their religious power from the fact that they were experienced by the people. But "the usual value-concept is concretized, made determinate, in actual every day experience; Mattan Torah (and the Exodus) points only to occasions of the distant past . . . (which) has nonetheless . . . a great effect on everyday life. It functions . . . as a belief that gives significance to Halakah and Haggadah." (p. 348). As we shall see, I consider the distinction between "value-concept" and "dogma" somewhat artificial.
22. Max Kadushin, Worship and Ethics, op. cit., p. 113.
23. (III-30)* A parallel passage occurs in Yalkut Shimoni, Psalms 717.
24. Soncino translation. (III-43)*
25. Max Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, op. cit., p. 347.
26. Ibid., p. 372.
27. Max Kadushin states (Worship and Ethics, op. cit., p. 113) that אמונה is not used in the dogmatic sense because it is a value-concept. "Concepts of the hereafter" in the Amidah, he argues, "are not pure value concepts, for instead of being only suggestive and connotative, they point to specific events, events that, it is believed, will take place in the future; in fine, a hereafter concept represents a rabbinic dogma." We lack the space for a detailed critique of Kadushin's approach to rabbinic thought. Suffice it to say that this seems to be a case of too rigidly imposing the constructs of his system on the rabbinic material. We have seen clearly that אמן has a substantial element of dogma in it, in reference specifically to belief in resurrection and redemption. That a verb form makes this association rather than the noun is important for Kadushin, who believes rabbinic thought proceeds by "value-concepts," which must have noun form. The methodology of this study argues that it is the root that is significant, not the form used.
28. G. F. Moore, op. cit., p. 238, quoted at the beginning of Chapter 5.
29. Martin Buber, Two Types of Faith, New York, Harper and Row, 1961, pp. 7-12.

30. See Louis Jacobs, Faith, op. cit., p. 5.
31. Ephraim Urbach, op. cit., p. 31.
32. See articles on "Faith" in The Jewish Encyclopedia and in The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia and on "belief" in the Encyclopedia Judaica.
33. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, "Faith, Hope, and Trust: A Study in the Concept of Bittahon," in J. G. Weiss, ed., Papers of the Institute of Jewish Studies London, Jerusalem, The Magnes Press, Vol. 1, 1964, pp. 95-139.
34. A. Marmorstein, The Doctrine of Merits in Old Rabbinical Literature, New York, K'tav Publishing House, Inc., 1968, p. 176. I do not know where Marmorstein found this citation.
35. (III-7)*
36. Mekilta Vayissa 2 (Horowitz-Rabin ed., p. 161). (VIa-8)* Note the dissenting view. We will discuss this shortly. A similar passage is found in Tanhuma, Beshallah 20.
37. (XXIII-4)*
38. The passage in Nehemiah 8:9-10 concerns Rosh HaShannah: "'This day is holy unto the Lord your God; mourn not, weep not.' For all the people wept, when they heard the words of the Law. Then (Ezra) said unto them: 'Go your way, eat the far, drink the sweet, and send portion unto him for whom nothing is prepared; neither be ye grieved, for the joy of the Lord is your strength.' "
39. Urbach (op. cit., p. 34) points out the similarity between this passage and Mishnah Baba Batra 10:8 (V-37)*, mentioned in Chapter 3. In the latter, a loan is made because of trust (אמונה) in a guarantor of the loan. God in this aggadah promises to serve as such a guarantor, who will ensure that the people acquire what they need to repay the loan. (III-5)*
40. A similar idea is found in Sotah 46b. The people of Jericho are called מקסני אמונה, because, says Rashi, they worried about their livelihood, since they could no longer sell the water which Elisha had sweetened.
41. (XXIII-29)*
42. The translation is Braude's. (XXIII-26)* See also (XXIII-27)*

43. (III-34)* In Yalkut Shimoni Psalms 674, we find a corrupt version of this passage: the word adam is missing. In Shabbat 31a, אָדָם is associated with Seder Zeraim, without explication.
44. A similar idea is more obscurely stated in Shabbat 104a. There the letters nun and nun sofit are likened to נָאֵן כִּפְּוִי וְנָאֵן פִּשְׁוִי. Soncino and Rashi help us to interpret this as follows: The faithful are bent, i.e., humbled, in this world, but in the world to come can stand upright.
45. See Footnote 35.
46. Midrash Mishlei 16:31. (III-21)*
47. Exodus Rabbah 51:1 (Mirkin ed., Vol. 6, p. 205). However נָאֵן here may not mean faithful to God, but rather reliable/trustworthy in the sense of the Temple treasurers, for example, discussed in Chapter 3. (IV-6)*
48. Makkot 24b.

*Passages indicated with an asterisk appear in Appendix I. They are listed according to the numbers in parentheses.

CHAPTER 7: USAGES OF בטח

We have seen in the usages and connotations of אמון a series of useful spectra. We saw that there are three levels of usage -- the inter-human, the divine, and the human-divine. We also saw that inferences concerning meanings might be drawn from one level to another. A progression of usage can also be seen in the ways the Rabbis use the term בטח, but the nature of the "levels" is quite different and the analogies of meaning which may be drawn between levels of usage are less clear and less direct.

בטח deals almost exclusively with levels of attitude in the divine-human relationship. בטח is used in the sense of "promise" or "make sure" (הבטיח), usually applied to God. People, by virtue of certain deeds, find themselves "certain" (מובטח) about their fates. In the most extensive and comprehensive usage, בטח refers to an ultimate, concrete trust/reliance in God, which leads to a pervasive, inner sense of security (also described by the term בטח).

The analogies of meaning between these levels are more conceptual than linguistic. This means that we cannot be certain that the analogies were explicit in the minds of the rabbis, as we can be concerning אמון. For we saw that, for example, אמון in the sense of cognitive belief, or אמונה as the reliable carrying-out of obligations, were used at all the levels examined. However, הבטיח ("promise") is nowhere

explicitly associated with בטח ("secure"). The association of מובטח ("certain") and בטח ("sure") is conceptually clearer, but not much more linguistically explicit.

The levels of usage of בטח are more personal and internal than those of אמן. The major difference between levels of usage seems to be the degree to which a person's self is engaged in the attitude. When God gives a "promise" (הבטיח) or a person is "certain" (מובטח), a perception or attitude primarily of the mind, and perhaps of the psyche, is being described. A person "knows" with reasonable certainty that certain things will happen. "To depend on" or "to be secure" (בטח) are describing an action and an attitude that are existential and ultimate, engaging the whole self at fundamental levels of one's life.

PART I: Promises and certainty

There is substantial usage in rabbinic literature of the hiph'il form of בטח in the sense of "promise," as in modern Hebrew. Although primarily a "religious" usage, בטח as "promise" is only distantly associated with the major "religious" usages to be discussed later. Although in strict logic, "to promise" and "to make sure and/or secure" are related, we do not find them so directly linked in rabbinic literature, as discussed above. Passages which describe the בטחון of people sometimes depict God "making them secure" by means of promises, as we will discuss. However, הבטיח in the sense of "promise" is not directly associated with בטחון as "confidence" or "security."

One distinction should be noted at the outset. We will see that בטחון is overwhelmingly an attitude expressed by individual persons. הבטיח applied to God, as it most frequently is,¹ usually refers to promises made to the nation. We see at this level of usage far greater similarity to אמן than we will see at any other level.

We saw, for example, that an important element in God's faithfulness, and hence the people's faith, was His reliability in fulfilling promises. It is therefore not surprising that we find aggadot which depict God taking action in fulfilment of promises similar to those He takes in exhibiting his אמן. For example, in several aggadot, God divides the Sea as a

reward for the faith the people have shown. (See Chapter 5, p. 84.) That faith is rooted, as we saw, in trust that God would lead them safely out of Egypt, in fulfilment of His promises to the Patriarchs. Now this is made explicit:

"Then the Lord said to Moses, 'Why do you cry out to Me?' " (Exodus 14:15). . . . Another interpretation -- It is for the sake of the promise which I made (הבטחה שהבטחתי) to your ancestors that I split the sea for you, as it is written, "Your descendants shall be as the dust of the earth; you shall spread out to the west and to the east (literally, to the sea) . . ." (Genesis 28:14).²

Similarly we saw that an important aspect of God's was that He keeps His promises over a long period of time. (See Chapter 4, p. 54.) We now see an explicit statement of this idea in Exodus Rabbah. God is depicted as fulfilling His promises to Abraham, that his descendants would be numerous and a great nation (Genesis 12:1ff.), after 210 years. He similarly fulfils promises He makes to Jacob and Moses,³ and to the people.⁴ One such promise we did not see among the

מן passages: An aggadah in the Mekilta offers an imaginative explanation for the forty years' wandering: When the Canaanites heard that the Israelites were about to enter, they conducted a scorched earth policy, which devastated the land. Because God had promised (הבטחתי) the people a fruitful, not a destroyed land, he made them wander in the desert for forty years, to give the Canaanites time to repair the damage they had done.⁵

As God's faithfulness inspired the Israelites' faith,
so too do His promises give the people certainty:

("Then Miriam the prophetess, Aaron's sister) took a timbrel in her hand (and all the women went out after her in dance (m'cholot) with timbrels)." (Exodus 15:20). So how come they had timbrels and m'cholot out there in the wilderness? Because the righteous (among them) knew for sure (היו מובטחים ויודעים) that the Holy One, Blessed be He, would work miraculous acts of salvation for them. So at the time they were leaving Egypt, they prepared timbrels and m'cholot for themselves.⁶

We will shortly discuss other actions which inspire in people a sense of certainty. We will see one particular example in which, as here, מובטחים means virtually the same as מאמינים. Similarly in Exodus Rabbah, we find a play on the word אז which shows that the Song of the Sea was a response to the נצחון the people had when they saw the miracles God performed there.^{6a} We saw an identical play on the word אז in reference to אמנה in Chapter 5 (See Footnote 28). Although not spelled out, נחם has the same sense as אמן, i.e., trust in God's providential actions.

The reciprocal nature of promises, obedience, and trust is even somewhat more explicit with this usage of נחם than it was with אמן. According to Sotah 39ab, after the High Priest delivered his blessing, he would turn from the people, face the ark, and say, "Master of the Universe, we have done what you have decreed for us, now do for us what you have promised us (הבטחתנו). Look down from Your holy abode, from heaven, and bless Your people Israel . . . !" (Deuteronomy 26:15).⁷ An explicit appeal -- God should respond to Israel's

faithfulness with His own, i.e., by fulfilling the promises of blessing and providence He has made to the people.

Other passages in which God makes promises could be cited,⁸ but the point should be clear. **בטח** in this sense fills out an important aspect of the concept of **אמן** and has some striking aggadic parallels. It may also be seen to underlie

בטחון as reliance to a certain extent. We will see later clear examples of **הבטיח** as "to give assurance" and we will discuss the clear conceptual similarity between "to promise" and "to make sure." Reliance on God (and certainty about His actions) are undoubtedly rooted in a sense of His reliability in fulfilling His promises to guard and protect Israel.

This conceptual association, however, is never made explicitly in the rabbinic literature, as far as I have seen. Furthermore we have seen that **בטח** says more about the person placing the reliance than about anticipated actions of God. **בטחון** is so broad and comprehensive an attitude, so total a dependence, that it seems quite unrelated to specific promises God makes. It is more directly related to the Biblical image of God as one who battles on behalf of His people.

בטח is also used frequently in the sense of "to be certain or sure." Again, though **הבטיח** ("promise") has a conceptual relationship to **מובטח** ("to be certain"), for example in regards to rewards for the righteous, this association is not made linguistically explicit in rabbinic literature. Furthermore, **בטח** in this sense is not direct reliance on

God in the sense we will shortly discuss. מוֹכַח refers rather to certainty concerning actions God takes, and thus is similar in meaning to מַאֲמִין . In this sense, מוֹכַח is similar to

הַבְטִיחַ in that it partakes of an everyday common connotation of "to be sure, to have no doubts," rather than the more comprehensive, existential sense of dependence which בִּטָּח connotes.

A major focus of מוֹכַח is reward in the world to come; this is similar to the אֱמֶן of the individual. In a passage from Berachot 4a, David declares that he is certain (מוֹכַח מוֹכַח אֲנִי בֵּן) that God rewards the righteous. מוֹכַח אֲנִי בֵּן here is almost identical with אֲנִי מַאֲמִין בֵּן , perhaps with overtones of a greater degree of certainty or a more substantial reliance on God.

We may cull from rabbinic literature an extensive list of deeds which, if performed, make a person certain that he will find a place in the world to come (מוֹכַח שֶׁהוּא בֵּן). God is not explicitly related to this certainty. Since He rewards righteous behavior, however, and since these are presumably examples of good deeds, there is an implicit trust in God being described.

The following make a person sure to enter the world to come: reciting Psalm 145 three times a day;⁹ responding יְהִי שְׁמִי כְּשֵׁם אֲבוֹתֵינוּ

during Kaddish; sleeping with another man's wife in a dream;¹⁰ and diligently studying halachot.¹¹ Being in the Land of Israel is considered so great a virtue, that if one walks only four cubits in the land, one is assured of

life in the world to come, as is even a Canaanite maidservant who lives in the Land.¹² These statements are not intended to be taken literally. They are hyperbolic claims intended to focus attention on deeds considered to be of great significance, which might otherwise be passed over lightly. Max Kadushin aptly calls such passages "emphatic statements."¹³

A touching aggadah on Moses's death epitomizes this theme, that a righteous man may be certain of entering the life of the world to come:

When Moses died, Joshua was continuously weeping and crying out and mourning for him stubbornly. He would say, "My father, my father! My master, my master! My father -- who raised me. My master -- who taught me Torah." He was mourning him continuously for many days, until the Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Joshua, "Joshua, How much longer are you going to continue mourning? Was Moses's death your loss alone? Was it not mine as well? Since he died, I have been enveloped in complete mourning, as it is written, 'In that day the Lord God called to weeping and to lamentation . . . ' " (Isaiah 21:12), but Moses knew (מוֹנֵחַ לוֹ) that he would enter the world to come, as it is written, "The Lord said to Moses, 'You are soon to lie with your fathers and will rise.' " (Deuteronomy 31:16).¹⁴

Clearly this idea, that the righteous are assured of a place in the world to come, is the converse of the idea that they have no security in this life, which we discuss on p. 147.

Other actions or events make us certain of other results or rewards. The everyday, mundane sense of the term is clear in these aggadot. For example, a man should sell anything and everything to see that his daughter marries a scholar, for then he'll be sure that his descendants will be scholars.¹⁵ In a similar vein, two stories are told of two sages who, on

hearing clever responses from two young boys, are sure that they will grow up to be great sages themselves, which they do.¹⁶ In Baba Metziah 83b, R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon receives rather earthy confirmation of his certainty about a decision he rendered.¹⁷ Israel may be certain that Elijah will not come on Erev Shabbat and cause them all sorts of problems concerning terumah.¹⁸ If a person prays with kavannah, he may be sure his prayer will be heard.¹⁹ And there are three rituals which, if done promptly, are insured success:

If one lays his hands (on the animal) and slaughters it (immediately), he may be sure his sacrifice is accepted. If he washes his hands and says the blessing (over the meal) immediately, he may be sure that Satan won't bother him during the meal. If he recites the sh'ma and immediately (thereafter) prays (the amidah), he may be sure his prayer is accepted.²⁰

These passages are not intended to express an unwavering confidence in the magical effectiveness of the actions described. Rather these, too, are a form of "emphatic statement." They are meant to suggest, I believe, confidence in the overall orderliness and reasonable predicability of the universe. These actions are considered significant and praiseworthy. These passages suggest that if one performs one of these actions, one can be reasonably certain that the desired result will be obtained. That is to say, to take the last two examples, we are being urged to pray with kavannah and to do certain rituals in immediate succession. These are considered important and valuable. We are assured that if we do so, our prayers

will be accepted, our rituals successful. The possibility is being left open, however, that another factor might intervene and change the result.

PART II: **בטח** as reliance on God

בטח is used primarily to delineate an attitude held by an individual (rarely by the nation) and the state of mind which that attitude engenders. **בטח** usually refers to trust in and dependence on God and the resultant state of confident security and certainty. As R. J. Zwi Werblowsky puts it,

בטחון is initially "a specific positive virtue exercised in certain situations."²¹ In this sense, it is much like **אמן**, but more active and with the emphasis placed on the actions of the human individual more than on the expectations directed at God. This reliance stimulates "a mental state. Trust makes for peace of mind and quietness of soul."²² As Louis Jacobs aptly writes, "The man of Bittahon is possessed of the assurance that his life is in God's hands and that therefore he has nothing to fear."³ Jacobs distinguishes the two major elements: The trust is more than a statement of expectations about God's actions; it is actively placing the fortunes of one's life in His hands. And this leads to a state of quiet confidence and security.

בטחון in God underlies a person's life in general; it provides the basis for hope and a sense of security:

("My norms alone shall you observe, and faithfully follow My laws.) I am the Lord your God," (Leviticus 18:4) And lest you should say, "I have completely lost all hope," Scripture teaches, "I am the Lord" -- I am your confident hope, for on Me you place your reliance (**בטחון**).²⁴

Though the nature of בטחון is unspecified here, it clearly has a broad, supportive character, capable of saving a person from despair about his future.

Reliance on God is usually discussed in unfavorable comparison to reliance on the other things people tend to trust. The condemnation of relying on someone (or something) other than God is made, on one level, in a general, abstract sense. Midrash Psalms, for example, merely combines two Psalm verses to emphasize that we should rely on God and not on mortal rulers.²⁵ This maintains the Biblical sense of בטח as total dependence and trust, emphasized by the synonym

לחסו, "to take refuge." We learn that we should not place our ultimate reliance on people in general:

("For You are not a God who desires wickedness;) evil cannot abide with You." (Psalm 5:5) . . . Our Rabbis taught thus: There are three things with which the Holy One, Blessed be He, associated His name, even though there were evil -- the "enticer," i.e., the serpent which enticed the woman, . . . one who transgresses the teachings of the Sages, . . . and one who places his reliance (עושה בטחוני) in flesh and blood, as it is written, "Thus said the Lord: Cursed is he who trusts in man (and who makes mere flesh his strength . . .)" (Jeremiah 17:5). When is he cursed? -- at that time when "(he) turns his thoughts from the Lord,"²⁶ and casts his reliance (בטחוני) on flesh and blood.²⁶

In this passage, a clear value judgment is being made. It is not just that reliance on men is not as practical or effective as trust in God. It is considered improper and wrong; it causes one to turn one's thoughts from God. God demands not just worship and obedience, but dependence as well.

In other passages, the concern is more practical, more concrete. People are considered unreliable and ineffective to depend on. Such is the earthy folk wisdom of the Amora, Samuel:

Another man used to say: The man on whom I relied (**דרחצינא עליה**) raised his club and stood (against me). Samuel said to R. Judah, This is referred to in the verse, "My ally in whom I trusted (**בטחתי**), even he who shares my bread, has been utterly false to me."²⁷

People cannot be depended on because so many are deceivers:

"Happy is the man who makes the Lord his trust (**בטחו**), who turns not to the arrogant or to the followers of falsehood." (Psalm 40:5). R. Yudan taught: Many, many thousands (are the people) who roam after deception; woe unto him who relies (**בטח**) on them.²⁸

People cannot be depended on because they cannot be trusted. They falsely promise to assist you, or they even turn against you. The person who trusts in his fellow human beings is bound to find his hopes and plans frustrated.

Similarly, reliance on idols is futile and, indeed, detrimental:

"Put not your trust in the great." (Psalm 146:3). R. Simon in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi taught: Anyone who puts his trust (**בטח**) in the Holy One, Blessed be He, merits to be like Him. From what (do we know this)? From the verse, "Blessed be he who trusts the Lord, whose trust is the Lord alone." (Jeremiah 17:7). But anyone who puts his trust (**בטח**) in idols is condemned to be like them. From what do we know this? From the verse, "Those who fashion them, all who trust in them, shall become like them." (Psalm 115:8). Our Rabbis taught: Anyone who leans on (**נשען**) flesh and blood passes away, as do those who rely on him (**מרוסטיא**).²⁹

Note here the parallel between **בטח** and **נשען**, "lean on." **בטח** implies very concrete, practical reliance. It

means depending on someone to take care of things for you or, at the least, to offer substantial assistance. One "leans on" men or idols, because one expects them to help out in time of need. The benefits of **נִסְכָּם** in this passage may have an other-worldly focus. Meriting to be like God probably refers to life in the world to come, in contrast to the perishable nature of idols and mortal human beings.

One cannot even rely on one's own deeds. Midrash Psalms has an aggadah on this theme concerning David:

"I call You, O Lord, hasten to me." (Psalm 141:1). What is meant by "hasten to me" -- "As I have hastened to do Your commands, so may you hasten to me." To what may this be likened -- to one who had a law suit before the ruler. He saw that everyone else had an advocate to plead their cause. He called to the ruler and beseeched him, "Everyone has their advocate to plead their cause. But I have no advocate, no one to speak for me. You be my judge and my advocate." Similarly David said, "Some rely on (**בְּנִסְכָּם**) their proper and upright deeds, and some rely on the deeds of their ancestors. I rely on (**בְּנִסְכָּם**) You, even though I have no good deeds. However, because I call you, answer me."³⁰ This is why it says, "I call You, O Lord, hasten to me."

There are at least two possible interpretations. According to one, David is placing his reliance on God in terms of his personal security and fortunes in this life. Reliance on one's deeds is then comparable to relying on one's own strength and power, which is deprecated here as in other passages we will discuss. Similarly, the "deeds of the ancestors" refers to living off the family name, the family yichus.

The second, and more likely, interpretation is that David is asking God to grant him a place in the world to come out of

תוה , i.e., despite his being unworthy. The emphasis on the moral nature of the deeds ("upright, proper, good") and the reference to the מעשה אבות (a form of זכות אבות) support this interpretation. A similar idea is clearly stated in Berachot 4a:

David said before the Holy One, Blessed be He, "Master of the Universe, I am certain (מובטח אני בך) that you will grant a good reward to the righteous in the world to come. But I do not know whether or not I will have a share among them."³¹

Interestingly enough, the opposite point of view concerning the value of deeds is taken in a passage from Yalkut Shimoni. Here our deeds do provide us with a basis on which to rely on God:

"Trust in the Lord and do good, abide in the land and remain loyal." (Psalm 37:3). R. Haggai transposed this verse "Trust in the Lord and do good" thus: Do good and (therefore) trust in the Lord (בטח בה). A fitting parable concerns an agronomos³² who went out to check the measures. One (of the merchants) saw him and hid from him. The official said to him, "What's wrong with you, that you hide? Make your measures fairly and do not be afraid." Therefore the verse says, "Trust in the Lord and do good, abide in the land and remain loyal."³³

בטח here could be, as in the first David passage, related to the course of our lives. Our good deeds give us some merit; on the basis of that merit, we can rely on God to take care of or assist us in our daily affairs and we need not fear disaster. On the other hand, בטח could be directed at God's reward for righteous deeds in the world to come. In this sense, בטח is conceptually similar to אמן . In the

second David passage, in fact, מוֹבֵטֵחַ אֲנִי בָךְ could be replaced by אֲנִי מֵאֲמִין בָךְ without much difference in meaning. One trusts in God that He grants rewards, either out of love, as in the first David passage, or because of righteous behavior, as in the other two passages.

Before we discuss the major area of life to which בְּטַחֲוֹן in God addresses itself, one other general theme should be mentioned. In a small number of passages, the theme is developed that even the wicked person who places his trust in God receives merit for this. Thus R. Eliezar and R. Tanhum in the name of R. Jeremiah interpret as follows Psalm 32:10, "Many are the sorrows of the wicked, but he who trusts in the Lord, compassion (חַסֵּד) surrounds him." -- "Even a wicked man, if he trusts (בֹּטֵחַ) in the Lord, 'compassion surrounds him.' "34

In Shabbat 129a, R. Josi b. Elisha teaches that the punishment the wicked receive is mitigated if they trust in God. He says that all the sufferings that come upon Israel are brought because of wicked judges. He implies that the punishments would be worse, were it not for the fact that the judges trusted in God:

"They were wicked, but they fastened their trust (חָלְו בְּטַחֲוֹנָם) on He who spoke and the world came into being. Therefore the Holy One, Blessed be He, brings three punishments on them in response to the three transgressions they have done, as it is written, 'Therefore, because of you, Zion will be plowed like a field, Jerusalem will become heaps, and the Temple mount like the high places of a forest.' " (Micah 3:12).35

The implication seems to be that the punishment of precise measure for measure is more lenient than if the judges of Israel had not trusted in God. The reliance implied is at a very fundamental, general, and internal level. Even though one's deeds are faulty, God also attends to a person's internal attitude, specifically where one places his ultimate reliance. If the reliance is on God, this seems to indicate an acknowledgement of God at a basic level, which is considered meritorious.

בטחון most often involves reliance on God for personal security and safety from harm in our daily affairs. As Max Kadushin puts it, "When bittahon is used . . . the note is one of reliance on God for security or safe-keeping, usually for personal security."³⁶ A general statement of this theme occurs in Menachot 29b. R. Ami offers an interpretation of Isaiah 26:4 --

"Trust ye in the Lord for ever, for the Lord is God, an everlasting Rock." . . . Everyone who puts his trust (בטחון) in the Holy One, Blessed be He, behold he has a refuge (מחסה) in this world and in the world to come."³⁷

Again we have בטחון parallel with מחסה, which means "refuge" or "protection." This parallel gives בטחון in this world the strong connotation of physical security and safety. In the world to come, מחסה probably refers to reward to be received for the בטחון manifested in this life.

We may place our reliance on God for personal security because we know that He rescues those who follow and depend

on Him.³⁸ This theme is graphically developed in Yalkut

Shimoni:

"In You, O Lord, have I taken refuge, let me never despair." (Psalm 31:2). You find that everyone who trusts in (נוֹסֵחַ) the Holy One, Blessed be He, He rescues, as it is written, "Let him trust in the name of the Lord and lean upon his God." (Isaiah 50:10). So that you will recognize this is His nature, (consider that) Hannaniah and Azariah, (who) trust in Him (נִסְתָּחוּ בּוֹ), He rescued. You likewise find that He rescued Daniel from the pit. So David said, "Since this is His nature, that He rescues all who trust in Him, 'In You, O Lord, have I taken refuge.' "³⁹

The Biblical examples support a total, confident trust in the face of great danger. נִסְתָּחוּ is clearly reliance on God for physical security. If we place our reliance on God, we need not fear personal harm, because He will rescue us from danger. We therefore may confidently and calmly enter situations that would otherwise frighten us. We can conduct our daily lives with a sense of calm and peace of mind, fearing no untoward events. The inner attitude stimulated by reliance on God for personal security we will discuss in greater detail later.

God can be confidently depended on to protect our personal security, to guard us against dangers. This is one reason for placing our trust in Him and not in our fellow human beings. This is the message of a dramatic story related in the Jerusalemi:

R. Pinhas told of an incident concerning Rav. He was traveling up from Hamat Tiberias when some Romans met him. They said to him, "Whose follower are you?" He told them, "I am a follower of Vespasian," so they released him. In the evening, they came to him (apparently without recognizing him). They said to him, "How much longer will you set yourself with these Jews?" He said to them, "Why?" They replied, "We met a certain man, who told us that he was a Jew. We said to him, 'Whose

follower are you?' He told us that he was a follower of Vespasian." (Rav) asked them, "What did you do to him?" They said, "We released him and he went his way." (Rav) said to them, "You acted properly." And if this is what happens to a man who fixes his trust (נחלה) (בטחוננו) on flesh and blood, how much more so for one who firmly relies (נחלה) (בטחוננו) on the Holy One, Blessed be He! This is what is meant by the verse, "(It shall come to pass that) whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered." (Joel 3:5).⁴⁰

This passage helps us understand passages cited earlier, which urge that we rely on God, not human beings. The implication of the meetings of Rav with the Romans is that while some people can be safe by relying on other men (here, Vespasian), it is better to trust in God. It is better in the sense that it is more fitting and more praiseworthy. And as the לא כל עכך and the verse from Joel make clear, trust in God is better than in men because it is evident that God protects those who rely on Him.

Reliance on God is, then, preferable to any other kind because it is more effective and more demonstrative of a meritorious attitude towards God. It is more effective, for example, than reliance on the sword or the bow:

"Greatly frightened, the Israelites cried to the Lord." (Exodus 14:10) -- (that is to say), they immediately grasped hold of the craft of their ancestors, of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, (i.e., prayer). As it is written, "And now I (Jacob) give to you (Joseph) one portion more than to your brothers, which I wrested from the Amorites with my sword and bow." (Genesis 48:22). Did he really acquire it with his sword (בחרבו) and with his bow (בקשתו)? Is it not taught "I do not trust in my bow, it is not my sword that gives me victory." (Psalm 44:7). Rather this means to teach you that "my sword" (חרבי) is prayer (תפילה) and "by my bow" (בקשתי) is supplication (בקשה). . . . Jeremiah said, "Cursed

is he who trusts in man," but concerning prayer he said, "Blessed is he who trusts in the Lord, whose trust is in the Lord alone." (Jeremiah 17:5, 7). He is their trust (בטחון) in the hour when they pray to Him, for he is close to them, as it is written, "The Lord is near to all who call Him." (Psalm 145:18). David voiced the same idea to Goliath, "You come to me with a sword and with a spear and with a javelin; but I come to you in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel," (I Samuel 17:45). And as it is written, "They (call) on chariots, they (call) on horses, but we call on the name of the Lord our God. They collapse and lie fallen, but we rally and gather strength. O Lord, grant victory! May the King answer us when we call." (Psalm 20:8-10). (Other similar examples are given.)

What is written about Moses, "Moses sent messengers to the king of Edom We cried to the Lord and He heard our plea."⁴¹ Edom replied, "You take pride in what your father Isaac bequeathed to you, as it is written, 'The voice is the voice of Jacob' (Genesis 27:22) and 'The Lord heard our plea (literally, voice).' (Deuteronomy 26:7). We take pride in what our father Isaac bequeathed us, as it is written, 'But the hands are the hands of Esau' and 'By your sword you shall live.' (Genesis 27:40). This explains the verse, 'But Edom answered him, 'You shall not pass through us, else we will go out against you with the sword.'-- They relied on (בטחון) nothing but the sword, while Israel grasped hold of the craft of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as it is said, 'The Israelites cried out to the Lord.'⁴²

Our בטחון lies properly with God, not military might; this is the religious superiority of Israel over Edom. The dependence on God urged is very deep and very comprehensive. The only human action consistent with faith in God is prayer, i.e., the request for God's assistance.

This passage is a classic example of the Rabbis' extreme denigration of physical prowess and reliance on military might as unworthy of one who worships the Lord. Thus a clear and explicit Biblical example of reliance on arms is metaphorized out of existence; "sword" and "bow" are midrashically refashioned

into "prayer" and "petition." This is part of the hortatory, homiletic element of the passage, which urges trust in God as more meritorious and religiously superior to reliance on strength. The Jeremiah verses and the Edom-Israel exchange at the end fit into this element. A practical, empirical element undergirds the hortatory level. David, other figures, and Israel (Psalm 20) are offered as proof that not only is reliance on God morally superior, but it is practically more effective as well.

Both the merit and the effectiveness of trust in God are depicted in a Midrash Psalms passage about Abraham. Abraham is viewed as superior to the four righteous men who preceded him (Noah, Shem, Eber, and Asshur) because they all deserted God in some way, but Abraham remained loyal (אינו כניח

להקב"ה). And his trust in God served him in good stead when he was thrown into the furnace:

"It is better to take refuge in the Lord than to trust in man." (Psalms 118:8). Abraham had no trust (בוסס) either in the words of his father or in the words of his mother.^a For Terah, who was a star-gazer, saw in the star of Haran that the whole world was to be peopled out of Haran, and saw in the star of Abraham that Abraham was to be cast into fire.^b Men of all nations came into the house of our father Abraham and asked him: "With whom dost thou belong?" and he answered: "With the Holy One, Blessed be He, that is in Heaven." At once they seized him and cast him into the fiery furnace. And therein went down with him neither watch-angel, nor seraph, nor any angel, but the Holy One Himself, Blessed be He, as is said "I am the Lord that brought thee out of the fire of the Chaldees."^c (Genesis 15:7).⁴³

When Abraham does not trust (בוסס) his father's words, belief in the sense of האמין might be what is intended. A more

likely interpretation is that he did not rely on them in determining what action to take. וְכִרִי אֲבִיר here is like avodah zarah in the next passage we will discuss. Abraham doesn't rely on the predictions of the stars because they have no substance, no reality; placing one's life in the hands of the stars would be useless, indeed harmful. Trusting (הַאֲמִין) in God's promises to him (Genesis 15:6), he places his life in God's hands (נוֹסֵחַ) and, in 15:7 (according to the midrash), his trust is rewarded by God's personally rescuing him from the furnace.⁴⁴ The trust, and its vindication, bear close resemblance to the Biblical models of Daniel and Shadrach et. al.

Similarly in Ta'anit 22b, reliance on God's strength is considered more effective than reliance on idols: Josiah is sure that he will triumph over the Pharaoh Neco because Neco trusts in (בִּסְחָ) idols (עֲבוֹדָה זָרָה).⁴⁵ This sheds some light on the Deuteronomy Rabbah passage cited earlier (p. 133), which says that those who trust in idols are condemned to end up like them. Idols are seen to be "no-gods," as Jeremiah says (2:11 inter alia); they have no real existence, no real power. Reliance on them for physical security is, thus, vain and futile. The emphasis here is on the effectiveness of reliance on God, not its religious value.

In contrast, the emphasis is on the meritorious nature of such reliance, and not its practical value, in a Proem

to Lamentations Rabbah: Isaiah (22:9-10) criticizes the people for strengthening the walls of Jerusalem. The question is raised, "Didn't Hezekiah do the same thing?" The answer is given:

Hezekiah trusted (בטח) in the Lord, the God of Israel, but you did not trust in Him (הִנְסַחְתֶּם). This is referred to in the verse, "But you gave no thought (לֹא הִנְסַחְתֶּם) to Him who planned it, you took no note of Him who designed it long before." (Isaiah 22:11).⁴⁶

It is not the building of walls itself that is being criticized, it is the intent. Hezekiah has already demonstrated his devotion and faithfulness to God (II Chronicles 31:20-21). Therefore he is not seen here, in rebuilding the walls, as relying on his own might and not God's. Human effort is not condemned, the passage teaches, if it is combined with trust in God. The Jerusalemites in Isaiah's day are criticized because they seem to be relying solely on their own strength, turning their hearts and their trust away from God.

We have seen so far that, when motivation for בטחון is discussed, the primary source is the fact that God rescues and protects those who trust Him. There are some isolated instances of other qualities of God which underlie בטחון. For example, we should rely on God because His providential care to us never ceases and fills our lives:

R. Hiya in the name of Rabbi taught: Those who brought first fruits to the Temple used to sing, "Let everything that breathes praise the Lord." (Psalm 150:6). What is meant by (this verse)? -- As long as the breath goes in and out of our bodies, we must say "Halleluyah."

"Praise the Lord" -- for the wonders which He does for us every moment, for He never diverts (His attention) from us for even a moment,⁴⁷ therefore, "Trust in Him (בַּטְחוּ בּוֹ) at all time. Ye people, pour out your hearts to Him, God is a refuge for us. Selah." (Psalm 62:9).⁴⁸

בטח here is very comprehensive, pervading all aspects of life. We can rely on God to help us in everything we do because His providence watches over us at every moment. This underlies a practical, everyday reliance on God which is one aspect of בטחון we will discuss shortly. (It is an aspect which, as we shall see, some scholars greatly overestimate in importance.)

The extensive nature of God's power, in addition to its intensive nature just described, also supports בטח :

"Trust ye in the Lord for ever, for the Lord is an everlasting Rock." (Isaiah 26:4). You should know in whom you are trusting (בּוֹטְחִים), in He who created two worlds with two letters . . . this world and the world to come."⁴⁹

God is worthy of being relied on because of his might; there is nothing you could trust him for that He would not be able to provide. It is also important to note that a basis for trust here is the fact that God's power obtains both in this world and in the world to come. As we saw, a similar idea underlies faith (אֱמֶן) in God's justice.

In a similar passage, the people of Israel are assured that if they trust in God they will have no cause to despair (Psalm 31:2, David speaking metaphorically in the first person). When they respond, "But has Israel not already despaired in this world," the answer is given, "It is sufficient

that we have despaired in this world, for we will have no cause to despair in the world to come."⁵⁰ Israel is being assured here that their trust in God will be rewarded. Though they have suffered greatly in this world, they will find peace and reward in the world to come. Although "Israel" is written, individuals in their personal fates, not the nation, may be the focus of this assurance. If so, this idea is related to the concept of *יִסְתָּ*, as it speaks to the question of God's justice and the suffering of the righteous.

We have seen several usages of *נָסַב* which are close to *יִסְתָּ*. In fact, there is considerable conceptual similarity. Both are appropriately rendered in English as "trust." But there is an important, if subtle difference between the two. The core of a person's *יִסְתָּ* is his expectations and beliefs concerning God's actions, particularly His faithfulness to His promises of reward and providential care. Though *נָסַב* involves expectations of God's protection, the term is more person-centered than God-centered. The focus of *נָסַב* shifts to the human actions which follow from the trust, and describes a concrete, ultimate reliance on God in the fortunes of life. This conception of *נָסַב* is supported by reference to the synonyms used -- *נָסַב*, to take refuge, and *יָנַח*, to lean upon.

Though *יִסְתָּ* sometimes has this sense of concrete reliance, as when the Israelites followed Moses into the wilderness without provisions, the dominant sense of individual *יִסְתָּ* is

trust that God is just despite appearances. (**נֶסֶח** is almost exclusively individual, very rarely national.) **נֶסֶח** is confident trust that if one puts his fate in God's hands, he will be safe and protected. Let me suggest a case which illustrates the distinction: Two people are approaching a town that is in flames. The person expressing the attitude of **אֱמֵן** might say, "If we enter this town and are burned, I trust in God that He is acting justly." The man of **נֶסֶח** might say, "I trust in God, therefore if we enter the town we won't get burned." This model is suggested by the stories of the Biblical figures who are taken as paradigms of **אֱמֵן**.

I make this distinction here so that we might look again at the Tanhuma passage described in Chapter 6 (p. 91), which associates **אֱמֵן** and **נֶסֶח**. Abraham tells God that, in leaving Haran at his command, he was placing total trust in Him (**בְּנֶסֶח־י שִׁבְכַחְתִּי בְךָ**). Sarah complains that she left Haran with Abraham because she believed in God's words (**הֵאֱמַנְתִּי לְדַבְרֶיךָ**). She then appeals to God to save her for the sake of the trust she placed in His words (**בְּנֶסֶח־י בְּדַבְרֶיךָ**). It is possible that **נֶסֶח** is being used here in the sense of "trust in God's promises" like **אֱמֵן**. This is strongly suggested by Sarah's similar statements **הֵאֱמַנְתִּי לְדַבְרֶיךָ** and

בְּנֶסֶח־י בְּדַבְרֶיךָ. But the analysis just given suggests an alternative reading: **אֱמֵן** here refers to the trust Abraham and Sarah placed in God's promised blessings. **נֶסֶח** refers to the reliance they placed in God's protection and care, because

of which they left their homeland for Canaan and Egypt.

Though implicit, this seems the sense of Abraham's statement

בטחוני שבטחתי בך . One might almost say that their
אמן , their reliance on God, was a result of their בטחון ,
their trust in His word. Though useful for analytic purposes,
this formal schema is not to be found explicitly stated in
the rabbinic literature. It does, however, suggest some pos-
sible dynamics of the relationship between the two terms.⁵¹

PART III: בטח as an Inner Sense of Security

We have been looking at usages of בטח which delineate a personal attitude directed towards God. In this sense, with its characteristic form the transitive verb בוטח, בטח means placing one's reliance on God, largely in the area of personal security. We will now examine בטח as a subjective, inner attitude -- the inner feelings, the state of being, which derives from this reliance. To put it another way, having placed our reliance on God, with what kind of inner sense do we approach the changing fortunes of our lives?

Although a major usage of לבטוח is to rely on God for physical security, we find only a few passages in which בטח means explicitly "to be safe or secure." One such passage is a variation on the incident of R. Akiba and the other Tannaim on Mount Scopus, and occurs just before it in Makkot 24a. In this story, the three other Tannaim are distressed to see, as they are entering Rome, that this people of idolators live "secure (לבטח), at peace (שלום), and at ease (שאנן)" while Israel has been laid waste.⁵²

The plaint of these Tannaim is rooted in their sense that as idol worshippers, the Romans should have no security. It is Israel, the worshippers of the Lord, who should be dwelling in peace, security, and prosperity. A similar usage applied to the nation occurs in Yalkut Shimoni: " 'You shall dwell securely in your land.' (Leviticus 26:5). In your land you

will dwell securely (לָבֶטֶח), but you will not dwell securely outside the land."⁵³

בטח is also applied to the security of the individual:

R. Judan said, Even though God said to Jacob, "Return to the land of your fathers (where you were born, and I will be with you)" (Genesis 31:3), nevertheless, "Jacob was greatly frightened." (Ibid., 32:8). From this we learn that a righteous man has no security (הַבִּטְחָה) in this world.⁵⁴

Even though a man is righteous, nevertheless troubles and sorrows may befall him in this life. He can never feel completely at ease and secure.

In none of these passages is being secure (בטח) directly related to placing trust in God (בִּטְחָא). We must infer that it is God who provides the security, in these cases, as a result of God's will, though the expectation of security following righteousness is clearly being disappointed.

בטח as an inner sense of being is discussed most often in contradistinction to fear and anxiety. As R. J. Zwi Werblowsky writes, בטח is "faith in God's ever-present providence and the concomitant sense of security and lack of anxious tension,"⁵⁵ very much a this-worldly attitude. The Biblical paradigms are, as we have seen, Daniel in the lion's den and Shadrach and company in the fiery furnace. One enters a perilous situation confident that no harm will come. The classic story illustrating this attitude concerns Hillel:

Our Rabbis taught: One time Hillel the elder was coming from a journey. He heard a voice cry out in the city, but he said, "I am sure (מִבְּטַח אֲנִי) that this does not

come from my house." To him applies the following verse: "He will not be afraid of evil tidings, his heart is steadfast, trusting (בטח) in the Lord." (Psalm 112:7). Rava said: Anyone who interprets this verse may make the second part explain the first, or the first part explain the second. The second part explains the first? -- "He will not be afraid of evil tidings." Why? Because "his heart is steadfast, trusting in the Lord." The first part explicates the second? -- "His heart is steadfast, trusting in the Lord." (Therefore) "he will not be afraid of evil tidings."⁵⁶

We saw earlier that trust in God for personal security is frequently urged as meritorious and beneficial. We now see what that בטח accomplishes. Hillel's trust in God is so comprehensive and so deep that he is confident that God would not let any harm befall his family. The unspoken source of this confidence is his piety and his righteousness, as well as his reliance on God's protection. Rava's two readings of Psalm 112:7 are really the same idea. One who places his reliance on God attains an inner security, confidence, and peace of mind. He can be sure no disaster will strike him or his family, because he relies on God's beneficent protection and care.

בטח in this sense is so valued a virtue that fear is condemned as indicative of weakness of faith. As R. J. Zwi Werblowsky puts it, "If hope, reliance, etc. are a sign of piety, then fear is obviously a sign of wickedness."⁵⁷ The Aggadah uses Jacob and Moses as examples of this unworthy fear:

"Then Jacob was greatly afraid and was distressed." (Genesis 32:8). R. Pinhas in the name of R. Reuben taught: There were two men whom the Holy One, Blessed

be He, gave assurance (הבטיח), but who were nevertheless afraid . . . (Jacob and Moses). The Holy One, Blessed be He, said to (Jacob), "For I will be with you," (Genesis 28:15), but in the end he was afraid, as it is written, "Then Jacob was greatly afraid." . . . The Holy One, Blessed be He, said to (Moses) "For I will be with you," (Exodus 3:12) yet in the end he was afraid. "The Lord said to Moses, 'Do not be afraid,' " (Numbers 21:34), and one does not say "Do not be afraid" except to one who is frightened.⁵⁸

When the children of Israel in a time of suffering try to use Jacob's example to justify their anxiety and fear, they in turn are criticized:

R. Berechiah and R. Chelbo in the name of R. Samuel bar Nahman, in the name of R. Nathan, taught: Israel was worthy of destruction in the days of Haman (for their lack of faith) had they not (or -- but they) defended their attitude by reference to that of their ancestor. They said, "If our father Jacob, to whom the Holy One, Blessed be He, gave his assurance (הבטיח), saying to him, 'Behold I am with you,' was afraid, how much more so should we fear." It was for this attitude that the prophet chastized Israel and said to them, "Have you forgotten the Lord your Maker . . . stretched forth the heavens and laid the foundations of the earth." (Isaiah 51:13). Have you forgotten what was said to you, "If the heaven above can be measured (and the foundations of the earth beneath searched out, then I will cast off all the seed of Israel)." (Jeremiah 31:37). Have you seen the heavens wander or the earth shake? Should you not have learned from the setting up of the heaven and earth? Instead, "You are afraid continually, all the day." (Isaiah 51:13).⁵⁸

הבטיח here has, of course, the root sense of "promise." But, as is true conceptually in English as well, it also has the sense of making someone feel secure, sure, confident, i.e., the sense of "giving assurance." הבטיח, then, means to make someone בטח. Despite the fact that God has promised to be with them, i.e., to watch over, guide, and protect them, Moses

and Jacob are insecure, afraid. The forcefulness of the criticism of this attitude is clearer in the second part of the aggadah -- by basing themselves on Jacob, Israel holds an attitude of fear of suffering which the Rabbis say makes them worthy of destruction. The implication is that in the time of the persecution of Haman, the people should have trusted in God to protect them; their fear shows that they did not have sufficient faith in God's power and love.

Fear as a sign of lack of sufficient נחמה is the theme which strongly emerges from two incidents which follow the story of Hillel, cited earlier (Berachot 60a):

A certain disciple was one following R. Ishmael son of R. Jose in the market place of Zion. The latter noticed that he looked afraid, and said to him: You are a sinner, because it is written: "The sinners in Zion are afraid." (Isaiah 33:14). He replied, But it is written, "Happy is the man that feareth alway." (Proverbs 28:14). -- He replied: That verse refers to words of Torah.⁵⁹ R. Judah b. Nathan used to follow R. Hammuna. Once he sighed, and the other said to him: This man wants to bring suffering on himself, since it is written, "For the thing which I did fear is come upon me, and that which I was afraid of hath overtaken me. But (he replied) it is written, "Happy is the man who feareth alway." He replied: That is written in connection with words of Torah.⁶⁰

The setting of these incidents in the market is a significant detail. It indicates that נחמה is a pervasive attitude which is supposed to accompany us in the routine of everyday life. The critical comments of R. Ishmael and R. Hammuna to their followers indicate that the preferable attitude is not to be afraid and not to sigh. They should have נחמון, the confidence that nothing untoward will happen as they conduct their daily

affairs. If they are pious and place their trust in God, He will protect them and see to their well-being.

So fear and anxiety are considered signs of impiety incompatible with trust in God. But there is a countervailing attitude, discernible in the incident with R. Ishmael, which mitigates the severity of this notion. Fear might be an indication of a state of sin. The sin, a person worries, may cause God to remove His protection; this anxiety accounts for both his fear and his apparent lack of faith. It isn't that he lacks **בטחון**. He does trust God, but he fears that his sins might induce God as Judge to punish him by deserting him and allowing harm to befall him. As R. J. Zwi Werblowsky puts it, "Not only the fulfilment of one's own hopes and desires, but even God's promised graces . . . now appear less certain."⁶¹

A passage in Tanhuma offers this as the reason why Moses and Jacob were afraid:

This is one of the qualities of the pious, that even though God has given them His assurance (**הבטחון**), they do not discard their fear (of Him, or -- of sin). Thus it is written concerning Jacob, "Then Jacob was greatly afraid." (Genesis 32:8). Why was he afraid? He said to himself, "Perhaps I acted sinfully in some way while with Laban, and the Holy One, Blessed be He, has abandoned me, as it is written, 'Let Him not find anything unseemly among you and turn away from you.' " (Deuteronomy 24:15). Similarly Moses grasped hold of this fear, in the manner of his ancestor. Why was he afraid? He said to himself, "Perhaps Israel acted faithlessly in the war with Sihon, or were corrupted with some transgression." The Holy One, Blessed be He, said " 'Do not fear,' they are all completely righteous."⁶²

The same justification for Jacob's fear is offered in the Mekilta:

"Remember, I am with you; I will protect you (wherever you go . . .)" (Genesis 28:15), yet Jacob was frightened and afraid, as it is written, "Then Jacob was greatly afraid and was distressed." (Genesis 32:8). A man whom the Holy One, Blessed be He, has given His assurance (הבטחה) was frightened and afraid?! Jacob our father said to himself, "Woe is me! Perhaps sin has made me (forfeit divine protection)."63

Sin is thus an acceptable justification for doubting whether God's promised protection will be forthcoming. It is interesting to note concerning the root בטח here, that even when we are discussing the reliability of God's actions, the focus is still on the human action more than the divine.

We have seen, then, that the major form of בטח is reliance on God for one's personal security, and the resultant sense of inner calm and confidence in facing the problems of daily life. In one passage, a more general, pervasive reliance is involved. God is to be relied upon not just to protect us, but more broadly to provide for our general needs:

Rabin, the son of R. Ada taught in the name of R. Yitzhak: If someone who regularly comes to synagogue fails to come one day, the Holy One, Blessed be He, inquires after him, as it is written, "Who among you fears the Lord, who obeys the voice of His servant? Though he walk in darkness and has no light" (Isaiah 50:10). If he went to fulfil a mitzvah, he has light, but if he went to attend to a private concern (דבר רשות), he has no light. Why? Because he should have relied on (לבטוח) the name of the Lord, and he did not (לא בטח). (This is what the verse means), "Let him trust in the name of the Lord."64

One is permitted to set aside one mitzvah (here, prayer), if it is necessary to do so to perform another mitzvah. But for a private matter, one should attend to the mitzvah and trust

in God to take care of other concerns. Such a private concern may be a business deal or some other matter of livelihood, or something that needs attention at home, or the like. The question here is a דבר רשות versus a דבר מצוה; the intention is not to totally denigrate human effort. A private matter should receive less of our attention; we should depend more on divine assistance. Human effort is clearly secondary to reliance on God in matters of everyday welfare.

This is, however, the only explicit instance of such a pervasive בטה I found. (See pp. 143-4 for another passage which is possibly related to this theme.) That is to say, I find little to support R. J. Zwi Werblowsky's conclusion that "the quest for livelihood is the ordinary man's major concern, and Rabbinic references to bittahon deal for the most part with this main worry."⁶⁵ On the contrary, rabbinic references to בטחון deal for the most part with another concern entirely, i.e., personal security. Up to the point of this statement in his monograph, Werblowsky has dealt with two major areas of an individual's life, over which the rabbis debate human effort versus divine intervention -- livelihood and consulting a doctor over illness. We have seen, however, that the activism-quietism debate concerning sustenance falls within the area of אמן, not בטה. Furthermore, as Werblowsky acknowledges,⁶⁶ the root בטה is nowhere associated with either of the two concerns he mentions. Therefore, it is tenuous to directly apply the concept of בטחון to either concern.

Louis Jacobs, in his book Jewish Values,⁶⁷ develops a view of bittahon similar to Werblowsky's. He, too, discusses bittahon primarily in terms of livelihood. He develops the human effort-divine providence debate as an aspect of bittahon. For example, Jacobs quotes as an example of bittahon versus human self-reliance the debate of R. Simeon and R. Ishmael, which I quoted at the end of Chapter 6. Neither בטח nor יִצְחָק is used in this passage, but we saw that this debate did help illuminate one aspect of יִצְחָק. It bears no relation, however, to any passage I have found which uses the root בטח.

This dialectic between human effort and divine providence does seem to be part of later concepts of bittahon, which Jacobs seeks to show are not dominant in Judaism. He cites the Michtav Me'elياهو of Rabbi E. Dressler as a modern example and Mesillat Yesharim of Luzzato as a medieval example of a passive human attitude towards life, which Jacobs finds Jewishly objectionable. But he argues against this position with rabbinic views which do not mention the term בטח.

בטחון in rabbinic literature focuses primarily on personal security, sometimes in the broad sense of general well-being. It is trust that God will protect us and generally manage our lives for our good. Werblowsky is essentially correct when he writes, "Bittahon seems to indicate a sense of certainty that ultimately everything rests with God." But I see no support for the second part of Werblowsky's assertion, that bittahon is the certainty "that He will bring to fruition

whatever it is that we want or do,"⁶⁸ except in the most general sense of confidence that things usually go well for us. **בטח** does not seem to imply reliance on God to provide sustenance nor to cure us of illnesses.

This is not to say that this is not an important area of rabbinic thought. Werblowsky and Jacobs assemble an impressive array of aggadot which touch upon these concerns. My difference with these scholars is largely methodological, as my Introduction indicates. The passages they cite may in fact have very little to do with rabbinic notions of reliance on God, I would argue, because the term which describes that attitude, **בטח**, is not found in these discussions.

One concluding note: **בטח** is primarily the attitude of placing reliance. It is significant that God is never described as **בוטח**, as placing reliance, nor is He depicted as having **בטחון**. The only usage of **בטח** with God as the actor is

הבטיח, "promise." **בטח** is used overwhelmingly in a subjective sense, i.e., placing reliance and feeling secure. **אמן** has a broader range, so that we saw it applied to God, largely in the objective sense of demonstrating faithfulness/reliability. The focus of **בטחון** is completely on the person having the attitude, i.e., the one who trusts and feels secure. **אמן** has more to say about expectations and perceptions about the other party. Thus, in fact, when **אמן** is being applied to God, a statement is really being made about human perceptions of

God. Therefore, בטח as בטחון , overwhelmingly internal and subjective in nature, cannot be applied to God. On whom would He rely, on whom could He be perceived to need to depend? When these questions are posed, we get a clearer picture of the concrete, practical, comprehensive nature of בטח .

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 7

1. There are, of course, examples of הבטיח used to refer to promises people make to each other. However, I did not find it a very common usage. See Derech Eretz Zuta, Chapter 2; Sanhedrin 98a; Pesachim 91a. (XXV-7, 9)*
2. Mekilta Beshallach 3 (Horowitz-Rabin ed., p. 97). I prefer the Weiss rendering הבטחת (p. 35) to Horowitz-Rabin's הבטחתים. (XXII-4)* See also Yalkut Shimoni. (XXV-14)*
3. Exodus Rabbah 38:6 (Mirkin ed., Vol. 6, p. 119). (XXV-5)*
4. Sifrei, Ha'azinu 309 (Finkelstein ed., p. 350). (XXV-12)*
5. Mekilta, Beshallach, Proem (Horowitz-Rabin ed., p. 76). (XXV-15)*
6. Mekilta, Shirah 10 (Horowitz-Rabin ed., p. 151). (XXI-20)*
- 6a. Exodus Rabbah 23:4. (XXIII-7)*
7. (XXV-8)* A parallel passage: Sifrei, Ki Tavo 303 (Finkelstein ed., p. 322).
8. See Sifra Bechukotai, Perek 8:2; Sifrei, Be-ha'alotecha 84 (Horowitz ed., p. 83); Mekilta Shira 10 (Horowitz-Rabin ed., p. 149); Shevuot 35b. (XXI-15, XXV-6, 11, 16)*
9. Berachot 4b. (XXI-2)*
10. Berachot 57a. A little pre-Freudian psychological insight, I presume. (XXI-3, 4)*
11. Megillah 28a. (XXI-8)*
12. Ketubot 111a. (XXI-9, 10)*
13. Max Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, op. cit., p. 42.
14. Sifrei Nitzavim 305 (Finkelstein ed., p. 327). The next sentence literally reads, "This people will thereupon go astray (literally, rise up and go astray) after the alien gods" The midrash takes the word אֲשֶׁר out of context to make its point. (XXI-19)*
15. Pesachim 49a. (XXI-6)*
16. Nazir 29b and Gittin 58a. (XXI-11, 13)*

17. (XXI-12)*
18. Pesachim 13a. (XXI-14)*
19. Deuteronomy Rabbah 2:1. (XXI-16)*
20. Ibid., 2:10. (XXI-17)*
21. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, op. cit., p. 113.
22. Ibid.
23. Louis Jacobs, Jewish Values, London, Valentine, Mitchell & Co., 1960, p. 86.
24. Sifra Acharei Mot, Perek 13:11. (XXIII-11)*
25. Psalm 118:8 -- "It is better to take refuge (לחסות) in the Lord than to trust (בטוח) in mortals." Psalm 146:3 -- "Put not your trust (אל תבטחו) in the great."
26. Midrash Tanhuma, Tazriah #9. (XXIII-9)*
27. Sanhedrin 7a. (XX-18)*
28. Genesis Rabbah 89:3 (Mirkin ed., Vol. 4, pp. 78-79). (XX-6)*
See also Genesis Rabbah 88:7 (Mirkin ed., Vol. 4, p. 73).
God is depicted as more reliable and more patient than men, in contrast particularly to the cupbearer who forgot Joseph.
29. Deuteronomy Rabbah 5:9 (Mirkin ed., Vol. 9, pp. 90-91). (XX-7)*
30. Midrash Psalms 141:1. (XX-10)*
31. (XXI-1)*
32. Agronomos = market official who checked weights and measures.
33. Yalkut Shimoni, Re'eh, #892. (XX-3)*
34. Yalkut Shimoni, Psalms, #719. (XX-9)*
35. (XXIII-2)* A parallel passage occurs in Yoma 9b.
36. Max Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, op. cit., p. 43.
37. (XXIII-15)*

38. Yalkut Shimoni, Psalms, #643 -- " 'And they that know Thy name will put their trust in Thee.' Why? 'For Thou, O Lord, hast not forsaken them that seek Thee.' " (Psalm 9:11).
39. Yalkut Shimoni, Psalms, #714, quoted in Werblowsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 115-116. See also Yalkut Shimoni, Isaiah, #473. (XX-4)* This is one of the few examples of כְּכֹל being ascribed to the people of Israel as a whole.
40. Talmud Jerusalmi, Berachot 9:1. (XXIII-12)*
41. Numbers 20:14-18.
42. Mekilta Beshallah 2 (Horowitz-Rabin ed., pp. 91-93). Certain phrases are found in the Lauterbach ed. (Vol. II, p. 207) and in the Romm edition, but not in Horowitz-Rabin: the Psalm 44:7 and Psalm 145:18 proof-texts. I include them because I think they clarify the point. (XX-16)*
43. Midrash Psalms 118:11. (Buber ed., p. 484). The translation is Braude's. The text is rather problematic, so I quote here notes Braude makes to his translation. a -- "So PE. ET reads 'or in the words of his master.' ET goes on to say, 'saying: Because my father was righteous, I shall be delivered in his righteousness.' But these words, not in PE, are omitted here as extraneous." b -- "Throughout the story ET has Haran as the one who is to be cast in the fire and Abraham as the one out of whom the whole world is to be peopled. But this reading is unlikely." c -- "By a play on words, *Ur* is frequently rendered 'fire' and 'fiery furnace,' into which Abraham was cast." ET = Buber edition, which I used here. PE = edition of Aaron Moses Padua (Warsaw, 1865). (XX-13c)*
44. Although כֹּל is not used here, the relationship I suggest here is the one I believe obtains between the two concept-terms. See p.145 for a more extensive discussion.
45. (XX-5)*
46. Lamentations Rabbah, Proem #24. (XX-17)*
47. Braude translates this phrase, "take care not to be diverted from Him for one instant." Either translation is plausible, and neither changes the basic sense.
48. Midrash Psalms 62:3. (XX-11)*

49. Ibid. (XX-12)* A parallel passage may be found in Menachot 29b. See Footnote 37.
50. Yalkut Shimoni, Isaiah, #473. See Footnote 39. I interpret the word בושה as broader than the usual translation "humiliation."
51. See Chapter 6, Footnotes 2 and 3. In the Genesis Rabbah passage, הבטחה may also be either parallel to אמנה or distinct in its meaning, as in our analysis of the Tanhuma passage. A third possibility is that הבטחה means "a promise," as in modern Hebrew. We examine the use of בטח in this sense in Part I of this chapter.
See p.142 for one aggadah where the schema I suggest is implicit.
52. A parallel passage occurs in Sifrei, Ekev, 43 (Finkelstein ed., p. 95).
53. Yalkut Shimoni, Bechukotai #682. (XXVI-1)*
54. Genesis Rabbah 76:2. (XXVI-1)*
55. Werblowsky, op. cit., p. 113.
56. Berachot 60a. (XXI-5, XXIII-1a)* A similar story is told about R. Pinhas. Although the root is not used, the attitude is clearly the same as Hillel's. The relationship of piety to the attitude of confident security is more explicit in this incident: Once there was a certain man who dug public wells. His daughter was on a journey; she came to cross a river and was drowned. Some people came and told R. Pinhas what had happened to this man's daughter. He said to them, "That's impossible. Since this man did the will of the Holy One, Blessed be He, by means of water, He would never destroy his daughter by water." Immediately a call went up in the city, "The well-digger's daughter has come!" Our Rabbis said, "When R. Pinhas b. Yair spoke as he did, an angel came down and brought her up. (V-10c)*
R. Pinhas maintains that the daughter of a pious man, one "who does the will of the Holy One, Blessed be He," would not suffer (i.e., be punished) in this manner. As an assertion of belief concerning God's justice, it perhaps should be considered more a matter of אמונה than of בטחון. If it were the well digger himself who had this attitude, it would clearly be an expression of בטחון in the manner of Hillel.

57. Werblowsky, op. cit., p. 115.
58. Genesis Rabbah 86:1 (Mirkin ed., Vol. 3, pp. 176-177). (XXV-1, 2)*
59. "lest one forget them." (Werblowsky, op. cit., p. 114).
60. Soncino translation. (XXIII-lab)* (See Footnote 56).
 I phrase this negatively because בטחון is being counter-posed against fear. בטחון, then, indicates confidence that nothing bad will happen or that, very generally, things will go well. I find no indication that בטחון is associated with an attitude that our efforts will be particularly successful, that we will prosper.
 R. Akiba, whom we saw at the end of Chapter 6 as the epitome of faith, and Nahum of Gamzu exhibit a related attitude. Their feeling is that "all that God does is for the best. As R. Akiba puts it (Berachot 60b (XXIII-24)*):
 כל מה שעושה הקב"ה הכל לטובה
 And concerning Gamzu it is written (Taanit 21a (XXI-7)*):
 אמי קרו ליה נחום גם זוז וכל מילחא דהוה סלקא ליה אמי, גם זוז לטובה.
 This is conceptually similar to בטח, in the sense that no harm can really come to a righteous man, and even more closely related to the אמן of the individual. But neither root is used here, so we cannot directly associate them.
61. Werblowsky, op. cit., p. 115.
62. Midrash Tanhuma, Chukat #25. (XXV-4)*
63. Mekilta, Amalek 2 (Horowitz-Rabin ed., p. 185). (XXV-3)*
64. Berachot 6b. (XX-2)* The verse has been moved to clarify the sense of the passage.
65. Werblowsky, op. cit., p. 109.
66. Ibid., p. 113.
67. Louis Jacobs, Jewish Values, op. cit., Chapter 6.
68. Werblowsky, op. cit.

CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, let me summarize briefly the major usages of *בְּרִית* and *אֲמִתּוּת*, compare the two terms, and discuss the implications of my findings for an understanding of rabbinic views on religious faith.

In conducting this analysis, we will find Eugene Borowitz's notion of the "covenantal dialectic" in rabbinic thought a useful hermeneutic. Jewish thought, Borowitz finds, is rooted in a bifocal premise:

God-Israel is the primal term of Judaism Yet the two partners, both affirmed as necessary to all that follows, are substantially different in character. God is infinite and universal; Israel is particular and historic. The demands and needs of the one . . . can easily differ from the other. Yet, they stand in relationship Thus, because he has a two-faceted primary belief, any Jewish thinker, responding to a situation or a personal need, may legitimately interpret Jewish truth from the aspect of either partner in the Covenant. . . . Jewish thought is thus fundamentally dipolar in character and . . . (the) common pattern is to speak from the point of view of either God's or Israel's needs in the Covenant."¹

This conception of rabbinic thought is helpful to understand not only specific usages of our terms, but also the range of usage as well. For, although *בְּרִית* and *אֲמִתּוּת* are both terms descriptive of the covenant relationship, the breadth of their usage differs considerably. *בְּרִית* is a far more extensive term. It is used to describe, in great depth, both sides of the covenant relationship, the human and the divine, and,

in addition, strongly suggests the linkage of the two: **נבט** , on the other hand, focuses predominantly on the human side of the dialectic.

יזא is the broader of the two terms in other senses as well. Unlike **נבט** , which focuses almost exclusively on the divine-human relationship, **יזא** is used commonly to describe interactions between human beings. The range of connotations within each level of human experience is broader for **יזא** , and the analogies between connotations at various levels may be more clearly and explicitly perceived. Finally, the Rabbis, like the Bible, see **יזא** from two perspectives: **יזא** is used both in a "subjective," active sense of "placing trust, believing" and in an "objective," reflective sense of "trustworthy, reliable, believed." The Rabbis apply both senses to human beings, but to God primarily the objective usage. **נבט** , on the other hand, is used exclusively in the subjective, internal sense of "depending on" or "being secure."

יזא used to describe human interaction exhibits a range or spectrum of related connotations. Several of these connotations may then be found in **יזא** as applied to God and to people in the divine-human relationship. To summarize briefly,

יזא is used extensively, in both halachic and aggadic passages, with the meaning of cognitive belief that a statement or assertion is true. Cognitive belief and personal trust become linked, suggesting that belief in a statement and trust in a person have a bearing on each other. **יזא** is then used in a general,

abstract sense of trust in a person. Finally, that trust focuses on specific obligations in a relationship. **אמן** in this sense is used "subjectively" -- "to place trust in someone," and "objectively" -- "to be reliable, trustworthy, honest" in the fulfilment of obligations.

The latter, objective sense is the dominant meaning applied to God in His relationship with human beings. The Rabbis deal with the divine-human relationship in two aspects, related but distinct. With little overlap, aggadot deal either with the corporate body of the people of Israel or with individual persons. Interestingly, the Rabbis devote greater attention to God's **אמנה** (faithfulness) towards individuals, in contrast to the Biblical emphasis on the nation. **אמן** applied to God in his relationship with individuals primarily means that He faithfully/reliably rewards righteous acts and punishes misdeeds. Faced with a reality in which the righteous often suffer while the wicked prosper, the Rabbis broaden and deepen the concept. God is considered reliably just whether His actions appear fair to us or not. His justice is felt to continue into the next world, where He may be counted on to reliably and justly fulfil His promise of reward and punishment.

God's **אמנה** towards the people consists similarly in His faithfully carrying out His promises to Israel made in consequence of the covenant. God demonstrates His faithfulness by actions of salvation and providential care experienced by the people as historical events.

As we might expect, the most extensive and detailed discussion of **אֱמוּנָה** concerns human attitudes towards God. Again a distinction is drawn between national and individual

אֱמוּנָה. How does **אֱמוּנָה** reside in a corporate body? The nation's faith is evinced in situations which affect the people as a whole. Such **אֱמוּנָה** is expressed in relation to the nation's actions or destiny. An individual's faith, on the other hand, focuses on personal fate and deeds.

אֱמוּנָה applied to the people refers to Israel's trust in God, sometimes described as a general, abstract truth, but more often as a concrete trust that He will guide and protect them in fulfilment of His covenantal promises. **אֱמוּנָה** may thus be found at either pole of the covenantal dialectic. God is seen as a faithful, reliable God (**הָאֵל הַנֶּאֱמָן**); the people place their trust in Him (**אֶמְצִינִים בּוֹ**). The relationship is personal, concrete, and reciprocal: The people place their trust in God because they frequently experience His power wrought on their behalf in faithful fulfilment of His covenantal obligations to them. He has shown Himself to be a God worthy of trust; the people therefore trust Him (or, in error, fail to have faith in Him).

How does Israel's faith manifest itself? Primarily by faithfulness to their covenantal obligations, that is, by obedience to God's commands. Again, we see the covenantal dialectic at work -- **אֱמוּנָה** means faithfulness to the obligations of the covenant, related sometimes to one partner, at

other times to the other. Though the two poles are rarely explicitly linked, the covenantal dialectic enables us to see the intense reciprocity of the covenant relationship which the term יֵדָוָה embodies. The reciprocity is imbalanced; God's faithfulness inspires Israel's, not the other way around. But this is understandable, given the imbalance of the relationship between an infinite deity and finite human beings.

The Rabbis devote considerable attention to the rewards God gives the people for their faith and faithfulness. Since יֵדָוָה refers largely to trust in God and obedience to His word in the context of the covenant, the significance of the emphasis on rewards is clear. The many aggadot detailing the rewards are implicit exhortations to the people to retain their faith, their commitment to the covenant, and their hope for the vindication of their faith.

יֵדָוָה applied to individuals, like that of the nation, also refers to trust in God. The trust covers a broad range of concerns and takes the form of confidence that God keeps His word and provides providential care and protection. A major manifestation of individual יֵדָוָה is faithfulness to God's word. However, Rudolph Bultmann² and other scholars³ considerably overestimate the degree to which faith in the rabbinic literature may be equated with obedience to the law. Faithfulness is, indeed, an important expression of יֵדָוָה. There are, furthermore, a few aggadot which directly associate יֵדָוָה with the performance of mitzvot. They are, however,

very small in number and cannot be seen to be describing a major manifestation of faith, let alone the primary one. The dominant emphasis of rabbinic discussions of *emunah* is the subjective sense of a comprehensive trust in God's benevolence and power.

Furthermore, there are other significant forms and manifestations of *emunah* not related to faithfulness. A major form of the faith of the individual is trust in the justice of God's actions even when they appear cruel and unfair to us. Faith in this sense is trust in God maintained in the face of a harsh and discouraging reality. There are only a few aggadot which clearly describe the *emunah* of the individual in these terms. But the covenantal dialectic can help us to gauge the importance of this theme. We saw that God's faithfulness to His promises of reward and punishment is a common rabbinic theme. We further saw that the Rabbis strive to demonstrate the reliability of God's justice in the face of the contradictory evidence people see around them. The covenantal dialectic enables us to see this as the reciprocal, divine pole of these aggadot which define individual *emunah* as trust in God's reliable justice. The reciprocal linkage of these dialectic statements of the same theme reveal this conception of *emunah* to be one of great significance to the Rabbis.

Faith as belief in God's justice despite appearances is quite close to the modern, neo-Pauline conception. To a certain extent in rabbinic thought, faith enters when we do not have empirical evidence, when our experience does not

provide a basis to trust God, when we do not know (See Chapter 6, p. 93). We must not overstate the prominence of this conception in rabbinic thought. The dominant rabbinic conception of **יָדָא** is clearly trust in God's benevolent and protective power. But it is a significant rabbinic idea which has been all but ignored by scholars of rabbinic theology.

Another somewhat rare, but significant form of **יָדָא** has similarly been dismissed or given scant attention. **יָדָא** is sometimes used in the sense of cognitive belief in something which has not been experienced. Three such rabbinic "dogmas" are described in association with **יָדָא** -- resurrection of the dead, the final redemption, and the giving of the Oral Law. This finding runs counter to the commonly held belief that the Rabbis were concerned only with deeds, never beliefs.⁴

Lastly, **יָדָא** is often used in a very comprehensive, existential, and practical sense of total reliance on God. The faith of the individual is frequently defined as a passive dependence on God's power and assistance to provide one's daily care and sustenance. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky⁵ and Louis Jacobs⁶ erroneously ascribe this attitude to **יִסְחָרְיָהּ**, probably because, as we shall see, it is closer to the characteristics of **נִסָּא** than to what we have seen in the connotations of

יָדָא. This is an ideal form of **יָדָא** urged by some Tannaim, especially R. Eleazar of Modi'im and R. Simeon b. Yochai, but opposed by the more balanced, majority view that people must labor to provide for themselves.

Rabbinic discussion of the **יֵד** of human beings seems about evenly divided between personal faith and national faith. I see little evidence to support Martin Buber's statement: "The personal Emunah of every individual remains embodied in that of the nation and draws its strength from the living memory of generations in great leadings of early times."⁷ Certainly the national experiences of God's saving and protecting power provide a strong, implicit basis on which to place trust in God, for both Israel and individuals. But the faith of the individual must be considered distinct from that of the nation. Its concerns, while similar to the nation's, have a completely different focus and often a radically different form, particularly the trust in the reliable operation of God's justice and the assertion of certain creedal beliefs.

It is important, at this point, to comment on Buber's overall conception of **אמונה**, since it is a well-known and influential analysis. Buber's basic notions are, I believe, quite accurate and perceptive. Within a covenanted people, which has experienced God's guidance, a Jew's faith, Buber writes, "is a perseverance in trust in the guiding and covenanting Lord." Buber contrasts this with Christian pistis: "To the man needing salvation in the despondent hour, salvation is offered if only he will believe that it (the Kingdom of God) has happened and has happened (by means of Jesus)."⁸ That is to say, Emunah is "trust in" and pistis is "belief that." Furthermore, Buber perceptively points out the personal,

reciprocal nature of the יֵדָא relationship between human beings and God. He notes the two major aspects of יֵדָא -- "fidelity," which we have termed the "objective" sense of reliability or faithfulness, and "trust," which we have called the "subjective" usage.⁹ These ideas accord with our conclusions in this study.

But Buber has an unfortunate tendency to read too much of his own brand of existentialism into the term. At one point, for example, he describes Emunah as the "immediacy of the whole man directed towards the whole God, that which is revealed in Him and that which is hidden, . . . the great trust in God as He is, in God be He as He may."¹⁰ While יֵדָא in the rabbinic literature is often this open, general, "existential" trust, it is far more often concrete expectations that God will take certain fairly specific actions. Clearly יֵדָא is more experiential and more comprehensive than the cognitive, intellectual "belief that" implied by the term pistis;¹¹ in this sense Buber's distinction is valid. But יֵדָא is more often a specific "trust that" than the broad, undifferentiated, I-Thou "trust in" Buber seems to limit the term to.

The explanation for Buber's approach is quite simple. Buber uses the term Emunah ("faith") as we would today in a phrase like "the Jewish faith," that is, as a synonym for the religion as a whole. Buber does not use the term Emunah with a view towards delineating precisely how it was used in the Bible or rabbinic literature, but rather to embrace the entire

range of ways human beings relate to God. This is clear, for example, when Buber applies Emunah to the relationship of human beings to God described in Deuteronomy 6:4ff.¹² Buber's distinction, therefore, is of limited usefulness in seeking to understand the rabbinic conception of אמן .

בטח , like אמן , exhibits levels and spectra of usage.

בטח is applied in the hiphi'l form (הִפְסִיחַ) to God, and sometimes to people, in the everyday mundane sense of the word, "promise." God makes explicit promises of the kind he implicitly fulfils when described as נֶאֱמָן, but this association is never made directly in aggadot I found. At the next level, the form מוֹבִטח ("to be certain") appears frequently. Most often it refers to a person who, because he is a righteous person in general or because of certain deeds he has performed, may be sure that he will find a place in the world to come. Other deeds are seen to make a person certain of other results, e.g. if his daughter marries a scholar, a person may be sure his descendants will be scholars.

The primary and dominant usage of בטח describes a comprehensive, concrete, ultimate reliance on God and the resultant inner state of confident security. This reliance is discussed, at one level, in a general abstract sense, often in unfavorable comparison to reliance on other people or things. The major expression of בטח involves reliance on God for personal security and safety from harm in our daily lives. In a few passages, the reliance urged seems even more comprehensive, and focuses on a person's general well-being.

This reliance leads to an inner sense of security and confidence in facing one's daily affairs. Fear and anxiety are seen as impious signs of lack of reliance on God, except to the extent that a person might fear that his sins have caused him to forfeit God's protection. The emphasis of

בטח is strongly on security and safety from harm. It is reliance on God to protect us and generally manage the course of our lives for our benefit. It does not seem to imply, as R. J. Zwi Werblowsky and Louis Jacobs assert,¹³ practical reliance on God to conduct out daily affairs, such as providing us with sustenance or curing us of illness.

Clearly, אמן has a more extensive range of usage and the associations between levels of usage are more directly and more clearly drawn than is true of בטח. Furthermore, while the levels of usage of אמן are largely transpersonal, those of בטח are primarily personal and internal. The major difference we can see in the levels of connotations of בטח is the depth of the human self which the attitude engages.

מוכנס is largely intellectual and somewhat emotional; בטח is more truly existential, involving the whole self at fundamental levels. Even when one's life is involved in both attitudes, מוכנס is to be sure something will happen, בטח is to actually place one's life on the line.

The different way the Rabbis use אמן and בטח is, I believe, quite revealing of the distinction they are making between the attitudes the terms define. אמן seems to be the

more extensive and comprehensive of these two terms describing rabbinic conceptions of human attitudes towards God. Its nuances and connotations are more completely and more extensively developed. It covers a broader range of both divine action and human response. **אמונה** involves trust in God over a broad range of individual and national expectations, and faithfulness to His word in a wide area of human behavior. It is a basic, primary term embodying the fundamental, reciprocal commitment to the covenant relationship binding God and His people.

But **חבה** is the more intensive and more personal of the two attitudes. It does not embrace as wide an area of a person's life. The sphere of human activity it describes is more limited and it does not deal with the individual as a part of the people. It tells us little about divine action. But **חבה** is the more personally comprehensive, existential of the two attitudes. **אמונה** is trust that God will do something. It very often leads to human deeds expressing reliance on God's power, but the focus is on the human expectations of divine action. Even when the actions are not forthcoming, the attitude, the trust, persists, its focus transferred to another realm. Although, as Buber has pointed out, it is an attitude deeper than cognitive belief, it is primarily an attitude of mind and emotions.

חבה engages the entire person, the entire self. Its focus is on the inner state of being and the actions of the person, rather than on his expectations of divine action.

In placing his reliance on God, a person literally offers his life into God's hands. The Rabbis know and approve that people rely on the assistance of other people; **בטח** has the connotation of a fundamental, ultimate grounding of one's life in God's protective care.

The attitudes are clearly related concepts, but the Rabbis do not explicitly delineate what the relationship is. I would describe it in these terms: **אמן** expresses a deep and abiding trust in God's power and care. On the basis of that trust, a person places his reliance (**בטח**) on God, trusting Him to protect and assist him. If the reliance (**בטח**) turns out to be in vain, if some harm befalls the person, he still has faith (**אמן**) that God's actions are just and for his benefit.

The attitudes thoroughly merge, under the rubric of **אמן** , in one significant area of life. As we have seen, several Rabbis term people **מחוסרי אמונה** if they fail to rely on God to provide them with sustenance. This is a practical, concrete, total reliance on God more characteristic of the connotations of **בטח** than of **אמן** . This seems to indicate that the Rabbis understood the close relationship of the two attitudes. **אמן** as a term absorbs the concept of **בטח** and indeed becomes the comprehensive word for the total attitude of human trust in God.

It is important to compare the rabbinic usages of **אמן** and **בטח** to those in the Bible, which are, in a sense, their

foundations. The Rabbis operate very substantially from the base of the Biblical connotations of these terms. Just about all of the meanings found in the Bible are also found in the Aggadah. The Rabbis, though, considerably extend the applications of יֵאֱמָר and אֱמָנָה, and deepen their meaning.

The congruence of connotations of יֵאֱמָר between the two bodies of literature is especially strong concerning the people of Israel and their relationship to God. In both, the primary sense of the יֵאֱמָר of the people is confident trust in God, His promises and beneficence, as well as covenantal faithfulness to His word. The Rabbis indicate the great significance they attach to the term by extending its application to events with which the Bible does not associate יֵאֱמָר. (See, for example, Chapter 5, pp.70 - 73) They also add considerable personal depth to the Biblical conception and make clearer the reciprocal relationship involved, largely through the device of the mashal. The major rabbinic extension of the Biblical usage is to describe יֵאֱמָר in several aggadot in terms of a comprehensive, existential trust that leads us to total reliance on God's power. (See Chapter 5, pp.80 - 81)

God's יֵאֱמָר for the Rabbis retains the Biblical sense of His faithfulness and steadfast concern towards His people. But far more than the Bible, the Rabbis emphasize God's יֵאֱמָר towards individuals, as His faithfulness/reliability to reward and punish.

In fact, the major distinction between rabbinic and Biblical usages of אמן is the far greater stress the Rabbis place on individual אמן, in contrast to the Bible's clear emphasis on the corporate experience of the people of Israel. At the inter-human level, both the Bible and the Rabbis use אמן to mean both belief and personal trust between people. But the Rabbis add an aspect not found in the Bible, applying אמן to the reciprocal, contractual relationship of business transactions.

Even more importantly, the Rabbis extensively discuss אמן as personal trust in God concerning one's individual fate, a sense rarely found in the Bible. The significant concept of faith in God's justice despite a contradictory reality is very rare in the Bible and not nearly as explicitly stated. (See Chapter 2, p. 21.) Similarly, the association of אמן with trust in God for sustenance is not found in the Bible. The sharp, related condemnation of those who lack faith (מחוסרי אמונה), common in rabbinic literature, is also not found in the Bible, as Isaac Heinemann points out.¹⁴ Finally, the creedal sense of אמן, which the Rabbis sometimes use, is not found in the Bible.

There is considerable congruence between rabbinic and Biblical connotations of בטח. Both emphasize personal reliance on God for physical security, in contrast to reliance on human beings and human creations. Both also describe בטח in terms of the inner feeling of security, contrasted with fear,

that this reliance inspires. Although בטח, like אמן, has a somewhat more personal, subjective sense for the Rabbis that for the Bible, the expansion and development of the term is far less extensive than for אמן.

What do these two terms, אמן and בטח, tell us about rabbinic notions of religious faith. We cannot make any firm judgments about the relative importance of faith, i.e., is it more or less important a religious concept for the Rabbis than מצוות, 'יראת ה', etc. It is debatable whether this kind of assessment can ever be accurately made, given the scope and complexity of rabbinic thought. The linguistic conceptual methodology employed in this study does support the conclusion that אמן is the more common and more extensive term than בטח. But without studying other terms such as 'יראת שמים, 'אהבת ה', קבלת עול מלכות שמים, etc., we cannot determine precisely the position trust in God occupies within the overall rabbinic conception of the relationship between human beings and God.

There are, nevertheless, significant conclusions we can make about the place of faith in rabbinic thought. אמן must be considered a fundamental rabbinic concept about the human-divine relationship, for it underlies, indeed embodies the primary relationship between human beings and God, the covenant. As Eugene Borowitz points out, Israel-God is the primal term of Judaism and rabbinic thought may be characterized by a

covenantal dialectic moving between these two poles. In a very real sense, ḥesed is the epitome of the covenant relationship and the expression par excellence of the covenantal dialectic.

Applied to God, ḥesed indicates that He reliably carries out His obligations that arise out of the covenant relationship. Applied to Israel, ḥesed refers to their abiding trust in God that He is faithful to the covenant, and then expresses their own faithful obedience to the covenant which that trust inspires.

Like the Biblical covenant itself, ḥesed is substantially rooted in concrete acts of divine salvation, experienced as historical events. The paradigm of Israel's faith and faithfulness (as well as of their absence) is the Exodus experience. But it seems that, for the Rabbis, the faith which is urged on the people of Israel is no longer felt to be something that is literally rooted in their own experiences. Even a casual reading of the relevant aggadot shows that in the middle-late Tannaitic period (and possibly the late Amoraic as well),¹⁵ there was widespread doubt about whether God's saving power was still working on Israel's behalf.

Thus we see aggadot urging Israel to trust God on the basis of His past acts of salvation, if they cannot trust Him on the basis of His promises for the future (Chapter 5, pp. 70-72). Other aggadot indicate that, had their faith been sufficiently strong, Israel might never have been subjugated to Rome and the other nations (Chapter 6, pp. 91-92). This conclusion

may also explain why certain of the Sages say that it is obvious that Israel should trust God when they experience the miracles of the Exodus. The implication is that it is less obvious and more important to have faith even in the absence of such experiences (Chapter 5, p. 83). In fact, the whole range of aggadot we have examined, praising Israel's faith during the Exodus, lauding the people as ^{מַאֲמִינִים בְּנֵי} _{מַאֲמִינִים}, criticizing the lack of durability of their faith, and listing extensively the rewards of faith, are probably exhortations to faith directed at the people suffering under the domination and persecutions of Rome.

Israel suffers, Rome prospers in ascendance over God's covenanted people, where is His promised protection and saving power? These have been experienced in the past, the Rabbis are teaching, therefore Israel must continue to trust in their God. The clearest, most dramatic statement of this theme is made by R. Akiba (Chapter 6, p. 115; Chapter 7, p. 148). Akiba's faith is even bolder and more profound than the conception just stated. His faith that God will redeem His people according to His covenantal promises is based not on past acts of salvation, but on the experiences of destruction and subjugation themselves. Just as He has brought the punishments He swore to bring upon the rebellious people, Akiba believes, so will He bring the redemption He promised as well.

The religious faith of the individual person also seems to be a major concern of the Rabbis, more so than for the Bible.

The concept of נִסְמָךְ (and one sense of יִסְמָךְ) imply that we should ground our everyday activities in a sense of ultimate reliance on God's assistance. This does not eliminate the importance of human effort, reliance on other people, or assistance to our fellow human beings. But there is an underlying sense that all these are ephemeral and, in the last analysis, unreliable. While depending on our own efforts, our friends, and human creations, we must remain aware that our ultimate security and success lie in reliance on God's power and care.

יִסְמָךְ also extensively underlies an individual's life, especially in the religious and moral spheres. Like that of the nation, individual יִסְמָךְ expresses the covenantal dialectic -- trust in God's providential care and abundant rewards, faithfulness to His word. More significantly, rabbinic יִסְמָךְ implies a certain world view. The world in general and human affairs in particular are ordered by God in a just, reliable manner, whether this is clear to us or not. The Biblical models dear to the Rabbis demonstrate that when we place our trust in God to fulfil his promises, our trust is vindicated, regardless of our own actions. We can trust in God's goodness, His beneficent care, and particularly His justice, even when unfortunate events in our lives and in those of the people around us cast doubt on God's justice.

Though substantially considered a matter of experienced reality, this faith is also powerfully asserted without the

basis of empirical evidence, often in the face of disheartening and painful realities of life. As we saw concerning the faith of the people, the Rabbis, I believe, are seeking to demonstrate how God's justice and providence may be considered concrete, experienced reality even when people do not literally feel this to be the case.

Their problem, then, is not so significantly different from our own in the modern era of Holocaust and other examples of God's apparent silence. Their solutions, pointing largely to life in the world to come, may be difficult for most of us today to accept. But their endeavor to perceive God's faithfulness as experienced reality worthy of trust is an admirable and thoroughly Jewish response to the problem.

This thesis has delineated significant aspects of rabbinic views on religious faith. The two terms examined, however, are but a part of a larger picture, part of the broad and complex matrix of rabbinic discussions of the relationship between human beings and God. This study is, therefore, just the beginning of a broader examination of faith in rabbinic literature, from which we might be able to derive guidance for our own search for a contemporary understanding of religious faith.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 8

1. Eugene B. Borowitz, "Covenant Theology -- Another Look," Worldview, March, 1973, p. 25.
2. Bultmann and Weiser, op. cit., Chapter 5.
3. See, for example, Edmond Jacob, op. cit., p. 174, and E. C. Blackman, op. cit., p. 228.
4. See Louis Jacobs, Faith, op. cit., p. 5; G. F. Moore, op. cit., p. 238; Israel Abrahams, op. cit.
5. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, op. cit., pp. 110-111.
6. Louis Jacobs, Jewish Values, op. cit., Chapter 6.
7. Martin Buber, Two Types of Faith, op. cit., p. 171. In Buber is referring to יָדָע only in the Bible, I have no quarrel with what he says. My disagreement arises from my analysis of the rabbinic material.
8. Ibid., p. 11.
9. Ibid., p. 29.
10. Ibid., p. 154.
11. I am, of course, referring here to the dominant rabbinic sense of יָדָע which we have discerned. There is, as we saw, a small number of cases in which יָדָע is used in the sense of cognitive belief. They also indicate the limited usefulness of Buber's distinction.
12. Buber, op. cit., pp. 130-131.
13. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, op. cit., p. 113; Louis Jacobs, op. cit.
14. Heinemann, op. cit.
15. We can date some of the aggadot which make this point by the Sages whose names are mentioned. Most are Tannaim: R. Akiba (T2), R. Shimon b. Yochai (T3), R. Meir (T3), R. Johanan (T3), R. Yitzhak (T4). Two Amoraim are mentioned at the ends of chains of tradition which stretch back to late Tannaim: R. Chelbo (A4) and R. Berechiah (A5).

APPENDIX I: Hebrew Sources Cited

Chapter 3

III-16. "אנה אנחנו עולים אחינו הכסו את לבבנו לאמר" (דברים א:כח) – אמרו לו משה רבינו אילו מבני אחרים היינו שומעים דברים הללו לא היינו מאמינים אלא מבני אדם שבנינו בניהם ובנותינו בנותיהם.

ספרי דברים כ"ה (34-5)

III-18 בשנה אחת מתו משה ואהרן וכריס שוב לא מצאו ישראל נח רוח אחרי משה שנאמר "ואכחיד את שלשת הרועים בירח אחד." (זכריה י"א: ח). וכי בירח אחד מתו והלא בשנה אחת מתו שנאמר "נדיבי עמים נאספו עם אלהי אברהם." (תהילים מז:י) אלא מתה מרים בטלה הבאר וחזרה בזכות משה ואהרן מת בכל עמוד הענן וחזרו שניהם בזכות משה מת מש ה בטלו שלשתם ולא חזרו. באותה שעה היו ישראל נפוצים וערומים מכל מצות. נתקבצו כל ישראל אצל משה ואמרו לו אהרן אחיך היכן הוא אמר להם אלהים גנזו לחיי העולם הבא ולא היו מאמינים לו אמרו לו אנו יודעים בך שאכזרי אתה שמא אמר לפניך דבר שאינו הגון וקנסת עליו מיחה מה עשה הקב"ה הביא מטחו של אהרן וחלאת בשמי שמים והיה הקב"ה עומד בהספר עליו ומלאכי השת עונים אחריו ומה היו אומרים "תורת אמת היתה בפינו וגו'" (מלאכי ב:ו)

ספרי נצבים ש"ה (326)

III-9 "ושעריך לאבני אקדח." (ישעיה נ"ד:י"ב) כי הא דיתבי רבי יוחנן וקא דריש עתיד הקב"ה להביא אבנים טובות ומרגליות שהם שלשים על שלשים וחוקק בהן עשר על עשרים ומעמידן בשערי ירושלים לגלג עליו אותו התלמיד השחא כביעתא דציצלא לא משכחין כולי האי משכחין לימים הפליגה ספינתו בים הוא מלאכי השת דיתבי וקא מינסרי אבנים טובות ומרגליות שהם ל' על ל' וחוקק בהן עשר ברום עשרים אמר להו הני למאן אמרו ליה שעתידי הקב"ה להעמידן בשערי ירושלים אחא לקמיה דרבי יוחנן אמר ליה דרוש רבי לך נאה לדרוש כאשר אמרת כן ואיתי. אמר לו ריקא אלמלא לא ראיח לא האמנח. מלגלג על דברי חכמים אתה. נתן עיניו בו ונעשה גל של עצמות.

בבא בתרא ע"ה

For III-35bc, see Chapter 5.

III-22 "וה" נתן את חן העם בעיני מצרים וישאלום וינצלו את מצרים" (שמות י"ב:ל"א) כמשמעו לא הספיק לומר השאילני עד שהוא פוצאי ונותן לו דברי ר' ישמעאל. ר' יוסי הגלילי אומר האמינו בם משלש ימי האפילה שהיו אומרים מה אם בשעה שהיינו באפילה והם באורה לא נחשדו ועכשיו הן נחשדין.

מכילתא בא פרשה י"ג (47)

V-23 "ויאמר אם שמע חשמע לקול ה' אלהיך והישר בעיניו תעשה והאזנת למצותיו ושמרת כל חקיו כל המחלה אשר שיתי במצוריים לא אשים עליך כי אני ה' ושאך." (שמות טו:כ"ו) – "והישר בעיניו תעשה" – זה משא ומתן מלמד שכל מי שנושא ונותן באמונה ורוח הבריות נוחה הימנו מעלין עליו כאילו קיים את כל התורה כולה.

מכילתא מטכתא דיוסע בשלח א
(158)

V-25 ואם לא למד כל צרכו יעשה מעשיו באמונה. אמר אליהו זכורנו לברכה פעם אחת הייתי מהלך בדרך ומצאתי אדם אחד והיה מלעיג לי ומחלוצץ בי. אמרתי לו מה אתה משיב ליום הדין אחר שלא למדת תורה. אמר יש לי להשיב בינה ודעת ולב שלא נחננו לי מן השמים. אמרתי לו מה מלאכתך? אמר לי צייד עופות ודגים אני. אמרתי לו מי נתן לך דעת ולב ליקח פשתן ולטווחו ולארגו ולעשות המצודות ולקחת בהן דגים ועופות ולמכרם. אמר לי בינה ודעת שנחננו לי מן השמים. אמרתי לו ליקח את הפשתן לארגו ולטווח ולקחת הדגים והעופות נחננו לך בינה ודעת אבל לקנות את ההורה לא נחננו לך בינה וכתוב "וכי קרוב אליך הדבר מאד בפיך ובלבבך לעשותו." (דברים ל': י"ד). מיד הורה בלבו והרים קולו בבכי. אמרי לו בני אל ירע לך שכל באי העולם כיון שבאין וגמשיכין מן החורה מוכיחין עליהם שנאמר "ובשו עבדי פשתיפ שריקות וארגים חורי" (ישעיה י"ט: ט) עליו ועל כיוצא בו ואל הדומים לו ועל העורין כמעשיו "ואחריית דבר יראת ה'" ועוין באמונה בו ומונה מלאכתו וראוי לחיי העוה"ב.

מדרש תנחומא וילך ב

V-10d מעשה בר' שמעון בן שטח, שלקח חמור אחד מישמעאלי אחד. הלכו חלמיריו ומצאו בו אבן אחת תלויה לו בצוארו, אמרו לו, רבי, "ברכת ה' היא תעשיר." (משלי י': כ"ב) אמר להם ר' שמעון בן שטח: חמור לקחתי, אבן טובה לא לקחתי. הלך והחזירה לאותו ישמעאלי, וקרא עליו אותו ישמעאלי: ברוך ה' אלהי שמעון בן שטח. הוי: מאמונתו של בשר ודם אחת יודע אמונתו של הקב"ה, שנאמן לשלם לישראל שכר מצות שהן עושין. מניין - "ושמרת את המצוה." (דברים ז': י"א). אבל מתן שכר - "והיה עקב חשמעון." בעקב אני פורע לכם.

דברים רבה ג:

IV-27 א"ל זונין לר"ע לבי ולבך ידע דעבודת כוכבים לית בה משא והא קחזינן גברי דאולי כי מחברי ואהו כי מצמדי מ"ס אמר לו אמשול לך משל למה"ד לאדם נאמן שהיה בעיר וכל בני עירו היו מפקידין אצלו שלא בעדים ובא אדם אחד והפקיד לו בעדים פעם אחד שכת והפקיד אצלו שלא בעדים אמרה לו אשתו בוא ונכפרנו אמר לה וכי מפני ששואה זה עשה שלא כהוגן אנו נאבד את אמונתינו. אף כך יסורין בשעה שמשגדין אוהן על האדם משביעין אותן שלא הלכו אלא ביום פלוגי ולא חצאו אלא ביום פלוגי ובשעה פלוגית ועל ידי פלוגי ועל ידי סם פלוגי כיון שהגיע זמן לצאת הלך זה לבית עבודת כוכבים אמרו יסורין דין הוא שלא נצא וחוזרין ואומרים וכי מפני ששואה זה עושה שלא כהוגן אנו נאבד שבועתנו והיינו דא"ר יוחנן מאי דכתיב "וחלים רעים ונאמנים." רעים בשליחותן ונאמנים בשבועתן.

עבודה זרה נה.

V-13b "אל אמונה", בעל הפקדון, "ואין עול", גובה שלו באחרונה שלא כמדת בשר ודם מדת הקב"ה מדת בשר ודם - מפקיד אצל חברו כיס של מאתים ויש לו אצלו מנה כשהוא בא ליסול את שלו אמר לו צא מנה שיש לי בידך והי לך את השאר. וכן פועל ושעשה אצל בעל הבית ויש לו בידו דינר כשהוא בא ליסול את שכרו אומר לו צא דינר שיש לי בידך והי לך את השאר, אבל מי שאמר והיה העולם אינו כן אלא "אל אמונה" בעל הפקדון "ואין עול" גובה את שלו באחרונה.

ספרי האזינו ש"ז (344-345)

V-10a "תפקדו אתם לצבאתם אתה ואהרן ואחכם יהיו איש איש למטה."
 דבר אחר: "האל הנאמן" (דברים ז:ט) - רבנין אמרי: מאמנתו של
 בשר ודם את יודע אמנתו של הקב"ה. מעשה בר' פינחס בן יאיר,
 שהיה דר בעיר אחת בדרום, והלכו אנשים להתפרנס שם והיו בידן שתי
 סאין של שעורים, והפקידו אצלו ושכחו אותן והלכו להן. והיה
 ר' פינחס בן יאיר זורע אותן בכל שנה ועושה אותן גרן וכונסן.
 אחר שבע שנים הלכו אותן החברים לשם לחבצ אותן לחן להן. מיד הכיר
 אותן ר' פינחס בן יאיר, אכר להם: כואו וטלו אוצרוהיכם. הרי
 מאמנתו של בשר ודם אתה יודע אמנתו של הקב"ה.

דברים רבה ג:

For IV-7, see Chapter 4.

IV-10 ("וימח שם משה עבד ה' בארץ מואב) על פי ה'." (דברים,
 ל"ד:ה) - כשהמקום נוטל נשמתם של צדיקים נוטלה מהם בנחת רוח
 משלו. משל למה הדבר דומה לאחד נאמן שהיה בעיר והיו הכל מפקידים
 אצלו פקדון כשבא אחד מהם לחבוע את שלו היה מוציא ונותן לו לפי
 שידע היכן הוא. וכשבא לשלוח ביד בנו ביד עבדו ביד שלוחו הופך
 תחתונים על העליונים לפי שאינו יודע היכן הוא. כך כשהמקום
 נוטל נשמתם של צדיקים נוטלה בנחת וכשהוא נוטל נשמתם של רשעים
 מוסרה למלאכים רעים למלאכים אכזריים כדי שיטמנו את נשמתם וכן
 הוא אומר "אך מרי יבקש רע) ומלאך אכזרי ישלח בו" (משלי יז:יא)
 ואומר "חמות בנוער נפשם." (איוב לו:י"ד)

ספרי וזאת הברכה שנ"ז (428)

Chapter 4

V-31 אח מוצא שמדות טובות של הקב"ה בהשפע בפרוי ורבו.
הטוב ברבוי החדד ברבוי הרחמים ברבוי הצדקה ברבוי האמונה
ברבוי הפדות ברבוי הברכה ברבוי השבח ברבוי השלום ברבוי...
האמונה ברבוי שנאמר "חדשים לבקרים רבה אמונתך." (איכה ג:כג)
מדרש מגילת אסתר י:טו

V-34 "לדור ודור אנומתך כוננת ארץ ותעמד" (ההילים קיט:צ)
השמים והארץ עומדין על האמונה שנאמר "חסדי ה' עולם אשירה
לדור ודור אודיע אמונתך בפי" (ההילים פט:ב). וכה"א "מי יאמר
זכיהי לבי טהורי מחטאתי" (משלי כ:ט). הן בקדושיו לא יאמין
ושמים לא זכו בעיניו" (איוב טו:טו). ומי נכלט והכל עומדין
בדין לכך נאמר "למשפטין עמדו היום כי הכל עבדיך" (ההילים קיט:
צא).

מדרש ההילים קיט:לז

IV-17 "ואל אשה בנדת טמאתה לא תקרב לגלות ערותה" (ויקרא יח:ט)
אין לי אלא שלא יגלה מנין שלא תקרב חלמוד לומר לא תקרב אין לי
אלא נידה בל תקרב בל חגלה. מנין לכל העריות בל תקרבו ובל
חגלו חלמוד לומר "לא תקרבו לגלות" (שם יח:ו). "אני ה'"
(שם שם:שם) אני נאמן לשלם שכר.

ספרא אחרי מות י"ג:ב
(פה 4)

IV-18 "זשמרתם את חוקותי ואת משפטי אשר יעשה אתם האדם (וחי
בהם אני ה'). " (ויקרא יח:ה) ליתן שמירה ועשייה לחוקים ושמירה
ועשייה למשפטים. "וחי בהם" לעולם הבא. ואם תאמר בעולם זהו
והלא סופו מת הוא הא מה אני מקיים "וחי בהם" לעולם הבא. "אני
ה'" נאמן לשלם שכר.

ספרא אחרי מות פרשה ט:י
(פה 4)

IV-19 "וידבר ה' אל משה לאמר דבר אל בני ישראל ואמרת אליהם
אני ה' אלהיכם" (ויקרא יח:א) אני ה' שאמרת והיה העולם אני
דיין אני מלא רחמים. אני דיין להיפוע ונאמן לשלם שכר.

ספרא אחרי מות פרשה ט:א
(פה 3)

IV-10 ("ויפת שם משה עבד ה' בארץ מואב) על פי ה'." (דברים ל"ד:ה)
כשהמקום נוסל נשמתם של צדיקים נוסלה מהם בנחת רוח משלו. משל
למה הדבר דומה לאחד נאמן שהיה בעיר והיו הכל מפקידים אצלו פקדון
כשבא אחד מהם לחבוע את שלו היה מוציא ונוחן לו לפי שידע היכן
הוא. וכשבא לשלוח ביד בנו ביד עבדו ביד שליחו הופך תחתונים על
העליונים לפי שאינו יודע היכן הוא. כך כשהמקום נוסל נשמתם של
צדיקים נוסלה בנחת וכשהוא נוסל נשמתם של רשעים מוסרה למלאכים
ועים למלאכים אכזריים כדו שיטתו אח נשמתם וכן הוא אומר "אך
מרי יבקש רע) ומלאך אכזרי ישלח בו" (משלי יז:יא) ואומר "המות
בנוער נפשם." (איוב לו:י"ד)

ספרי וזאת הברכה שנ"ז (428)

V-13b "אל אמונה" בעל הפקדון, "ואין עול", גובה שלו באחרונה שלא כמדת בשר ודם מדת הקב"ה מדת בשר ודם - מפקיר אצל חברו כס של מאתים ויש לו אצלו מנה כשהוא בא ליטול את שלו אומר לו צא מנה שיש לי בידך והי לך את שאר. וכן פועל ושעשה אצל בעל הבית ויש לו בידו דינר כשהוא בא ליטול את שכרו אומר לו צא דינר שיש לי בידך והי לך את השאר, אבל מי שאמר והיה העולם אינו כן אלא "אל אמונה" בעל הפקדון "ואין עול" גובה את שלו באחרונה.

ספרי האזינו ש"ז (344-345)

V-17 דבר אחר הצור תמים פעלו, כשירד משה מהר סיני נתקבצו ישראל אצלו אמרו לו רבינו משה אמור לנו מה היא מדת הדין למעלה אמר להם אני אומר לכם לזכות את הזכיי ולחייב את חייב, אלא אפילו להחליף בדבר, אל אמונה ואין עול.

ספרי האזינו ש"ז (346)

V-16a ד"א "הצור תמים פעלו" - כשחפסו את רבי חנינה בן חרדיון נגזרה עליו גזירה לישרף עם ספרו אמרו לו נגזרה עליך לישרף עם ספרך קרא המקרא הזה "הצור תמים פעלו". אמרו לאשתו נגזרה על בעלך גזרה לישרף ועליך ליהרג קרא המקרא הזה "אל אמונה ואין עול". אמרו לבתו נגזרה על אביך לישרף ועל אמך ליהרג ועליך לעשות מלאכה קרא המקרא הזה "גדול העצה ורב העלילה אשר עיניך פקוחות" (ירמיה ל"ב:יט). אמר רבי כמה גדולים צדיקים אלו שבשעת צרתם הזמינו שלושה פסוקים של "צידוק הדין" מה שאין כן בכל הכתובים, כיוונו שלשתם את לב וצידקו עליהם את הדין.

ספרי האזינו ש"ז (346)

V-15 "אל אמונה" כשם שמשלם לצדיק גמור שכר מצוה שעשה בעולם הזה לעולם הבא כך משלם לרשע גמור שכר מצוה קלה שעשה בעולם הזה בעולם הזה. וכשם שנפרע מרשע גמור על עבירה שעשה בעולם הזה לעולם הבא כל נפרע מצדיק גמור על עבירה קלה שעשה בעולם הזה בעולם הזה.

ספרי האזינו ש"ז (345-346)

V-1 אל אמונה ואין עול (דברים ל"ב:י) אל אמונה - כשם שנפרעים מן רשעים לעולם הבא אפילו על עבירה קלה שעושין כך נפרעין מן הצדיקים בעולם הזה על עבירה קלה שעושין. ואין עול - כשם שמשלמין שכר לצדיקים לעולם הבא אפילו על מצוה קלה כך משלמין שכר לרשעים בעולם הזה אפילו על מצוה קלה שעושין.

תענית י"א.

V-14 "הצור" - הצייר שהוא צראת העולם חחילה ויצר בו את האדם שנאמר "וייצר ה' אלהים את האדם." (בראשית ב:ז). "המים פעלו" - פעולתו שלמה עם כל באי העולם ואין להרהר אחר מעשיו אפילו עילה של כלום ואין אחד מהם שיסתכל ויאמר אילו היו לי שלש עינים ואילו היו לי שלש ידים ואילו היו פני הפוכות לאחרי כמה היה נאה לי, חלמוד לומר "כי כל דרכיו משפט", יושב עם כל אחד ואחד בדין ונותן לו מה שהוא ראוי לו. "אל אמונה" - שהאמין בעולם ובראו.

"ואין עול" - שלא נבראו בני אדם להיות רשעים אלא צדיקים וכן הוא אומר "לבד ראה זה מצאתי אשר עשה האלהים את האדם ישר והמה בקשו חשבונות רבים." (קהלח ז:כט)

ספרי האזינו ש"ז (344)

III-44 דבר אחר (אמרת) לה'. (תהילים טז:ב) אמר דוד לפני הקב"ה רבונו של עולם אף על פי שהייתי מלך המלכותי עלי, אמר לו הקב"ה איני מחזיק לך טובה, "טובתי בל עליך," (יא) ולמי היא טובתי? "לקדושים אשר בארץ המה," שאין הקב"ה קורא לצדיק קדוש (יב) עד שניתן בארץ, למה שיצר הרע מיצר לו, ואין מאמין בו בעולם הזה עד יום מותו, וכן אמר שלמה "כי אדם אין צדיק בארץ אשר יעשה טוב ולא יחטא" (קהלח ז:כ), לפיכך אינו קורא קדוש עד שניתן בארץ, (יג) לכן נאמר "לקדושים אשר בארץ," ואפילו אבות העולם לא נקראו קדושים עד שנחנו בארץ, שנאמר הן בקדושים לא יאמין (איוב טו:טו), ואימתי האמין בהם, בשעה שאמר למשה "לך ואספת את זקני ישראל" (שמות ג:יז), סמך משה ואמר "זכור לאברהם ליצחק ולישראל עבדיך" (שם לב:יג), (יד) אמר ר' פנחס אילו בקשו אבות העולם שיהא דירתן למעלה היו יכולין, ואף על פי כן לא נקראו קדושים עד שמתו, ונסתם הגולל בפניהם. (טו) אמר ר' אחא בר פפא מאי קרא "ומשך אבירים בכחו" (איוב כד:כב), זה יצר הרע שמשך אבירים בכחו, ומי הם, דוד אנוש דוד המבול דור הפלגה וסדומיים, (טז) לפיכך "יקום צדיק ולא יאמין בחיין" (איוב שם), כל זמן שהוא בחיים:

מדרש תהילים טז:ב

IV-7 "וידעת כי ה' אלהיך הוא האלהים האל הנאמן." (דברים ז:ט). אמר ר' חיה בר אבא: למה הדבר דומה לאוהבו של מלך שהפקיד אצלו פקדון ומת אוהבו של מלך. בא בנו ומבקש את הפקדון מידו. אמר לו: חן לי הפקדון שהפקיד אבא אצלך. אמר לו המלך: מצאת אחר טוב ממני? הפקדון שאצלי לא שמתי אותו ולא קפלתי אותו! כך כשחטאו ישראל בימי ירמיה אמר לו הקב"ה לירמיה: לך להם לישראל: "מה מצאו אבותיכם בי עול." (ירמיה ב:ה). על כל מה שנשבעתי לאבותיכם לא קימתי? נשבעתי להם שאני מבורך את בנייהם שנאמר "כי בורך אבוכם וגו', " (בראשית כ"ב:י"ז), לא ברכת אתכם על ידי משה שנאמר "ה' אלהיכם הרבה אתכם" (דברים א:י) אמרתי לו שאני מוציא אתכם ברכוש גדול, שנאמר "ואחרי כן יצאו ברכוש גדול" (בראשית טו:י"ד) לא עשיתי כך - "ויוציאם בכסף וזהב ואין בשבטיו כושל." (תהילים ק"ה:ל"ז). לפיכך אמר משה: "ומשמרו את השבעה" (דברים ז:ח), מן "ויפדך מבית עבדים" (שם שם: שם) את יודע שהוא "האל הנאמן."

דברים רבה ג:ג

V-22 "ויהי ידיו אמונה" (שמות יז:יב) בידו אחת שלא קבל בה מישור כלום. ובידו אחת אמר משה לפני הקב"ה רבונו של עולם על ידי הוצאת את ישראל מצרים ועל ידי קרעת להם את הים ועל ידי עשית להם נסים וגבורות כך על ידי חעשה להם נסים וגבורות בשעה הזאת.

מכילהא כסכתא דעמלק א (181)

V-11 "מה יחרון העושה וגו'" (קהלח ג:ט) ... אמר ר' יצחק
 ב"ר מריון "וצדיק באמונתו יהיה (שצדיק באמונתו יהיה)
 (חבקוק ב:ד) אפילו צדיק חי העולמים מאמונתו הוא חיה. אמר
 הקב"ה בחילה הרגתי בכורי מצרים שנאמר (שמות י"ב:כ"ט) "ויהי
 בחצי הלילה וה'הכה וגו'" אף כל בכור שילד לך תהא מקדישו לי
 שנאמר "קדש לי כל בכור" (שם י"ג:ב) תהא מקדש לי הבכורות
 באמונתי. הוי וצדיק באמונתו יהיה.

קהלח רבה ג:ט

Chapter 5

III-19 "וייראו העם את ה'" לשעבר במצרים לא היו יראים ה' אבל כאן "וייראו העם את ה' ויאמינו בה' ובמשה עבדו." אם במשה האמינו קל וחומר בה'. בא זה ללמד שכל מי שמאמין ברועה נאמן כאלו מאמין במאמר מי שאמר והיה העולם. כיוצא בדבר אתה אימר "וידבר העם באלהים ובמשה." (במדבר כא:ה) אם באלהים דברו קל וחומר במשה. אלא זה בא ללמד שכל מי שמדבר ברועה נאמן כאלו מדבר במי שאמר והיה העולם.

פכילתא מסכתא דויהי בשלח ו'
(114)

III-3 אמר ריש לקיש: החושד בכשרים לוקה בגופו דכתיב, "ויען משה ויאמר) והן לא יאמינו לי (שמות ד:א). וגליא קמי קודשא בריך הוא דמהימני ישראל. אמר לו הן מאמינים בני מאמינים ואהא אין סופך להאמין. הן מאמינים - דכתיב "ויאמין בה' (ויחשבה לו צדקה) (בראשית ט"ו:ו). אחא אין סופך להאמין שנאמר "יען לא האמנתם בי וגו'." (במדבר כ:י"ב). מכאי דלקה דכתיב "ויאמר ה' לו עוד, הבא נא את ידך בחיקך (ויבא ידו בחיקו ויוציאה והנה ידו מצורעת כשלג.) (שמות ד:ו)

שבת צ"ז.

III-25 "והיה כאשר ירים משה ידו וגבר ישראל" (שמות יז:יא) - וכי ידיו של משה מגברות את ישראל או ידיו שוברות את עמלק? אלא כל זמן שהיה משה מגביה את ידיו כלפי מעלה היו ישראל מסתכלין בו ומאמינין במי שפיקד את משה לעשות כן והקב"ה עושה להם נסים וגבורות. כיוצא בו "ויאמר ה' אל משה עשה לך שרף" (במדבר כא:ח) וכי נחש טמית ומחיה? אלא כל זמן שהיה עושה כן היו ישראל מסתכלין בו ומאמינין במי שפיקד את משה לעשות כן והקב"ה שולח להם רפואות.

מכילתא דעמלק א (180)

III-17 "ואמר אליכם) לא תערצון ולא תיראון מהם" (דברים א:כ"ט). מפני מה כי ה' אלהיכם ההולך לפניכם" (דברים א:ל). אמר להם מי שעשה לכם נסים במצרים וכל הנסים האלו, הוא עתיד לעשות לכם נסים בכניסתכם לארץ. "ככל אשר עשה אתכם במצרים לעיניכם" (שם שם:שם), אם אין אתם מאמינים להבא, האמינו לשעבר.

ספרי דברים כ"ה (35)

III-28 "והתהלכתי בתוכם" - משלו משל למה הדבר דומה למלך שבא אל ארצו והיה הארץ ההוא מיטמר מלפניו. והמלך אומר לארץ מה לך שאחא מיטמר מלפני. הריני כיוצא בך. כך עתיד המקום לטייל בין הצדיקים וצדיקים מזדעזעין מלפניו והמקום אומר להם לצדיקים מה לכם שאחא מזדעזעים מלפני הריני כיוצא בכם. (אי) לפי שאני כיוצא בכם יכול לא תהא מוראי עליכם, תלמוד לומר "והייתי לכם לאלהים ואחא תהיו לי לעם," אם אין אתם מאמינים לי בדברים הללו "אני ה' אלהיכם אשר הוצאתי אתכם מארץ מצרים," אני הוא העשיתי לכם נסים במצרים, עתיד אני לעשות לכם כל (המעשים) (הנסים) האלו.

ילקוט שמעוני בחקתי תרעב

III-35 ד"א: "שלח לך אנשים (ויתרו את ראץ כנען) (במדבר יג:ב) אף על פי שאמר הקב"ה "שלח לך" לא היה מן הקב"ה שילכו. למה? שכבר אמר להם הקב"ה שבחה של ארץ ישראל "כי ה' אלהיך מביאך אל ארץ טובה" (דברים ח:ז) וכן הוא אומר "כי ארץ... ארץ הרים ובקעת למסר השמים חשחה מים." (שם יא:י-יא) ועד שהם במצרים אמר: "וארץ להצילו... להעלתו... אל ארץ טובה ורחבה." (שמות ג:ח) ומהו "שלח לך אנשים"? אלא ישראל הם בקשו הדברים הללו שבשעה שהגיעו לירושלם את התחומים, אמר להם הקב"ה: "ראה נתן ה' אלהיך לפניך את הארץ, עלה רש." באותה שעה נחקרבו כל ישראל אצל משה שנאמר "והקרבו אלי כלכם ותאמרו: "נשלחה אנשים לפנינו ויחפרו לנו את הארץ." (שם ס:כב). זהו שאמר עזרא: "ולא שמעו אל מצוהיך... ולא זכרו נפלאתיך." (נחמיה ט:כז-יז) וכן הוא אומר "וארון ברית ה' נסע לפניכם... לתור להם מנוחה" (במדבר י:לג). אלא אמרו: "נשלחה אנשים לפנינו ויחפרו לנו את הארץ, שלא האמינו. וכן בדוד הוא אומר: "לא האמינו לרברו." (תהילים קו:כד) "ובחורתי מאנו ללכת" (שם עח:י). ר' יהושע (בן לוי) אומר: למה היו דומים? למלך שזמן לבנו אשה נאה ובת טובים ועשירה. אמר לו הבן, אלך ואראה אותה, שלא היה מאמין לאביו. מיד הקשה הדבר והורע לאביו. אמר אביו: מה אעשה? אם אמר לו: איני מראה אותה לך עכשיו הוא אומר כעורה היתה לפיכך לא רצה להראותה. לסוף אמר לו: ראה אותה ותדע אם כזבתי לך. בשביל שלא האמנת בי קונם שאין אתה רואה אותה בביתך, אלא לבנך אני נותנה. וכן, הקב"ה אמר לישראל: "טובה הארץ" ולא האמינו אלא אמרו: "נשלחה אנשים לפנינו ויחפרו לנו את הארץ." אמר הקב"ה אם מעכב אני עליהם הם אומרים: על שאינה טובה, לא הראה אותה לנו אלא יראו אותה ובשבעה שאין אחד מהם נכנס לתוכה שנאמר: "אם יראו את הארץ אשר נשבעתי לאבתם, וכל מנאצי לא יראוה" (במדבר יד:כג) אלא לבניהם אני נותנה.

במדבר רבה טז:ז

VI-3 ר' נתן אומר: "ואמת ה' לעולם" דגים שבים אמרוהו כדור חונא דאמר רב חונא: ישראל שאותו הדור מקטני אמנה היו וכדורש רבה בר מרי מאי דכתיב "וימרו עליהם בים סוף" (תהילים ק"ו:ז) סלמד שהמרו ישראל באותה שעה ואמרו כשם שאנו עולים מצד אחד כך מצויים עולים מצד אחר. אמר לו הקב"ה לשר של ים פלוס אותן ליבשה אמר לפניו רבש"ע כלום יש עבד שנותן לו רבו מתנה וחוזר ונוטל ממנו אמר לו לך אחד ומחצה שבהן. אמר לו רבש"ע יש עבד שתובע את רבו אמר לו נחל קישון יהא לי ערב מיד פלט אותו ליבשה. ובאו ישראל וראו אותן ש נאמר וירא ישראל את מצרים כח על שפת הים.

פסחים ק"ח:

VIa-3 נסעו בני ישראל מרעמסס לסוכות ומסוכות לאיתם לפני פי החירות. יום חמישי נסעו ממצרים ובאו עד רעמסס וביום הששי ובשבת שבתו שם ובאחד בשבת שהוא רביעי לנסיעתן התחילו ישראל מחקין עליהם ומציעין בהמחם לצאת אמרו להם האקטורין הגיעה פרוחזימה שלכם לחזור למצרים שנאמר "שלש ימים אמרו להם ישראל" וכשיצאונו ברוח פועה יצאונו שני "ממחרת הפסח יצאו בני ישראל ביד רמה." אמרו להם האקטורין רוצין ולא רוצין סופכם לקיים דברי מלכות עמדו עליהם ישראל הכו מהם פצעו מהם הרגו מהם הלכו והגידו לפרעה. אמר להם משה חזרו לאחריכם. כיון שתקעה קרן לחזור התחילו מחוסרי אמונה שבישראל תולשין שעריהן ומקורעין בגדיהם עד שאמר להם משה

מפי הגבורה נאמר לי שאתם בני חורין לפיכך נאמר "וישובו ויחנו לפני פי החירות" (שמות יד:ב)
מכילתא דויהי בשלח א

Via-4 "ויאמר אליהם משה איש אל יותר ממנו עד בקר ולא שמעו אל משה" (שמות טז:כ) - אלו מחוסרי אמנה שבישראל.
מכילתא דויסע בשלח ד

Via-5 "ויהי ביום השביעי יצאו מן העם ללקוט ולא מצאו" (שמות טז:כז) - אלו מחוסרי אמנה שבישראל.
מכילתא דויסע בשלח ד

V-32 ר' יהודה בר' סימון פתח: "ויאמר אסתירה פני מהם" (דברים לב:כ). לבן מלך שיצא לשוק ומכה ואינו לוקה, מבוה ואינו מחבזה. והיה עולה אצל אביו במרוצה א"ל אביו מה את סבור שבכבודך את מחבד? אין את מחבד אלא בכבודי. מה עשה אביו? הפליג דעתו ממנו ולא היה בריה משגחת עליו. כך בשעה שיצאו ישראל כמצרים נפלה אימתן על כל האומות שנא' "שמעו עמים ירגזון חיל אחז יושבי פלשת. אז נבהלו אלופי אדום אילי כואב ואהזמו רעד נמוגו כל יושבי כנען תפול עליהם אימתה ופחד." (שמות יז:ח). כיון שבאו לידי עבדות ומעשים רעים, א"ל הקב"ה מה אתם סוברים שבכבודכם אתם מחבדים אין אתם מחבדים אלא בשביל כבודי. מה עשה הקב"ה? הפליג דעתו מהם קיטעא ובאו עמלקים ונזדווגו להם לישראל שנאמר "ויבוא עמלק וילחם עם ישראל ברפידים" (שמות יז:ח). ועוד באו כנעניים ונזדווגו לישראל שנא' "וישמע הכנעני." (במדבר כא:א). אמר הקב"ה אין בכך אמנה של טמא אתם מאמינים לדבוריכם, הפכפכין אתם שנא' "כי דור תהפוכות הם בנים לא אמן במ" (דברים לב:כ) - אמן כתיב. בשעה שהנביאים מברכין אותן לא פתח אחד מהם לומר אמן עד שאמרו ירמיה שנא' "ואען ואמר אמן ה'" (ירמיה יא:ה). באותה שעה אמר הקב"ה הפכפכין אתם טרחנין הם, סרבנין הם, לכלותן אי אפשר להחזירן למצרים אי אפשר, להחליפן באומה אחרת אי אפשר וכו'.

מדרש רות רבה פתיחא ג'

V-18 "בנים לא אמן במ" (דברים לב:כ) - בנים אתם שאין בכך אמונה. ועדתם על הר סיני ואמרתם "כל אשר דבר ה' נעשה ונשמע" (שמות כ"ד:ז). "אני אמרתי אלהים אתם (ובני עליון כלכם)" (תהילים פב:ו), כיון שאמרתם לעגל ("ויעשהו עגל כסכה ויאמרו) אלה אלהינו ישראל", (שמות ל"ב:ד) אף אני אמרתי לכם "אכן כאדם חסותון" (תהילים פב:ז). הכנסתי אתכם אל ארץ אבותיכם ובניחם לכם בית הבחירה ואמרתי שלא תהיו גולים ממנו לעולם, כיון שאמרתם "אין לנו חלק ברוד" (שמואל ב' כ:א), אף אני אמרתי "וישראל גלה יגלה מעל אדמתו." (עמוס ז:י"ז)

ספרי האזינו ש"ז

III-23 "וגם צדה לא עשו להם" (שמות יב:לס) להקדיע שבחן של ישראל עד שלא אמרו למשה היאך נצא למדבר ואין לנו צדה לדרך אלא האמינו והלכו אחר משה ועליהם מפורש בקבלה "הלך וקראת באזני ירושלים לאמר..." (כה אמר ה' זכרתי לך חסד מעורין אהבת כלולתיך

לכתח אחר במדבר בארץ לא זרועה." מה שכר נטלו על כך "קדש ישראל לה' ראשית תבואתה וגו'." (ירמיה ב:ב-ג).

מכילתא בא י"ד (50)

V-21 אחרים אומרים דבר גדול עשו ישראל כדי היא האמונה שהאמינו בי שאקדש להם את הים שלא אמרו למשה היאך אנו יוצאים למדבר ואין בידינו מחיה לדרך אלא האמינו והלכנו אחרי משה. עליהם מפורש בקבלה "הלוך וקראת באזני ירושלים לאמר זכרתי לך חסד נעורייך אהבת כלולותיך לכתח אחר במדבר בארץ לא זרועה" (ירמיה ב:ב) מה שכר נטלו על כך "קדש ישראל לה' ראשית תבואתה כל אוכליו יאשמו ועה חבא עליהם נאם ה'." (שם ב:ג)

מכילתא ויהי בשלח ג (99-100)

I/II-11 רבי אומר: אמר הקב"ה: כדי היא האמנה שהאמינו בי ישראל שאקדש להם הים שלא אמרו למשה: היאך נחזור לאחורינו שלא לשבור לב סף ונשים שמענו? אלא האמינו בי והלכנו אחר משה.

שמות רבה כא:ח

I/II-9 ר' מאיר אומר אמ' לו כדי אמנה שהאמינו בי ישראל במצרים אני קורע להן את הים. שלא אמרו לו למשה היאך נחזור לאחורינו שלא נשבור לב סף שמענו אלא האמינו והלכנו אחרי משה.

מכילתא דרבי שמעון בר יוחאי בשלח יד:טו (58)

III-24 "ויסע משה את ישראל מים סוף ויצאו אל מדבר סור" (שמות טו:כב) אמר רבי יהושע זו נסיעה לא נסעו אלא על פי משה ושאר כל המסעות כולן נסעו על פי הגבורה שנאמר "על פי ה' יחנו ועל פי ה' יסעו" (במדבר ט:כג) אבל נסיעה זו לא נסעו אלא על פי משה שנ' "ויסע משה את ישראל" ר' אליעזר אומר על פי הגבורה נסעו שכן מצינו בשנים ושלשה מקומות שלא נסעו אלא על פי הגבורה. וכאן לא נסעו אלא על פי הגבורה. ומה ת"ל "ויסע משה את ישראל" להודיע שבחן של ישראל שכיון שאמר משה קומו סעו לא אמרו היאך אנו יוצין במדבר ואין בידינו מחיה לדרך אלא האמינו והלכנו אחר משה ועליהם מפורש בקבלה "הלוך וקראת באזני ירושלים וגו'."

מכילתא דויסע משה א 152

V-30 "ויבאו בני ישראל בתוך הים ביבשה." (שמות יד:כא) אם בים למה "ביבשה" ואם ביבשה למה "בתוך הים"? אלא מכאן אתה למד שלא נקדש להם הים עד שבאו לתוכו עד חסמן, ואחר כך נעשה להם יבשה.

שמות רבה כא:ו

III-12 דבר אחר: "אז ישיר משה." הוא הוא דכתיב: "ויאמינו בדבריו וישירו תהילתו" (תהילים ק"ו:י"ב). אמר ר' אבהו: אף על פי שכתוב כבר שהאמינו עד שהיו במצרים שנאמר "ויאמן העם" (שמות ד:ל"א) חזרו ולא האמינו שנאמר "אבותינו במצרים לא השכילו נפלאותיך" (תהילים ק"ו:ז) כיון שבאו על הים וראו גבורתו של הקב"ה היאך עושה משפט בושעים, כמה דתימא, "ותאחז במספט ידי", ושקע את מצרים בים, מיד (דברים ל"ב:מ"א) ויאמינו בה' ובמשה עבדו. (שמות י"ד:ל"א)

שמות רבה כ"ג:ב

ובזכות האמנה שותה עליהם רוח הקדש ואמרו שירה, הדא הוא דכתיב, "אז ישיר משה ובני ישראל, ואין אז" אלא לשון אמנה, שנאמר "ויהי מאז הפקיד אתו בביתו" (בראשית ל"ט:ה) וכתיב: "וכל יש לו נתן בידו" (שם שם: ד), הוי "ויאמינו בדבריו ישירו חהילתו".

שמות רבה כ"ג:ב

III-11 "ויראו העם את ה'" - שנו רבותינו: הקורא את שמע צריך להזכיר קריעת ים סוף ומכת בכורים באמת ויציב ואם לא הזכיר אין מחזירין אותו אבל אם לא הזכיר יציאת מצריים מחזירין אותו.... ולמה צריך להזכיר קריעת ים סוף באמת ויציב, לפי שכיון שקרע להם את הים האמינו בו, שנאמר "ויאמינו בה" ובמשה עבדו" (שמות י"ד:ל"א) ובזכות האמנה שהאמינו זכו לומר שירה ושרתה עליהם שכינה שכן כתיב אחריו, "אז ישיר משה" (שם ס"ו:א), לכך צריך אדם לסמך גאולה לחפילה, כשם שהם הסמיכו שירה אחר האמנה והקריעה.

שמות רבה כ"ג:ב

I/II-8 "הבו לה" משפחות עמים. (תהילים כט:) - אמר ר' אחא עמים הבו לה' אין כתיב כאן אלא משפחות עמים הבו לה' כבוד ועוז. כשהיו מביאין אותם לא הווי מביאין דרך בזיון אלא בכבוד ועוז. באיזו זכות - בזכות שאמרו שירה על הים. רב נחמן אמר בזכות אמנה שהאמין אברהם שנאמר "והאמין בה". (בראשית טו:ו). רבי הלבו בשם ר' יוחנן אמר כתיב "וירא ישראל את הים הגדולה" (שמות יד:לא) - דאדין אדם ואינם מאמינים! אית בר נש דחמי ולא מהימן. הוי בזכות האמנה שהאמינו ישראל במצריים, שנאמר, "ויאמן העם" (שמות ד:לא).

שיר השירים רבה ד:ח

III-13 ד"א: "תשורי מראש אמנה", אמר ר' נחמיה: לא זכו ישראל לומר שירה על הים אלא בזכות אמנה, שנאמר "ויאמן העם" (שמות ד:לא). אמר ר' יצחק: היו רואין כל אותן נסים שנעשו להם ולא היה להם להאמין? אלא אמר ר' שמעון בר אבא: בשביל האמנה שהאמין אברהם להקב"ה שנאמר "והאמן בה" ממנה זכו יש ראל לומר שירנו על הים, שנאמר, "אז ישיר משה", הוי, "תשורי מראש אמנה".

שמות רבה כ"ג:ה

Chapter 6

II-2 אמר ר' אמי אין גשמים יורדין אלא בשביל בעלי אמנה שנאמר "אמת מארץ תצמח וצדק משמים נשקף." (תהילים קל"ה:י"ב) ואמר רבי רבי אמי בא וראה כמה גדולים בעלי אמנה מניין מחולדה ובור ומה המאמין בחולדה ובור כך המאמין בהקב"ה על אחת כמה וכמה.

חענית ח.א

XXIII-10 "ויראו אתה שרי פרעה ויהללו אתה אל פרעה" (בראשית יב: טו). כיון שראה אברהם כך, התחיל בוכה ומתפלל לפני הקב"ה ואמר, ובש"ע זו היא בטחוני שבטחתי בך ועכשיו עשה למען רחמין וחסדך ואל תביישני מסברי. ואף שראו צווחת ואמרת רבוננו של עולם, אני לא הייתי יושעת כלום, אלא כיוון שאמר לי שאמרת לו "לך לך", האמנתי לדברייך. ועכשיו נשאחתי יחידה מאבי ומאמי ומבעלי. יבא וישע זה ויתעלל בי. עשה למען שמך הגדול ולמען בטחוני בדברייך. א"ל הקב"ה חייך אין דבר וע נובע בך ובבעליך, הה"ד "לא יאנה לצדיק כל און ורשעים מלאו רע" (משלי יב:כא).

תנחומא לך לך ה'

XXIII-31 ראתן בלבד ובו לקה פרעה. אמר ר' אחא: אפלו קורות ביתו לקו, והכל היו אומריין: 'על דבר שרי אשת אברם.' אמר ר' ברכיה: עלו דסולמיסן למקדב למסאנא דמטרונה. וכל אותו הלילה היתה שרה שטוחה על פניה ואמרת: רבון עולמים, אברהם יצא בהבטחה ואני יצאתי באמנה, אברהם יצא חוץ לסירה ואני בתוך הסירה! אמר לה הקדוש ברוך הוא: כל מה שאני עושה, בשבילך אני עושה, והכל אומרים: "על דבר אשת אברם."

בראשית רבה מא:ב

III-31 אמר ר' ברכיה ור' חלבו ור' שמעון בן יוחאי בשם ר' מאיר-מלמד שהראה הקב"ה ליעקב שרה של בכל עולה ויורד של מדי עולה ויורד ושל יון עולה ויורד ושל ארום עולה ויורד. אמר הקב"ה ליעקב אף אתה עולה. באותה שעה נתירא יעקב אבינו ואמר שמא חיינו כשם שלאנו ירידה אף ליכך. אמר לו הקב"ה ואתה אל תירא, אם אתה עולה אין לך ירידה עולמית. לא האמין; ולא עלה. א"ר ברכיה ור' חלבו בשם רשב"י, ר' מאיר דיה דרוש "בכל זאת חטאו עוד ולא האמינו בנפלאותיו" (תהילים עח:לב). זה אבינו יעקב שלא האמין ולא עלה. אמר לו הקב"ה אלו האמנת ועלית עוד לא ירדה. ועכשיו שלא האמנת ולא עלית עתידין בניך שיהו משתעבדין בך' מלכיות בעולם הזה במסים ובארונות ובזימיות ובגלגליות.

ויקרא רבה כט:ב

III-2 אמר רב אמי אין מיתה בלא חטא ואין יסורין בלא עון... מיתביי אמרו מלאכי השרת לפני הקב"ה רבוננו של עולם מפני מה קנסת מיתה על אדם הראשון אמר להם מצוה קלה צויתיו ועבר עליה א"ל והלא משה ואהרן שקיימו כל התורה כולה ומתו א"ל מקרה אחד לצדיק ולרשע ולטוב ולרע... (קהלת ט) הוא דאמר כי האי חנא רחמיא ר"ש בן אלעזר אומר אף משה ואהרן בחטאם מתו שנאמר "יען לא האמנתם בי להקדישני לעיני בית ישראל לכן לא תביאו את הקהל הזה אל

הארץ אשר נחתי להם" (במדבר כ: י"ב) הא האכנתם בי עדיין לא הגיע זמנכם ליפטר מן העולם.

שבת נ"ה:

III-41 "שאל פני רשע לא טוב" (משלי יח: ה) לא טוב להם לרשעים שנושאים להם פנים בעולם הזה, לא טוב לו לאחאב שנשאו לו פנים בעוה"ז, שנאמר "יען כי נכנע אחאב מלפני לא אביא הרעה בימיו." (מלכים א' כ"א: כט) "להטות צדיק במשפט טוב להם" (משלי יח: ה), טוב לו למשה שלא נשאו לו פנים בעוה"ז שנאמר "יען לא האמנתם בי להקדישני" (במדבר כ: י"ב) הא אילו האמנתם בי עדיין לא הגיע זמנכם ליפטר מן העולם.

יומא פז.

III-37 "לכן לא תביאו את הקהל הזה אל הארץ" (במדבר כ: י"ב). משל למה הדבר דומה? לשתי נשים, שלוקות בבית דין. אחת קלקלה ואחאב אכלה פגי שביעית. אמרה להם אותה שאכלה פגי שביעית: בבקשה מכס הודיעו לבריות על מה אני לוקה, שלא יאמרו, אף אני קלקלתי. הביאו פגי שביעית וצלו עליה, הכריזו ואמרו: זו קלקלה ולקחה, וזו אכלה פגי שביעית ולקחה. אף כך אמר משה: רבוני, הרי גזרת עלי למות במדבר עם הדור הזה שהכעיסו, שנאמר "כמה ימרוהו במדבר יעציבוהו בישימונו." (תהילים עח: ט) ועכשו יאמרו הדורות שאני כמותם יכתב עלי על מה נענשתי. לפיכך כתוב: "יען האמנתם."

במדבר רבה יט: יב

III-36 "יען לא האמנתם בי" (במדבר כ: י"ב) - וכי לא אמר משה דבר קשה מזה? שאמר: "הצאן ובקר ישחט להם ומצא להם." (במדבר י"א: כב) אף שם אין אמנה והיא גדולה מזו ומפני מה לא גזר עליו שם? למה הדבר דומה? למלך, שהיה לו אוהב והיה מגיס בינו לבין המלך בדברים קשים ולא הקפיד המלך עליו. לימים עמד והגיס במעמד לגיונות גזר עליו מיתה. אף כך אמר לו הקב"ה למשה: הראשונה שעשית - ביני לבינך עכשו - כנגד הרבים אי אפשר! שנאמר: "יען לא האמנתם בי להקדישני לעיני ישראל."

במדבר רבה יט: י

VIa-2 "כי אשא אל שמים ידי" (דברים י"ב: מ) - כשבוא הקב"ה את העולם לא בראו אלא במאמר ולא בראו אלא בשבועה ומי גרם לו ליטע מחוסרי אמנה הם גרמו לו ליטע שנאמר: "וישא ידו להם להפיל אותם במדבר." (תהילים ק"ו: כ"ו) "אני נשאתי את ידי אל הגוים וגו'."

ספרי האזינו ש"ל

VIa-1 "ויבא נח (ובניו ואשתו ונשי בניו אתו אל התבה) מפני פי המבול." (בראשית ז: ז). אמר ר' יוחנן: נח מחסר אמנה היה אלולי שהגיעו המים עד קרסליו לא נכנס לתבה.

בראשית רבה ל"ב: ו

VIa-6 ותלך ותמלא את החמט מים וחשק את הנער." (בראשית כא: יט) מחסרת אמנה הייתה.

בראשית רבה נג: טו

III-29 "למנצח בנגינות מזמור לאסף שיר. נודע ביהודה אלהים (בישראל גדול שמו)" (תהילים עו:א-ב) זש"ה "אשא דעי למרחוק (ולפעלי אתן צדק)" (איוב לו:ג). אמר הקב"ה אשא אברהם למרחק, "קורא ממזרח עיט מארץ מרחק איש עצתי" (ישעיה מו:לא), מי שמודיע אותי בעולמי. "ולפעלי אתן צדק" - למי שנעשה פועלי כשם שהפועל יגע במלאכתו, כך אברהם פועל בנסיונות הנסהו הקב"ה. אימתי - "ויאמין בה" (בראשית טו:ו)

אגדת בראשית פרק פ:א

IV-25 "ויהי היום ויבאו בני האלהים להתיצב על ה' ויבא גם השטן בתוכם. ויאמר ה' אל השטן מאין הבא ויען השטן את ה' ויאמר משוט בארץ ומהתהלך בה." (איוב א:ו-ז). אמר לפניו רבש"ע שטחי בכל העולם כולו ולא מצאתי נאמן כעבדך אברהם שאמרתי לו "קום התהלך בארץ לארחה ולרחבה כי לך אתננה" (בראשית יג:יז) ואפילו הכי בשעה שלא מצא מקום לקבור את שרה עד שקנה בד' מאות שקל כסף לא הרהר אחר מדותיו. "ויאמר ה' אל השטן השמת לבך אל עבדי איוב כי אין כמוהו בארץ..." (איוב ס:ח)

בבא בתרא סו:

V-28 ר' יצחק פתח: "ראש דברין אמת (ולעולם כל משפט צדק" (תהילים קיט:קס) - אמר ר' יצחק: מתחלת ברייתו של עולם "ראש דברין אמת" - "בראשית ברא אלהים." ואין אלהים אלא אמת, שנאמר, "וה' אלהים אמת" (ירמיה י:י), "ולעולם כל משפט צדק" (תהילים סם:שם) - שכל גזרה וגזרה שאתה גוזר על ברייתך הן מצדיקין עליהם את הדין ומקבלין אותו באמונה.

בראשית רבה א:ז

III-38 ח"ר כשנחפס רבי אליעזר למינות, העלו לגרדום לידון. אמר לו אותו הגמון: זקן שכמוך יעסוק בדברים בטלים קללו! אמר לו: נאמן על הדיין. כסבור אותו הגמון עליו הוא אומר, והוא לא אמר אלא כנגד אביו שבשמים, אמר לו הואיל והאמנתי, עליך דימוס, פסור אתה.

עבודה זרה סו:

V-27 ר' אחא בשם ר' אבא בר כהנא כתיב "אורה חיים פן חפלים, נעו מעגלותיה ולא תדע" (משלי ה:ו) סילטל הקב"ה מתן שכרן של עושי מצות כדי שיהיו עושיין אותן באמנה.

תלמוד ירושלמי פאה א:א

III-30 "אהבו את ה' כל חסידיו (אמונים נצר ה' ומשלם על יתר עשה גאווה" (תהילים לא:כד) אלו צדיקי ישראל. אמונים נוצר ה' - אלו ברי הצדק ד"א "אמונים נוצר ה' - אלו פושעי ישראל, שהם עונין אמן בעל כרחם באמונה, ואומרים ברוך מחיה מתים. ד"א "אמונים נוצר ה' - אלו ישראל שאומרים ברוך מחיה המתים ובאמונה עונין אמן, שמאמינים בכל כחם בהקב"ה שמחיה מתים ועדיין לא בא תחיית המתים, אומרים גואל ישראל, ועדיין לא נגאלו אלא לשעה וחזרו ונשעבדו, והם מאמינים בי שאני עתיד לגואלם, הוי "אמונים נוצר ה'".

מדרש תהילים לא:ח

III-43 אמר רבי יוסי ברבי חנינא אמן בו שבועה בו קבלת דברים
בו האמנת דברים. בו שבועה דכתיב, "ואמרה האשה אמן אמן"
(במדבר ה:כב) בו קבלת דברים, דכתיב "ארוור אשר לא יקים את דברי
התורה הזאת לעשות אותם ואמר כל העם אמן." (דברים כז:כו). בו
האמנת דברים דכתיב "ויאמר ירמיה הנביא (אל חנניהו) אמן כן
יעשה ה', יקם ה' את דבריו." (ירמיה כח:ו)

שבועות לו.

III-7 ופסקו אנשי אמנה: אמר רבי יצחק אלו בני אדם השן
פאמינין בהקב"ה דתניא רבי אלעזר הגרול אומר כל מי שיש לו פח
בסלו ואומר מה אוכל למחר אינו אלא מקטני אמנה והיינו דאמר
ר' אלעזר מאי דכתיב "כי מי בז ליום קטנות." (זכריה ד:י) מי
גרם לצדיקים שיחבזבו ש ולחנן לעתיד לבא. קטנות שהיה בהן שלא
האמינו בהקב"ה.

סוטה מ"ח: - מ"ט.

VIa-8 דבר יום ביומו, ר' יהושע אומר כדי שילקוט אדם מהיום
למחר כעין מערב שבח לערב שבת. ר' אלעזר המודעי אומר כדי שלא
ילקוט אדם מהיום למחר כעין מערב שבת לערב שבת שנ' דבר יום ביומו
מי שבא יום ברא פרנסתו מצאן היה ר' אלעזר המודעי אומר כל מי
שיש לו מה יאכל היום ואומר מה אוכל למחר הרי זה מחוסר אמנה
שנאמר למען אנחנו הילך בתורת אדם לא ר' יהושע אומר שנה אדם
שחי הלכות בשחרית ושחים בערבית ועוסק במלאכתו כל היום מעלין
עליו כאלו קיים כל התורה כולה מכאן היה ר' שמעון בן יוחאי
אומר לא נחנה תורה לדרוש אלא לאוכלי המן הא כיצד היה יושב ודרוש
ולא היה יודע מהיכן אוכל ושותה ומהיכן היה לובש ומתכסה הא לא
נחנה תורה לדרוש אלא לאוכלי המן (ושניים להם אוכלי תרומה).

מכילתא דויסע ב'

XXIII-4 תניא אמרו עליו על שמאי הזקן כל ימיו היה אוכל לכבוד
שבת. מצא בהמה נאה אומר, זו לשבת. מצא אחרת נאה הימנה מניח
את השניה ואוכל את הראשונה. אבל הלל הזקן מדה אחרת הייתה לו,
שכל מעשיו לשם שמים שנאמר, "ברוך ה' יום יום." (תהילים סח:כ)
תניא נמי הכי בית שמאי אומרים מחד שכיך ושבתין ובית הלל אומרים
ברוך ה' יום יום.

ביצה טז.

V-37 המלוה את חברו בשטר, גובה מנכסים משעבדים. על ידי עדים -
גובה מנכסים בני חורין. הוציא עליו כתב ידו שהוא חייב לו -
גובה מנכסים בני חורין. ערב היוצא לאחר תחום שטרות - גובה
מנכסים בני חורין. מעשה בא לפני רבי ישמעאל, ואמר: גובה מנכסים
בני חורין. אמר לו בן ננס: אינו גובה לא מנכסים משעבדים ולא
מנכסים בני חורין. אמר לו: למה? אמר לו: הרי החונק את אחד בשוק
ומצאו חברו ואמר לו: "הנח לו" - פטור, שלא על אמונתו הלווה; אלא
איזהו ערב שהוא חייב? "הלווה ואני נוחן לך" - חייב, שכן על
אמונתו הלווה.

בבא בתרא י:ח

III-5 אמר להם: "לכו אכלו משמנים ושמו מכתקים ושלחו מנות לאין נכון לו כי קדוש היום לאדונינו ואל תעצבו כי חדות ה' היא מעוזכם." (נחמיה ח:י). ...מאי לאין נכון לו אמר רב חסדא למי שלא הניח ערובי חבשילין איכא דאמרי מי לא היה לו להניח ערובי חבשילין אבל מי שהיה לו להניח ערובי חבשילין ולא הניח כושע הוא? מאי "כי חדות ה' היא מעוזכם." אמר ר' יוחנן משום ר' אליעזר בר' שמאון אמר להם הקב"ה לישראל בני לוו עלי וקדשו קדושה היום והאמינו בי ואני פורע.

ביצה ט"ו:

XXIII-29 ח"ר ואספת דגנך מה ח"ל לפי שנאמר לא ימוש ספר התורה הזה מפניך יכול דברים ככתבן ח"ל ואספת דגנך הנהג בהן מנהג דרך ארץ דברי ר' ישמעאל ו"ש בן יוחי אומר אפשר אדם חורש בשעת חרישה וזורע בשעת זריעה וקוצר בשעת קצירה ודש בשעת דישה וזורע בשעת הרוח תורה מה תהא עליה אלא בזמן שישראל עושים רצונו של מקום מלאכתן נעשית ע"י אחרים שנאמר ועמדו זרים ורעו צאנכם וגו' ובזמן שאין ישראל עושים רצונו של מקום מלאכתן נעשית ע"י עצמן שנאמר ואספת דגנך ולא עוד אלא שמלאכת אחרים נעשית על ידן שנאמר ועבדת את אויבך וגו' אמר אביי הרבה עשו כר' ישמעאל ועלחה בידן כרשב"י ולא עלחה בידן.

ברכות לה:

XXIII-26 "כי חסייתי בך, אמרתי לה' אלי אתה, טובתי בל עליך." (תהילים טז:א-ב). זהו שאמר הכתוב, "ה' הארץ ומלואה חבל ויושבי בה" (שם כד:א), מכאן אמרו חכמים כל הנהנה בעולם הזה בלא ברכה מעל, עד שיתירו לו מצות.

מדרש תהילים טז:

XXIII-27 אבהו כתיב "בן חקדש המלאה הזרע אשר חזרע וחבואה הכרם" (דברים כב:ט) העולם הזה עשוי ככרם, ומה פדיונו ברכה, מאי טעמא, ר' שמעון בן לקיש אמר מהאי קרא (אמרת לה' אלי) (אמרת לה' אדני) אתה, אם אכלת וברכת (כביכול) כאילו משלך אכלת, טובתי בל עליך, שאין עליך חובת מעילה על טובת שאכלת:

מדרש תהילים טז:

III-34 "עדות ה' נאמנה, מחכימת פתי" (תהילים יט:ח) זה סדר זרעים, שאדם מאמין בחייו של עולם וזורע.

במדבר רבה יג:טז

III-21 "עטרת תפארת שיבה בדרך צדקה תמצא." (משלי טז:לא). אם ראתה אדם שהוא מהסס בתורה ובמעשים טובים וכגמילות חסדים, עתיד לזכות לעטרת שיבה, לכך נאמר "דרך צדקה תמצא." בא ולמד מאברהם, מתוך שחלק כבוד למלאכי השת, וכה לעטרת שיבה, שנאמר, "ואברהם זקן בא בימים" (בראשית כד:א), וכל כך למה, "בדרך צדקה תמצא," והיכן מצינו שעשה צדקה דכתיב "והאמין בה" ויחשבה לו צדקה." (בראשית טו:ו)

מדרש משלי ט"ז:לא

IV-6 "אלה פקודי המשכן" (שמות ל"ח:כ"א) : כך פתח ר' חנניאל
 בר אבא - "איש אמונות רב ברכות" (משלי כ"ח:כ), אתה מוצא כל מי
 שהוא נאמן הקב"ה מביא ברכות על ידיו מי שאינו נאמן (שם שם:שם)
 "ואף העשיר לא ינקה." "איש אמונות" - הרי זה משה, השוא נאמנו
 של הקב"ה, שנאמר "לא כן עבדי משה בכל ביחי - נאמן הוא," (במדבר,
 י"ב:ז), הוי "איש אמונות רב ברכות," שכל הדברים שהיה גזבר עליהם
 היו מחבבכים לפי שהוא נאמן. "ואף להעשיר לא ינקה," זה קרח,
 שהיה לוי ובקש לסל כהנה גדולה, ומה היה סופו, "ותפתח הארץ את
 פיה." (במדבר ט"ז:ל"ב)

שמות רבה נ"א:א

Chapter 7

XXIII-11 (אח משפטי תעשו ואת חקתי תשמרו ללכת בהם) אני ה' אלהיכם. (ויקרא יח:ד) - ... ושמא חאמר אבד סברי ואבד סכוי תלמוד לומר "אני ה' - אני סברך ואני סכוייך ועלי בסחונך.

ספרא אחרי מות פרק יב:יא

XXIII-9 "כי לא אל חפץ רשע אתה) לא יגור רע" (תהילים ה:ה) ... ד"א "לא יגור רע" - אמר רבי אליעזר בן פדח בשם רבי יוחנן: אין שמו של הקב"ה נזכר על הרעה אלא על הטובה... כך שנו רבוהינו ג' דברים הזכיר הקב"ה שמו עליהם ואע"פ שהן לרעה. על המסית, זה הנחש שהסית את האשה... ועל העובר על דברי חכמים... ועל העושה בסחוננו בבשר ודם שנאמר "כה אמר ה' ארור הגבר אשר יבטח באדם (ושם בשר זרעו ומן ה' יסור לבו)" (ירמיה יז:ה). אימתי הוא אחר בשעה שמן ה' יסור לבו" וישלך בסחוננו על בשר ודם.

מדרש תנחומא תוריע ט

XX-18 הוה דהוה קאמר ואזיל גברא דרחצינא לליה אדייה לגזיזיה וקם א"ל שמואל לרב יהודה קרא כתיב "גם איש שלומי אשר בסחתי בו אוכל לחמי הגדיל עלי עקב" (תהילים מא:י)

סנהדרין ז.

XX-6 "אשרי הגבר אשר שם ה' מבטחו ולא פנה אל רהבים ושטי כזב" (תהילים מ:ה). ר' יודן אמר: המון רבי הברביא, שהם שטים אחרי כזב, אוי לו למי שהוא בוטח בהם.

בראשית רבה פט:ג

XX-7 זה שאמר הכתוב: אל תבטחו בנדיבים וגו'. " (תהילים רמו:ג) אמר ר' סימון בשם רבי יהושע בן לוי: כל מי שבטח בהקב"ה זוכה להיות כיוצא בו. מניין? שנאמר: "ברוך הגבר אשר יבטח בה" והיה ה' מבטחו. (ירמיה יז:ז) אבל כל מי שיבטח בעבודה כוכבים נחתיב להיות כיוצא בה. מניין? שנאמר "כמהם יהיו עושים (כל אשר בטח בהם)." (תהילים קטו:ה). רבנן אמרי: כל מי שנשען בבשר ודם עובר אף פרוסטיא שלו עוברת, שנאמר "בבן אדם אין לו תשועה" (שם קמו:ג), מה כתיב אחריו - "תצא רוחו ישב לאדמתו." (שם שם:ד). אמר הקב"ה: ויודעין שאין בשר ודם כלום ומניחין כבודי ואומריין: "שימה לנו מלך." (שמואל א' ח:ה). חייכם שסופכם להרגיש מה עתיד להגיע לכם מתחת מלככם. מניין, שנאמר, "כל מלכיהם נפלו אין קרא בהם אלי." (הושע ז:ז).

דברים רבה ה:ט

XX-10 "מזמור לדוד ה' קראתיך חושה לי" (תהילים קמא:א) אמר שלמה, "מאור עינים ישמח לב (שמועה טובה חדשן עצם)" (משלי סו:ל) - האיר הקב"ה עיניהם של צדיקים, שמח את לבן, דשן עצמותם, כשבשרן בשורות טובות. ומה היא הבשורה שבשרן? מה שכתוב למעלה מן הפרשה "אך צדיקים יודו לשמך (וישבו ישרים את פניך" (תהילים קמ:יד). אמר דוד בבקשה ממך אהיה מאותן שרואין פניך ה' קראתיך וגו' מהו "חושה לי"? חשתי לעשות דבור, אף אתה חושה לי. למה היה דומה - למי שהיה לו דין לפני השלטון ואה שיש לכל סניגורין ולדבר עליהם.

קרא אל השלטון ואמר לו בבקשה ממך הכל צריכין הם לסניגוריהם.
אני אין לי סניגור אין לי מי שידבר עלי אחת. הדין ואחת הסניגור.
כך אמר דוד יש כשהוא בוסח על מעשים נאים ונכוחים שיש לו ויש
שבוסח על מעשה אבותיו. ואני בוסח בך אע"פ שאין בי מעשים טובים
אלא על שקראתיך ענני לכך אמר "ה' קראתיך וגו'".

מדרש שוחר טוב תהילים קמא

XXI-1 ודוד מיקרי לנפשיה חסיד והכתיב "לולא האמנח לראות בטוב
ה' בארץ החיים (תהילים כז:יג). וחנא משמיה דרבי יוסי למה נקור
על "לולא"? אמר דוד לפני הקב"ה רבונו של עולם מובטח אני בך
שאחא משלם שכר טוב לצדיקים לעתיד לבא אבל איני יודע אם יש לי
חלק ביניהם אם לאו.

ברכות ד.

XX-3 "בטח בה' ועשה טוב שכן ארץ ורעה אמונה" (תהילים לז:ג) -
רבי חגי מסרס הדין קריא "בטח ועשה טוב" - עשה טוב ובטח בה'.
משל לאגרונומוס שיצא לשער את המדות וראה אותו אחד והיה מיטמן
מלפניו, אמר לו מה לך מיטמן? עשה מדותיך ביושר ואל תחירא.
הה"ד "בטח בה' עשה טוב שכן ארץ ורעה אמונה" - עשה שכונה של
ארץ הוי זורע הוי נוסע. "ורעה אמונה" - רעה אמונתן של אבות
כד"א "עיני בנאמני ארץ." (תהילים קא:ו)

ילקוט שמעוני ראה תחצב

XX-9 "רבים מכאובים לרשע (והבוסח בה' חסד יסובבנו)" (תהילים לב:י)
רבי ור' ישמעאל בר' יוסי היו יושבין ועוסקין במגילת קינוח ערב
שבת עם חשכה, שיירו בה אלייף בית אחד. אמרו למחר אנו גומרין
אותה. כשעלה רבי נכשל באצבעו, קרא על עצמו "רבים מכאובים לרשע."
רבי אליעזר ור' תנחום בשם רבי ירמיה: אפילו רשע ובוסח בה' "חסד
יסובבנו".

ילקוט שמעוני תהילים חשים

XXIII-2 חניא רבי יוסי בן אלישע אומר אם ראית דור שצוות רבות
באות עליו צא וברוק בדייני ישראל שכל פורענות שבאה לעולם לא
באה אלא בשביל דייני ישראל שנאמר "שמעו נא זאת ראשי בית יעקב וקציני
בית ישראל המהעכים משפט ואת כל הישרה יעקשו בונה ציון בדמים
וירושלים בעולה ראשיה בשוחד ישפוטו וכהניה במחיר יורו ונביאיה בכסף
יקטמו ועל ה' ישענו וגו' (מיכה ג:ט-י). רשעים הן אלא שחלו בסחונם
במי שאמר והיה העולם לפיכך מביא הקב"ה עליהן ג' פורעניות כנגד ג'
עבירות שבידם שנ' "לכן בגללכם ציון שדה תחרש וירושלים עיין תהיה
והר הבית לבמות יער." (שם שם:יב).

שבת קלט.

XXIII-15 כדכעא מיניה ר' יהודה נשיאה מרבי אמי, מאי דכתיב "בטחו
בה' עדי עד כי ביה ה' צור עולמים" (ישעיה כו:ד) "אל כל התולה
בטחוננו בהקב"ה הוי לו מחסה בעולם הזה ולעולם הבא. אנא הכי
קאקשיא לי מאי שנא דכתיב "ביה" ולא כתיב "יה" כדדרש ר' יהודה
בר ר' אלעאי - אלו שני עולמות שבא הקב"ה אחד בה' ואחד ביהודה.

מנחות כט:

XX-19 בך ה' חסיחי אל אבושה (תהילים ל"א:ב) אתה מוצא שכל פי שבוטה בהקב"ה הוא מצילו שנא' יבטח בשם ה' וישען באלהיו (ישעיה נ"י) חדע לך שכן הוא, חנניה ועזריה שבטחו בו הציל אותם וכן אתה מוצא בדניאל שהצילו מן הבור. אמר דוד הואיל וכן הוא שכל מי שבוטה בך אתה מצילו, בך ה' חסיחי.

ילקוט שמעוני תהילים תשי"ד

XX-4 דבר אחר "מי בכם ירא ה'" בשעה שישראל נכנסים לצרה הם אומרים להקב"ה גאל אותנו, והקב"ה אמר להם יש ביניכם ירא שמים, והם אומרים לשעבר בימי משה בימי יהושע בימי דוד בימי שמואל, אבל עכשו כל שאנו הולכים היא מחשכת לנו והולכת שנאמר "אשר הלך חשכים" אמר להם הקב"ה "בטחו בשמי" והוא עומד לכם שנאמר "יבטח בשם ה'", ולמה? שכל מי שבוטה בשמי אני מצילו וכן דוד אומר "בך ה' חסיחי אל אבושה" (תהילים ל"א:ב). מי היה בחשכה ולא הואתיו, חנניה מיסאל ועזריה "ענה נבוכדנצר ואמר בריך אלהיון די סורך מיסך ועבד נגו) די שלח מלאכיה ושזיב לעבדוהי די התרחצו עלוהי" (דניאל ג:כח), וכן דניאל "והוסק לדניאל מן גובא" (שם ו:כד), ואומר "בטחו בה' עדי עד" (ישעיה כו:ד) "בך ה' בטחתי אל אבושה לעולם", דינו שנחביישנו בעולם הזה ולא נבוש לעולם הבא וכן הוא אומר "ישראל נושע בה'" (חשועת עולמים לא תבשו ולא תכלמו עד עולמי עד.) (ישעיה מה:יז)

ילקוט שמעוני ישעיה חעג

XXIII-12 אמר רבי פינחס עובדא הוה ברב דהוה עייל מחמחה דטיברי פגעון כיה רומאי. אמרון ליה מן דמאן את אמר לון מן דסופיינוס ופנינה: בדמטא אתו לגביה א"ל עד אימתי את מקיים עם אילין יחודאי אמר לון למה. א"ל פגעיןן בחד א"ל יחודאי ואמרי ליה מן דמאן את אמר לן דסופיינוס. אמר לון ומה עבדתון ליה. א"ל דין ליה פנינון יתיה. אמר לון יאות עבדיתון: ומה מי שהוא נחלה (בטחונן) בבשר ודם ניצול. מי שהוא נחלה (בטחונן) בהקב"ה לא כל שכן. הח"ד כל אשר יקרא בשם ה' ימלט:

XX-16 (ופועה הקריב וישאו בני ישראל אח עיניהם והנה מצרים נסע אחריהם) וייראו מאד ויצעקו בני ישראל אל ה' (שמות יד:י) מיד תפסו להם אמונות אבותם אומנות אברהם יצחק ויעקב. ואומר: "ואני נחתי לך שכם אחד על אחיך אשר לקחתי מיד האמרי בחרבי ובקשתי." (בראשית מח:כב) וכי בחרבו ובקשתו לקחה? אלא לומר לך "חרבי" - זו תפילה "בקשתי" - זו בקשה וכן הוא אומר "גור אריה יהודה" (בראשית מט:ט) ואומר "וזאת ליהודה" (דברים לג:ז) וכן ירמיה אומר - "ארור הגבר אשר יבטח באדם" (ירמיה יז:ה) ובתפילה מהו אומר "ברוך הגבר אשר יבטח בה' והיה ה' מבטחו" (שם יז:ז) מבטחו בשעה שמתפללין לו והוא קרוב להם שנאמר "קרוב ה' לכל קראיו" (תהילים קמה:יח) וכן אמר דוד לגלית "אתה בא אלי בחרב ובחנית ובכידון ואני בא אליך בשם ה' צבאות אלהי מערכות ישראל" (שמואל א' יז:ט) וכתוב "אלה ברכב ואלה בסוסים ואנחנו בשם ה' אלהינו נזכיר. המה כרעו ונפלו ואנחנו קמנו ונתעורר. ה' הושיע המלך יעננו ביום קראנו." (תהילים כח:י-י). במשה מהו אומר "וישלח משה מלאכים מקדש אל מלך אדום וגו'... ונצק אל ה' וישמע קולינו" (במדבר כ:י-טז). אמר להם אתם מתגאים על מה שהוריש לכם אביכם יצחק דכתיב "הקול קול

יעקב (בראשית כז:מ) "וישמע ה' את קולינו" (דברים כו:ז) ואנו מחבאים על מה שהוריש לנו אבינו יצחק דכתיב "והידיים ידי עשו" "ועל חרבך תחיה" (בראשית כז:מ). הדא הוא דכתיב "ויאמר אליך אדום לא תעבור בי פן בחרב אצא לקראתך" (במדבר כ:יח) - שאינן בוטחים אלא בחרב אבל ישראל תמשו אומנות אבותיהם אומנות אברהם יצחק ויעקב שנאמר "ויצקו בני ישראל אל ה'." (שמות יד:י)

מכילתא ויהי בשלח ב

XX-13 (טוב לחסות בה' מבטוח באדם). חמשה דברים עמדו בעולם, נח שם עבר אשור ואברהם, נח לא הקפיד לעבוד הקב"ה אלא עמד ונטע כרם. שם ועבר הסמינו את עצמם, אשור אמר היאך אני דר בין הרשעים הללו והלך לו, שנאמר מן הארץ ההוא יצא אשור (בראשית י:יח), אברהם צדקתו עומדת לעולם, אמר איני מניח את הקב"ה, ואף הקב"ה לא הניחו, שנאמר אני ה' אשר הוצאתיך מאור כשדים (שם סו:ז), טוב לחסות בה' מבטוח באדם. שלא היה בוטח לא על דברי אביו, ולא על דברי רבו, לומר אבי היה צדיק ואני נמלט בצדקתו, ותרח הי' רואה במזלות, ראה מזלו של חרן ששהוא נשרף, ומזלו של אברהם שכל העולם מתמלא ממנו, נכנסו כל האומות אצל אברהם אבינו אמרו לו של מי אתה, אמר להם של הקב"ה שבשמים, מיד נטלוהו והשליכוהו לתוך כבשן האש, ולא ירד עמו לא עיר ולא שרף ולא מלאך, אלא הקב"ה בעצמו, שנאמר אני ה' (אלהיך) אשר הוצאתיך מאור כשדים (בראשית סו:ז) ה' ה' היה לבו חלוק והיה בוטח על דברי אביו, נכנסו כל האומות אצלו, אמרו לו של מי אתה, אמר בלבבו אברהם גדול ממני, אם ראיתיו שנמלט, אומר אני של אברהם אני, ואם לאו אומר אני שלכם אני, כיון שנמלט אברהם אמר להם של אברהם אני, מיד נטלוהו והשליכוהו לתוך כבשן האש, לא הספיק לירד עד שהמיתו האש, והשליכו המלאך לפני אביו, שנאמר וימח ה' ה' על פני חרן אביו (בראשית יח:כח), ותרח יפה היה רואה במזלות מזלו של חרן שהוא נשרף, ומזלו של אברהם שהעולם נתמלא ממנו ואינו יודע אם מן האנשים, או מן הנשים, ושרי היתה בתו של חרן, שנאמר ויקח אברם ונחור להם נשים שם אשת אברם שרי וגו' בת חרן אבי מלכה ואבי יסכה (שם י"א:כט) ויסכה היא שרה, ונתמלא כל העולם ממנה:

פירוש תהילים קיח:יא

XX-11 א"ר חייא בשם רבי מעלי בכורים כך היו פזמרים "וכל הנשמה תהלל יה". (תהילים קנ) - מה "תהלל יה" - כל שעה שהיא עולה ויורד בגוף אנו חייבים לומר הללויה. "תהלל יה" על הנפלאים שהוא עושה עמנו בכל שעה שלא להפליג ממנו שעה אחת הוי "בטחו בו בכל עת עם שפכו לפניו לבבכם אלהים מחסה לנו סלה." (תהילים סב:ט)

פירוש שוחר טוב תהילים סב

XX-12 "לפנצח על ידותון מזמור לדוד. אך אל אלהים דומיה נפשי." (תהילים סב:א). וז"ה "בטחו בה' עדי עד (כי ביה ה' צור עולמים)" (ישעיה כו:ד). הווי יודעים במי אתם בוטחים, במי שבוא שני עולמים בשתי אותיות שנאמר "כיה ה' צור עולמים." (שם) - העולם הזה והעולם הבא. העולם הזה נברא בה"א, וכן הוא אומר, "אלה תולדות השמים והארץ בהבראם" (בראשית ב:ד), בה"א בראם. והעולם הבא נברא ביו"ד, לפיכך "כיה ה' צור עולמים."

פירוש שוחר טוב תהילים סב

* נספח להלן

* XX-5 "וישלח אליו מַרְאָכִים לאמר מה לי ולך מלך יהודה לא עליך אתה היום כי אל בית מלחמתי ואלהים אמר לבהלני חדל לך מאלהים אשר עמי ואל ישחיתך" (דברי הימים ב': לה:כא) - מאי "אלהים אשר עמי"? אמר רב יהודה אמר רב זו עבודה זרה אמר הואיל וקא בסח בע"ז יכילנא ליה.

תענית כב:

XX-17 "ואת בקיעי עיר דוד ראיחם כי רבו... ואת בתי ירושלם ספרחם וחתצו הבתים לבצר החומה." (ישעיה כב:ט) מלמד שהיו נוחצין בתיהם מוסיפין על החומה. ולא כבר עשה חזקיהו כן? הלא כתיב "ויחזק ויבן אח כל החומה ופרוצה וגו'" (דברי הימים ב' לב:ה). אלא חזיקה בה' אלהי ישראל בסח אבל אתם לא הבטחתם. היינו הוא דאמר "לא הבטחתם אל עושיה ויוצרה מרחוק ראיחם." (ישעיה כב:יא)

פתיחתא דאיכה רבתי כד

XXVI-1 "וישבתם לבטח בארצכם" - בארצכם אתם יושבים לבטח ואי

אתם יושבים לבטח בחוצה לארץ.

ילקוט שמעוני בחוקותי חרעב

XXII-2 א"ר יודן אמר לו המקום "שוב אל ארץ אבותך (ולמולדתך

ואהיה עמך" (בראשית לא:ג) אף על פי כן "ויירא יעקב מאד." (שם לב:ח) אלא מכאן שאין הבטחה לצדיק בעולם הזה. ר' הונא בשם ר' אחא אמר "הנה אנכי עמך" (בראשית כח:טו) (וכתיב) "אם יהיה אלהים עמדי" (שם שם:כ) אלא מכאן שאין הבטחה לצדיק בעולם הזה.

בראשית רבה עו:ב

V-10c דבר אחר: מעשה באדם אחד שהיה חופר שיחין לרבים. בתו

היתה הולכת בדרך ובאת לעבר הנהר ושטפה. באו ואמרו לו לר' פנחס: כך הגיע לבחור של פלוני. אמר להם, אי אפשר כיון שהיה עושה רצונו של הקב"ה במים אין הקב"ה מאבד את בתו במים. מיד נפלה צוחה בעיר: באחה בתו של פלוני! אמרו רבוהינו כיון שאמר ר' פנחס בן יאיר כך ירד מלאך והעלה אותה.

דברים רבה ג:ב

XXI-5 (משנה) -... מברך על הרעה מעין הטובה ועל הטובה מעין

על הרעה. והצועק לשעבר הרי זו תפלת שוא. היתה אשתו מעוברת ואומר יהי רצון שתלד אשתי זכר הרי זו תפלת שוא. היה בא בדרך ושמע קול צוחה בעיר ואומר יהי רצון שלא תהא בתוך בתי הרי זו תפלת שוא... (ברכות נד.) "היה בא בדרך" - ח"ר מעשה בהלל הזקן שהיה בא בדרך ושמע קול צוחה בעיר אמר מובטח אני שאין זה בתוך בתי ועליו הכתוב אומר "משמועה רעה לא יירא נכון לבו בטוח בה." (חזקוני קיב:ז)

ברכות ט.

XXIII-1 אמר רבא: כל היכי דדרשת להאי קרא מרישיה לסיפיה מדיש,

מסיפיה לרישיה מדיש. מרישיה לסיפיה מדיש? - "משמועה רעה לא יירא." מה טעם? "נכון לבו בטוח בה" משמועה רעה לירא. ההוא תלמידא דהוה קא אזיל בתיה דרבי ישמעאל ברבי יוסי בשוקא דצידן. חזיה דקא מפחיר אמר ליה, חסאה את דכתיב "פחדו בציון חסאים." (ישעיה לג:יד). א"ל והכתיב "אשרי אדם מפחד תמיד" (משלי כח:יד). אמר ליה ההוא בדברי חורה כתיב. יהודה בר נתן הוה שקיל ואזיל בתריה דרב המנונא. אחנח. א"ל יסורים בעי ההוא גברא לאחור אנפשיה דכתיב "כי פחד פחדתי ויאתני ואשר יגרתי ובוא לי." (איוב ג:כה). והא כתיב "אשרי אדם מפחד תמיד." ההוא בדברי חורה כתיב.

ברכות ט.

XXV-1 "ויירא יעקב מאד ויצר לו" (בראשית לב:ח) - ר' פנחס בשם

ר' ראובן: שני בני אדם הבטיחין הקב"ה ונתייראו הבחור שבאבות והבחור שבנביאים. הבחור שבאבות - זה יעקב שנאמר "כי יעקב בחר לו ית" (תהילים קלא:ד) ואמרו לו הקב"ה "כי אהיה עמך" (ישעיה נא:יג) ולבסוף נתיירא שנאמר "ויירא יעקב." הבחור שבנביאים זה משה שנאמר "לולי משה בחירו" (תהילים קו:כג) ואמרו לו הקב"ה "כי אהיה עמך" ובסוף נתיירא "ויאמר ה' אל משה אל חירא אותי" (במדבר כא:לד) אינו אומר אל חירא אותי אלא למי שנתיירא. ר' ברכיה ור' חלבון בשם ר' שמואל בר נחמן משם ר' נתן ואויים היו ישראל כלייה בימי המן אלולי שנשמעה דעתן על דעת הזקן אביהם. אמרו מה אבינו יעקב

שהבטיחו הקב"ה ואמר לו "והנה אנכי עמך" נתיירא אנו על אחת כמה וכמה. הוא שהנביא מקנא את ישראל ואמר ההם "ותשכח ה' עושר נוסה שמים ויוסד ארץ." (ישעיה נא:יג). אמר להון אנשיחון מה אמר לכו כה אמר ה' אם ימדו שמים מלמעלה" (ירמיה לא:לו) - ואם ראיתם שמים שמטו והארץ מחמוסטה? מנסיית שמים וארץ לא היה לכם ללמוד, אלא "וחפחיד תמיד כל היום."

בראשית רבה עו:א

XXIII-24 אמר רב הונא אמר רב משום רבי מאיר וכן תנא משמיה דרבי עקיבא לעולם יהא אדם רגיל לומר כל דעביד רחמנא לטב עביד. כי הא דר' עקיבא דהוה קאזיל באורחא מטא להביא מטא בעא אושפיזא לא חהבי ליה. אמר, כל דעביד רחמנא לטב אזל. ובח בדברא והוה בהדיה תרנגולא וחמרא ושרגא. אחא זיקא כבייה לשרגא אחא שונא אכליה לתרנגולא אחא אריה אכילה לחמרא אמר כל דעביד רחמנא לטב ביה לוליא אחא גייסא שבייה למחא אמר להו לאו אמרי להו כל מה שעושה הקב"ה הכל לטובה.

ברכות ס:--סא.

XXI-7 אמרו עליו על איש גם זו שהיה סומא משתי עיניו גירס משתי ידי וקיסע משתי רגליו וכל גופו מלא שחין והיה מוטל בבית רעוע ורגלי מוטחו מונחין בספלין של מים כדי שלא יעלו עליו נמלים פעם אחת בקשו חלמידיו לפנות מטחו ואח"כ לפנות את הכלים אמר להם בניי פנו את הכלים ואח"כ פנו מטחי שמובטח לכם כל זמן שאני בבית אין הבית נופל. פינו את הכלים ואחר כך פינו את מטחו ונפל הבית. אמרו לו חלמידיו רבי וכי מאחר שצדיק גמור אתה למה עלמה לך כך אמר להם בניי אני גומתי לעצמי שפעם אחת הייתי מהלך בדרך לבית לחמי והיה עמי משוי ג' חמורים אחד של מאכל ואחד של משתה ואחד של מיני מגדים בא עני אחד ועמד לי בדרך ואמר לי רבי פרנסני אמרתי לו המחן עד שאפרוק מן החמור לא הספקתי לפרוק מן החמור עד שיצתה נשמחו. הלכתי ונפלתי על פניו ואמרתי עיני שלא חסו על עיניך יסומו ידיי שלא חסו על ידיך ותגדמו רגליי שלא חסו על רגליך יתקטעו ולא נחקררה דעתי עד שאמרתי כל גופי יהא מלא שחין. אמרו לו אוי לנו שראינוך בכך. אמר להם אוי לי אם לא ראיתוני בכך. אמאי קרו ליה נחום איש גם זו? דכל מילתא דהוה סלקא ליה אמר גם זו לטובה.

תענית כא.

XXV-4 "ויאמר ה' אל משה אל תירא אותי" (במדבר כא:לד) זה שאמר הכתוב "אשרי אדם מפקח תמיד ומקשה לבו יפול ברעה" (משלי כח:יד) - כך היא מדת החסידים אע"פ שהקב"ה מבטיחן אינן פורקין יראה. וכן ביצקב כתיב "ויירא יעקב מאד." למה נתיירא? אמר, שמא נתקלקלתי אצל לבן בכלום (וכתוב "ולא יראה בן ערות דבר ושב מאחוריו" (דברים כג:טו) והניחני הקב"ה. ואף משה תפס את הירא בדרך אביו. ולמה נתיירא אמר שמא "מעלו ישראל במלחמת סיחן או נתקלקלו בעבירה. אל הקב"ה "אל תירא" כלן השלימו בצדק.

סדרש הנחומא חקת כ"ה

XXV-3 "ושים באזני יהושע" (דברים יז:יד) - ר' אלעזר המודעי אומר זה אחר מארבעה צדיקים שנחן להם רמז. שנים חשו ושנים לא חשו. משה נחן לו רמז ולא חש יעקב נחן לו רמז ולא חש, דוד ומרדכי נחן להם רמז וחשו... יעקב נחן לו רמז ולא חש - שנאמר "והנה אנכי עמך ושמרתיו" (בראשית כח:טו) והוא היה מפקח ויירא שנאמר "ויירא יעקב

מאד ויצר לו (שם לב:ח). אדם שהקב"ה הבטיחו היה ירא ומפחד?
אלא שאמר יעקב אבינו, אוי לי שמא יגרום החטא!

מכליתא מסכתא דעמלק בשלה ב

XX-2 אמר רבין בר רב אדא אמר רבי יצחק: כל הוגיל לבא לבית
הכנסת ולא בא יום אחד הקב"ה משאיל בו שנאמר "מי בכס ירא ה' שומע
בקול עבדו אשר הלך חשכים ואין נוגה לו" (ישעיה נ:י). אם לדבר
מצוה מצוה הלך נוגה לו ואם לדבר הרשות הלך אין נוגה לו. "יבטח
בשם ה'" (שם). מאי סעמא? משום דהוה ליה לבטוח בשם ה' ולא בטח.

ברכות ו:

XXI-2 אמר רבי אלעזר אמר רבי אבינא כל האומר "תהילה לדוד"
(תהילים קמ"ה) בכל יום ג' פעמים מובטח לו שהוא בן העולם הבא.
מאי סעמא? אילימא משום דאחיא באל"ף בי"ת נימא "אשרי חסימי דוך"
(תהילים קי"ט) דאחיא בחמניא אפיין. אלא משום דאית ביה "פוחח אח
דוך" (שם: קמ"ה: טז) נימא הלל הגדול דכתיב ביה "נותן לחם לכל בשר"
(שם קלו:כה). אלא משום דאית ביה חוחי.

ברכות ד:

XXI-3 העונה "יהא שמיה רבא מברך" מובטח לו שהוא בן העולם הבא.

ברכות נז.

XXI-4 הבא על אשת איש בחלום מובטח לו שהוא בן העולם הבא.

ברכות נז.

XXI-8 חנא דבי אליהו כל השונה הלכות מובטח לו שהוא בן עולם
הבא, שנאמר "הליכות עולם לו" (חבקוק ג:ו). אל תקרי "הליכות"
אלא "הלכות".

מגילה כח:

XXI-9,10 "נותן נשמה לעם עליה ורוח להולכים בה" (ישעיה מב:ה)...
האי "נותן נשמה לעם עליה" מאי עביד ליה? מיבעי ליה לכדורבי אבהו
דאמר ר' אבהו אפילו שפחה כנענית שבארץ ישראל מובטח לה שהיא בת
העולם הבא. כתיב הכא "לעם עליה" וכתיב החם "שבו לכם פה עם
החמור" (בראשית כב:ה) עם הדומה לחמור.

כתובות קיא.

"ורוח להולכים בה" - א"ר ירמיה בר אבא א"ר יוחנן - כל המהלך
ארבע אמות בארץ ישראל מובטח לו שהוא בן העולם הבא.

כתובות קיא.

XXI-19 כיון שמת משה היה יהושע בוכה ומצעק ומתאבל עליו במדבר
והיה אומר אבי אבי רבי רבי אבי שגדלני רבי שלמדני חורה והיה
מתאבל עליו ימים רבים עד שאמר לו הקדוש ברוך הוא ליהושע: יהושע,
עד כמה אחה מתאבל והולך וכי לך בלבד מה משה והלא לאמת אלא לי
שפיוס שמת אבל גדול הוא לפני, שנאמר "ויקרא ה' אלהים ביום ההוא
לבכי ולמספד וגו'" (ישעיה כב:יב) אלא מובטח לו שכן עולם הבא הוא
שנאמר "ויאמר ה' אל משה הנך שכב עם אבותיך וקם." (דברים לא:טז)

ספרי נצבים ש"ה

XXI-6 ח"ר: לעולם ימכור אדם כל מה שיש לו וישא בת תלמיד חכם
שאם פת או גולה מובטח לו שבניו תלמידי חכמים ואל ישא בת עם הארץ
שאם פת או גולה בניו עם הארץ.

פסחים מט.

XXI-11 ח"ר מעשה ברבי יהושע בן חנניה שהלך לכרך גדול שברומי.
אמרו לו תינוק אחד יש בבית האסורים יפה עינים וטוב ראוי
וקווצותיו סדורות לו חתולים. הלך ועמד על פתח בית האסורים.
אמר "מי נתן למשיטה יעקב וישראל לבוזזים." (ישעיה מב:כד). ענה
אותו תינוק ואמר "הלא ה' זו טחאנו לו ולא אבו בדרכיו הלך ולא
שמעו בתורתו." (שם). אמר מובטחני בו שמורה הוראה בישראל.
העבודה איני זו מכאן עד שאפרדנו בכל ממון שפוסקון עליו. אמרו
לא זו משם עד שפדאו בממון הרבה. ולא היו ימים מועטין עד שהורה
הוראה בישראל. ומנו? רבי ישמעאל בן אלישע.

גיטין נ"ח.

XXI-13 מעשה ברבי חנינא שהדירו אצלו בנזיר והביאו לפני רבן
גמליאל. והיה רבן גמליאל בודקו לידע אם הביא שתי שעורות אם
לא הביא. (רבי יוסי אומר לידע אם הגיע לעונה נדרים אם לאו.)
אמר לו רבי אל תצטער לבדקני. אם קטן אני אהיה בשביל אבא, אם
גדול, אני אהיה בשביל עצמי. עמד רבן גמליאל ונסקו על ראשו.
אמר, מובטח אני בזה שמורה הלכה בישראל אמרו לא היו ימים מועטים
עד שהורה הוראה בישראל.

נזיר כט:

XXI-12a רבי אל ירע בעיניך, שהוא ובנו בעלו נערה מאורסה ביום
הכפורים. הניח (ר' אלעזר) ידו על בני מעיו אמר, שישו בני
מעיו. ומה ספיקות שלכם כך ודאית שלכם על אחת כמה וכמה מובטח
אני בכס שאין רמה וחולעת שולטת בכס.

בבא מצאה פג:

XXI-14 אף תלויות לא ישרפו שמא יבא אליהו ויטהרם. אמרו לו
כבר מובטח להן לישראל שאין אליהו בא לא בערבי שבחות ולא בערבי
ימים טובים מפני הטורה.

פסח יג.

XXI-16 זה סמן לתפילה - אם כוון לבו לתפילה יהא מובטח שתפילתו
נשמעה, שנאמר "תכין לבם תקשיב אזנך." (תהילים י:יז)

דברים רבה ב:א

XXI-17 "כי מי גוי גדול וגו'" (דברים ד:ז) הלכה: אדם מישראל
קורא את שמע מהו שיהא לו מתן להמתין אחר קריאת שמע ואחר כך
יתפלל? כך שנו חכמים: שלש תכיפות הן - חכף לסמיכה - שחיטה
חכף לנטילת ידים - ברכה חכף לגאולה - תפילה. ומי שהוא עושה
כן מהו מתן שכרו? אמר רבה בר אבהו: אם סמך ושטח יהא מבטח
שקרבונו נתקבל, ואם נטל ידיו וברך מיד יהא מובטח שלא יהא שטן
מקטרג בסעדתו, ואם קרא קריאת שמע ונתפלל מיד יהא מבטח שתפילתו
נשמעה.

דברים רבה ב:י

XXV-7 ר' יהושע בן לוי אשכח לאליהו שהוי קיימי אפיתחא דמערותא דרבי שמעון בן יוחאי. אמר ליה אחינא לעלמא דאחי. אמר ליה, אם ירצה אדון הזה. אמר ר' יהושע בן לוי שנים ראיתי וקול ג' שמעתי. אמר ליה אימת אחי משיח... אמר ליה זיל שייליה לדידיה. והיכא יתיב? אפיתחא דקרתא, ומאי סימניה? יתיב ביני עניי טובלי חלאים וכולן שרו ואסירי בחד זינמא. איהו שרי חד ואסיר חד אמר דילמא מבעינא דלא איעכב. אזל לגביה אמר ליה שלום עליך רבי ומורי. אמר ליה שלום עליך בי ליואי. אמר ליה לאימתי אחי מר א"ל היום. אחא לגבי אליהו א"ל מאי אמר לך. אמר ליה שלום עליך בר ליואי א"ל אבטחך לך ולאבון לעלמא דאחי א"ל שקורי קא שקר בי דאמר לי היום. אהינא ולא אחא. א"ל הכי אמר לך "היום אם בקולו חשמעו." (ההילים צה:ז)

סנהדרין צח:

XXII-3 קבל עליך דברי חורה בצער. ואל תהי מבקש עלבונך. חשבון יפה ופרק טוב יש הבטחה ויש אמת.

Editor's comments:

מבקש עלבונך - אל תרדוף לנקום עבור עלבונך שעלבו בך. חשבון יפה: השחדל לחיות בחשבון. ופרק טוב: התנהגות טובה. יש הבטחה: אם תבטיח - קיים באמת.

דרך ארץ זוטא פרק ב

XXV-9 מתני' - האונן והמפקח את הגל וכן מי שהבטיחוהו להוציא סבית האסורים והחולה והזקן שהן יכולין לאכול כזית שוחטין עליהן על כולם. אין שוחטין עליהן בפני עצמן שמא יביאו את הפסח לידי פסול... גמ' - אמר רבה בר חונא א"ר יוחנן לא שנו אלא בית האסורין דעכו"ם אבל בית האסורין דישאל שוחטין בפני עצמן כיון דאבטחינהו מפי' ליה דכתיב "שארית ישראל לא יעשו עולה ולא ידברו כזב." (צפניה ג:יג)

פסחים צא:

XXII-4 "ויאמר ה' אל משה מה תצק אלי (דבר אל בני ישראל ויסעו)" (שמות יד:טו)... ד"א בשביל הבטחה שהבטיחום אבותיהם אני אקדש לכם את הים, שנאמר "והיה זרעך כעפר הארץ ופרצת ימה וקדמה." (בראשית כח:יז) ר' יהודה בן בתירה אומר אמר לו הקב"ה כבר עשיתי הבטחה שהבטחתי אברהם אביכם, שנאמר "וישם את הים לחרבה" (שמות יד:כא)

מכילתא ויהי בשלח ג

XXV-14 ד"א עושה אני להם הבטחה שהבטחתי לאבותיהם שבזכותן אני קורע את הים שנאמר "והיה זרעך כעפר הארץ וגו'." ר' יהודה בן בתירה אומר כבר עשיתי הבטחה שהבטחתי את אבותיהם, שנאמר "וישם את הים לחרבה וגו'."

ילקוט שמעוני

XXV-5 "וזה הדבר אשר תעשה להם" (שמות כט:א)... ד"א "וזה הדבר" - הה"ד "לעולם ה' דבור נצב בשמים." (ההילים קיט:ח) וכי אין דברו של הקב"ה נצב בארץ אלא בשמים? א"ר חזקיה בר חייה: מפני שהבטיח הקב"ה דבר ואחר רד"ו שנים באתה הבטחה שהבטיח הקב"ה את הצדיק. כיצד? בשעה שאמר הקב"ה לאברהם

"לך לך מארצך... ואעשך לגוי גדול" (בראשית יב:א) אמר לפני הקב"ה רבש"ע מה הנאה יש לי בכל הברכות הללו והריני הולך מן העולם בלא בנים. "אל הקב"ה לאבוהם כבר אתה יודע שאין אתה מוליד? אמר לפניו רבש"ע כל אני רואה במזל שלי שאיני מוליד. "אל מן המזל אתה מתיירא? חייך כשם שאי אפשר לאדם למנות את הכוכבים כך א"א למנות בניך. "א"ר' יהודה בר סימון בשם ר' חנין באותה שעה העלה הקב"ה את אברהם למעלה מכיפת הרקיע וא"ל "הבט נא השמימה וספור הכוכבים אם תוכל לספור אותם ויאמר לו כה יהיה זרעך." (בראשית טו:ה). "אל כשם שאתה רואה את אלו ואי אתה יכול למנותם כך יהיה זרעך שאין אדם יכול למנותם. וכן אתה מוצא ביעקב שהבטיחו הקב"ה וא"ל "והיה זרעך כעפר הארץ" (בראשית כח:יד). וכן "אנכי ארד עמך מצרימה ואנכי אעלה גמ עליה" (בראשית מו:ד) וקיים לו הקב"ה, הוי "לעולם ה' דברך נצב בשמים." וכן אתה מוצא באהרן שהבטיחו הקב"ה לכשה ואמר לו "ואתה הקרב אליך את אהרן אחיך (ואת בניו אתו מתוך בני ישראל לכהנו לך)" (שמות כח:א) וקיים לו הקב"ה, הוי "וזה הדבר אשר תעשה להם (לקדש אתם לכהן לך)" (שמות כט:א)

שמות רבה לח:ו

XXV-12 "הוא עשן ויכננך" (דברים לב:ו) -... רבי שמעון בן יהודה אומר הושיבך על בסיסך הלעיטך ביוח שבעה עממים ונחן לך מה שנשבע לך זהורישך מה שהבטיחך.

ספרי האזינו שט

XXV-15 ד"א "כי קרוב הוא" - לא הביאן המקום בפשוטה אלא כיון ששמעו כנעניים שישראל נכנסין עמרו ושרפו כל הזרעים וקצצו כל האילנות וסתרו את הבנינים וסתמו את המעינות. אמר הקב"ה לא הבטחתם לאבותם שאכניסן לארץ חריבה אלא מלאה כל טוב שנאמר "בתים מלאים כל טוב" (דברים ו:יא) אלא הריני מקיפן במדבר ארבעים שנה עד שיעמדו כנעניים ויתקנו מה שקלקלו.

מכילתא ויהי בשלח פתיחתא

XXI-20 ("וחק מרים הנביאה אחות אהרן) את החף בידה (ותצאן כל הנשים אחריה בתפנים ובמחלת") (שמות טו:כ) - וכי מנין היו להם תופים ומחולות במדבר? אלא הצדיקים היו מובטחים ויודעים שהקדוש ברוך הוא עושה להם נסים וגבורות. עת שיוצין ממצרים התקינו להם תופים ומחולות.

מכילתא מסכתא דשירחא י ויהי בשלח י

XXIII-7 ועכשו ים היה ונעשה לנו יבשה שנאמר "ובני ישראל הלכו ביבשה בתוך הים." נקלטנו באז שהפך לנו ים ליבשה הוי "אז ישיר משה ובני ישראל." (שמות יד:לא) ואין אז אלא לשון בטחון שנאמר "אז תלך לבטח דרך" (משלי ג:כג)

שמות רבה כג:ד

XXV-8 וכי מהדר אפיה מציבורא מאי אמר? אדברית רב חסדא לרב עוקבא ודרש: רבונו של עולם עשינו מה שגזרת עלינו עשה עמנו מה שהבטחתנו "השקיפה ממעון קדשך מן השמים וגו'" (דברים כו:טו)

סוטה לט.-לט:

XXI-15 "ובנחה יאמר שובה ה' רבבות אלפי ישראל" (במדבר י: לו)
 מאד הכתוב כשהיו ישראל נוסעים אלפים וחונים רבבות כביכול אמר
 משה לפני המקום אינני מניח את השכינה לשרות עד שתעשה לישראל
 אלפים ורבבות שמתשובה שאמר אחה יודע מה אמר להם "ה' אלהי
 אבותיכם יסף עליכם ככם אלף פעמים (ויבורך כאשר דבר לכם")
 (דברים א: יא). אמרו לו משה ובינו הרי אנו מובטחים בברכות
 הרבה שכן הבטיחנו ככוכבי השמים וכחול הים וכצמחי אדמה ואתה
 נוחן קצבה לברכותינו. אמר להם אני בשר ודם יש קצבה לברכתי זו
 משלי אבל הוא יבורך אתכם כאשר דבר לכם כחול ימים וכצמחי אדמה
 וכדגי הים וככוכבי השמים לרוב.

ספרי במדבר בהעלותך פד

XXV-6 כל שמות האמורים בגבעת בנימין ר' אליעזר אומר, חול
 רבי יהושע אומר קדש. אמר לו ר' אלעזר וכי מבטיח ואינו עושה?
 אמר לו ר' יהושע מה שהבטיח עשה. והם לא ביחנו אם לנצוח אם
 לנצח.

שבועות לה:

XXV-11 "והנשאים בכם ימקו בעונם (בארצת איביכם ואף בעונות
 אבתם אתם ימקו)" (ויקרא כו: לו) - אינו אומר "ימקו" אלא ימסו
 בעונם ובעונות אבותם אתם ימסו. והלא כבר הבטיח המקום לישראל
 שאינו דן האבות ע"י בנים ולא בנים על ידי אבותם שנאמר "לא
 ימותו אבות על בנים ובנים לא ימותו על אבות (כו איש בחטאו ימותו")
 (דברי הימים ב' כה: ד). א"כ למה נאמר "אף בעונות אבותם אתם
 ימקו." אלא בזמן שהם חפוזי מעשה אבותם דור אחר דור דוריהם
 נידונים על ידיהם.

ספרא בחוקותי פרק ח: ב

XXV-16 "הבאמו ותטעמו בהר נחלתך" (שמות טו: יז) - בהר שהבטחנו
 בו שנאמר "בהר קדשי בהר מרום ישראל" (יחזקאל כ: ס).

מכילתא מסכתא דשירחא
 ויהי בשלח י

APPENDIX II: Hebrew Sources Concerning Rewards for אמן

Mekilta Beshallach 6

V-20 "ויאמינו כה" - גרולה האמונה שהאמינו ישראל כפי שאמר והיה העולם שבשכר שהאמינו ישראל כה' שרתה עליהם רוח השקר ואמרו שירה שנאמר "ויאמינו כה' וכמשה עבדו" ונאמר "אז ישיר משה וכני ישראל." וכן אחה מוצא שלא ירש אברהם אבינו העולם הזה והעולם הבא אלא בזכות שהאמין כה' שנאמר "והאמין כה' ויחשבה לו צדקה." (בראשית ט"ו)

מכילתא ויהי כשלח ו'

I/II-4 "אז ישיר משה וכני ישראל" - ר' נחמיה אומר כל המקבל עליו מצוה אחת כאמנה כדאי הוא שחשירה עליו רוח הקדש שכן מצינו כאבותינו שבשכר אמנה שהאמינו אבותינו כה' זכו ושרתה עליהם רוח הקדש ואמרו שירה שנאמר "ויאמינו כה' וכמשה עבדו" ונאמר "אז ישיר משה וכני ישראל." וכן אח מוצא שלא ירש אברהם אבינו העולם הזה והעולם הבא אלא בזכות אמנה שהאמין כה' שנאמר "והאמין כה' ויחשבה לו צדקה." וכן אח מוצא שלא נגאלו ישראל ממצריים אלא בשכר האמנה שנאמר "ויאמן העם." (שמות י: לא.) וכה"א אמונים נוצר ה'." (תהילים לא: כד.)

מכילתא ויהי כשלח ו'

II-3 מזכירין אמונת אבות ואומר "ואהרן וחור חסכו כידיו" (שמות יז: יב) ואומר "זה השער לה' צדיקים יבאו בו" (תהילים קי"ח: כ) כבעלי אמנה מהו אומר "פחחו שערים ויבא גוי צדיק שומר אמונים" (ישעיה כו: ב) השער הזה כל בעלי אמונה נכנסין בו וכה"א "טוב להודות לה' ולזמר לשמך עליון להגיד בכקר חסדך ואמונתך כלילות עלי עשור ועלי נבל עלי הגיון ככנור כי שמחחני ה' כפעליך במעשה יריך ארנן." (תהילים צב: כ-ו.) מי גרם לנו לכא לירי שמחה זו שכר אמנה שהאמינו אבותינו בעולם הזה שכלו לילה, לפיכך זכינו לעולם הבא שכולו כקר, לכך נאמר "להגיד בכקר חסדך ואמונתך כלילות." וכן יהושפט אומר לעם "האמינו כה' אלהיכם ותאמנו האמינו כנביאיו והצליחו." (דה"ב: כ: כ) וכתיב "עיניך תלא לאמנה" (ירמיה ה: כ) וכתיב "צדיק כאמונתו יחיה" (חבקוק ב: ד) וכתיב "חשויים לכקרים רבה אמונתך." (איכה ג: כג.)

מכילתא ויהי כשלח ו'

I/II-5 וכן אחה מוצא שאין הגליות מתכנסות אלא בשכר אמנה שנאמר "אחי מלכנון כלה אחי מלכנון תבואי תשורי מראש אמנה." (שיר השירים ד: ח) וכתיב "וארשתוך לי לעולם וארשתוך כאמונה" (תושע ב: כא) הא גרולה אמנה לפני הקב"ה שבשכר אמונה שרתה רוח הקדש ואמרו שירה שנאמר "ויאמינו כה' וכמשה עבדו אז ישיר משה וכני ישראל את השירה חזאת לה." וכן הוא אומר "ויאמינו בדבריו וישירו התילתן." (תהילים קו: יב.)

מכילתא ויהי כשלח ו'

Parallel passages: Yalkut Shimoni, Hosea 519 and Beshallach 208.

Mekilta Beshallah 3

I/II-6 רבי אומר כרי היא האמנה שהאמינו כי שאקדע להם את
הים שנאמר "וישובו ויחנו לפני פי החירות." (בין מגדל ובין
הים לפני כעל צפון נכחו תחנו על הים.) (שמות יד:ב) ...
שמעיה אומר כרי היא האמנה שהאמין כי אברהם אביהם שאקדע להם
את הים, שנאמר "והאמין בה" ויחשבה לו צדקה." (בראשית טו:ו)
אבטליון אומר כרי היא האמנה שהאמינו כי שאקדע להם את הים,
שנאמר "ויאמן העם וישמעו." (שמות יד:לא).

מכילתא ויהי כשלח ג'

V-21 אחרים אומרים דבר גדול עשו ישראל כרי היא האמונה
שהאמינו כי שאקדע להם את הים שלא אמרו למשה היאך אנו יוצאים
למדבר ואין כידינו מחיה לדרך אלא האמינו והלכו אחרי משה.
עליהם מפרש כקלה "הלוך וקראת כאזני ירושלים לאמר זכרתי לך
חסד נעורייך אהבת כלולותיך לכתך אחרי כמדבר בארץ לא זרועה"
(ירמיה כ:ב) מה שכר נטלו על כך "קדש ישראל לה" ראשית תבואתו
כל אוכלין יאשמו רעה תבא עליהם נאם ה'." (שם כ:ג)

מכילתא ויהי כשלח ג'

I/II-9 ר' מאיר אומר אמ' לו כרי אמנה שהאמינו כי ישראל
במצרים אני קורע להן את הים. שלא אמרו לו למשה היאך נחזור
לאחורינו שלא נשכור לכ טף שמענו אלא האמינו והלכו אחרי משה.

מכילתא ורבי שמעון
כר יוחאי כשלח יד:טו

I/II-11 רבי אומר: אמר הקב"ה: כרי היא האמנה שהאמינו כי
ישראל, שאקדע להם הים, שלא אמרו למשה: היאך נחזור לאחורינו
שלא לשכור לכ טף ונשים שעמנו? אלא האמינו כי והלכו אחרי משה.

שמות רבה כא:ח

III-11 "וייראו העם את ה'", שנו רבותינו: הקורא את שמע
צריך להזכיר קריעת ים סוף ומכת בכורים כאמת ויציב ואם לא
הזכיר אין מחזירין אותו אבל אם לא הזכיר יציאת מצריים מחזירין
אותו.... ולמה צריך להזכיר קריעת ים סוף כאמת ויציב, לפי
שכיון שקדע להם את הים האמינו בו, שנאמר "ויאמינו בה" ובמשה
עברו. (שמות י"ד:לא) ובזכות האמנה שהאמינו זכו לומר שירה
ושרתה עליהם שכינה שכן כתיב אחריו "אז ישיר משה." (שם טו:א),
לכך צריך אדם לסמך גאולה חתפילה, כשם שהם הסמיכו שירה אחר
האמנה והקריעה. וכשם שהם טהרו לכס ואמרו שירה שכן כתיב "
"וייראו העם את ה' ויאמינו בה" (שמות י"ד:לא) ואחר כך "אז
ישיר." (שם ט"ו:א), כל צריך אדם לטהר את לבו קדם שיתפלל.

שמות רבה כ"ב:ג

III-12 דבר אחר: "אז ישיר משה." הוא הוא דכתיב: "ויאמינו
בדבריו ישירו תהילתו" (תהילים ק"ו:י"ב). אמר ר' אבהו:
אף על פי שכתוב כבר שהאמינו עד שהיו כמצריים, שנאמר "ויאמן
העם" (שמות יד:לא), חזרו ולא האמינו שנאמר "אכזרתינו כמצריים
לא השכילו נפלאותיך" (תהילים ק"ו:ז') כיון שכאו על הים וראו
גבורתו של הקב"ה היאך עושה משפט כרשעים כמה רחמא "ותאחז
כמשפט ירי", ושקע את מצרים בים מיד (דברים ל"ב:מ"א) "ויאמינו
בה" ובמשה עברו." (שמות י"ד:לא)

שמות רבה כ"ב:ג

ובזכות האמנה שרחח עליהם רוח הקדש ואמרו שירה, הוא
הוא רכתיב, "אז ישיר משה וכני ישראל." ואין "אז" אלא לשון
אמנה, שנאמר "ויהי מאז הפקיר אחו ככיתו," (כראשית ל"ט:ה')
וכתיב: "וכל יש לו נחן כידו" (שם שם:ר), הוי "ויאמינו
בכריו ישירו תהילתו."
שמות רבה כ"ג:כ

V-8 "תשורי מראש אמנה" (שיר השירים ד:ח) - אמר ר' יוסטא:
הר הוא ושמו אמנה, ער אותו ההר - ארץ ישראל, וסמנו ולהלן -
חוץ לארץ. אמר ר' אלעזר בר' יוסי: כשיגיעו הגלילות לשם, יהיו
אומרים שירה לכך נאמר: "תשורי מראש אמנה." ר"א: "תשורי מראש
אמנה" עתידין ישראל לומר שירה לעתיד לבוא, שנאמר "שירו לה'
שיר חדש כי נפלאות עשה," (תהילים צח:א), ובאיזה זכות אומרים
ישראל שירה בזכות אברהם שהאמין בקב"ה, שנאמר "והאמין בה"
(כראשית ט"ו:ו'), היא האמונה שישראל נותלין בה' ועליו הכתוב
אומר, "וצדיק כאמונתו יחיה." (הכקוק ב:ר), הוי "תשורי מראש
אמנה."

שמות רבה כ"ג:ה

Parallel passage: Yalkut Shimonl, Song of Songs 988.

III-13 ר"א: "תשורי מראש אמנה," אמר ר' נחמיה: לא זכו ישראל
לומר שירה על הים אלא בזכות אמנה, שנאמר "ויאמן העם" (שמות ד:
ל"א), וכתיב "ויאמינו בה" (שמות י"ו:ל"א). אמר ר' יצחק:
היו רואין כל אותן נסים שנעשו להם ולא היה להם להאמין? אלא
אמר ר' שמעון בר אבא: כשכיל האמנה שהאמין אברהם להקב"ה שנאמר
"והאמן בה", ממנה זכו ישראל לומר שירה על הים שנאמר "אז ישיר
משה," הוי "תשורי מראש אמנה."
שמות רבה כ"ג:ה'

I/II-8 "הכו לה' משפחות עמים." (תהילים כט:) - אמר ר' אחא
עמים הכו לה' אין כתיב כאן אלא משפחות עמים הכו לה' כבוד ועוז.
באיזו זכות - בזכות שאמרו שירה על שים. רב נחמן אמר בזכות
אמנה שהאמין אברהם שנאמר "ויאמין בה." (כראשית טו:ו). רבי
חלבו כשם ר' יוחנן אמר כתיב "וירא ישראל את היר הגדולה"
(שמות יד:ל"א) - וארין ארס ואינם מאמינים! אית כר נש דחמי
ולא מהימן. הוי בזכות האמנה שהאמינו ישראל במצריים, שנאמר
"ויאמן העם" (שמות ד:ל"א).

שיר השירים רבה ד:ח

Parallel passage: Song of Songs Rabbah 4:8.

I/II-13 ר"א "תשורי מראש אמנה" - בזכות מה זכו ישראל לומר
שירה על הים בזכות האמנה שהאמינו, מה כתיב למעלה מן הענין,
"וירא ישראל את היר הגדולה וכו'" (ויאמינו בה; ובמשה עבדו)
(שמות י"ד:ל"א). אמר ר' נחמיה בזכות מה אמרו שירה בזכות
האמנה שהאמינו תהילה שנאמר "ויאמן העם" (שם ד:ל"א). "תשורי
מראש אמנה" בזכות האמנה זכו לומר שירה שנאמר "אז ישיר משה."

תנחומא כשלח יא

V-26 למדני מיעקב שמחלילת מעשיו היה ירא שמים שנאמר "ויחננו אל יעקב את כל אלהי הנכר וגו'" (בראשית ל"ה:ד) וכן אבותינו הראשונים שנאמר "וירא ישראל את ה' הגדולה וגו'" (שמות י"ד:לא) ללמדך שכשכר יראה וכשכר רמנה שהאמינו בו מחללה עתיד הקב"ה שיכא ויפדה אותם מבין אומות העולם, שנאמר "חולי וגוהי בת ציון (כ"ולדת כי עתה צתאי מקריה ושכנת כשרה וכאח עד ככל שם חנצלי שם ינאלך ה' מכך איביר") (מיכה ד:י)

ילקוט שמעוני לך לך עו

I/II-7 "חשור" (שיר השירים ד:ח) - שעתידין להביא את ישראל כתשורה הזו "והכילו את כל אחיכם מכל הגוים וגו'" (ישעיה סו:כ) ואומר "הכו לה' משפחות עמים" (תהילים כט:) "מראש אמנה" בזכות אמנה שהאמינו בהקב"ה על הים "ויאמינו בה" (שמות י"ד:לא) בזכות אמנה שהאמין אברהם בשם, בזכות אמנה כסגרים "ויאמן העם." (שמות ד:לא)

ילקוט שמעוני שיר השירים
חחקה

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. PRIMARY SOURCES

ילקוט שמעוני, "פרדס", ניו יורק.

מדרש משלי, מבוא מאת שלמה באבער, ווילנא, "ראם", 5653.

מדרש רבה, פרוש מאת משה אריה מירקין, "יבנה", חל אביב, חשי"כ.

מדרש רבה, "פאר" כמו שנדפס בדפוס "ראם", ירושלים, חש"ל.

מדרש תהילים, יצא לאור מאת שלמה באבער, ווילנא, בדפוס "ראם", 1891.

מדרש תנחומא, ווארשא, חרפ"ז.

מדרש שוחר טוב, הוצאת "מדרש", חש"ך.

מכילתא דרבי ישמעאל, נערכו על ידי חיים שאול האראוויטץ ו ישראל אברהם רבין, במברגר אה ואהרמן, ירושלים, חש"ך.

מכילתא דרבי שמעון בן יוחאי, הוכן וסודר בידי יעקב נחום הלוי ועזרא ציון מלמד, הוצאת מקיצי נרדמים, ירושלים, חש"ו.

ספרא דבי רב, הובא לבית דפוס על ידי אייזק דוד וויס ו יעקב הכהן שלאסבערג, ווין, 1862.

ספרי דבי רב, עם חלופי גרסאות והערות מאת חיים שאול האראוויטץ, לייפציג, חרע"ז.

ספרי על ספר דברים, עם חלופי גרסאות והערות מאת אליעזר אריה פינקלשטין, ברלין, הוצאת האגודה החרבותית היהדות בגרמניה, השלפ"ק.

חלמוד כבלי

חלמוד ירושלמי

II. INDICES, CONCORDANCES

- גרוס, משה דוד, אוצר האגדה, ירושלים, מוסד הרב קוק, תש"ו.
- הימאן, אהרן, תורה הכתובה והמסורה, חל אביב, דביר, תרצ"ז.
- מאנדלקרן, ש., קונקורדנציה לתנ"ך, ירושלים, הוצאת שוקן, תשכ"ז.
- קוסופסקי, בנימין, אוצר לשון התנאים למכילתא דרבנן ישמעאל, ירושלים, ירושלים, בית המדרש לרבנים באמריקה, תשכ"ה.
- , אוצר לשון התנאים לספרא, ירושלים, הוצאת מסדה, תשכ"ז.
- , אוצר לשון התנאים לספרי, ירושלים, הוצאת מסדה, תשל"א.
- קאסאווסקי, חיים יהושע, אוצר לשון התלמוד, מסד החינוך והתרבות של ממשלת ישראל, תשל"ב.

III. SECONDARY SOURCES -- HEBREW

- אורבך, אפרים א., חז"ל: פרקי אמונות ודעות, ירושלים, הוצאת ספרים על שם י"ל מאגנס, תשל"א.
- היינמן, יצחק, "אמונה", אנציקלופדיה מקראית, ירושלים, מוסד ביאליק, תשס"כ, כרך א', עמ' 426-428.
- , "בסחון", אנציקלופדיה מקראית, כרך ב', עמ' 50.

IV. ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS

The Babylonian Talmud, London, Soncino Press.

Braude, William G., The Midrash on Psalms, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1959.

Freedman, H. and Simon, Maurice, editors, Midrash Rabbah, London, Soncino Press, 1939.

Lauterbach, Jacob Z., Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society, 1933.

V. SECONDARY SOURCES -- ENGLISH

Abraham, Israel, "Belief," Encyclopedia Judaica, Jerusalem, Keter Publishing House Ltd., 1971, Vol. 4, pp. 429-434.

Blackman, E. C., "Faith, Faithfulness," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, New York, Abingdon Press, 1962, Vol. E - J, pp. 222-228.

Borowitz, Eugene B., "Covenant Theology -- Another Look," Worldview, March, 1973, pp. 21-17.

Buber, Martin, Two Types of Faith, New York, Harper & Row, 1951.

Bultmann, Rudolph and Weiser, Artur, Faith, London, Adam & Charles Black, 1961.

"Faith," The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, New York, The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia Inc., Vol. 4, p. 233.

Golub, Mark Steven, The Rabbinic Connotations of אהב and נחב, unpublished rabbinic thesis, HUC-JIR, 1972, pp.

Kadushin, Max, A Conceptual Approach to the Mekilta, New York, The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1969.

-----, The Rabbinic Mind, New York, Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1965.

-----, The Theology of Seder Eliahu, New York, Bloch Publishing Company, 1931.

-----, Worship and Ethics, Evanston, Ill., Northwestern University Press, 1964.

- Kohler, Kaufmann, "Faith," The Jewish Encyclopedia, New York, K'tav Publishing House, Vol. 5, p. 326.
- , Jewish Theology, New York, K'tav Publishing Co., 1965.
- Jacob, Edmond, Theology of the Old Testament, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1955.
- Jacobs, Louis, Faith, New York, Basic Books, 1968.
- , Jewish Values, London, Valentine, Mitchel & Co., 1960.
- Marmorstein, A., The Doctrine of Merits in Old Rabbinical Literature, New York, K'tav Publishing House, Inc., 1968.
- Montefiore, C. G., Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings, New York, K'tav Publishing House, Inc., 1970.
- , and Loewe, H., A Rabbinic Anthology, New York, Schocken Books, 1974.
- Moore, George Foot, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Rad, Gerhard von, Old Testament Theology, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1962.
- Rowley, H. H., The Faith of Israel, London, S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1956.
- Schechter, Solomon, Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, New York, Schocken Books, 1961.
- Urbach, Ephraim, The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs, Jerusalem, The Magnes Press, 1975.
- Vriezen, Th. C., An Outline of Old Testament Theology, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1958.
- Werblowsky, R. J. Zwi, "Faith, Hope, and Trust: A Study in the Concept of Bittahon," in Weiss, J. G., editor, Papers of the Institute of Jewish Studies London, Jerusalem, The Magnes Press, 1964, Vol. 1, pp. 95-139.