



ישיבת הר עציון

Yeshivat Har Etzion – Israel Koschitzky VBM Parsha Digest, Year VII, #10 Parashat Toldot 5785

Selected and Adapted by Rabbi Dov Karoll

Quote from the Rosh Yeshiva

Indeed, in the Ramban's view, the institution [of yeshivot hesder] can be traced back to our very fountainhead. In explaining why Avimelech was so anxious to conclude a treaty with Yitzhak, he conjectures that it may have been due to the fact "that Avraham was very great and mighty... and he was a lion-hearted soldier, and he pursued and vanquished 4 very powerful kings.... And the son emulated the father, as Yitzhak was great like his father...."

This account of lion-hearted patriarchs and their sword-wielding disciples may fall strangely upon some ears.... The fact, however, remains: the primary tradition is hesder. -Harav Aharon Lichtenstein zt"l, "The Ideology of Hesder" in *Leaves of Faith* volume 1, <https://etzion.org.il/en/philosophy/great-thinkers/harav-aharon-lichtenstein/ideology-hesder>

Parashat Toldot Dividing the Berakhot

By Rav Ezra Bick

Based on: <https://etzion.org.il/en/tanakh/torah/sefer-bereishit/parashat-toldot/toldot-dividing-berakhot>



The question of why Yitzchak wanted to give Esav the berakhot (blessings) is 1 of the most widely discussed by commentators on Bereishit. Several commentators have suggested that Yitzchak never intended to deny Yaakov the spiritual legacy of Avraham, including the promise of the Land. The berakha intended for Esav, ultimately usurped by Yaakov, was a different, parallel one to that given to Yaakov at the end of the parasha. Yitzchak was aware that the spiritual stature of Esav disqualified him from being the bearer of the mantle of Avraham.

There are several versions of this double-berakha theory. R. Menachem Leibtag suggested that Yitzchak thought that both children would together share in "Jewish" identity. Both would receive personal blessings, just as all of Yaakov's 12 children were blessed, each according to his nature. There is no reason not to bless both, though the "bechira," the "birkat Avraham" of "zera" (offspring) and "aretz" (homeland), was reserved for Yaakov alone. Rivka, on the other hand, knew that the 2 sons were destined to be 2 nations, not 1 – God told her before they were born that "Two PEOPLES are in your womb and 2 NATIONS shall separate out of your bowels, and 1 nation shall be stronger than the other and the older shall serve the younger." Knowing that Yitzchak's plan cannot be fulfilled, she acts to divert the berakha from Esav. The main support for this contention lies in comparing the berakha intended for Esav with the one Yitzchak gives Yaakov at the end of the parasha, right before Yaakov departs for Charan. The first refers only to prosperity and power. There is no mention of the Land of Israel (birkat ha-aretz) and none of the promise of children, or the future people of Israel, the 2 elements of the repeated blessing given by God to Avraham. The second, on the other hand, is explicitly called "birkat Avraham" – "And Kel Shakkai shall bless you and make you fruitful and multiply you, that you should be a MULTITUDE OF PEOPLE; and give you the BLESSING OF AVRAHAM, to you and your seed with you, that you should INHERIT THE LAND in which you dwell, which God gave to Avraham."

What is left unexplained in this scheme? One perplexing point is the apparent belief of Yitzchak that the berakha given to Yaakov (Esav) cannot be shared – there is nothing left to give Esav after this has been given to Yaakov. Why not? Why cannot both have a blessing of prosperity and riches? In fact, Yitzchak soon recovers and blesses Esav. The difference between the berakha given to

Yaakov and that given to Esav seems to lie in the element in the first berakha of “You shall be the superior of your brother and the sons of your mother shall bow before you.” This can be given only once. But that itself is puzzling. Why did Yitzchak see fit to subjugate 1 brother to the other? Yaakov, in giving blessings to his children, did not divide the physical benefits in such an exclusive manner. If the disagreement of Yitzchak and Rivka was whether to follow the example of Avraham – Yitzchak, or to anticipate the path of Yaakov – 12 tribes, Yitzchak’s choice and the attendant tension does not correspond the subsequent form taken by Yaakov.

A second point relates to the prophecy received by Rivka before the birth of the children. It must be argued that Rivka had not shared this prophecy with Yitzchak. Two weeks ago, in the shiur on Vayera, a similar question arose whether Avraham told Sara about the impending birth of Yitzchak before the arrival of the angels. I argued then (against the Ramban) that it is inconceivable that Avraham would not have told Sara. In Rivka’s case, silence has admittedly a greater probability. Unlike the earlier case, this prophecy does not directly concern Yitzchak. Specifically, the element of Sara’s name change, which I believe could not have been withheld from Sara, is absent here. Nonetheless, the necessity of concealing a prophecy given to one foreparent from the other is troubling. Why should Rivka have never told Yitzchak?

Finally, I have a methodological problem. If the basis of the story is a simple mistake, out of ignorance of God’s plan, what is its significance? The passing on of the blessing is the central story of the parasha, indeed, the central story of Yitzchak’s life (after the akeida, which is schematically part of Avraham’s life). Yitzchak’s mistake is a logical one, and in fact is only wrong by a few years, by 1 generation. I believe it is not enough to interpret Bereishit as a logical personal narrative; it must be a story of the Avot, of the creation of the Jewish people, of the spiritual community. What important ISSUE divided Yitzchak and Rivka?

In an article printed in Megadim (#21), Naava Guttman offers an interesting twist on the double-berakha theory. Yitzchak believed it necessary to separate the 2 aspects of a “holy people,” the spiritual and the political. The Jewish nation would be a political entity with a spiritual destiny, a nation living on the earth with a *raison d’être* centered in heaven. Yitzchak thought it not only possible to divide the berakhot between Yaakov and Esav, he thought it necessary. One son would devote himself to the life of the spirit, to being an “ish tam” who dwells in the tent; the other would be the political leader, molding the nation’s fortune in the world, IN ORDER TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE OF THE FORMER. In other words, “ha-kol kol Yaakov ve-hayadayim yedei Esav,” there is a man of hands and a man of words. The 2 cannot exist in the same individual. The 2 tasks are mutually exclusive. This is the distinction between king and priest, between court and temple. The need to be concerned with the problems of the world will ruin and contaminate the man of spirit and kedusha. Yitzchak recognized the personality of Esav and planned to utilize the strengths of that personality in order to further the future of Am Yisrael. Yitzchak loved Esav because “tzayid be-fiv” – he was practical, a provider, a hunter. Giving him a blessing of property and power is not merely a father caring for his son, it is part and parcel of the future of “I shall make you a great nation.” Hence, he grants him not merely wealth, but dominion as well, for Yitzchak believes that 1 aspect of Jewish life must be in control of the other. The practical side, that which must exercise power, shall rule, and “your mother’s sons shall bow down before you.” This does not mean that Esav will subjugate Yaakov, but that he will be the ruler, much as Yosef dreamed that his brothers would bow down to him. Once this berakha is given to Yaakov instead of Esav, however, Yitzchak has nothing left to give to Esav, for he is surely not worthy of receiving the blessing of Avraham, the spiritual leadership of sanctity.

On this theory, Rivka did not merely oppose Yitzchak’s choice, she disagreed with the theory behind it. She may be influenced by the message of God she received before the birth of the children, knowing not only that they would be “two peoples,” which could be understood as 2 tribes, 2 parts of a greater unit, but also that “one nation shall be stronger than the other,” which she understood as “one nation shall struggle against the other (ye’ematz).” It is also possible that, as Guttman claims, Rivka misunderstood, thinking that Yitzchak planned to give Esav the spiritual berakha. Guttman’s proof for this is that whereas Yitzchak tells Esav that he wishes to “bless you before I die,” Rivka tells Yaakov that Yitzchak said he wishes to “bless you before God before I die.” The blessing “before God” is reminiscent of the status of a kohen, who “stands before God.” But I think that even if Rivka understood Yitzchak’s intentions perfectly, she would have opposed them. The disagreement between Rivka and Yitzchak was one of principle. Rivka opposed separating the 2 aspects of Jewish existence so totally. Knowing Esav’s character, knowing how totally dominated he was by the practical, mundane side of life, she did not believe that separation of realms was the way to achieve a perfect union of Jewish destiny.

Rivka aspires to unity, to completeness, in 1 individual. In this she is the opposite of Yitzchak. Why did Yitzchak believe that Yaakov should be left without any practical control over his life, dependent on his brother for food, sustenance and political leadership? The

answer, I think, lies in Yitzchak's own personality. In another VBM shiur, I described Yitzchak as being purely spiritual, inward, contemplative, withdrawn from the world, and detached. In other words, in his own life, Yitzchak's immense spiritual stature was achieved by withdrawing from the sphere of the practical. He was a dreamer, a contemplative. We find no incidents in Yitzchak's life comparable to the drama of Avraham's or Yaakov's - in fact, we find nearly no incidents in Yitzchak's life retold by the Torah. Yitzchak was an "ola Temima" (a flawless, "pure" sacrifice – the term used by Chazal to describe his special status, which, among other things, prevented him from leaving the sacred grounds of Eretz Yisrael), sanctified, hallowed, separated. It is only natural, then, for Yitzchak to believe that Yaakov's spiritual destiny as a "yoshev ohalim" must be protected by finding someone else to carry out those functions that require contact with the hurly-burly of everyday life. Esav is the perfect candidate. Yitzchak imagines that Yaakov will be able to carry on and perfect his own life work, while Esav will lay the practical foundations to transform solitary Jewish existence into nationhood. What's more, Yitzchak believes that power and sovereignty should be granted to Esav, since his role requires it, and Yaakov has no need for it. This is one of the great spiritual positions in history – an absolute divorce between power in the world and personal spiritual development, echoing the plaint of Wordsworth, "the world is too much with us." Yitzchak knows from self-inspection that practical concerns, conflicts, and struggles would have destroyed him. In fact, God shielded him from them all his life, leaving us with a rather eventless biography to read, encapsulated in 1 parasha.

Rivka, on the other hand, is practical, with a bit of those qualities, such as deviousness and stealth, that are foreign to the "pure" nature of Yitzchak. She understands that Yaakov will complete the development of the avot, not by being more like Yitzchak, but by combining the "ohel" (tent) of Yitzchak with practical skills to change the world. (Getting ahead of ourselves, Yaakov is the first to build a house, "bayit," and not live in a tent.). She knows that dividing the aspects of Jewish national life will not lead to a greater whole, but to conflict. The relationship she had with Yitzchak cannot exist between Esav and Yaakov, and Yitzchak's plan will lead to conflict and struggle, not harmony. Even if she told Yitzchak what God had told her earlier, he would have understood it differently, given his character. She not only heard the message of God, she felt the boys' struggle in her womb, in her body, and could harbor no illusions about the outcome of giving Esav dominion over Yaakov. Hence, demonstrating her own practical side, and involving Yaakov in her scheme as well, she acted to correct the situation, to ensure that Yaakov would bear in himself, and pass on to his children, the unified dream of "tal ha-shamayim u-mishmanei ha-aretz" – the dew of heaven and the fatness of the earth – together with "birkat Avraham," the inheritance of Eretz Yisrael.

That her plan will be accomplished with trickery, with all the attendant moral ambiguity, is itself indicative of the nature of what is happening here. Yitzchak shuns any involvement with what could be possibly morally ambiguous, with anything that could affect his status as "ola temima." He has no contact with the mundane, lest it detract from the purity of his heaven-bound vision. The "trick" of getting the berakha is itself the contradiction to Yitzchak's plan, irrespective of the result in changing the intended recipient of the berakha. Hence, Yitzchak's response:

Yitzchak trembled very excessively and said, "Who, then, was it who hunted the provision, and brought it to me that I should eat from all before you came, and I have blessed him? Yea, and he shall be blessed."

The trembling, the anxiety of Yitzchak, has troubled commentators since Chazal. The midrash, feeling the dread implied in the words "charada gedola," says this refers to a feeling of gehinom; he felt the opening of hell, of death, before him. Yaakov brought the world, its deceit, its ambiguity and lack of clarity (see Rashi on v. 19) into Yitzchak's life; indeed, he fed it to him, and Yitzchak ate it "from all." This was a contradiction, a desecration, of the foundation of Yitzchak's whole existence, a corruption of his special purity. "Charada gedola" (a great trembling), asks the midrash, is greater than what? – "greater than the trembling he experienced on the altar at the akeida." The akeida defined Yitzchak as ola temima; deceit rocks, as an underlying anxiety and dread, that foundation.

Yitzchak, however, recovers. "Gam barukh yihiyeh" – yea, and he shall be blessed. In 1 second, Yitzchak sees that the next stage is not as he thought, a further deepening of spiritual detachment, but rather a widening of spiritual dimension to encompass and sanctify the practical side of life. The berakha he gave Yaakov CAN coexist with Yaakov's spiritual blessing. He shall be blessed, it is not impossible, it is not a contradiction. Yaakov shall leave the house of Yitzchak to wander, to struggle, with Esav, with Lavan, with the problems of his children, with galut and tum'a, and by doing so he will complete the building of "beit Yisrael." As the angel who blesses him and names him Yisrael says, "For you have struggled with God and men and you have prevailed."

Sefer Daniel

Lesson 6: Daniel Chapter 4

The First Dream and Its Interpretation (Part 4)

By Harav Yaakov Medan



Based on: <https://etzion.org.il/en/tanakh/ketuvim/sefer-daniel/daniel-4-first-dream-and-its-interpretation-4>

Thus far, we have discussed the phenomenon of Nevukhadnetzar's dream and the word of God that it contains. Let us now turn our attention to the meaning of the dream. It is described by Daniel as follows (2:31-36):

You, o king, saw – behold – a mighty image. This image was imposing and of extreme brightness; it stood before you, and its appearance was terrible. The head of this image was of fine gold, its front and arms were of silver, its belly and thighs of brass, its legs of iron, and its feet partly of iron and partly of clay. And you watched until a stone was cut without hands, and it struck the image on its feet which were of iron and clay, and broke them. Then the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver and the gold all broke into pieces and were like the chaff of the summer threshing floors, and the wind carried them away, and no place was found for them. And the stone which had struck the image became a great mountain, and it filled the entire earth. This was the dream, and we shall state its meaning before the king.

Daniel then goes on to present the following interpretation (2:37-45):

You are the king, king of kings, to whom the God of heaven has given kingdom, power, strength & glory; & wherever mortals dwell, the beasts of the field & the birds of the sky – He has given them into your hand & has made you ruler over all of them; you are the head of gold. And after you there shall arise another kingdom, inferior to yours, & then a 3rd kingdom, of brass, which will reign over the entire earth. And the 4th kingdom will be as strong as iron, for iron breaks to pieces & subdues all things, & like iron that shatters, so shall it break & shatter all of these. And as for your seeing the feet & the toes, partly of potters' clay & partly of iron – it shall be a divided kingdom, with some of the strength of iron in it, as you saw – iron mixed with miry clay. And like the toes of the feet which were partly iron & partly mire, part of the kingdom will be strong, & part will be broken. For as you saw iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of man, but they will not cleave to one another, just as iron cannot be mixed with clay. And in the days of these things, the God of heaven will raise a kingdom which will never be destroyed, nor will this kingdom be left to another people; it shall break & consume all of these kingdoms, & it shall remain forever, just as you saw that a stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, & it broke the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, & the gold. The great God has made it known to the king what will happen in the future, & the dream is certain, & its meaning is sure.

The elements most easily understood here are that Nevukhadnetzar and the Babylonian kingdom are the head of gold, and the Kingdom of God (and His people, Israel) are the stone that is cut out; this is the final Kingdom. In between, there are 3 other kingdoms: 1 is represented by the silver front and arms; the second is represented by the belly and thighs of brass; the third is represented by the legs of iron and its mixture with clay. Together with the kingdom of Babylon, these are the 4 kingdoms which subjugate Am Yisrael until the time of the redemption. The conventional interpretation of this vision is set forth in the midrash (Tanchuma, Teruma 6):

Daniel saw these 4 kingdoms, and was afraid... What did Daniel see? When Nevukhadnetzar had his dream and Daniel came to explain its meaning to him, he said, "You are the head of gold," "the front and arms of silver" – this is the kingdom of Babylon; and "after you there shall arise another kingdom," "its belly and thighs of brass" – this is the kingdom of Media, "and then a third kingdom, of brass, which will reign over the entire earth," its legs of iron – this is the kingdom of Greece. "And the fourth kingdom will be as strong as iron," "its feet partly of iron and partly of clay" – this is Edom. Why is [Edom] compared to iron and clay?... Just as iron is strong, so this evil kingdom is strong, but it is also compared to clay, because in the future God will break it, like clay... And he saw the king Mashiach, as it is written, "And you watched until a stone was cut..." Reish Lakish said: This is the king Mashiach. "And it struck the image on its feet" – [meaning,] all the kingdoms which are embodied in this image.

According to this interpretation, the second kingdom (silver) represents that of the Persians and Medes, the third kingdom (brass) is Greece, and the fourth kingdom, depicted as a mixture of iron and clay, is the "kingdom of Edom" – i.e., Rome.

What is the connection between Rome, in Europe, and Edom, whose homeland is Mount Se'ir? The etymological link is based on an exchange of the letters 'ר and 'ד. "Rome" in Hebrew is "Roma," spelled רומא; "Edom" is spelled אדום. Given the similarity between the letters 'ר and 'ד, they are exchanged in several places in Tanakh. The example most relevant to our discussion is: "At that time, Retzin, king of Aram, restored Eilat to Aram and drove the men of Yehuda from Eilat, and the Aramim [read (keri), "Adomim"] came to Eilat and

dwelled there, to this day” (Melakhim II 16:6). Just as Edom is exchanged for Aram, so Edom is exchanged with Rome.

As mentioned, almost all the commentators agree that the “silver kingdom” symbolizes the Persians and Medes (hence the 2 arms, according to R. Sa’adia Gaon), while the kingdom of brass represents Alexander the Great and the Greek empire which flourished after him. Ibn Ezra includes Rome within the third kingdom, apparently owing to the cultural and religious similarities between Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome. To his view, the fourth kingdom is that of Yishmael – that is, Islam. The commentary attributed to R. Sa’adia Gaon asserts that the divided fourth kingdom is comprised of both Rome and Yishmael. Rashi, however, like the midrash, ignores Yishma’el-Islam and identifies the fourth kingdom as Rome.

Reish Lakish, the source for identifying the fourth kingdom as Edom, could have imagined no alternative explanation. After all, the Islamic conquest began centuries after his death. Rashi could also ignore the kingdom of Yishma’el. He lived under the kingdom of Edom, if we identify all of Christianity with Edom-Rome (which accepted Christianity during the time of Constantine at the end of the first century of the fourth Jewish millennium, paralleling the third generation of Amoraim). R. Sa’adia Gaon and Ibn Ezra, however, could not ignore Yishma’el, nor could Abarbanel, who lived in Spain for most of his life. Hence, we conclude that the explanations of the various Rishonim reflect the history of their times.

As such, what can we say in our generation, after the many changes in Christendom, culminating in the horror of Nazi Germany (which is not identical with Christianity), as well as the rise & fall of the Soviet Union, & the rise of the United States? What has become of the idea of the “4 kingdoms”? Chazal reiterate the existence of 4 kingdoms in the context of the 2nd verse in the Torah (Ber. Rabba 2), the Covenant of the Parts (Mekh., Yitro, 9), the unclean animals in Vayikra 11 (Vay. Rabba 13), and the wild beasts in Yirmeyahu 5 (Yalkut Shim. Vay. 536). Hundreds of years have passed, and we have survived more than 4 kingdoms – & still Mashiach has not come!

The Maharal, at the beginning of his Ner Mitzva as well as in other places, explains the concept of the four kingdoms as tied specifically with the number 4 – meaning that the concept is valid regardless of the exact historical number. Maharal regards the number 4 as representing division (as in the “4 winds of the heavens” in Zekharia 6). This concept of division stands in opposition to God’s Kingship, which is expressed in unity. Hence, Maharal argues, the exact identification of the 4 individual kingdoms need not necessarily be historically and numerically accurate; several empires may be counted together as the final “kingdom” – especially given its composite nature.

R. Kook viewed the First World War as the awakening of the power of Mashiach (“The War,” Orot, p. 13). He was correct: towards the end of the war, Britain issued the Balfour Declaration, paving the way for a Jewish national home in Eretz Yisrael. Three years later, this aspiration was recognized by the nations at the San Remo Conference. This recognition of the establishment of a national home for Am Yisrael came with the disintegration of the 4 Great Powers: The Prussian Empire, the Russian Empire, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and the Ottoman Empire. The Maharal certainly did not have this specific historical event in mind, but he must have meant something of this sort.

Indeed, aside from the fact that Chazal invoked the concept of the “four kingdoms” in other contexts as well, as noted above, the connection between punishment and the number 4 appears in many places. We find God’s “4 severe judgments” in Yechezkel 14; the 4 families which God will visit upon Israel at the time of the Destruction, as related in Yirmeyahu 15; and many others. All of this lends support to the explanation proposed by Maharal.

The difficulties raised by the historical approaches are clear. Beyond the question of the kingdoms which arose after that of Edom and Yishma’el, it is difficult to conceive of Edom and Yishma’el as being 2 branches of the same kingdom. The difficulties inherent in the theoretical, non-historical approach likewise speak for themselves, arising as they do from the very fact that the historical dimension is ignored.

We shall therefore attempt to propose a different approach to the question. Perhaps we need not necessarily understand Daniel’s explanation as a view of history stretching until the coming of Mashiach, may he come speedily in our days. Even Yaakov, in his words to his sons on his deathbed, speaking of the “end of days,” appears to have foreseen their history only until the Sanctuary in Shilo and not beyond that: “The scepter shall not depart from Yehuda, nor the ruler’s staff from between his legs, until the coming of Shilo, and the obedience of the people shall be his” (Bereishit 49:10).

From this verse it appears that Yaakov did not foresee God’s choice of Jerusalem. Perhaps this is what Chazal meant when they said that “the end was hidden from him.” Daniel, too, did not necessarily see all the generations of human history over thousands of years.

To the best of our understanding, we may say that the silver front and arms indeed represent the Persians and the Medes (2 arms,

as noted). The belly and thighs of brass symbolize Alexander the Great. The feet of iron and clay are the Diadochi, who were not the continuation of the Macedonian kingdom, but rather a different kingdom ruled by Alexander's successors. This explains the emphasis in the dream on the division between them – between the house of Ptolemy, which ruled over Egypt, and the house of the Seleucids, who ruled over Syria and the surrounding region, and the negative relations between them, in the form of the impossible mix of iron and clay. We shall discuss the critical significance of this rift between the house of Ptolemy and the house of the Seleucids as a single but divided kingdom in the final chapter of this series. To our humble view, Daniel's vision never went beyond the Greek Empire and what came in its wake; he never envisioned the Roman Empire, and certainly not the Islamic conquest. We thus propose to explain all the calculations of the end of history and the redemption in a way that is different from the accepted approach.

Why did Daniel see all the way to the divided kingdom of Greece? This reality was to come about long after his time. And if he already saw that far, why not a little further, until the Roman Empire?

The essence of Daniel's vision, as we understand it, pertains to God's Kingship that would come after the kingdom of Ptolemies and the Seleucids – the kingdom of the Chashmonaim. In it, and through the miracles which God would perform in the Temple, Daniel perceived the manifestation of God's eternal Sovereignty. Indeed, the Hasmonean dynasty was the first Israelite monarchy to be established after the loss of Jewish independence with the death of Yoshiyahu, king of Yehuda, at the end of the First Temple Period. The miracles which occurred for the Chashmonaim in the Temple (the miracle of Chanuka) were a sign of the Divine Presence resting upon Am Yisrael in anticipation of the redemption. Perhaps, had we been worthy, it could indeed have been God's will for the redemption of Israel to be realized and maintained forever. However, free choice was stronger than this option, and the dynasty of the Chashmonaim deviated from the path of God, from the path of righteousness and justice, after the death of the righteous sons of Matityahu. Daniel's visions were therefore left in wait for a far-off redemption, the same redemption we are still awaiting – may it come soon – since a Divine promise for the good is never retracted.

The same fate waited many of the visions of our prophets, which have not yet been fulfilled (Yirmeyahu 18:9-10):

And at one moment, I may speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; but if it does evil in My sight, not obeying My voice, then I repent of the good which I had spoken of, to benefit it.

The dream interpreted by Daniel should be viewed in comparison to the visions of 2 of the prophets. One is Yirmeyahu, who prophesized the end of the Babylonian kingdom already in the year that Nevukhadnetzar rose to power. He also foretold the beginning of Israel's redemption from the Babylonian exile, after the fall of the Babylonian empire:

And it shall be, at the end of 70 years, that I shall visit upon the king of Babylon and upon that nation, says God, their iniquity, and upon the land of the Chaldeans, and I shall make it an eternal desolation. (Ibid. 25:12)

Therefore, so says the Lord of Hosts, God of Israel: Behold I shall punish the king of Babylon and his land, as I have punished the king of Assyria. And I will bring Israel back to their pasture, and they shall feed on Carmel and Bashan, and their soul shall be satisfied upon Mount Efraim and the Gilad. (ibid. 50:18-19)

The difference between Yirmeyahu and Daniel is that Yirmeyahu spoke about the beginning of the redemption, about the return to Tzion and the redemption of the land, which would commence 70 years after the rise to power of the Chaldeans – as indeed happened with Cyrus's declaration and the return to Tzion. Daniel, however, spoke about the revival of Israelite sovereignty, the liberation of the nation from its subjugation and exile. This is a longer process. According to the calculation of Chazal, it took an additional 200 years; according to the accepted historical calculation, it took approximately an additional 370 years. There were similarly considerable gaps in time between the redemption and settling of the land in the days of Yehoshua and the establishment of the great monarchy in the days of David. A great discrepancy between the 2 levels of sovereignty exists in our generation, as well.

The other prophet who provides an interesting comparison to Daniel is Chaggai. He belonged to a later period, prophesizing at the beginning of the period of the return to Tzion in the second year of Darius (Daryavesh), with the beginning of the construction of the Second Temple. Chaggai prophesized as follows (2:6-7):

For so says the Lord of Hosts: In just a little while, I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land. And I will shake all the nations, and the choicest of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory, says the Lord of Hosts.

Rashi and Radak explain that the reference here is to the miracles in the days of the Chashmonaim. But whereas Chaggai uttered this prophecy after the construction on the Temple had already begun, Daniel voiced the same message of hope while still in exile.

To subscribe, or for comments, questions or sponsorship opportunities, please write us at: VBMDigest@haretzion.org