



A WOMAN OF VALOR HAS BEEN FOUND: RUTH AMIDST A SEA OF AMBIGUITY¹

Simple glass reflects the beam of light that shines on it only once. A precious gem, in contrast, reflects different sparks with its many facets; a single beam of light that shines on it is reflected and is returned to us greatly enhanced. (Feivel Meltzer)²

Feivel Meltzer's analogy can serve as a guide for understanding a literary gem, Megillat Ruth. Appearing simple and idyllic on a first reading, the complexities of the narrative become increasingly dazzling with a closer look at the possibilities of interpretation. In this essay, we will explore the issue of textual ambiguities using Ruth as a banner example.

Mordechai Cohen sets out two criteria for ascertaining deliberate ambiguities in a biblical text: (1) one must establish the cogency of two separate readings; (2) one must demonstrate how the ambiguity contributes to the literary context by expressing something that could not be expressed in unambiguous language.³ Taking

this argument to a different level, one might contend that much in Megillat Ruth fits these criteria. Rather than being forced to choose between one or the other possibility, Megillat Ruth is best understood as containing multiple facets that each add to the religious messages of the narrative.

Seldom do we come across such an ideal society, characterized by *hesed* (loyalty, loving-kindness), heroes, and no villains. At worst, there are average characters such as Orpah, Boaz's foreman, and So-and-so who serve as foils to highlight the greatness of Ruth, Naomi, and Boaz.⁴ R. Ze'ira's classic statement captures the essence of the megillah:

א"ר זעירא מגלה זו אין בה לא טומאה ולא טהרה ולא איסור ולא היתר ולמה נכתבה ללמדך כמה שכר טוב לגומלי חסדים.

R. Ze'ira said: This scroll [of Ruth] tells us nothing either of cleanliness or of uncleanness, either of prohibition or permission. For what purpose then was it written? To teach how great is the reward of those who do deeds of kindness.

Ruth Rabbah 2:14

Although it appears that *hesed* is the predominant theme of our megillah, there is considerably less clarity over how to define that *hesed*, or what other religious lessons emanate from the text of Megillat Ruth. Which characters truly epitomize R. Ze'ira's statement? What is the relationship between divine providence and human *hesed*?

The First Five Verses: Punishment for Sins?

The Book of Ruth opens in a jarring fashion, with Elimelech, Mahlon, and Chilion dying at the outset. Some midrashim and later commentators contend that Elimelech and his sons deserved their respective deaths. They maintain that Elimelech left the Land of Israel,⁵ or a starving community behind,⁶ while his sons lingered in Moab and intermarried.⁷

Perhaps the juxtaposition of Elimelech's departure and his death and his sons' marriages and their deaths suggest these conclusions. However, there is a ten-year gap between the sons' marrying Moabites and their deaths (1:4). By including the lengthy time separating the two events, the megillah appears to exclude intermarriage as a direct cause of their deaths.⁸ We also are not told how long Elimelech remained in Moab before he died. These uncertainties yield at least three possible lines of interpretation:

1. *Elimelech, Mahlon, and Chilion simply died*: The family left during a famine for legitimate reasons. Ibn Ezra (on 1:2, 15) insists that Ruth and Orpah converted prior to their marriages to Elimelech's sons. The book's opening verses are primarily background, setting the stage for the main story of Naomi, Ruth, and Boaz, and should not be understood as punishment for sins.

2. *This story is parallel to Job*: Like Job, Naomi first complained about her God-given lot (1:20–21). The deaths and suffering at the outset of Ruth are theologically significant, but the reader is not told how.

Unlike the Book of Job, however, where God's direct involvement is discussed in the beginning and

end of the book, in Ruth it is not. Additionally, the characters in Megillat Ruth played an active role in changing their fate, whereas Job did not. It is unclear whether Megillat Ruth was intended to parallel the Book of Job or whether the two books should be contrasted, with Megillat Ruth's characters held responsible for their original suffering and credited for their eventual happiness.⁹

3. *This is a story of God giving just recompense*: Elimelech and his family are punished for leaving a starving community behind. The unwarranted lingering of Mahlon and Chilion in Moab led them to intermarry, causing their untimely deaths. Likewise, the happy ending of Megillat Ruth may be viewed as God's reward for the acts of *hesed* performed over the course of the story.

Does the text teach divine recompense? This reading is possible, but no more compelling than a non-recompense reading. This uncertainty encapsulates our difficulty in pinpointing any one specific interpretation of the ephemeral characters in the opening verses of Megillat Ruth. The initially straightforward narrative contains significant ambiguities that will continue throughout the book.

Naomi

We see a second ambiguity in the character of Naomi. It is unclear whether she was a passive follower of her husband, or an active participant in abandoning the community (assuming there *was* anything negative about their leaving). Sensitive to the vagueness of the text, several midrashim address both sides of the question:

הוא ואשתו ושני בניו, הוא עיקר, ואשתו טפלה לו, ובניו טפלין להם.

He was the prime mover and his wife secondary to him, and his two sons secondary to both of them.

Ruth Rabbah 1:5¹⁰

מה ראה הכתוב להכריז עליו ועל אשתו ועל בניו, לפי שהיו מעכבין זה (על) [את] זה, מצרות עין שהיה בכולן.

Why did the text mention him, his wife, and his children? To teach that all of them were stingy.

Ruth Zuta 1:2

From the text, it is difficult to determine whether Naomi did anything wrong, if she was an innocent victim of her family members' sins, or if she was a victim of the unexplained deaths of her family members.

The motives behind Naomi's efforts to persuade her daughters-in-law to remain in Moab also remain elusive. Although Naomi emphasized the marital prospects of Ruth and Orpah (in 1:8–15), it is possible that she was driven by other considerations as well:

ר' שמואל בר נחמני בש"ר יודן בר' חנינא בשלש מקומות כתיב כאן שבנה שבנה כנגד ג' פעמים שדוחין את הגר ואם הטריח יותר מכאן מקבלין אותו.

R. Shemuel b. Nahmani said in the name of R. Yehudah b. Hanina: Three times is it written here "turn back," corresponding to the three times that a would-be proselyte is repulsed; but if he persists after that, he is accepted.

Ruth Rabbah 2:16

מפני מה היתה מחזרת אותן כדי שלא תתבייש בהן שכן מצינו עשרה שווקים היו בירושלים. ולא היו מערבין אלו עם אלו ... ניכרים בלבושיהם בשווקים, מה שאלו לובשין לא היו אלו לובשין.

Why did Naomi want to return them? So that she would not be embarrassed by them. We find that there were ten markets in Jerusalem, and they [i.e., the

classes of people who shopped at each] never intermingled. . . . The people were recognized by their clothing — what one class wore, another would not.

Ruth Zuta 1:8

Ruth Rabbah 2:16 casts Naomi as unwilling to compromise Jewish religious standards. This view receives textual support from Naomi's observation that Orpah's return to Moab came with religious consequences as well: "So she said, 'See, your sister-in-law has returned to her people *and her gods*. Go follow your sister-in-law'" (1:15; cf. Ibn Ezra, Malbim).

In contrast, *Ruth Zuta* 1:8 depicts a less flattering portrait of Naomi. Her professed concern for the welfare of her Moabite daughters-in-law cloaked a desire to protect her own noble self-image in Judean society. The inordinate emphasis on Ruth as a "Moabite" (seven times in this tiny megillah!) could support this reading as well.

Despite the potentially complex nature of her concern for their welfare, Naomi certainly emerged successful by the end of the narrative. She had her estate redeemed by Boaz; she was esteemed by her neighbors; and Ruth's son was born into her family. It appears that there are several textually valid readings of Naomi's character:

1. *Naomi is a paragon of hesed*: Who could ask for a better mother-in-law than Naomi? Bereft of her husband and sons, with only Ruth and Orpah to comfort her, Naomi was more concerned with their welfare than with tending to her own loneliness. Moreover, Naomi never stopped caring for Ruth, helping her find security via matrimony. As a consequence of her *hesed*, God rewarded Naomi at the end

of the megillah with family, friends, and land (4:14–17).

2. *Naomi is self-serving*: Although Naomi always verbally expressed interest in her daughters-in-law, she really was more concerned for herself. She joined her family in abandoning her community. She wanted to drive her Moabite daughters-in-law away because they would harm her social status upon return. Naomi knew she could benefit from Boaz's intervention; therefore, she orchestrated the encounter between Boaz and Ruth to help herself. Fittingly, the narrative concludes with Naomi's happiness — she took the child and had the blessings of her friends along with her land. Ruth is only a tangential figure in the megillah's climactic frame.¹¹

3. *Naomi is similar to Job*: Naomi suffered without any explanation, complained against God, and then was restored in the end:

וַתֹּאמֶר אֱלִיהֶן אֵל תִּקְרָאנָהּ לִי נַעֲמִי קְרָאנָהּ לִי
מָרָא כִּי הֵמָּר שָׁדַי לִי מָאָד.

She said to them, Call me not Naomi; call me Mara; for the Almighty has dealt very bitterly with me (ki hemar Shaddai li me'od).

Ruth 1:20

חַי אֱ-לֹהֵי הַיָּמִים וְשָׁדַי הֵמָּר נָפְשִׁי
As God lives, who has taken away my judgment; and the Almighty, who has tormented my soul (ve-Shaddai hemar nafshi).

Job 27:2

Although Naomi used similar language to that of Job, possibly indicating that she viewed herself as suffering unjustly, the narrator remains conspicuously noncommittal as to whether or not Naomi's story parallels that of Job.

4. *Naomi is complex*: Naomi was concerned with herself, and also for

Ruth. One might view the happy ending either as a consequence of Naomi's and the other characters' actions, or as a providential reward for her goodness, or some combination thereof. This view combines the first two explanations above, and each layer of motivation appears to be simultaneously sustained by the text.

Boaz

Yet another ambiguity can be found in the person of Boaz. According to all readings, Boaz was a hero. He protected Ruth from harassment (2:9, 15) and helped her in other ways unbeknownst to Ruth (2:15–17). He provided sustenance for Naomi (3:15), completed the redemption of Naomi's field, and married Ruth (3:18–4:10). Boaz deserves praise for overcoming the anti-Moabite biases of Judean society.

However, Boaz allowed Ruth to glean for approximately three months (cf. *Ruth Rabbah* 5:11) and needed prodding from Naomi and Ruth before he took more substantial action. Why didn't he help earlier, especially given his awareness of Ruth's character and outstanding accomplishments (2:11–12)?

Perhaps the Moabite issue figures decisively in answering that question, since there was a stigma against marrying her. Additionally, Boaz assumed that he was too old so Ruth would not be interested in marrying him (3:10–11). These reasons may explain Boaz's possible reluctance to marry Ruth; but how do we justify his allowing her to glean in his field for so long instead of giving her food and support directly? As Feivel Meltzer observes, "it is impossible to understand adequately why Boaz did

not see it fit to visit the widows and attend their needs.”¹²

Sensitive to these cues, some midrashim cast Boaz as one who acted kindly only when he knew he would receive something in return:

אמר ר' יצחק למדתך תורה דרך ארץ שכשיהא אדם עושה מצוה יהא עושה אותה בלב שמח ... אלו היה יודע בועז שהקב"ה מכתוב עליו ויצבט לה קלי עגלים פטומים היה מאכילה.

R. Yitzhak commented: The Torah teaches you that when a person performs a good deed he should do so with a cheerful heart. ... If Boaz had known that the Holy One, blessed be He, would have it written of him that he “Gave her parched corn” (2:14), he would have given her fattened calves!

Lev. Rabbah 34:8

אמר רבה בר רב הונא אמר רב אבצן זה בעז מאי קמ"ל ... מאה ועשרים משתאות עשה בעז לבניו שנאמר (שופטים יב, ט) ויהי לו שלשים בנים ושלשים בנות שלח החוצה ושלשים בנות הביא לבניו מן החוץ ושפט את ישראל שבע שנים ובכל אחת ואחת עשה שני משתאות אחד בבית אביו ואחד בבית חמיו ובכולן לא זימן את מנוח אמר כודנא עקרה במאי פרעא לי תאנא וכולן מתו בחייו.

Rabbah, son of R. Huna, said in the name of Rav: Ibzan is Boaz. What does he come to teach us [by this statement]? ... Boaz made for his sons a hundred and twenty wedding feasts, for it is said, “And he [Ibzan] had thirty sons, and thirty daughters he sent abroad, and thirty daughters he brought in from abroad for his sons; and he judged Israel seven years” (Jud. 12:9); and in the case of every one [of these] he made two wedding feasts, one in the house of the father and one in the house of the father-in-law. To none of them did he invite Manoah, [for] he said, “Whereby will the barren mule repay me?” All these died in his lifetime.

Bava Batra 91a

Boaz certainly is a paragon of

hesed. At the same time, however, these midrashim view Boaz’s *hesed* as insufficient and motivated at least partially by his own interests. Both lines of interpretation are simultaneously supported by the text.

Divine-Human Continuum in Megillat Ruth

There is an apparent ambiguity in 2:20 concerning Naomi’s gratitude upon learning that Ruth was gleaning in Boaz’s field:

ותאמר נַעֲמִי לְכַלְתָּהּ בְּרוּךְ הוּא לֵה' אֲשֶׁר לֹא עֹזב חֲסִדוֹ אֶת הַחַיִּים וְאֶת הַמֵּתִים וְתֹאמַר לֵה' נַעֲמִי קָרוֹב לָנוּ הָאֵישׁ מִגְּאֻלָּנוּ הוּא.

Naomi said to her daughter-in-law, “Blessed is he to the Lord, who has not abandoned His kindness with the living and with the dead.” ...

or

Naomi said to her daughter-in-law, “Blessed to the Lord is he who has not abandoned his kindness with the living and with the dead.” ...¹³

It is unclear whether Naomi acknowledged God for orchestrating Ruth’s chancing upon Boaz’s field, or whether she blessed Boaz for his efforts in treating Ruth well and for his potential as a redeemer. Mordechai Cohen views this verse as intentionally ambiguous, highlighting the complex relationship between human and divine action in Megillat Ruth. This ambiguity runs throughout the megillah, as it often is unclear where human initiative stops and God’s intervention begins.

While Boaz blessed Ruth by saying that God should reward her for coming under His wings (*tahat kenafav*, 2:12), Ruth eventually realized that nothing would get done unless Boaz actively spread his “wings” over Ruth (*u-parastah kenafekha al*

amatekha, 3:9). Earlier, Naomi had prayed that God grant marital security (*menuhah*) to her daughters-in-law (1:9); but she ultimately had to orchestrate the threshing floor scene to provide that security (*mano’ah*) for Ruth (3:1). One might view the happy ending as a consequence of the concerted actions of the characters. It is equally possible to view the human actions as mirroring God’s plan — the divine blessings people had wished on one another had been realized.

It is noteworthy that the only two times the narrator explicitly mentions God’s involvement are regarding the end of the famine (1:6) — which is presented only as something Naomi heard — and Ruth’s getting pregnant (4:13).¹⁴ The omission of such references in the rest of the narrative leaves the extent of God’s involvement subject to speculation. According to one reading, the megillah teaches that God played a hidden role to allow greater human action. According to another, it reveals God’s providential hand constantly assisting these paragons of *hesed*.

The Relationship between Ruth and Judges

The opening verse of Megillat Ruth connects the narrative to the period of the Judges. What is the connection between the Dark Age of Judges and the display of *hesed* in Megillat Ruth, where the Judeans were religiously faithful and kind to one another?

The megillah does not offer greater precision in dating the narrative than that it occurred in the period of the Judges — a period spanning centuries. Some midrashim link Ruth to the time of the earlier judges,¹⁵ while others identify Boaz with the later judge Ibzan (Jud. 12:8).¹⁶ Malbim,

however, suggests that the story of Ruth is not dated precisely, casting it as representative of the entire period.

How Megillat Ruth is representative of the period of the Judges, however, remains problematic. Malbim asserts that the opening verses of Megillat Ruth highlight the negative atmosphere of Judges. These verses demonstrate that people were concerned primarily for themselves, and this selfishness was characteristic of the period. According to Malbim, Megillat Ruth's connection to the period of Judges is limited primarily to its opening verses. In contrast, the remainder of Megillat Ruth is characterized by *hesed*.

Alternatively, one might argue that Megillat Ruth is characteristic of the period, but in a more complex manner. Most people were generally righteous or at least average. However, the unwillingness of individuals to help one another except when they could gain themselves demonstrates a general lack of *hesed*. The Gemara (*Bava Batra* 91a) cited earlier regarding Boaz — one of the great figures of that era — captures this theme. Boaz certainly demonstrated *hesed* in the megillah; but the Gemara accuses even this hero of not inviting Samson's father Manoah to his children's wedding feasts since he would not receive a reciprocal invitation. To remedy this societal problem, and to break out from the cycle of the period, the Israelites needed an outsider like Ruth to teach them what true *hesed* was. One midrash captures this message:

אמר הקב"ה תבוא רות שהיא גיורת ולא
ביחשה בחמותה, ותוכיח את ישראל שמרדו ב.
*God said: may Ruth, who is a convert,
and who did not challenge her mother-in-law, come and rebuke Israel who has*

rebelled against Me.

Ruth Zuta 1:7

This midrash looks beneath a superficial reading of Megillat Ruth, in which the Judeans are not depicted as “rebels.” Instead, the midrash forges an intimate connection between Megillat Ruth and Judges and determines the root problem inherent in Israel's society to be selfishness.

Conclusion

Ruth is the only character in the megillah who is unambiguously positive, reflecting genuine *hesed*. She sacrificed heroically to accompany Naomi and to accept God. A textual parallelism points to Ruth being compared to Abraham in leaving her family to serve God:

ויאמר ה' אל אברם לך לך מארצך וממולדתך
ומבית אביך אל הארץ אשר אראך. ואעשה
לגוי גדול ואברכך ואגדלה שמך והיה ברכה.
*The Lord said to Abram, “Go forth from
your native land and from your father's
house to the land that I will show you.
I will make of you a great nation, and
I will bless you; I will make your name
great, and you shall be a blessing.”*

Gen. 12:1–2

ויען בעזו ויאמר לה הגד הגד לי כל אשר עשית
את חמותך אחרי מות אישך ותעזבי אביך
ואמך וארץ מולדתך ותלכי אל עם אשר לא
ידעת תמול שלשום.

*Boaz said in reply [to Ruth], “I have been
told of all that you did for your mother-in-
law after the death of your husband, how
you left your father and mother and the
land of your birth and came to a people
you had not known before.”*

Ruth 2:11

In light of this comparison, one might argue that Ruth is portrayed even more favorably than Abraham. God spoke directly to Abraham and promised him reward. In contrast, Ruth came

voluntarily and hardly could have expected anything but a lifetime of begging and discrimination in return for her sacrifices. Ruth also declined marriage opportunities with younger Judeans in order to marry Boaz, so she could preserve Mahlon's name.

The ambiguity of Ruth's world is reflected in the many ambiguous characters and circumstances presented by the text. The extent of God's intervention in her suffering and salvation is unclear, as are the motivations of the members of the society on whom she depended. Nevertheless, she remained steadfast in her commitment to Naomi, Mahlon, and God. Ruth has the distinction of being the *only* biblical woman explicitly called by the epithet *eshet hayil*, woman of valor (3:11). While Ruth struggled mightily to preserve Mahlon's name, she in fact has immortalized her own name, winning the hearts of readers generation after generation.

Similar to many complex passages in Tanakh, Megillat Ruth is characterized by deliberate ambiguity. Not only are multiple readings possible; these ambiguities are precisely the vehicles through which the short narrative captures so many subtleties in so short a space.

Endnotes

1. Earlier versions of this essay appeared originally in Hayyim Angel, “A Woman of Valor Has Been Found: Ruth Amidst a Sea of Ambiguity,” *Shabuot Reader* (New York: Tebah, 2009), pp. 103–117; Hayyim Angel, *Creating Space between Peshat and Derash: A Collection of Studies on Tanakh* (Jersey City, NJ: Ktav-Sephardic Publication Foundation, 2011), pp. 173–185; Hayyim Angel, *Vision from the Prophet and Counsel from the Elders: A Survey of Nevi'im and Ketuvim* (New York: OU Press, 2013), pp. 272–282.

2. *Da'at Mikra: Ruth*, in *Five Megillot* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1973), introduction p. 3 n. 1.

3. Mordechai Cohen, “*Hesed: Divine or Human? The Syntactic Ambiguity of Ruth 2:20*,” in *Hazon Nahum: Studies in Jewish Law, Thought, and History Presented to Dr. Norman Lamm*, ed. Yaakov Elman and Jeffrey S. Gurock (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1997), pp. 11–38, esp. pp. 32–33.

4. See especially Meltzer, introduction to *Da'at Mikra: Ruth*, p. 8; Moshe Garsiel, “Literary Structure, Development of Plot, and the Goal of the Narrator in Megillat Ruth” (Hebrew), in *Hagut ba-Mikra*, vol. 3, ed. E. Menahem (Tel Aviv: Israel Society for Biblical Research, 1979), pp. 66–83.

5. See *Bava Batra* 91a; *Gen. Rabbah* 25:3; Rashi (on 1:2).

6. See *Ruth Rabbah* 1:4; *Tanhuma Behar* 3; *Zohar Hadash Ruth* 77b; Rashi (on 1:2).

7. See *Ruth Rabbah* 2:9; Targum (on 1:4), Rashi (on 1:12), Malbim (on 1:4), who maintain that Ruth and Orpah did not convert prior to their marriages to Mahlon and Chilion. Ibn Ezra (on 1:2, 15) disagrees, as does *Zohar Hadash Ruth* 79a. Rambam (*Hil. Melakhim*

5:9) maintains that the family members were punished because they were communal leaders and therefore held to a higher standard of conduct. Malbim adopts a middle position: the initial departure of Elimelech and family was justified, since they went only as a temporary measure (*la-gur*); once they elected to stay permanently, however (*va-yeshevu sham*), they brought punishment upon themselves.

8. Sensitive to this difficulty, *Tanhuma Buber Behar* 8 states: “For those ten years, God was warning them. When He saw that they were not repenting, He began to strike their camels and cattle—yet they still did not repent. When He saw that they did not repent, immediately (!) ‘Mahlon and Chilion died also.’” See also *Ruth Zuta* 1:4: “This teaches that decrees are suspended for ten years.” Of course, without these modifications, the text is far less clear in presenting their deaths as punishment.

9. See further discussion in R. Amnon Bazak, “The World Is Built on *Hesed*: Between Megillat Ruth and Job” (Hebrew), *Megadim* 18–19 (1993), pp. 169–175.

10. Cf. Rashi, Malbim.

11. The dialogue in chapter 4 intimates that Boaz considered Naomi’s field to be

the primary element in the redemption altogether; Ruth is mentioned only in passing (4:3, 9–10). Ezra Z. Melammed (“*Megillat Ruth in Light of the Halakhah*” [Hebrew], *Sinai* 24 [1961], p. 156) maintains that Ruth was the more important aspect of the deal, but Boaz emphasized the field out of respect for Ruth.

12. Meltzer, *Da'at Mikra: Ruth*, p. 16, n. 20.

13. See the survey of opinions on this verse in Cohen, “*Hesed: Divine or Human? The Syntactic Ambiguity of Ruth 2:20*,” pp. 11–38. The above translations are from his article, pp. 11–12.

14. The formulation that God “gave her pregnancy” (*va-yitten lah herayon*) is unique in Tanakh. Perhaps this expression signals divine approval of the union of Boaz with the Moabite Ruth (Tamara Cohn Eskenazi and Tikva Frymer-Kensky, *The Jewish Publication Society Commentary: Ruth* [Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2011], introduction p. li).

15. *Ruth Rabbah* 1:1; *Seder Olam Rabbah* 12; cf. *Makkot* 23a.

16. *Bava Batra* 91a.

CHELKEINU, B'NEI ISRAEL-OHEV ZEDEK, AND YU'S CENTER FOR THE JEWISH FUTURE—RIETS PRESENT

SUMMER KOLLEL

IN NORTHEASTERN PHILADELPHIA • JUNE 28–JULY 18, 2019

- A special 3-week opportunity of community learning and inspiration!
 - Featuring amazing avreichim from RIETS
- For more information, please contact
Dov Simons: chelkeinu@chelkeinu.org



ROSH KOLLEL
RABBI DANIEL
STEIN
ROSH YESHIVA, RIETS



ישיבת רבנו יצחק אלחנן
Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary
An Affiliate of Yeshiva University
CENTER FOR THE JEWISH FUTURE

CHELKEINU INITIATIVE

BNAI ISRAEL
OHEV ZEDEK
קהילת בני ישראל אוהב צדק