

Kol Rina
An Independent Minyan
Parashat Noach
October 9, 2021 *** Cheshvan 3, 5782

Noach in A Nutshell

https://www.chabad.org/parshah/article_cdo/aid/3155/jewish/Noach-in-a-Nutshell.htm

G-d instructs Noah—the only righteous man in a world consumed by violence and corruption—to build a large wooden teivah (“ark”), coated within and without with pitch. A great deluge, says G-d, will wipe out all life from the face of the earth; but the ark will float upon the water, sheltering Noah and his family, and two members (male and female) of each animal species (and 7 of the “pure” species).

Rain falls for 40 days and nights, and the waters churn for 150 days more before calming and beginning to recede. The ark settles on Mount Ararat, and Noah dispatches a raven, and then a series of doves, “to see if the waters were abated from the face of the earth.” When the ground dries completely—exactly one solar year (365 days) after the onset of the Flood—G-d commands Noah to exit the teivah and repopulate the earth.

Noah builds an altar and offers sacrifices to G-d. G-d swears never again to destroy all of mankind because of their deeds, and sets the rainbow as a testimony of His new covenant with man. G-d also commands Noah regarding the sacredness of life: murder is deemed a capital offense, and while man is permitted to eat the meat of animals, he is forbidden to eat flesh or blood taken from a living animal.

Noah plants a vineyard and becomes drunk on its produce. Two of Noah’s sons, Shem and Japheth, are blessed for covering up their father’s nakedness, while his third son, Ham, is punished for taking advantage of his debasement. The descendants of Noah remain a single people, with a single language and culture, for ten generations. Then they defy their Creator by building a great tower to symbolize their own invincibility; G-d confuses their language so that “one does not comprehend the tongue of the other,” causing them to abandon their project and disperse across the face of the earth, splitting into seventy nations.

The Parshah of Noach concludes with a chronology of the ten generations from Noah to Abram (later Abraham), and the latter’s journey from his birthplace of Ur Casdim to Charan, on the way to the land of Canaan.

Haftarah in a Nutshell - *Isaiah 54:1-10*

Forsaken Jerusalem is likened to a barren woman devoid of children. G-d enjoins her to rejoice, for the time will soon come when the Jewish nation will return

and proliferate, repopulating Israel's once desolate cities. The prophet assures the Jewish people that G-d has not forsaken them. Although He has momentarily hid His countenance from them, He will gather them from their exiles with great mercy. The *haftorah* compares the final Redemption to the pact G-d made with Noah in this week's Torah reading. Just as G-d promised to never bring a flood over the entire earth, so too He will never again be angry at the Jewish people.

"For the mountains may move and the hills might collapse, but My kindness shall not depart from you, neither shall the covenant of My peace collapse."

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

Beyond Nature (Noach) from the Rabbi Sacks z"l Legacy Trust

<https://rabbisacks.org/noach-covenantconversation/>

Are we naturally good or naturally bad? On this, great minds have argued for a very long time indeed. Hobbes believed that we have naturally "a perpetual and restless desire of power after power, that ceaseth only in Death." [1] We are bad, but governments and police can help limit the harm we do. Rousseau to the contrary believed that naturally we are good. It is society and its institutions that make us bad. [2]

The argument continues today among the neo-Darwinians. Some believe that natural selection and the struggle for survival make us, genetically, hawks rather than doves. As Michael T. Ghiselin puts it, "Scratch an 'altruist' and watch a 'hypocrite' bleed." [3] By contrast, naturalist Frans de Waal in a series of delightful books about primates, including his favourite, the bonobos, shows that they can be empathic, caring, even altruistic [4] and so, by nature, are we. E. Hulme called this the fundamental divide between Romantics and Classicists throughout history. Romantics believed that "man was by nature good, that it was only bad laws and customs that had suppressed him. Remove all these and the infinite possibilities of man would have a chance." [5] Classicists believed the opposite, that "Man is an extraordinarily fixed and limited animal whose nature is absolutely constant. It is only by tradition and organisation that anything decent can be got out of him." [6]

In Judaism, according to the Sages, this was the argument between the angels when God consulted them as to whether or not He should create humans. The angels were the "us" in "Let us make mankind." (Gen. 1:26) A Midrash tells us that the angels of chessed and tzedek said "Let him be created because humans do acts of kindness and righteousness." The angels of shalom and emet said, "Let him not be created because he tells lies and fights wars." What did God do? He created humans anyway and had faith that we would gradually become

better and less destructive.[7] That, in secular terms, is what Harvard neuroscientist Steven Pinker argues too.[8] Taken as a whole and with obvious exceptions we have become less violent over time.

The Torah suggests we are both destructive and constructive, and evolutionary psychology tells us why. We are born to compete and co-operate. On the one hand, life is a competitive struggle for scarce resources – so we fight and kill. On the other hand, we survive only by forming groups. Without habits of co-operation, altruism and trust, we would have no groups and we would not survive. That is part of what the Torah means when it says, “It is not good for man to be alone.” (Gen. 2:18) So we are both aggressive and altruistic: aggressive to strangers, altruistic toward members of our group.

But the Torah is far too profound to leave it at the level of the old joke of the Rabbi who, hearing both sides of a domestic argument, tells the husband, “You are right,” and the wife “You are right,” and when his disciple says, “They can’t both be right,” replies, “You are also right.” The Torah states the problem, but it also supplies a non-obvious answer. This is the clue that helps us decode a very subtle argument running through last week’s parsha and this one.

The basic structure of the story that begins with Creation and ends with Noah is this: First God created a universe of order. He then created human beings who created a universe of chaos: “the land was filled with violence.” So God, as it were, deleted creation by bringing a Flood, returning the earth to as it was at the very beginning when “the earth was formless and empty, darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the spirit of God hovered over the waters.” (Gen. 1:2) He then began again with Noah and his family as the new Adam and Eve and their children.

Genesis 8-9 is thus a kind of second version of Genesis 1-3, with two significant distinctions. The first is that in both accounts a key word appears seven times, but it is a different word. In Genesis 1 the word is “good.” In Genesis 9 it is “covenant.” The second is that in both cases, reference is made to the fact that humans are in the image of God, but the two sentences have different implications. In Genesis 1 we are told that “God created humanity in His own image, in the image of God He created them, male and female He created them.” (Gen. 1:27) In Genesis 9 we read, “Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed, for in the image of God has God made humanity” (Gen. 9:6).

The difference is striking. Genesis 1 tells me that “I” am in the image of God. Genesis 9 tells me that “You,” my potential victim, are in the image of God. Genesis 1 tells us about human power. We are able, says the Torah, to “rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air.” Genesis 9 tells us about the moral limits of power. We can kill but we may not. We have the power, but not the permission.

Reading the story closely, it seems that God created humans in the faith that they would naturally choose the right and the good. They would not need to eat the fruit of “the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil,” because instinct would lead them to behave as they should. Calculation, reflection, decision – all the things we associate with knowledge – would not be necessary. They would act as God wanted them to act, because they had been created in His image.

It did not turn out that way. Adam and Eve sinned, Cain committed murder, and within a few generations the world was reduced to chaos. That is when we read that “The Lord saw how great the wickedness of the human race had become on the earth, and that every inclination of the thoughts of the human heart was only evil all the time. The Lord regretted that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved Him to His heart.” (Gen. 6:6) Everything else in the universe was tov, “good.” But humans are not naturally good. That is the problem. The answer, according to the Torah, is covenant.

Covenant introduces the idea of a moral law. A moral law is not the same as a scientific law. Scientific laws are observed regularities in nature: drop an object and it will fall. A moral law is a rule of conduct: do not rob or steal or deceive. Scientific laws describe, whereas moral laws prescribe.

When a natural event does not accord with the current state of science, when it “breaks” the law, that is a sign that there is something wrong with the law. That is why Newton’s laws were replaced by those of Einstein. But when a human being breaks the law, when people rob or steal or deceive, the fault is not in the law but in the deed. So we must keep the law and condemn, and sometimes punish, the deed. Scientific laws allow us to predict. Moral laws help us to decide. Scientific laws apply to entities without freewill. Moral laws presuppose freewill. That is what makes humans qualitatively different from other forms of life.

So, according to the Torah, a new era began, centred not on the idea of natural goodness but on the concept of covenant, that is, moral law. Civilisation began in the move from what the Greeks called physis, nature, to nomos, law. That is what makes the concept of being “in the image of God” completely different in Genesis 1 and Genesis 9. Genesis 1 is about nature and biology. We are in the image of God in the sense that we can think, speak, plan, choose and dominate. Genesis 9 is about law. Other people are also in God’s image.

Therefore we must respect them by banning murder and instituting justice. With this simple move, morality was born.

What is the Torah telling us about morality?

First, that it is universal. The Torah places God’s covenant with Noah and through him all humanity prior to His particular covenant with Abraham, and His later covenant with Abraham’s descendants at Mount Sinai. Our universal humanity precedes our religious differences. This is a truth we deeply need in

the twenty-first century when so much violence has been given religious justification. Genesis tells us that our enemies are human too.

This may well be the single most important contribution of monotheism to civilisation. All societies, ancient and modern, have had some form of morality but usually they concern only relations within the group. Hostility to strangers is almost universal in both the animal and human kingdoms. Between strangers, power rules. As the Athenians said to the Melians, "The strong do what they want, while the weak do what they must." [9]

The idea that even the people not like us have rights, and that we should "love the stranger" (Deut. 10:19), would have been considered utterly strange by most people at most times. It took the recognition that there is one God sovereign over all humanity ("Do we not all have one father? Did not one God create us?"; Mal. 2:10) to create the momentous breakthrough to the idea that there are moral universals, among them the sanctity of life, the pursuit of justice, and the rule of law.

Second, God Himself recognises that we are not naturally good. After the Flood, He says: "I will never again curse the ground because of humankind, even though the inclination of their minds is evil from childhood on." (Gen. 8:21) The antidote to the yetzer, the inclination to evil, is covenant.

We now know the neuroscience behind this. Our brains contain a prefrontal cortex that evolved to allow humans to think and act reflectively, considering the consequences of their deeds. But this is slower and weaker than the amygdala (what Jewish mystics called the nefesh habehamit, the animal soul) which produces, even before we have had time to think, the fight-or-flight reactions without which humans before civilisation would simply not have survived.

The problem is that these rapid reactions can be deeply destructive. Often they lead to violence: not only the violence between species (predator and prey) that is part of nature, but also to the more gratuitous violence that is a feature of the life of most social animals. It is not that we only do evil. Empathy and compassion are as natural to us as are fear and aggression. The problem is that fear lies just beneath the surface of human interaction, and it can overwhelm all our other instincts.

Daniel Goleman calls this an amygdala hijack. "Emotions make us pay attention right now – this is urgent – and give us an immediate action plan without having to think twice. The emotional component evolved very early: Do I eat it, or does it eat me?" [10] Impulsive action is often destructive because it is undertaken without thought of consequences. That is why Maimonides argued that many of the laws of the Torah constitute a training in virtue by making us think before we act. [11]

So the Torah tells us that naturally we are neither good nor bad, but we have the capacity for both. We have a natural inclination to empathy and sympathy, but we have an even stronger instinct for fear which can lead to violence. That is why, in the move from Adam to Noah, the Torah shifts from nature to covenant, from tov to brit, from power to the moral limits of power. Genes are not enough. We also need the moral law.

[1] Hobbes, *Leviathan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 48.

[2] See Rousseau, *Discourse on the Origin and Foundations of Inequality Among Men* (*Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes*), 1754.

[3] Ghiselin, *The Economy of Nature and the Evolution of Sex* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 247. [4] See Frans de Waal's discoveries in, for example, *Good-Natured: The Origins of Right and Wrong in Humans and Other Animals* (Harvard University Press, 1996); *Primates and Philosophers: How Morality Evolved* (Princeton University Press, 2006); *Chimpanzee Politics* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007); *The Age of Empathy: Nature's Lessons for a Kinder Society* (Broadway Books, 2009); *The Bonobo and the Atheist* (W. W. Norton, 2013); *Are We Smart Enough to Know How Smart Animals Are?* (W. W. Norton, 2016). [5] T. E. Hulme, "Romanticism and Classicism," in T. E. Hulme: *Selected Writings*, ed. Patrick McGuinness (New York: Routledge, 2003), 69.

[6] *Ibid.*, 70. [7] See *Bereishit Rabbah* 8:5. [8] Steven Pinker, *The Better Angels of our Nature*, New York: Viking, 2011. [9] Thucydides, *The Peloponnesian War* 5.89.

[10] Daniel Goleman, *Emotional Intelligence* (London: Bloomsbury, 1996), 13ff.

[11] *Mishneh Torah, Hilchot Temurah* 4:13.

Staying Afloat in a World of Loss: Noach 5782 by R. Aviva Richman

https://mechonhadar.s3.amazonaws.com/mh_torah_source_sheets/RichmanParashatNoach5782.pdf?utm_campaign=Dvar%20Torah%205782&utm_medium=email&hsmi=167244585&hsenc=p2ANqtz-FUdSoaQkyFoZRhGQGQ5PZb2R-ow28eJCpWIGVT9URVVH3A TFoHAKDRQDenQZE4Lso2ASuxhnC-xTgx4TA Ox7bFdKA&utm_content=167244585&utm_source=hs_email

Parashat Noah hurls us into confrontation with the fact that creating life is difficult, bound up in disappointment and loss. The resounding focus on loss of life in the Flood at the beginning of the parashah reemerges in a more contained and subtle way, as the end of the parashah relates that Avram and Sarai could not bear children. ¹ These two accounts of disappointment and loss in creating life that are bookends of Parashat Noah—in epic proportions and on the scale of one couple's journey with infertility—inform each other, and guide us in navigating loss and cultivating resilience in our own lives. While both are stories of loss of life on the most fundamental level, we can apply the lessons learned more widely to the risks we take when we hope to create in many different realms of life. How do we confront disappointment and loss, possibly over and

over again? The scope of the utter destruction of life in the Flood is overwhelming, related repeatedly: “all creatures breathed their last breath;” “everything alive died;” “all existence was erased” (Genesis 7:21-23). Each verse turns the wrench deeper into a sense of loss on an unimaginable scale. Living through COVID over the past year and a half, and witnessing recent devastation from climate crisis, the chilling description resonates too close to home, as we’ve confronted loss on a scale unknown in most of our lifetimes. The words read more like a eulogy and less like an unrelatable epic. Sheltering as best we can, we grieve like Noah must have grieved in the ark. The Flood story articulates an enormous, public, and shared loss.

The Torah’s explicit detailing of loss in the Flood contrasts starkly with the terse description of Avram and Sarai’s infertility, where their private experience of loss remains buried in the gaping holes etched out by the narrative’s stark edges. At the end of Parashat Noah, sticking out in the long list of “begats,” Sarai was barren (Genesis 11:30). From this brief sentence through to the announcement of birth that comes chapters—and decades—later, we can only imagine that there must have been much disappointment and loss in Avram and Sarai’s reproductive journey. The Torah does not relate a medical history of periods, miscarriages, or lost pregnancies in the many years they tried to conceive. All of this lies out of focus, beyond the margins of the text. We are led to wonder about the loss they suffered privately. Their unarticulated disappointments resonate like overtones against the backdrop of the story of the Flood. The Torah’s articulation of loss in the Flood offers language that honors the risk of hope and intensity of disappointment that may ensue when we try to create life. An inability to get pregnant, or a lost pregnancy, can feel like the loss of an entire world. Understanding the Flood through the lens of infertility and pregnancy loss offers an important frame for the midrash that teaches that God created and destroyed many worlds before creating our world. **2** The divine process of creation wasn’t smooth. The living, breathing world we know came only in the wake of multiple attempts and losses. Even as our position differs markedly from God’s—God’s losses come from exercising control while our own losses stem from lack of control—this teaching reminds us that the story of any birth and creation often has chapters of complex prologues. The vibrancy of life and creativity is bound up in losses. **3**

The parashah’s juxtaposition of global and personal loss works in two directions. Not only does the massive loss of the Flood honor the gravity of “smaller” personal loss. Our personal experiences with loss can also orient and anchor us as we confront loss on a larger scale. The loss described in the Flood is totally overwhelming. It is impossible to imagine this much destruction, let alone know how to respond. Our experiences navigating personal loss, even if it feels totally devastating, can help build our muscles of resilience in the face of more global

loss. We can all trace our origins back to the uncertainty, risk, and possible loss involved in the pregnancy and birth that brought each of us into the world. We don't always think about these experiences as formative, even as they are fundamental to all of humanity. Yet, in a recent book, Dr. Chavi Karkowsky argues for the importance of telling the stories of our origins in risk. The risks of pregnancy and birth are "complicated experiences that ask women and their families to be stronger, braver, and more vulnerable than most of us know." ⁴ This insight from her extensive work in obstetrics can go beyond the bodily experience of a person carrying a pregnancy. Anyone willing to embark upon the journey of entering into profound relationship to nourish another human life carries deep hopes and confronts the risk of deep disappointment. These origins that brought all of us into being can ground us as we face uncertainty, disappointment, and loss in the lives we live out in the world. We are born of strength, bravery, and vulnerability—however conscious or subconscious. We can carry that with us each day.

Parashat Noah, from beginning to end, beckons us into the fortitude required to live in a world of risk and loss. God's grief in facing the loss of a world and readiness to hope to be in relationship with humanity yet again parallels the grief and hope that Avram and Sarai must have felt each time they tried yet again to bear a child. From our Divine and human parents, we can learn the bravery to risk creation and relationship, the vulnerability of confronting loss, and the strength to try again.

¹ Their names before they were changed to Avraham and Sarah (Genesis 17). ² Kohelet Rabbah 3:11 "God brings everything to pass precisely at its time " (Ecclesiastes 3:11). R. Abahu said: From here we learn that the Holy Blessed One was building worlds and destroying them, building worlds and destroying them until [God] made these and said, 'These are pleasing to me—those were not pleasing to me...'" ³ See R. Tali Adler's profoundly moving essay based on this midrash in Hadar's High Holiday Reader 5781, "Hayom Harat Olam," available here: <https://www.hadar.org/torah-resource/high-holidays-5781>. ⁴ Introduction to Chavi Eve Karkowsky, High Risk: A Doctor's Notes on Pregnancy, Birth, and the Unexpected (Liveright, 2020).

[Who Do You Think You Are?:Noah by Kendell Pinkney
https://www.jtsa.edu/torah/who-do-you-think-you-are/](https://www.jtsa.edu/torah/who-do-you-think-you-are/)

When I received the results, I can't say I was all that surprised:
67% Sub-Saharan African, 30% Northwest European, 2% Indigenous American,
1% unaccounted for.

I already knew that my ethnic heritage was decently mixed up. I had spent enough years peppering my grandmothers with the kinds of questions only a child feels comfortable pursuing: "Where was your mother from? Where was

your father from? Belize?! Which city? Dangriga? Sounds weird. Never heard of it. Wait, grandma, your grandmother was a white woman from Louisiana?!" But there was something intriguing about seeing my genetic make-up. Witnessing my genes splattered in Pollock-esque hues across a map of the world gave me an unexpected, concrete sense of belonging. It pointed toward lands and collective memories that preceded the stories of my grandmothers. It is common to be interested in one's roots. In fact, it has become cliché. All one has to do is take a quick look at the ever expanding commercial landscape of genealogy kits and the proliferation of prestige media to know that identity and personal origins are big business. And I get it; of course we want to uncover the stories of our origins! These stories help us make sense of our world. In fact, as a theatre maker and (almost) rabbi, I spend most of my time outside of JTS creating narratives that test and tug on the knotty intersections of identity, race, religion, and text. But within this understandable impulse to know our roots, there is also the potential for danger. After all, we humans are storytelling animals, and as such, we can succumb to the temptation of creating false lineages and mobilizing them for less than optimal purposes. This week's parashah contains an infamous example of that.

In Parashat Noah, we read the epic story of a family who survives a world-ending flood with a menagerie of animals aboard a vast, floating ark. As a kid, I was drawn to this story. Maybe it was that I imagined being stuck on a cruise with lemurs, dogs, giraffes, and chinchillas wouldn't be so bad. An only child can dream, right?! During adolescence, however, I became aware of a seemingly innocuous little pericope within this saga that had been used for egregiously oppressive purposes. In [Genesis 9](#), the story goes that Ham, one of Noah's sons, happened upon a drunk Noah and saw עֲרוֹתָאָבִי (his father's nakedness). As a result of this transgression, Noah cursed Ham's son, Canaan, to be a slave to his brothers. These few lines of text were eventually built into a robust pseudo-scientific, pseudo-historical theory called "The Curse of Ham," which posited that Africans were the descendants of Ham, and thus worthy of being enslaved. This idea of African descent from Ham proved so resilient that even long after the end of slavery and Jim Crow, I encountered a faint whiff of this "origin story" in the Black churches and racially mixed Southern communities I grew up in. As any student who has taken a JTS history class can tell you, there is no greater sin one can commit than the sin of presentism—the process of uncritically interpreting the past through the cultural contexts and assumptions of the present day. What slave owners and a fair amount of their contemporaries did was just that—they read themselves and their contemporary realities into the text. From there, they made the mental leap that connected Ham and his descendants with slavery and Black Africans—an idea that is nowhere present in the biblical text. This "leap" didn't arise in the antebellum South, however. As

noted historian David M. Goldenberg writes in his meticulously detailed reception history of this text, *Black and Slave: The Origins and History of the Curse of Ham*, the history of viewing Black people as those cursed to be slaves winds its way back through Christian Europe and even into some etiological myths of Black enslavement in Islam. This myth can also be found amongst certain Jews starting in the medieval era. Most notably, the commentator ibn Ezra subtly pushes back against this ideology using the genealogies of the Tanakh.[1]

But my purpose here is not to blame Jews, Christians, or Muslims of any specific era for the rise of anti-Blackness; history is far too complex to paint past realities with such a broad brush. Rather, my intent is to highlight that in our yearning to know our origins and shore up our group identities, our cultural memories can become highly impressionable. And left unchecked, this can lead us to read our worst impulses into our sacred texts and justify unethical abuses that can be as destructive as the mythic deluge of Noah's generation.

As real as this concern may be, I do not think that it needs be a self-fulfilling prophecy. As with many warnings and challenges, if we approach them from a different vantage point, we may also find opportunities. I don't mean to be a Pollyanna, implying that within every hardship is a silver lining; some realities are too hard to rehabilitate with a "paradigm shift." What I am saying, however, is that it takes a clear-eyed pragmatism to see life as it is and then choose to perform a feat of creative daring and construct what could be. From my perspective as an artist and theatre-maker, I believe that bringing a critical awareness of ourselves to the projects of history, Jewish tradition, and collective memory can unleash unexpected creative possibilities.

This year at JTS (in partnership with The Hendel Center for Justice and Ethics at JTS, [Reboot](#), [Udan](#), and [JCC Harlem](#)) I'm privileged to be collaborating with seven amazing artists to launch "[The Workshop](#)"—North America's first arts fellowship centering the work of JOCISM (Jews of Color, Indigenous Jews, Sephardi, and Mizrahi) artists and culture-makers. As Jews of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds who are deeply interested in matters of identity and origins, we will spend a year studying ancient Jewish texts around the theme of collective memory. We will ask of both the texts of our heritage and of ourselves, "What does it mean to remember? How is that memory recorded? How, if at all, does what we, or a text "remembers" align with historical events? How does remembering shape our sense of identity? And most consequentially, who has the power to create or destroy memory?" From our study, we will generate new works of art that will wrestle with these questions in ways that are sometimes bold, sometimes subversive, occasionally unexpected, often entertaining, and always nuanced.

My hope is that by engaging Jewish text both with other JOCISM folks and in conversation with the New York Jewish community, our artists will craft tales, dances, pictures, songs, theatre, and other visions that are as constructive for klal Yisrael as they are challenging. Such art is good for the Jews. What is more, it is good for humanity. And maybe through the transforming power of creative imagination and Jewish community we will be able to perform some small tikkun —deconstructing and repairing those longstanding narratives that have saddled us with curses that no longer serve us. [1] See his comment on לאחיו in [Genesis 9:25](#) (*Kendell Pinkney is a student at the The Rabbinical School of JTS, Class of 2022*)

YAHRTZEITS

Treasure and Rich Cohen remember their grandson Andrew Morris Levy on Monday October 11th (Cheshvan 5)

Mike Schatzberg remembers his father Joseph Schatzberg on Wednesday October 13th (Cheshvan 7)

Blossom Primer remembers her sister Rhonda Rappaport on Friday October 15th (Cheshvan 9)