

THE SIFRE D'AGGADTA AS SOURCES
OF THE MIDRASH

BENJAMIN B. LEFKOWITZ

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
for Rabbinic Ordination

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

1975

Advisor: Professor Leonard S. Kravitz

PREFACE

Before beginning this thesis, there are two points which require explanation. Firstly, a brief definition of the uses of the terms "Midrash," "Midrash," "midrash," and "aggadah" is in order. "Midrash" refers to the entire corpus of that literature. A "Midrash" is one specific book, while a "midrash" denotes a particular passage within a larger work. The word "aggadah" is used synonymously with "midrash." Secondly, the system of transliteration follows no particular "scientific" pattern, but is intended merely for phonetic clarity. Thus, ך symbolizes the ך and ך represents the ך. The ך is denoted by "h," ך by "k," and ך by "k" and "ch."

In addition, there are a number of people to whom acknowledgements are due. I wish to thank Professor Leonard S. Kravitz for his invaluable guidance and instruction; the library staff of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in New York, for their perseverance and assistance in locating several sources; and Mrs. Margaret Taeler for her aid in the typing of this work. Most importantly, all the gratitude and admiration that a husband can give go to my wife Barbara. Her patience, understanding, encouragement, as well as her typing, were truly a labor of love.

Brooklyn, New York
February 21, 1975

Benjamin B. Lefkowitz

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	1
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II. THE BACKGROUNDS OF THE SOURCES	5
CHAPTER III. A COMPARISON OF THE PARALLELS BETWEEN BERESHIT RABBAH AND TANHUMA C	15
CHAPTER IV. PARALLELS BETWEEN TANHUMA C AND MIDRASH HAGGADOL	35
CHAPTER V. PARALLELS BETWEEN MIDRASH HAGGADOL AND BERESHIT RABBAH	47
CHAPTER VI. PARALLELS IN BERESHIT RABBAH, TANHUMA C, AND MIDRASH HAGGADOL	60
CHAPTER VII. REPETITIONS IN BERESHIT RABBAH	76
CHAPTER VIII. FURTHER EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF SIFRE D'AGGADTA	85
CHAPTER IX. CONCLUSION	92
FOOTNOTES	98
BIBLIOGRAPHY	104

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the course of reading various Midrashim, it can be observed that a great many passages have parallels which appear in widely divergent sources. The object of this thesis is to discover the cause of these parallels. Due to the vastness of the material involved, the original sources for this work were restricted to the aggadot found in Tanpuma C, Bereshit Rabbah, and Midrash Haggadol dealing with seder bereshit (Genesis 1:1-6:8). A cursory preliminary investigation led to the belief that there might have been an Urtext--an original Midrash from which the above books, as well as all other works, had been derived. This hypothesis was based on the following observations:

- 1) in all three sources the same aggadot seem to always be linked to the same scriptural verse;
- 2) in all three sources the same verse in the Prophets or Hagiographa seems to be used as the basis for expounding the identical verse from the Torah;
- 3) in each of the three sources, there is material which is unique to that work, giving the impression that the various compilers and redactors had at their disposal one basic text from which they culled selections as they desired.

This theory was, to some extent, reinforced by two articles by Louis Finkelstein. In one¹ he traces the origins of the Tannaitic Midrashim back to an "Aggadic Midrash I" and "Aggadic Midrash II." In the other,² he claims that sections from Sifre and Midrash Haggadol which correspond in substance but not in textual reading are derived from a common source. Furthermore, Midrash Haggadol contains numerous passages for which there are no

parallels anywhere in Rabbinic literature; Margalioth refers to them by saying, "Its source has disappeared."³

However, further research demonstrated that an Ur-text was not the solution to the problem. Firstly, the sheer volume of the material that would have to have been included in such a corpus would militate against the likelihood of its existence. Secondly, any extensive reading in the various Midrashim shows that in every extant work there are whole series of statements, either anonymous or ascribed to various rabbis. These quotations may be directly linked according to the subject matter with which they deal, or they may all be utterances by the same person. They may have in common a key word, phrase, or biblical verse, or they may merely be strung together in a sort of "stream-of-consciousness." The various rabbis are not quoted in any particular order--there is no progression from older to younger or vice versa. The net effect resembles either a distant cousin of Bartlett's Familiar Quotations or a poorly written research paper in which the author seems to be quoting anyone and everyone on any given topic without care for organization or the avoidance of extraneous material. Thus, even if there had at one point been some magnum opus, it could not have been the original source of the Midrashim extant today, for if these anthologies were copied from it, that corpus itself must of necessity have been one massive compendium of traditions, a collection of all the sources which existed previous to it.

These findings brought about a new hypothesis, namely, a multiplicity of early written sources. Since the oldest of the primary texts, Bereshit Rabbah, was compiled no earlier than late Amoraic times, research was originally restricted to that period. However, material in both primary and secondary sources indicated that there had indeed been written books of Midrashim, known as

sifre d'aggadta, as early as the first Amoraic generation and perhaps even earlier.

At this point, two questions arose:

- 1) what did these books contain?
- 2) is there any evidence of such written sources in the Tannaitic period?

The answer to the first question led to the belief that the answer to the second question was "yes."

The collected evidence indicates that there may have been as many as six different types of "aggadah-books:"

- 1) maaseh-books containing anecdotes and stories about various personages and events;
- 2) written records of the discussions in the academies;
- 3) commentaries on the various books of the Bible (perhaps the Habakkuk pesher from the Qumran scrolls?);
- 4) written collections of sermons similar to the Pesiktot extant today;
- 5) collections of common proverbs and aphorisms;
- 6) compilations of sayings by individual rabbis (on which the final chapter of this thesis will concentrate).

The idea in New Testament scholarship of the Quelle, a collection of the sayings of Jesus, which would have been written in early Tannaitic times, led to the conclusion that other such collections were coeval with it. Undoubtedly, the sections in Avot beginning with "he used to say" were culled from such books, which would date this type of source to before Hillel, that is, to before the beginning of the Common Era. But the fact that Ben Sira is quoted in Bereshit Rabbah as if he were a rabbi, gives rise to the belief that even his book is a form of sifra d'aggadta. If such is the case, then the whole concept of written midrashic sources must be traced back to the Hellenistic period.

However, to prove all this is beyond the scope of this thesis. The object here is partially to explore

the methodology of comparing texts, and partially to determine the nature of some of the sifre d'aggadta. The first step in this inquiry will be to examine the opinions of previous scholars in relation to the backgrounds of the original sources in question.

CHAPTER II

THE BACKGROUNDS OF THE SOURCES

Before beginning any detailed exposition of the evidence, both explicit and implicit, for the existence of the sifre d'aggadta, it will be useful to briefly summarize some of the scholarly opinions concerning the backgrounds of the primary sources under consideration: Bereshit Rabbah, Midrash Haggadol, and Tanhuma C. They will be dealt with in the order given. However, the discussion of specific views concerning the sources of these works will be postponed until Chapter VIII.

In any examination of Bereshit Rabbah, three of the salient points are the origin of the title of the work, its authorship, and the date of its compilation. These three factors are closely intertwined, and will be reviewed by examining the views of the several authorities as they present them, rather than topically. In Dor Dor Vedorshav, I. Weiss maintains that like the vast majority of the Midrashim extant today, Bereshit Rabbah dates from the Gaonic period, although a great deal of older material is contained in it.⁴ As for the tradition ascribing the authorship to the first-generation Amora Rabbi Oshaya, Weiss feels it is highly probable that he began the work of collecting and editing the aggadot. As evidence, Weiss cites the statement in Hullin 141a that R. Oshaya was known to be a collector of mishnayot, and that his work was considered to be authoritative. Since R. Oshaya was a compiler of halachot, argues Weiss, why not of aggadot?⁵ Obviously, this is not a very convincing argument. The compiling of halachot proves nothing concerning aggadot. In addition, the text in Hullin never mentions writing.

Moore states that while the date of Bereshit Rabbah is difficult to determine, it shows marked parallels in

both style and material to Talmud Yerushalmi, and therefore its compilation took place at approximately the same time, although it does contain material dating from the second and third centuries.⁶ As for the name of the book, in the Middle Ages it was known as Bereshit de Rabbi Oshaya because of the first words "rabbi oshaya [rabbah] patah," but that the appellation "rabbah" ["the great," "the large"] did not come from the epithet of R. Oshaya. Rather, Moore feels that it was called "rabbah" to distinguish it from other collections of midrashim based on Genesis.⁷ Freedman states unequivocally that the title Bereshit Rabbah cannot be, as some scholars believe, a contraction of Bereshit de Rabbi Oshaya Rabbah because the preferred manuscript reading is merely "rabbi oshaya patah."⁸ In agreement with Zunz and Moore, Freedman dates the original redaction of Bereshit Rabbah as being roughly contemporary with Talmud Yerushalmi,⁹ with further accretions during and after the sixth century.¹⁰ Strack maintains that Bereshit Rabbah can be no more recent than Talmud Yerushalmi because it cannot be demonstrated that Bereshit Rabbah used Yerushalmi as a source.¹¹ Also, he proposes that the title "rabbah" was given to it to differentiate it from a smaller, older collection which does go back to R. Oshaya.¹²

Theodor is of generally the same opinion regarding the date of composition of Bereshit Rabbah. That is, he places it in approximately the same period as the Yerushalmi. He states that while a great deal of its material is Tannaitic, the preponderance of the material was redacted in Amoraic and post-Amoraic times, in the sixth century and later.¹³ However, he says, the tradition ascribing the authorship of Bereshit Rabbah to R. Oshaya may indicate that that Amora began the work of redaction,¹⁴ although the position that the book took the title "rabbah" from him is untenable.¹⁵ Theodor suggests two possible origins for the appellation. The first is that it was called "rabbah" to

distinguish it from other, smaller collections.¹⁶ The second is that since one fourth (the first twenty-nine parshiyot) of Bereshit Rabbah deal with only the first sidrah of Genesis (1:1-6:8), there may have been a Midrash on Genesis, perhaps incomplete, which was called "rabbah," and that while aggadot from other, smaller collections were added on, the total work derived its title from that major "rabbah" source.¹⁷

Herr is of the opinion that any ascription of the authorship or redactorship of Bereshit Rabbah to R. Oshaya is erroneous, due to the inclusion of so much later material.¹⁸ As for its title, he feels that it comes either from a contraction of Bereshit de R. Oshaya Rabbah, or that the term "rabbah" was used to distinguish this Midrash from the biblical book of Genesis.¹⁹ In so far as the date of its compilation is concerned, Herr places it earlier than the authorities mentioned above. Noting the similarities in style and language to Talmud Yerushalmi,²⁰ he gives an approximate dating in the fourth to fifth centuries,²¹ perhaps even as early as 425.²² Mirkin concurs with Herr in this, also placing the major redaction somewhere between 426 and 500,²³ and he gives several possibilities for the authorship and origins of the title of Bereshit Rabbah. He maintains that the theory that the appellation was a contraction from Bereshit de R. Oshaya Rabbah is evidence for the likelihood that although R. Oshaya was not the final redactor, he commenced the work, and collected the first essentials.²⁴ He suggests that Bereshit Rabbah could be Bereshit Raba,²⁵ from Bereshit R. Abba. R. Abba was known as a hasid, and much of Bereshit Rabbah deals with praises of God, something with which this particular sage would be more than likely to occupy himself.²⁶ However, the person he feels was most likely the primary compiler of Bereshit Rabbah was a different Oshaya, namely, Abba Oshaya Ish Tiriya, an Amora of the fourth generation. This Abba Oshaya was a fuller, and Bereshit Rabbah shows great familiarity with clothing. Also, Abba Oshaya was

known as one of the great scholars and aggadists of his day. Therefore, says Mirkin, Abba Oshaya Ish Tiriyaḥ was probably the first redactor, and that the work was completed ca. 426-500 in Tiriyaḥ, near Nazareth in Lower Galilee.²⁷

These theories, however, are guesses, and some of them are bad ones. The various attempts at determining the redaction and/or origin of the title of Bereshit Rabbah from possible copyists' errors are at best poor hypotheses, with no real evidence. For instance, how does Mirkin choose out Abba Oshaya when there were also R. Oshaya Rabbah, Rav Oshaya (an Amora of the third generation who emigrated from Babylonia to Eretz Yisrael), and R. Oshaya ben Shammai (an Amora of the fifth generation), any one of whom could have begun collecting the aggadot? R. Oshaya Rabbah was known as a compiler of mishnayot, and R. Oshaya ben R. Shammai lived much closer to even Mirkin's dating of the redaction than Abba Oshaya Ish Tiriyaḥ. In addition, to assume that a showing of expertise in a specific field is evidence of an author's or compiler's identity is a highly suspect methodology, especially since Bereshit Rabbah displays expertise in so many occupations. Nor is a fuller the only trade in which familiarity with clothing is possible; what about a tailor? Furthermore, to be able to pinpoint one single city in which such a highly composite work was put together, especially an out-of-the-way town like Tiriyaḥ, is most unlikely. The problem is, in fact, that because Bereshit Rabbah is so diverse, it is almost impossible to pick any specific date or compiler. The best that can be done is to sift the various strata and try to see how they fit into possible historical settings, and then to see if, when all the parts are fitted together, they aim at a common theme or are appropriate to a common historical situation. Even then the best that can be done is to determine an approximate terminus ad quem or terminus post quem and/or several possible authors, redactors, and compilers. But it would seem that definitive datings or

identifications of compilers of works (individual maamarim are another matter entirely) are impossible. Many theories are good possibilities. For instance, there is Herr's idea that the title "rabbah" is meant to distinguish the Midrash from the biblical Genesis, but even here there can be not certainty. The most probable statements at this point are that Bereshit Rabbah was called "the great" to distinguish it from other collections, and that while it contains material both old and new, its similarities in language and style with Talmud Yerushalmi would point to a date of compilation sometime in the fifth to sixth centuries.

A great deal has been, and is yet to be, written about Bereshit Rabbah. In contrast, Midrash Haggadol has not yet undergone such extensive scrutiny. There are probably three reasons for this. Firstly, it came to light only within the past century, and the full text became available only within the past three decades. Secondly, it is known to be a relatively late collection of numerous earlier sources, although it does contain some material authored by the compiler himself. Thirdly, because its probable date and author are more easily identified, there is very little need or desire to argue about it, for, as the maxim goes, the volume of writing about any specific author or literary work is in inverse proportion to the amount of solid knowledge concerning that author or work. The general concensus as to the origin of Midrash Haggadol is that it is a Yemenite work of the thirteenth century. It cannot have been compiled earlier than that, because Maimonides is quoted frequently.²⁸ Fisch gives its date as the thirteenth century, and sums up the general opinion that the compiler was one David ben Amram Adani.²⁹ Although some scholars, notably Saul Lieberman, feel that Yemen was not a creative community, and that Midrash Haggadol is an Egyptian work, perhaps even the product of Maimonides' son

Abraham,³⁰ this attribution is no longer seen as having any merit.

Finally, there is Tanhuma; more specifically, the so-called Tanhuma C. But it is impossible to give the background of this Midrash without mentioning Tanhuma A ("Buber Tanhuma") and Tanhuma B (the lost Yelammedenu). Tanhuma C is perhaps the hardest book to date because it quotes so extensively and verbatim from other sources such as Mekilta and Sheiltot. In addition, similar types of homilies in Shemot Rabbah and Devarim Rabbah, plus the multiplicity of Tanhumas, only serve to complicate the situation. Furthermore, in certain places where Rashi cites the Yelammedenu, the quote can be found in Tanhuma C, while some of his Tanhuma citations can not. Nor is anyone really sure whether all these Midrashim were originally one, or if there were two, or even three or more. There is still a great deal to be learned about this subject.

The names Yelammedenu and Tanhuma are generally considered by scholars to have the following derivations. Yelammedenu comes from that type of homily (which occurs frequently in the Tanhuma literature) in which an halachic question is raised and then answered, the homily being introduced by the formula "yelammedenu rabbenu"--"may our master teach us." "Tanhuma" is supposed to be derived from the fact that so many homilies are attributed to R. Tanhuma bar Abba, and begin with: "rabbi tanhuma bar abba patah"--"R. Tanhuma bar Abba began the discourse...."³¹ This naturally leads to the possibility that R. Tanhuma was the compiler of the collection bearing that name.³²

Buber is of the opinion that there were originally three separate Midrashim: Yelammedenu, Tanhuma C, and his own version (Tanhuma A).³³ As for the date of Tanhuma C, it is extremely difficult to determine. It is certainly later than the Talmud, because it quotes the Gemara extensively,³⁴ and it seems to copy from Pirke de R. Eliezer.³⁵

But as for the various parts of Tanhuma C which are citations from Sheiltot, Saadia, and (according to Buber) Maimonides' Mishneh Torah, they are later accretions.³⁶ I. Weiss maintains that Tanhuma C is later than Bereshit Rabbah,³⁷ but, like Buber, he gives no definite date, merely the approximate terminus post quem. However, he seems to contradict himself when trying to determine how many Tanhumas there actually were. At one point he maintains there were three separate collections,³⁸ but later on states that Tanhuma A and Tanhuma C have a common source in spite of all the differences in content and style; perhaps that source is the lost Yelammedenu.³⁹ The confusion over the origins of the several Tanhumas is pointed out by Zunz. As was mentioned above, where Rashi cites the Yelammedenu, the passage is often found in Tanhuma C, whereas sections he attributes to Tanhuma are not.⁴⁰ But in Yalkut Shimoni, citations from the Yelammedenu do not correspond to anything in Tanhuma C, while whenever Tanhuma is given as a source, it is the same as in Tanhuma C. Obviously, confusion reigns, although it is evident that there were at least two sources in circulation.⁴¹ The problem remains, however, as to why the names of the collections do not follow a consistent pattern. Perhaps the material in both of them was so similar that the titles were viewed as interchangeable, or perhaps the identical sources had their names reversed in different geographic areas and under separate traditions. Bacher feels that the various Tanhumas all derive from an Urtext, the compilation of which was begun by R. Tanhuma bar Abba, who drew from numerous collections of sermons based on the weekly Torah readings and the lections for special sabbaths and festivals.⁴² On the other hand, Ginzberg maintains that the Yelammedenu was a distinct compilation consisting only of halachic-aggadic homilies, some of which were borrowed and included in the Tanhuma.⁴³ Zunz concludes that there were two sources for Tanhuma C.

One was the Yelammedenu, the other, that compendium attributed to R. Tanhuma bar Abba.⁴⁴

Theodor holds a view opposite to that of Bacher, maintaining that the several Tanhumas, Yelammedenu, and Deuteronomy Rabbah are not different revisions or extracts from an "original" Yelammedenu, but are all separate compilations. For such a Yelammedenu to have been the source for so many collections it would have to have been vast and heterogeneous, and this is highly unlikely. It is more probable either that the "Yelammedenu" pattern (halachic introduction, proem, exposition) was the model for a whole group of Tanhumas, or that there was a Yelammedenu collection which underwent various additions and/or subtractions of material at the hands of various redactors.⁴⁵ In so far as the date of Tanhuma C is concerned, Theodor follows Brüll's argument which maintains that it was compiled in the eighth century, and was recognized as authoritative and was copied by Ahai Gaon when he wrote the Sheiltot, as well as by Saadia. Thus, he says, Tanhuma C was compiled somewhere between 650 and 720.⁴⁶ Lauterbach holds that R. Tanhuma bar Abba may have preserved his own homilies, and that his collection was used by later redactors.⁴⁷ Tanhuma C, he feels, is later than A and B, and while it contains a great deal of original material, it draws extensively from Buber's version, Yelammedenu, and the Talmud.⁴⁸ Strack's position, like those of Bacher and Lauterbach, is that R. Tanhuma bar Abba probably made a compilation of midrashim, but that the various Tanhuma collections were all derived and selected from one major "Yelammedenu" document, with additions from other sources.⁴⁹ Herr writes that there is as yet no definite proof one way or the other, and that it is still unsure as to whether such disparate works as the two Tanhumas, Yelammedenu, Shemot Rabbah, and Devarim Rabbah are all derived from one source, or merely a group of collections based on a

particular model.⁵⁰ Herr is of the opinion, mentioned earlier, that the terms "Yelammedenu" and "Tanhuma" are probably synonymous, and are references to a specific literary genre rather than individual books.⁵¹ Summarizing the work of previous scholars, he points out that Zunz, Buber, Epstein, Bacher, Ginzberg, Mann, Albeck, Liebermann, and others have sought an Urtext for the entire Tanhuma literature, but none of them was successful, and that the chances are that there was a multiplicity of collections.⁵² This position seems to be the most logical, if only because, as Theodor says, the **vastness and variety** of the Tanhuma literature would demand an Urtext of immense proportions and homogeneity. The existence of such a document would seem unlikely. With regard to the date of Tanhuma C, Herr maintains that the Yelammedenu form (rhetorical halachic question followed by aggadic discourse) was a relatively late phenomenon. In addition, due to the presence of anti-Karaite polemics, Tanhuma C cannot be earlier than the ninth century.⁵³ However, as has been shown, dating is a risky business at best, especially in a work such as Tanhuma C where there are so many recognizable quotes from other sources and accretions from later periods. Therefore, as with other texts, the date of this work is yet to be determined. All that can be suggested is that the constant theme of eventual messianic redemption would indicate **that these homilies** were written and/or specially chosen for compilation during a period of breakdown, instability, hardship, and persecution. Beyond this there are no solid clues, and a great deal of work will have to be done before any dating of Tanhuma C, or any other Midrash, can be satisfactorily established.

The uncertainty and lack of factual information concerning the Midrash is of great significance. It reveals how little is really known. If such basic and essential facts as the date, the identity of the compiler

(or compilers), or even (and this seems to be such a simple question to answer) the derivation and meaning of the name of a Midrash cannot be conclusively established, then all that exists is a series of anthologies of aggadot, useful only fragmentarily as homilies or possible sources of history. This thesis is an attempt to explore comparison of texts as a methodology for plumbing the as yet unfathomed depths of the Midrash.

This chapter has briefly surveyed the background of the sources under discussion. The following chapters will present a comparison of the common points, parallel passages, and differences of the texts, in order to determine the cause for those correspondences.

CHAPTER III

A COMPARISON OF THE PARALLELS BETWEEN
BERESHIT RABBAH AND TANHUMA C

In this chapter there will be an inquiry into the parallels between Tanhuma C⁵⁴ and Bereshit Rabbah,⁵⁵ in order to examine the evidence for the existence of numerous sifre d'aggadta as sources for the Midrashim. For the convenience of the reader, most of the examples cited are provided in the original Hebrew at the end of the chapter, and will therefore be referred to in the body of the text as Example 1, Example 2 etc.

In Example 1 is found the famous aggadah stating that the Torah existed before the creation of the universe. There are a number of interesting dissimilarities between the two versions. While both Midrashim quote Proverbs 8:30 as the basis of their interpretations, and both have the metaphor of the Torah as being God's 'uman or 'umenet--the model upon which He relies while constructing the universe--BR includes the parable of a king calling on an architect to build a palace for him, while T contains several interpolations. There is an important difference in vocabulary as well. T reads "nitya'etz," which implies a cooperative venture in which both God and the Torah are active partners; BR uses the verb "mabit"--the Torah is passive. On the other hand, it is BR which depicts the Torah as saying: "I was the working-tool of the Holy One, Praised be He." In addition, BR links the Torah with the word "bere'shit" by quoting Proverbs 8:22, while T assumes the reader knows that the Torah is identified with hochmah ("Wisdom"). In general, the differences in style, as well as the fact that BR seems much more complete, leave little likelihood that one copied from the other. Rather, different source texts were used, and they

presented somewhat different traditions of interpretation.

Both of the selections in Example 2 are built around the themes of the letter bet as signifying "lashon berachah" and the creation of two worlds--this world and the next. But the styles are obviously quite different, and the order of the two ideas is reversed. In addition, an anonymous statement in T is attributed in BR to R. Judah ben Pazi in agreement with an opinion of Bar Kapara. This problem of parallel statements being anonymous in one source but attributed to a particular authority in another is an interesting one. The general rule is that the anonymous statement will be found in a work of later compilation. This is normally acceptable if it can be proven that a direct relationship exists between the two texts, or when the comparison is between a homiletic Midrash like Tanhuma (in which ascriptions will be omitted because the format is one of sermon notes and the name of an author is secondary to the ideas expressed) and an exegetical work like Bereshit Rabbah (which is an academy-centered work in which the name of the teacher will be of somewhat more importance). However, so much of T, especially its earlier passages, is at such variance with BR while the similarities increase in the later sections, it is a strong possibility that the compiler of T did not have at his disposal anything like the BR extant today, but rather worked from a different text in which specific ma'amarim were anonymous rather than of known authorship. Naturally, the reverse is equally true. That is, the compiler of BR sometimes worked from a source in which a citation was anonymous whereas those used by T named the author. Neither compiler had any reason to name some authors but omit others, either selectively or at random. In this case, as in others, the differences in style plus the variance in the attributions of ma'amarim tend to show that different sources were being used by the two compilers.

In T7 and BR IX5, there is a common tradition that Hiram, king of Tyre, attempted to have himself worshipped as a god, and in both versions the proof-text employed is Ezekiel 28:13. But while BR refers to Nebuchadnezzar as having done the same thing, T speaks of Hadrian (= Titus), and is much more extensive in its development of the theme. It is clear that these two versions represent different interpretations which came either from a common source which was abbreviated or changed to fit the views and circumstances of the individual compiler,⁵⁶ or from two variant traditions. Similarly, there is evidence of multiple texts when the parallels in T6 and BR XI2 are observed. T gives a list of six things which were taken from Adam when he sinned, one of them being ziv panav. BR mentions the same thing, and like T, quotes Job 14:20. But while BR ascribes this idea to rabbanan, T cites R. Berechiah and R. Helbo in the name of R. Samuel bar Nahman as the authors, and BR XII6 (see below) views the ma'amar as that of R. Judan in the name of R. Abin. These differences as to the authorship of the statement strongly indicate that the compilers were working with a variety of sources which did not always agree on details. Indeed, the collector (collectors?) of Bereshit Rabbah was also employing divergent texts, as is indicated by the example just given.⁵⁷ (This will be discussed further in Chapter VII.)

Looking at Example 3, it can be seen that in both T and BR, the rule is expressed that on the Sabbath one must change his clothing, or at least let the garments down,⁵⁸ and in both versions R. Johanan and R. Huna ("Rav" in T is probably a scribal or even typesetters' error) are cited. But in T, R. Johanan is quoted only as referring to his garb as "his honor" and R. Huna says, "He who can should change [his clothing], and if not, he should let them down," while in BR R. Hiyya quotes R.

Johanan as being of the opinion that one must add an extra garment on the Sabbath, and R. Huna's statement mentions only the changing of clothing; the rule regarding "letting down" is attributed in BR to Abin bar Hasdai. Here too, the divergent traditions as to who said what would indicate that T and BR were pieced together from different, variant sources.

The central theme of the passages in Example 4 is: "Why did God create the world with imperfections?" In T, the discussion centers around the existence of the yetzer hara'; in BR, the focus is the need for milah. While both versions state that various foods such as mustard-seed and vetch need to be processed in order to become palatable, and although the basic outlines are the same in each case, the details differ. Furthermore, as can be seen, the passage in T is anonymous and is in no specific context, whereas, BR portrays a dispute between a "philosopher" and R. Oshaya. All this is another indication of the likelihood that the two works derived from multiple sources.

Example 5 is an instance in which the literary styles are extremely similar and the main ideas identical, yet at the same time there are a number of outstanding dissimilarities. There are a few minor differences--for instance, the phrase "umipne mah 'inun baserin" in BR, which is probably only an interpolation by a compiler--but these are of little consequence for the purposes of this discussion. However, other variations are of greater significance. BR attributes the beginning of the passage to R. Samuel bar Nahman while T cites his traditionaries R. Berechiah and R. Helbo in his name. This discrepancy is best explained by the existence of two different texts having been available to the compilers of the two works. This is all the more likely in view of the fact that the continuation of the section is attributed in BR to R. Judan

in the name of R. Abin, while T cites R. Judah Halevi bar Shalom. Both versions mention that the vav is present in the word toledot only twice, but is missing elsewhere, however, the styles, vocabularies and sentence orders are markedly different. The cause of such a divergence is not any modification by the compilers of the Midrashim. If one were copying directly from the other, or if both were copied from the same original source, and in either case, if the intent and outlook of the copies were the same as that of the original, there would be no reason to make any changes. The only explanation for these variations is that there was more than one textual tradition. Nor is it possible that these differences were merely the result of the vagaries of citation by memory from a common oral tradition; it is known that the compilers, and the rabbis themselves for that matter, had aggadah-books. (See Chapter VIII.)

There is a problem as to whether the list of the six things God took away from Adam is the same in both versions. It would seem that BR does not include banishment from the Garden of Eden. However, there is the statement "verabbanan 'amri bemotza'ei shabbat natal zivo mimenu uterado migan 'eden." It is as if this was originally part of the list of six, but was later absorbed into the general body of the passage and had to be replaced by counting peri ha'aretz and perot ha'ilan as two separate items. It might be true that T (or its sources) believed the two references to "fruit" were actually one, and added the banishment from Eden in order to complete the list of six. But the greater likelihood is that it was somehow lost from the source of BR, especially since BR cites Genesis 3:24 as the proof-text for the expulsion, just as does T, and BR uses only Genesis 3:17 as the proof-text for the two perot in the same way that T uses it for its one mentioning of "fruit." Along with this observation

goes the fact that the positions of komato and hayyav are reversed in the two works. This is further evidence that these Midrashim were compiled from different written sources.

The two passages in Example 5 contain additional evidence for the existence of numerous written sources. T has no proof-text for hayyav, and cites Psalm 139:5 in support of komato, whereas BR quotes Genesis 3:8, and in so doing assumes the reader knows the tradition that Adam was originally as large as the entire world, but shrank when he sinned. Most striking is the difference between BR and T when explaining how the me'orot were taken away. T simply quotes Isaiah 13:10. BR, however, has a long exposition attributed to R. Simeon bar Judah Ish Kefar Acco⁵⁹ in the name of R. Meir. The original use of this statement in BR XI2 is in a discussion concerning the means by which God blessed the Sabbath. (See Chapter VII.) Here it is more than obvious that the compiler of BR had a number of documents in front of him, and did not hesitate to commingle them, quoting long passages out of context when he felt they would be appropriate elsewhere. At the same time, it is clear that the compiler of T did not possess the same documents as BR, but used a shorter, more concise and unified statement of the same aggadic tradition. T did not copy this passage from BR, not only because of the comparative brevity of the former, but also because there is no allusion whatsoever to the material in the long discourse in BR.

At this point, BR contains an interesting phrase: "rabbi berechiah beshem rabbi shemu'el bar nahman 'amar 'af 'al pi shenivre'u hadevarim 'al meli'atan...." There is an important difficulty here. It might be necessary to repeat the original ascription of the passage, due to the confusion over its authorship caused by the interpolation of the previous section, but why is R. Helbo's name omitted

here? Either it was an oversight by the compiler or a copyist, or, it may have been that this whole aggadah of six items having been taken away but destined to be returned is a patchwork of two separate traditions. But the fact that the attribution had to be repeated indicates that the compiler was informing the reader of a return to an original train of thought--to his original source. This idea is further reinforced by the fact that BR has to repeat the entire list, as well as reiterate and clarify the meaning of the verse from Ruth 4:18 dealing with the descendants of Peretz. T does not do this; the compiler is working from only one source, but it is certainly different from that used by BR, since the proof-texts cited by T in order to illustrate how the six things will be restored to mankind are different from those employed in BR. It might be suggested that T substituted Isaiah 61:9 as a proof-text for ziv panav because Judges 5:31 was "required" for the messianic conclusion of the passage, and therefore there was one original text from which both T and BR derived, with the former making a necessary adjustment. But the variant proof-texts throughout the concluding sections of both these passages are additional evidence that the two works drew from different sources. The same is true of the digressions concerning the meanings of the word "komeniyut" and the verse from Ezekiel 47:12.

In BR XIX4 and T8, there are comments on the snake's conversation with Eve. In T the rabbis discuss the concept of lashon hara⁶; in BR, a ma'amar attributed to R. Joshua of Sichnin in the name of R. Levi also refers to the serpent as speaking maliciously. The real point of contact, however, is the use in both versions of the proverb, "Every artisan hates his competitors." But while T gives it in Hebrew ("kol 'uman sone bene 'umanuto"), BR is in Aramaic ("kol 'inash ve'inash sane bar 'umanuteh"). This is another

instance in which there may have been a common tradition of applying this specific maxim in connection with Genesis 3:5, but the divergent treatment, ascriptions, and language indicate that T and BR were using separate sources.

In Example 6 it can again be seen that the essentials are the same but the details vary. In the first place, the sequence in which aggadot are given is reversed. In BR, the interpretation that the place of Abel's sacrifice was the site of the Temple follows the view that Cain and Abel were contesting the ownership and occupation of real estate and movable property; in T, the order is the opposite. This is a clear demonstration that the two compilers were working from multiple sources which they spliced together according to their separate outlooks and ideas. There would be no reason for one to simply reverse the order. Also, both of these stories appear in T in a much less graphic way, and the reader is expected to know the interpretation that the place in which the two brothers offered their sacrifices was the location of the Temple, namely, Mt. Zion: "makom korbancha...tzion sadeh te'paresh." In both aggadot, BR depicts more of a dialogue between Abel and Cain, and presents the matter of property division in much more technical language than T. BR uses the words "karka'ot" and "metaltelin," as opposed to "tzo'n" and "'adamah" in T. These dissimilarities within a context of basic agreement are a further indication that the two Midrashim came not from modifications of one original source, but from a multiplicity of documents.

Additional evidence of the varying uses of numerous textual ingredients is to be found in the continuation of the Cain and Abel narrative (Example 7). Aside from the differences in style in the two explications of "vayakom kayin," there is the use of the statement by Cain that he and Abel are the only ones in the world, and that one of them would surely be asked to account for the other's

whereabouts. In BR, Cain employs it to deceive Abel, while in T, it is his reason for running away from his parents, "she'eyn mevakshin 'oto 'ela' mimeni." The explanation of how Abel was slain by Cain is a further illustration. In BR, there is a compendium of opinions by R. Simeon ben Gamliel, the rabbis, R. Azariah and R. Nathan bar Haggai in the name of R. Isaac, the last of them assuming the reader's knowledge of the aggadah that Adam offered a sacrifice. T seems to have selected only the opinion of rabbanan, and omits any reference to Adam's sacrifice by maintaining that Cain eventually came to strike Abel in the neck by a process of trial and error. Whether or not the compiler of T had BR in front of him, it is clear that both works are composites of a number of previous sources. That is (and this is especially true in the case of BR), a passage like the one under discussion was compiled from a collection of independent books of aggadot, some of which listed the sayings of a particular rabbi. (This hypothesis will be discussed at greater length in Chapter IX.)

There is an unattributed statement in T10 in which Cain is depicted as being shown how to bury Abel by two clean fowl, one of whom kills and then interrs the other. As a reward, the birds are given the merit of having their blood covered with dust after being slaughtered. A similar ma'amar in BR XXII8, ascribed to R. Elazar ben Pedat, states that the birds and the clean animals together buried Abel, and therefore merited two blessings: one, the covering of the blood for the birds, the other, the benediction over ritual slaughtering. Neither of these two passages is a direct copy or modification of the other. These are not minor differences in grammar or vocabulary, nor can the anonymity of the version in T as opposed to the ascription in BR be discounted as evidence. Once again the inference is that the two compilers were

working from separate texts which represented separate traditions. There is a subtle, implicit difference in the view of Cain's character, for T at least credits him with burying his brother. Also, R. Elazar's linking of the blessing over shehitah to burial seems artificial.

Aside from the use of Isaiah 46:4 in T, the two short citations in Example 8 seem to touch **at all** points, and they certainly agree on their basic interpretation of Genesis 4:13, namely, that Cain is asking if his sin is too great to be forgiven. In view of this agreement, there would have been no need for a compiler to make any alterations, and the best explanation for the differences in style, vocabulary, and the use of Isaiah 46:4 is that the two collectors had different texts, or selected one they preferred from among several possibilities.

In Example 9, T includes a picture of the animals gathering around Cain in an attempt to take revenge on him for the death of Abel, and Cain's pathetic cry to God. In BR, however, R. Judah's statement is similar. Here too, the animals gather together to avenge Abel's death, but the difference is that God gave Cain a sign in order to prevent such an occurrence. Despite the fact that there are certain points of contact, such as the use of the identical word "nitkansu"-"mitkansot" and the motif of the **animals** seeking to avenge Abel, the different uses to which they are put indicate the existence of multiple aggadic source traditions.

A clear demonstration of the fact that the compilers of T and BR drew from collectors of individual sources is found in Example 10. In T are presented two possible explications of the 'ot God placed upon C, and both bear the ambiguous attribution of "yesh 'omrim." The first, which mentions the Sabbath, has no parallel in BR. The other, the idea that God placed a horn in Cain's forehead, is the same as that of Abba Jose ben Kesari in BR, but

otherwise there are simply two lists of interpretations, each of which was culled from a series of documents. They cannot all have come from one unified source; it would have been too vast (as was mentioned in Chapter II). Rather, each collector had documents at his disposal which he pieced together as he wished. A further indication of this fact is that in BR two statements by Rav are interrupted by an opinion ascribed to Abba Jose ben Kesari. This could only occur if the person compiling the anthology were including statements from various sources and putting them together (as was stated in Chapter I) merely as he came upon them. Or it may be that in this case, the compiler had two somewhat disparate statements, both attributed to Rav, and felt constrained to separate them in some way.

In Example 11, the two versions of the story of Lemech are another display of the composite nature of the Midrashim. BR shows no familiarity with the tradition that Lemech slew Cain and Tubal-Cain. As a result, Adah and Zillah refuse to have intercourse with him, not out of grief or out of fear that their children would suffer divine retribution, but out of the knowledge that the Flood was coming; i.e., they refused to bring children into a world faced with an impending all-embracing doom, whereas in T they fear a much more personal and immediate tragedy. As in previous instances, the literary style and vocabulary of these parallel passages are quite different, although in both BR and T, Zillah and Adah do not want to be "molidot lim'erah," and they will address Adam with the same proverb: "'asya' ase bigretach." Both T and BR view Lemech's cryptic "ki 'ish haragti lepitz'i..." as being a question--as a statement of innocence--but whereas in BR Lemech says it to his wives, in T it is his plea before Adam's court. These differences show that BR and T, although containing many convergent elements, were drawn from separate sources. Indeed, the parenthetical insertion of

statements by Rabbi, R. Jacob bar Idi, and R. Johanan is clear evidence of a patchwork culled from a multiplicity of sources and traditions. In contrast to the rest of the passage, their utterances display an awareness that Lemech killed someone. Why else would God have to collect on "shtar hovo?" They inquire concerning the repetition of 'ish' and 'yeled' in Lemech's couplet, and their tone distinctly reveals that they are questioning as to whether one or two people were slain. Their queries could only fit in with a tradition in which Lemech was understood to have taken a life. The question they ask makes no sense unless there were at least one dead person under discussion. This is a very concrete example of a mixing of sources and traditions.

Some evidence of multiple sources can be found in a comparison of BR XXV2 with T11. In T, Noah brings rest "mima'asenu umi-'itzavon yadenu" because before his birth the crops would spring up only as thorns and thistles, nor were there any tools whatsoever, but after his entry into the world, whatever the farmer sowed he would reap, and Noah himself invented plows, axes, mattocks, and other implements. In contrast to this, in BR, R. Johanan holds that the problem was neither with the crops nor with the fact that all tasks had to be done barehanded. Rather, it was the animals that gave trouble. After man sinned, they would no longer obey him, and it was only subsequent to Noah's birth that they became tame and useful once again. In fact, R. Johanan either held a different view from that of the author of the passage in T, or else he did not know the aggadic tradition which held that before Noah there were no tools. He states that the ox would not obey the plowman, and for him to say this indicated that he obviously had to believe that the plow already existed.

Finally, in Example 12, it can again be seen that

the compilers of the two Midrashim were using collections of sources which, although showing awareness of common traditions, differed in their style, vocabulary, attributions of authorship, and even outlooks. T ascribes to the rabbis the opinion that "zimah" brings an "'androlomosya'" (universal execution), while in BR, R. Simlai speaks of "zenut." R. Azariah's ma'amar in T that God forgives all sins except lewdness is attributed in BR to R. Azariah and R. Judah ben Simon in the name of R. Joshua ben Levi. There is no reason for the compiler of T to have included only R. Azariah's name while eliminating the others; BR obviously had a different tradition. Lastly, there are the two varying treatments of the Sodom theme. The main idea in both cases is clearly the same, but in BR the statement is attributed to R. Joshua ben Levi in the name of Bar Pedayah, and the disparity in treatment is plainly seen. In T, the events are merely touched on, while in BR, Lot is portrayed as being forbidden to further defend the people among whom he dwells. The language in T is briefer and depicts only the greatness of the sin of Sodom. As in all the cases mentioned and explained above, these differences between BR and T could only have come about if the compilers were working from varied, multiple groups of sources.

This chapter has presented the case for the existence of multiple sources in so far as BR and T can provide any evidence. The next chapter will deal with the parallels between T and Midrash Haggadol.

CHAPTER III EXAMPLES

EXAMPLE 1

11

(מ) בראשית ברא אלהים, וז' שמיני הכתוב ה' בכתב ימי איין (מל' נ) ובראשית
המל' את עולמי תציע במוח וברא את העולם
על כפי אש לבנה באש שחרורה
שמיני וחדשי חסד אלהי (מל' מ') אל חסדי אלהי אמן. ובר' נבר' שמים
בראשית. יסבר ארץ

[illegible]

1. **የጥያቄው ዓላማ**፡ ለጥያቄው ዓላማ ማብራራት፡፡
 2. **የጥያቄው አፈጻጸም**፡ ለጥያቄው አፈጻጸም ማብራራት፡፡
 3. **የጥያቄው ዋና ዋና ክፍሎች**፡ ለጥያቄው ዋና ዋና ክፍሎች ማብራራት፡፡
 4. **የጥያቄው ጥቅም**፡ ለጥያቄው ጥቅም ማብራራት፡፡
 5. **የጥያቄው ማጠቃለያ**፡ ለጥያቄው ማጠቃለያ ማብራራት፡፡

EXAMPLE 2

15

לפי פתח בברכות של עולם בברית וואו בארץ וואו א' ראש
אמר האמות אלא לי שיהא לשון ארד וי' לשון ברד אמר הקב"ה אברא את העולם
בשלישון ברד וזה ענינה בשלשון ברד בני אדם פועלים לצדם בשלשון אדם עבדו ועד
למה ברא בברית ללמד לברית שהן שעו עולמות העולם הזה המושלם רבא :

BR 110

ה'תש"ח, י"ב שבט, י"ב

၂။ အထွေထွေ အကျဉ်းချုပ်
 ၃။ အကျဉ်းချုပ် အကျဉ်းချုပ်
 ၄။ အကျဉ်းချုပ် အကျဉ်းချုပ်
 ၅။ အကျဉ်းချုပ် အကျဉ်းချုပ်
 ၆။ အကျဉ်းချုပ် အကျဉ်းချုပ်
 ၇။ အကျဉ်းချုပ် အကျဉ်းချုပ်
 ၈။ အကျဉ်းချုပ် အကျဉ်းချုပ်
 ၉။ အကျဉ်းချုပ် အကျဉ်းချုပ်
 ၁၀။ အကျဉ်းချုပ် အကျဉ်းချုပ်

1 ויחבד קין אל רבאל אחיו כה אל חורק חורק
 ואת בניו ואתו פו שנים. אל רבאל אפסד. אל קין אבי אנו נטול יתר חורק על חורק פסד
 שחורבנו בו קרבנו. אל רבאל לא חסדו וכל רבד זה נפחד כשהו בניוים שנאמר ויהי
 מחרתם בשנה וחרון כרוב (דמיוס) צון שנה חרדו ויש אנשים שאמר קין להביל נחלץ
 חקרים. אל דו. נביל רבאל צאנו קין ארבה לעבור. והנה פוטים שנה ואל היה על זה
 ביום בשנה רבאל את צאנו רבאלו לרעה את הצאן קין וחרק אחריו מצד לבקשה ופסקיה
 לדי עד שבראדו זה מה

¶9

¶9

אנחנו רבאל אל קין ונביל רבאלו. וכשראה קין כי דבריו צוה
 רבד אתו אל חקשה בו רעה. ורדם עליו וחרדו ועמד ורדנו שנאמר ויפס קין מבדיל שנאמר.
 כי שידנו את ארבה כפנו נביל וחבד שצון במקשין ארבו אלא כפנו שצון ארבו בשנים ארבו.
 את רבאל
 חקשה חרדוה רבדוה בארבו ביום וברבילו שנה חורק וירע פוטים נשפדו חזקה עד
 שידנו רבאלו

EXAMPLE 6

BR XII17

ז. (ה) וילאמר קין אל רבאל ויחבד קין אל רבאל פוטים פוטים ונח -
 אצל מה חור מרדנים. אמרו: בואו ונחלק את העולם. אחר נטל המקצועות ואחר
 נטל המשקל. ורין אמר: ארצא דאח קאם קלח. וידיו: ורין אמר: מה דאח
 קבש. וידיו: ורין אמר: נחלקו ורין אמר: פרוח: מחור קר נקום ברו אל רבאל אחיו
 ונחלקנו. ויחשע דסקיו בשם ר' לר אמר: שרדום נטלו את המקצועות ושנחום
 נטלו את המשקל. וכל מה חור מרדני. אלא זה אמר: פרוח: פוטים פוטים ונח -
 נבנה: וזה אמר: פרוח: פוטים פוטים נבנה: שחאמר: וידיו פרוח: פוטים פוטים ונח -
 שרה אלא ברת המשקל. וידיו פוטים פוטים אמר: (פסד 2. יט) ציון שרה מרדני. ופחור
 קר נקום ברו על רבאל אחיו ונחלקנו.

EXAMPLE 7

BR XII18

ח. אמר ר' יוחנן: רבאל חבד רבדו פוטים פוטים שצון פלמוד לומר
 נקום. אלא פלמוד שרה נחור מרדני. אמר לו: שצנו פוטים פוטים מה את חולק
 ואומר לאבא? ונחלקא עליו רחמים. מרד עמר עליו נחלקנו.
 נבנה: וזה אמר: נחלקו ורין אמר: פרוח: פוטים פוטים נבנה: שחאמר: וידיו פרוח: פוטים פוטים ונח -
 שרה אלא ברת המשקל. וידיו פוטים פוטים אמר: (פסד 2. יט) ציון שרה מרדני. ופחור
 קר נקום ברו על רבאל אחיו ונחלקנו.

[illegible]

CHAPTER IV

PARALLELS BETWEEN TANHUMA C AND MIDRASH HAGGADOL

Midrash Haggadol⁶⁰ is an excellent tool for working in comparative Midrash. As was discussed in Chapter III, there is little likelihood that the compiler would make modifications of his originals. Margaliot,⁶¹ Fisch,⁶² and Rabinowitz⁶³ point out that MH is extremely faithful to its sources. Thus, it provides a compendium of numerous reliable, variant readings from older Midrashim, and is therefore a most useful work despite its relatively late composition. In this chapter, MH will be compared with T in order to examine the available evidence for the existence of sifre d'aggadta.

In Example 1 are two passages which demonstrate the presence of multiple traditions. Both show God as having "nitya'etz batorah" before creating the world. T, however, says "ucheshebara' hakadosh baruch hu'," implying that He used the Torah during the act of creation, whereas MH reads, "vechevan she'alah beda'ato livrot 'olamo." There is an important distinction between the two versions, especially when the statement by the Torah in MH is taken into account. The implication there is that God created the world because the Torah advised Him that it would be to His advantage. The point of T is: the Torah was God's continual adviser as he formed the world step by step. This difference is a clear indication of multiple sources, for as can be seen from the fact that there are two Mekiltot (of R. Ishmael and of R. Simeon ben Yohai), each "philosophical-theological" school within the parameters of rabbinic thought authored its own, different version of the same basic aggadot, and wrote them down in a manner conforming to its own particular system.

In addition, the passage from MH in Example 1

provides evidence for the opinion that Midrashim are composed of several independent sources. At the beginning of the selection, it is said of the Torah: "sheshemah tushiyah," and the mashal follows. Then comes what is almost a repetition of the first sentence: "'amrah torah bi nitya'etz hakadosh baruch hu' livrot 'et 'olamo shene'emar...." This is similar to the point made in T, and differs from that of the parable. Obviously, there is a combining of two similar, but not identical texts. Neither of them is the same as T, in spite of the common use of Proverbs 18:14 as a proof-text. The end result is that there are three texts which were employed here--two in MH, and one in T.

The selections in Example 2 clearly demonstrate that the various Midrashim were culled from separate texts. T begins its exposition with Proverbs 10:6, and the styles are dissimilar--T is much more expansive. Furthermore, there is a subtle difference in the meanings of the two passages. MH reads "ula'i ya'amod"--"perhaps [the world] will [be able to] stand up (i.e., remain in existence)," whereas in T, God states, "'evra' 'et ha'olam bileshon baruch umah keshenivra' bileshon baruch bene 'adam mach'isin leyotzram bileshon 'arur 'al 'achal kamah vechamah"--"I will create the world with the language of blessing, for if when it is created with the language of blessing men anger their Creator, [if it were created] with the language of cursing, so much the more so!" In T, God is trying to put some good into the world. In MH, the very existence of the world is at stake. There are two distinct points of view involved. They could only have been passed on in the form of separate literary traditions.

There were two versions in BR and T of the famous aggadah concerning the six things taken from Adam when he sinned; the same is true of MH and T (Example 3). Although most of the two texts are identical (except for minor

discrepancies which are due either to copyists' mistakes or to the addition of short explanations by the compiler of MH and are therefore inconsequential), there are a few interesting dissimilarities. For instance, the introduction to the theme in MH is considerably longer, and takes pains to explain the import of the entire passage. T assumes the reader is aware of the fact that Peretz is the ancestor of the Messiah; MH does not. It is most fascinating to note that both versions cite R. Juda (Judah) Halevi bar Shalom, but there is a vast difference in the two supposed "direct quotations." A continuing examination of the material shows that in the two selections, the order of komato and hayyav is reversed; MH has a proof-text for hayyav while T does not; and the proof-texts for komato and the me'orot are not identical.

Similarly, the sections dealing with the eventual restoration of man's radiance, height, life, etc., reveal the variant origins of the two versions. In MH, the proof-text for the return of man's radiance is Judges 5:31, but in T it is Isaiah 61:9. The statements concerning kommemiyut are of particular significance. MH reads "...kishte komot ba'adam hari'shon," but T quotes R. Simeon ben Jose as determining that kommemiyut means that every Jew will grow to a height of two hundred cubits, while an anonymous view holds that they will be one hundred cubits tall. This little explication appears to be a digression. It was probably added to the original aggadah from a different text which dealt with the exegesis of the book of Leviticus, but which some compiler deemed appropriate to insert at this point. The same is undoubtedly true of "mahu shekol hodesh vehodesh..." in T, where the proof-text for perot ha'arets is Ezekiel 47:12 instead of Zechariah 8:12, as in MH. This, and other similarities (such as the variant proof-texts for gan 'eden), are clear demonstrations of the existence of multiple textual

sources for the Midrashim.

In Example 4, the selections do not appear to correspond at all--T ascribes the statement to rabbanan, MH to R. Joshua of Sichnin. Nor do the writing styles or vocabularies resemble each other. However, both passages carry the same message: God forbids Adam and Eve to eat from the tree, says the serpent, in order to prevent them from competing with Him. This fact clearly indicates that while certain basic ideas were known to many authors and compilers, they were written down and preserved in numerous forms. This is equally true of the variants concerning the nature of Cain's sacrifice (Example 5), in which it is stated that he offered to God either flax seed and/or the leftovers from his meal. Here again the styles and vocabularies point to the same idea having been passed down in more than one version.

In general, the story of Cain and Abel as presented in T and MH provides evidence for the existence of multiple sources. The selections in Example 6 appear to be identical, but there are two distinct dissimilarities. Firstly, while T reads "ho'il ve'asita teshuvah," in MH the statement reads "ho'il vehodeta ve'asita teshuvah." There is a subtle difference involved--MH makes it clear that confession is integral and necessary to the process of repentance. Secondly, MH contains a reference to Job 22:13 which is not found in T. This allusion may very well have been part of the original aggadah in a source other than T. Or, since the two passages are so alike, the compiler of MH may have had a slightly diverse version of T. However, the question would still remain as to how such discrepancies arose.

Example 7 is another good illustration of the fact that the compilers of the various Midrashim worked from a multiplicity of sources. Both of these selections interpret Genesis 4:15 to mean that the 'ot God gave to

Cain was the Sabbath, which is likewise referred to as an 'ot in Exodus 31:17. However, it is clearly seen that there are two important differences between these passages. In T, God "na'al" the Sabbath before Cain; MH casts the Sabbath in a more active (and independent) role: "shabbat 'amdah lefanav," as if it interceded for Cain of its own accord. In addition, there is the statement in T, "keshem shelimed shabbat zechut 'al 'adam hari'shon kach limed 'al kayin." This second dissimilarity is noteworthy not only because it is not found in the parallel in MH, but because no aggadah concerning the saving of Adam by the Sabbath is found in T at all! This demonstrates that not only did T and MH derive from separate sources, but that T itself is a composite as well. Indeed, the compiler of T assumes the reader's close acquaintance with certain traditions, so that those traditions merely have to be hinted at. Many authors in world literature make allusions which they expect the reader to understand. They could do so only if there were other books to which to allude. Similarly, the references in midrashic literature to other "well-known" legends presuppose the availability or knowledge of other books extant at that time.

Further evidence for a multiplicity of sources is to be found in the passages in Example 8. Firstly, there is the discrepancy between the cryptic "kevar n-t-l-o(u) helko" in T and the somewhat more easily understood "kevar natal helko min ha'olam" in MH. Is the version in T a scribal error, a misprint, or a haplography? Is the version in MH merely an illustration of the rule that the simpler reading is only a later reworking of an original, difficult text? Or did the two compilers have two separate sources with two distinct readings? Secondly, MH gives the reasoning behind Lamech's conclusion that retribution for his sin will be postponed for seventy-seven generations. He feels his punishment will be delayed because he slew "bishgagah."

This excerpt, which is lacking in T, would once again indicate that the compilers of the two Midrashim were working with different sources. Furthermore, there are significant dissimilarities in the two depictions of Lemech and his wives arguing before Adam's "court." In T, Adah and Zillah mention only that Lemech slew Cain. In MH, Tubal-Cain is included. In T, only Adam and the two women participate in the discussion while Lemech is merely an onlooker. In MH, Lemech takes an active role. In T appears the sentence "'i ziknenu lefi tumo harago," the speaker and meaning of which are not clear. Further comparison show that the two portrayals are quite different, although both do cite the same proverb: "'asya' 'ase (yat) higretach." But while the closing sentences of the two passages are identical linguistically, MH concludes with Genesis 4:25 as the proof-text, whereas T cites Genesis 5:3. All this points to the variant readings in these Midrashim as having been culled from divergent sources.

There is one notable variation in the two texts in Example 9. An anonymous statement in T, "kodem shenolad noah...," is attributed to Rav Hisda in MH. From the surrounding material, it would appear that MH was copying either directly from T, or from the same source as T--the two versions are almost identical. But, aside from the fact that a statement by a Babylonian Amora seems to be out of place in T (which is generally considered to be a Palestinian work), why is the citation ascribed to a particular teacher in one version but not in the other? It is not likely that T is abridged and omits ascriptions. As has been stated in Chapter III, there are places where BR contains anonymous material which in T is ascribed to a specific teacher, and the same is true of MH vis à vis T. This difference of "anonymous" vs "attributed" could probably occur only if MH and T were using different sources. The same explanation may be given for the variations in

the use of Genesis 5:29 as a proof-text at the end of the passages.

The final evidence to be cited in this chapter is found in Example 10. In these two passages, exactly the same idea is expressed, and even the same Greek loan-word-- "'andralomosya'"-- is used, although in MH it is written corruptly as "'andromosyah." However, the two versions have variant ascriptions: T reads "shanu rabbotenu," while MH attributes the quotation to R. Simlai. In addition, their vocabularies are markedly different. MH states, "kol makom she'atah motze' zenut 'andromosyah ba'ah la'olam vehoreg'et hayafim ve'et hara'im;" T reads, "mipne zimah 'andralomosya' ba'ah la'olam vesafah hatovim vehara'im." There is a difference between "zenut" and "zimah." "Zenut" refers to prostitution and/or promiscuity, but "zimah" is general and total obscenity and sexual license. These dissimilarities, like all those mentioned in this chapter, are evidence that the literature of the Midrash was compiled from a multiplicity of sources.

The next step in this inquiry will be to compare and contrast selected passages from MH and BR, and to examine the evidence to be found therein.

CHAPTER IV EXAMPLES

EXAMPLE 1

דף

MH II (p. 11. 16-21)

מ) בראשית ברא אלדס . מן שאמר רחוב ה' בהמה יסר ארץ (מל' נ) ונשברא
הבה' את עולס ערען במורה נברא את העולם נמא' לי עצה ותחיה
אזי כנה לי נמחה (סס מ').

ובין שעלה ברעמו לבירה עלתנו נחנין במורה ששמה
ותחיה לבירה את העולם. הישבה אותו ואמרה לו רבנו שלעולם אם אין
צבא או ממה לטלף על מה הוא מולך. אם אין עם מקליסין את העלף
איות הוא כבודו שלטלף. ושמן הקביה דבריה נעבד לו. אמרה חורה כי
נחנין הקביה לבירה את עולמו. שאמר לי עצה ותחיה (סל' מ. יד)
ואמר ה' בהמה יסר ארץ (סס ג. יז)

EXAMPLE 2

דף

MH II (p. 1. 18-p. 1. 1)

נ) בראשית ברא אלדס וה שאמר רחוב ברכות לראש צדק וס' רשעים יכנה רכס
(מל' נ) לכה סחה בבריות של עולס בברית ונא בארץ והל' י' ראש
יכר האומות אלא לפי שראלף לעון צדק וס' לשון ברוך אשר העבירה אברה את העולם
כלשון ברוך וס' נשברה במשן ברוך בני אדם במשען לועים כלשון ארזי נאצי

למה בבית שדוא ברשון ברכה ולא באלף.
שדוא כלשון ארורה. אמר הקביה דואר העולם יכול לעמוד ודוא נברא
כלשון ארורה אלא דרעי בורא אותו בבית כלשון ברכה. אלא יעמוד.

ט' ויאמר קרן אל ה' גדול עניי מנשא. אמר לפני רבני
שלעולם יש דלמורין שגלשינן את הארס לפניך. איז ואמי דרי חן בארין
ואין יודעין שאני הדינני ואמה בשמים פנין אמה ידמי. כניין שגמאר
ואמרת מה ידע אל הדבד ערפל ישפט (איוונג' יט) אמר לו הקב"ה שובתה כל
העולם כולו אני סובל. אני עשיתי ואני אשא אני אכבול ואבטל (ישעיה ס"ד)
וכך אני ידמי. אמר לפני רבנו שלעולם כל העולם אמה סובל ועניי איז
אמה יכול לסבול. גדול עניי מנשוא. אמר לו הקב"ה הוואיל ודודלת ועשית
חשובה צא הנגלה מן המקום הזה.

EXAMPLE 7

T10

יש אומרים שבת נעל בבני כ"ז
(פסם ה) בני ובני ישראל את הוא לעולם כעם שלב שבת ומה על אדם
דחייבין כך לשל קל קל.

MH IV15 (p. 2-4)

יש אומרים שבת נעל לפני וניצל בה כחיה הבא את וכו' ומה הם בני
ויש בני ישראל את הוא לעולם (שם לא י).

EXAMPLE 8

T11

(1. 1. קכח.פ-14. 1. קכז.פ) (MH IV24-25)

לכח אצל להם לפי לנשו עני למה. אל רינת את קן וקנינו ותכל קן בני לא נעלה
אל כפר נמזו הלכו קן שבעה דורות. אבל אני שבעים ושבעה. אל לא נשבע קד מה
אני בעריות לנשיה. אל נלך לבד. ולכן למה אנני אדם ודאשין. אל ענה ומה אנני
עני זה בני עני את רינת. אל אני וקנינו לשי חוש רינת. אל אדם נש לפר החימה
והידי לא אדם ישי אש דרטי לפעני בנשיה אשר להו לכו חשכו לבעלן. אל אסא אבא
בגדן אתה פריש במסדך כמה ונשישם שנה וקנה מלמד אחרת מה כחם אחריו וחי
אדם ישישם ומה עני חומר בדמיו כנולש

וכן שבאו לכח אמר להן למך לנשו עני למה. אמרו
לו רינת קן וקנינו ותוכל קן בני לא נעלה. אמר להן כד נשל חלקן
מן העולם שבעה דורות אבל אני שבעים ושבעה מה אם קן שורד בודון
נמל לו שבעה ושבעה דור. אמרו לו לא נשבע קד מה אני מולידין למארה. אמר
להן נלך לרין הלכו להן אצל אדם הראשון אמרו לו ענה ונללה ארוננו
למך זה בעלני דר וקנינו ותוכל קן בנינו והוא אמר השמע לי אין אני
נשמעין לו מה אני מולידין והוא קובר. אמר לו למך ארני כשננה כח הדבר
לירי לא ברצוני ולא בדעתי. אמר להן אדם הראשון לכו השמעו לבעלכן
לא נכרא העולם אלא לפריה ורביה. אמרו לו אסא אמי ית חזרתך אתה
פרישת ממסדך כמה ונשישם שנה ואת מלמד אחרת מה כחם בחרתי
(בה) זידע אדם עני את אשתו.

ד11

ווקרא את שש מן לאמר זה נתמט . בן הזה ידע חסד מ
 גילמיו כמישיטו ונכיו נביא זה. א"ל ש בן יצחקן לסורין היו שבשעה שאלו הקב"ל לאדם
 ארורה האדמה בעבורך בנצבון האכלה כל יס חור אבר אדם רבשע ער ספי. אל ער
 צויל אדם כהל . ביון ענינו מן כחל סור יד לפר ואבר וראו זה נתמט ונ'. ונרד סמשיט
 ובנצבון ידעו קורם שנוכל מן לאבשרו וורקין היו קצוצין אלא היו וורקין חשם וקצרים
 קנים ורדדים בין שנוכל מן חור העולם לשוב . קצרו מה שורקו וורקין חשם וקצרים
 רשם . שנקרים וקצרים שנקרים . ולא ער אלא ער שנוכל מן עושין מלאכה בידים לפר
 מרוב ובנצבון ידעו . עולר מן החקן להם מדישט ומגלות . וקדושת וכל קל מלאכה .

EXAMPLE 9

1. 5 קלג. פ-18. 1 קלב. פ (MH V29)

כס ויקרא את שמו מן לאמור זה יתחבנו.

וכי מנין היה ידע לפר

שאמר זה יתמטו כמישיטו וכי נביא היה. אמר ר' שמעון בן יוחנן
 לאמור זה שבשעה שאמר הקב"ה לאדם ארורה האדמה בעבורך בעצבון
 האכלה אמר לפני רבנו שלעולם ער מדי. אמר לו ער שיוכל אדם מרול.
 בין שנוכל מן מרול סור ידע לפר ואמר זה יתמטו כמישיטו. מרול כמישיטו
 אמר רב חסדא קורם שיוכא מן לעולם היו וורקין חשם ונצא קוצים. שנקרים
 ונצא רדדים ובין שבו מן לעולם חור עולם ליישובו והיו וורקין חשם
 וקצרים חשם. שנקרים וקצרים שנקרים. לכך נאמר כמישיטו. ולא ער אלא
 ער שלא נולד מן היו עושין מלאכה בידים ובין שנוכל מן החקן מרוב
 מרדשות ומגלות וקדושת וכל כלי מלאכה. לכך נאמר ובעצבון ידעו.

EXAMPLE 10

ד12

11. 10-12 קלג. פ (MH V32)

(כ) ויקרא ה' כי רבתי רעית האדם שש כמותו בעין וימה אנדרוסטסה באה לעולם וכמה וסמכוס
 ודעים

אמר ר' שמאי

ככל מקום שאחר מוצא ונת אנדרוסטסה באה לעולם והרג את חופים
 ואח דרעים.

CHAPTER V
PARALLELS BETWEEN MIDRASH HAGGADOL
AND BERESHIT RABBAH

When comparing BR and MH, two things are immediately noticeable. Firstly, some material in parallel passages is given in a different sequence. Secondly, even within their overall frameworks, the two Midrashim do not follow the same order. Similar aggadot are associated with different verses, and even material connected with the same verse is presented in a variant arrangement. For instance, MH IV7 contains material from both BR XX7 and XXII6; MH IV17 from BR XIX8 and XXV1; MH II3 from BR XI9 and II3; MH II7 from BR VI7 and XIII13. Conversely, sections of MH II9 and III7 are together in BR XV7, and parts of MH II6 and II7 are a single passage in BR XIII12. In fact, numerous aggadot related in MH II6, are all to be found in BR XIII, but in a very different sequence.

Thus, the question that arises is: "What is the original order in which these passages are found?" That question immediately gives rise to another: "Did the compiler of MH rearrange material from BR as he saw fit? Did he have a version of BR different from the one extant today? Or, did he not have BR at all, but rather many of the same 'aggadah-books' which served as sources for BR?" As will be shown below, the fact that so much of the material in MH is dissimilar to the parallels in BR, suggests that the compiler of MH included midrashim in an order which he preferred. He probably worked from a text of BR that is different from ours, or not from BR at all, but from a parallel compilation (or compilations).

In Example 1, both BR and MH give the same explanation of the name "El shaddai." However, BR cites R. Nathan in the name of R. Aha and R. Berechiah in the name of R. Isaac, while in MH, Rav Judah quotes Rav, and Resh Lakish repeats

the formula, "'ani 'el shaddai she'amarti la'olam dai." In addition, BR simply states that God told heaven and earth "Enough!" because "'ilmale ken hayu motepim veholechim 'ad 'achshav." MH is more graphic, and provides a verse from Job to prove that God scolded the world and forbade it to expand any further. The presence of these discrepancies, even though the basic point of the passages is the same, could only occur if separate sources were being used by the two compilers. This is especially true in this instance, where both selections are ascribed to different authorities. If one version were ascribed and the other anonymous, it might be argued that the anonymous one is a later adaptation, or that the name of a teacher has been omitted by mistake. In the aggadot under examination, the attributions are not only definite, but refer to two different schools altogether. The rabbis mentioned in BR are all Palestinian, while MH seems to be combining two traditions: Babylonian (Rav Judah and Rav) and Palestinian (Resh Lakish). This clearly demonstrates the existence of multiple sources.

Further evidence is provided by the midrashim in Example 2. The passage in BR is a famous one, listing the things which were brought into being before Creation. MH contains a different list. BR speaks of the Patriarchs and the people of Israel as having a form of "pre-existence," but makes no mention of gan 'eden or gehinnom, as does MH. The proof-texts for those things which both lists have in common are the same. In BR, however, teshuvah is an addition by R. Abbahu ben R. Zeira, while in MH, it is included in the "original" group of seven with no mention of R. Abbahu. The orders in which the items are mentioned are dissimilar. Most importantly, BR differentiates between those which were "nivre'u," and those "she'alu bemahashavah lehibar'ot." MH makes no such distinction, and only says, "nivre'u 'ad shelo nivra' ha'olam." In

view of the discrepancies, both in detail and in theology, these two passages could only have derived from variant source traditions.

There are several noteworthy differences between the selections in Example 3. In MH, the aggadah is associated with Genesis 1:3: "And the wind (ruah) of God hovered....," while in BR, it is connected with Genesis 5:1: "This is the book of the generations of Adam." Although the idea expressed in both passages is identical, the styles are not. But the divergent ascriptions are most significant. BR cites R. Huna, a Palestinian Amora of the fourth generation;⁶⁵ MH quotes R. Joshua ben Karḥa, a Tanna who was a contemporary of R. Meir. Since R. Joshua ben Karḥa lived one hundred years before R. Huna, it appears that MH is quoting a text which is not only different from, but considerably older than the one used by the compiler of BR.

In Example 4, two versions of the identical narrative appear. However, the dissimilar literary styles indicate that the incident is being related by different authors. There is little likelihood that the compiler of MH would modify his source, especially since he is expressing the same idea. The MH version is longer, which might imply that the source of MH is older than BR and was copied and revised by the compiler of BR. However, the compiler of BR would have no more reason to make modifications than the compiler of MH.

Example 5 illustrates two distinct delineations of the six things taken from Adam when he sinned, which will be returned to mankind once the Messiah comes. At the outset, there is a variance in the ascriptions. BR cites R. Samuel bar Naḥman; MH quotes R. Berechiah and R. Ḥelbo in the name of R. Samuel bar Naḥman. MH feels it necessary to explain the symbolism of Ruth 4:18, while BR does not. In BR, R. Judan states only that six things were taken from Adam, but in MH, R. Judah Halevi ben

R. Shalom points out that the items taken away had originally been created specifically for Adam's benefit. Even the lists are different. BR does not include gan 'eden. However, the reference to Genesis 3:24 in the section dealing with the me'orot appears to indicate that gan 'eden was originally included in the list but was somehow "lost" or absorbed into another part of the text. In addition, when BR repeats the meaning of the passage, R. Berechiah speaks in the name of R. Samuel bar Nahman, but R. Helbo is never mentioned! The repetition of the point of the Midrash and the exclusion of R. Helbo, could only have taken place if the compiler had interpolated a separate document into his anthology, and were then informing the reader of a return to his original source. A second tangential statement found in BR but not MH, is in the section mentioning the return of hayyav: R. Simeon ben Yoḥai's statement that 'etz means Torah. When both Midrashim treat the restoration of komato, MH includes only a short explication of the word kommemyut in Leviticus 26:13, while BR includes ma'amarim by R. Simeon, R. Hiyya, et alia. Finally, there is the comment by MH at the very end of the passage stating that all these items will be returned to mankind "beyom havosh 'adonai 'et shever 'amo umahatz makato yirpa'." The effect of all these discrepancies is to demonstrate that the Midrashim extant today were collections of a multiplicity of documents from which the various compilers drew their material.

In Example 6 is found the well-known aggadah concerning God's futile attempt to find the proper part of Adam's body from which to construct woman so that she will have no faults. Here too, there are notable divergences. MH attributes the passage to rabbanan, while BR cites R. Joshua of Sichnin in the name of R. Levi. MH mentions that if Eve is created "min hatzava'r tehe'

gavhanit," whereas BR does not include that possibility. The styles of writing differ, and the proof-texts in the two selections are divergent in spite of the fact that the message being conveyed is the same. This obviously indicates the existence of different versions of the identical aggadah which were transmitted independently.

As in Chapters III and IV, the story of Cain and Abel provides additional evidence that the Midrashim are collections drawn from divergent sources. It can be immediately seen that the selections in Example 7 are written in different styles. In BR, one of the causes of the quarrel is due to the dispute over the division of property. It is presented in highly technical language at length, as opposed to the abbreviated version in MH, in which only the angry words "halosh" and "proah" remain. Another explanation of the origins of the violence between Cain and Abel is each one's coveting the site of the Temple as part of his own landholding. But here too the styles are dissimilar. BR attributes the ma'amar to R. Joshua of Sichnin in R. Levi's name, and MH identifies the site of Abel's and Cain's offerings with Mt. Zion. While both versions contain references to the possibility that the fight was over a woman, in MH, R. Zadok speaks of Abel's twin sister, whereas in BR, R. Huna mentions Abel's twin and R. Aibo alludes to a "havvah ri'shonah."

Finally, there are the statements in Example 8 which inquire as to why Noah did not sire children until he was five hundred years old. Once again the styles of writing are quite dissimilar, and in MH the midrash is anonymous while in BR it is attributed to R. Judan and R. Nehemiah in the name of R. Eliezer, the son of R. Jose the Galilean. Furthermore, the two aggadot are not identical in meaning. MH states only that God withheld children from Noah in order to spare him grief, should

they turn out to be evil and, as a result, be destroyed in the Flood. In BR, however, not only does God want to avoid that possibility, but He also does not want Noah to have too many children lest he be forced to build many arks. The ma'amar of R. Nehemiah adds that by preventing Noah from having children until reaching the age of five hundred, God kept them from being liable to punishment, since the Flood came before any of them was a century old. Clearly, these discrepancies could occur only if the material in MH was culled from a group of variant sources.

To complete the evidence for the existence of sifre d'aggadta implicit in the various Midrashim, the next two chapters will deal with material common to all three works under consideration, and will then examine some interesting duplications within BR itself.

CHAPTER V EXAMPLES

EXAMPLE 1

BR V8

MH 11 (p. 7-12)

(אני אל שרי)

הנאמרת לה יא. שאמרת לעולם די וכן כנולד לך נאמר כה אשר האל די. כנולד השנים ונשדו. אשר די יהודה אשר די בשנה שברא הקב"ה את העולם היה מרחוק והולך בשתי פקיעות שלשה עד שיער בוקבוקיה והעמידה שגאמר עמוד שנים ידעפו ורחקו מנערותו (איוג נ. יא). והנה דאמר ריש לקיש מאי דכתיב אני אל שרי, אני שאמרת לעולם די.

EXAMPLE 2

BR 14

MH 11 (p. 11-19)

הנאמרת לה יא. שאמרת לעולם די וכן כנולד לך נאמר כה אשר האל די. כנולד השנים ונשדו. אשר די יהודה אשר די בשנה שברא הקב"ה את העולם היה מרחוק והולך בשתי פקיעות שלשה עד שיער בוקבוקיה והעמידה שגאמר עמוד שנים ידעפו ורחקו מנערותו (איוג נ. יא). והנה דאמר ריש לקיש מאי דכתיב אני אל שרי, אני שאמרת לעולם די.

ר' ימן קשם ר' אחא נר' בר' ר' יצחק
אמר: (במשיחית יא) לאי אל שרי - האי שאמרת לעולם די, שאמרת
כן. הוי מרחוקים והולכים עד עכשיו.

ר' בר' אשי'ת בר' א' ל' ה' י' - אשי'ת דברים קרובים ל' יצחק
העולם. לש' מ'תם שגאמר, ויש מ'תם ש'על פ'מ'ש'ק'ה ל'ה'בר'א. מ'ת'ר'ה ר'כ'א
ה'ק'ב'וד ה'ק'ב'וד - מ'ת'ר'ה מ'ת'ר'ה מ'ת'ר'ה (מ'ש'ל' מ' ככ) 'זה' ק'נ'י ר'אש'ת ד'ר'כ'ו ק'נ'ים
מ'ש'ע'ל'י מ'א'ז'י; כ'ס'א ה'ק'ב'וד מ'ת'ר'ה ד'ר'כ'ו; (מ'ש'ל' מ' ככ) 'ז'כ'ר' ק'ס'א'ך מ'א'ז' מ'ש'ל'ים
א'ת'ר'ה. ה'א'ב'וד ה'ק'ב'וד ר'כ'ו מ'ש'ע'ל'י ש'מ'ו ש'ל ק'ש'ת' ע'ל'ו ב'מ'ש'ק'ה ל'ה'בר'א -
ה'א'ב'וד מ'ת'ר'ה ש'ג'א'מ'ר; (מ'ש'ל' מ' ככ) 'ק'ב'וד'ה ב'ת'א'ת'ה ב'ר'אש'ת'ה ר'אש'ת' א'ב'וד'ת'ה;
ה'ש'ר'א'ל מ'ת'ר'ה ש'ג'א'מ'ר; (מ'ש'ל' מ' ככ) 'ז'כ'ר' ע'ד'ת'ך ק'נ'י' ק'נ'ים; ב'ית' מ'ש'ק'ך מ'ת'ר'ה
ש'ג'א'מ'ר; (מ'ש'ל' מ' ככ) 'כ'ס'א ק'ב'וד מ'ר'ום מ'ר'אש'ו'ן ק'מ'ום מ'ק'ד'ש'ו'ן; ש'מ'ו ש'ל ק'ש'ת'
מ'ת'ר'ה ש'ג'א'מ'ר; (מ'ש'ל' מ' ככ) 'ז'כ'ר' ש'מ'ו ל'ע'ל'ים ק'פ'י' ש'מ'ש' ו'ת'ן ש'מ'ו. ר' א'ת'ר'ה
ק'ר'ב' ו'ש'ר'א' א'מ'ר; א'ר' מ'ת'ש'ק'ה, ש'ג'א'מ'ר; (ש'ס' כ' כ) 'ק'ש'ר'ם ק'ר'ים י'ל'דו ו'ת'ח'ל'ל'
א'ר'י'ן, ו'א'ת'ר'ה ה'ש'ע'ה; (ש'ס' כ' כ) 'ק'ש'ב' א'נ'ש' ע'ד ד'כ'א ו'ח'א'מ'ר ש'וכ'ו כ'ר' א'ר'ים.

[illegible]

WM 19 (d. 11. 8-17)

EXAMPLE 4

[illegible]

BR XII19

[illegible]

BR XXIV4

EXAMPLE 3

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יִשְׁמְרֵנוּ וְיִשְׁכְּלֵנוּ
 וְיִשְׁמְרֵנוּ מִכָּל חַסְדֵּי יְהוָה
 וְיִשְׁכְּלֵנוּ מִכָּל חַסְדֵּי יְהוָה
 וְיִשְׁמְרֵנוּ מִכָּל חַסְדֵּי יְהוָה
 וְיִשְׁכְּלֵנוּ מִכָּל חַסְדֵּי יְהוָה

(SI-6 . TITAN . d) SI HW

EXAMPLE 7

MH IV18 (p. 11. 10-18)

BR XX17

(ח) ויאמר קין אל הבל אחיו, מלמד שנחמטיו זה בזה, דין אמר
 הלוי ודין אמר פרות, ממך כך ויקם קין אל הבל אחיו ויהרגהו.
 דא ויאמר קין אל הבל אחיו, מה אמר לו, מחלוק את העולם אני ואחתי ואני
 הבבור אטול פי שנינו, אמר לו הבל אי אפשר אלא אם כן אני טטל יתר
 על חלוקי בקום זה שנחמקל בו קרבני, אמר לו קין לא חטול, ועל דבר זה
 נפלה קטטה בעיניו, דמחב ויהי ברוחם בשרה ולחלן כחב ציון שדה
 חדרש (ויסח נה יתן סחמ ג יב), ר' צדוק אומר חוטה שלחבל היה נאה
 ביותר וחמדה קין ועליה נפלה קטטה בעיניו, דמחב ויהי ברוחם בשרה
 ואין שדה אלא אשה שנחשלה בשרה.

ז. (ח) ויאמר קין אל הבל אחיו, פה ירד פ ש ד ה קו' -
 "על מה הרי מדינינו, אמר: בואו נחלק את העולם, אחד נטל המקצועות ואחד
 נטל המטלטלין, דין אמר: ארעא דאח קאם עצלה, דידו: ודין אמר: מה דאח
 לבש, דידו: ודין אמר: חלוקי קין אמר: פרותו ממך כך, עקם קין אל הבל אחיו
 בתרגומו, ר' יהושע דסקיין בשם ר' לוי אמר: שנייהם נטלו את המקצועות ושניהם
 נטלו את המטלטלין, ועל מה הרי מדינינו, אלא זה אמר: פתחומי בית המקדש
 נכונה וזה אמר: פתחומי בית המקדש נכונה, שנייהם (סחמ ג יב), ציון שדה חדרש, ובמחך
 שדה אלא בית המקדש, הרי מה דאח אמר: יחדה בר' אמר: יעל סחמ חרואשונה הרי
 כך עקם קין על הבל אחיו בתרגומו, יחדה בר' אמר: יעל סחמ חרואשונה הרי
 מדינינו, אמר ר' איבו: סחמ חרואשונה חוהה לעפרה, ועל מה הרי מדינינו, אמר ר'
 חניא: יחאמקה יתרה נלךה עם הבל, זה אמר: אחי נטקלה, שאני בכור וזה
 אמר: אחי נטקלה, שיעלךה עמי, ובמחך כך עקם קין אל הבל אחיו בתרגומו.

EXAMPLE 8

MH V32 11. 6-10) ב.ק.ה.פ.)

BR XXVII2

לכ) וידע ג' בן חמש מאות שנה ויולד. ופי' ספני מה לא

הוליד אלא עד חמש מאות שנה. כפי שלא ידעו בניו והערכו כדור המבול
ואם יאבדו במבול נמצא מצטער עליהן, לכך נחמטש ורעו קודם המבול,
אבל לאחר המבול פרה ורבה ופילא את כל העולם, ועלי הכתוב אושר
בנקום רשעים יסתר אדם וכאבדם ירבו צדיקים (ספ' ל' נח, זח).

ב. (הי.) ג' יולד נח שלשה בנים שם אדם חם ויפת ויפת
קתוב: (מחליט. יד.) "לשחללים קבית ה' כחצרות אלהי'ע כפרח' - לשחללים
קבית ה' וז' נח, לשחללים הקדוש ברוך הוא כחצרות, 'כחצרות אלהי'ע כפרח' -
'יולד נח אדם חם ויפת ויפת' (שם שם. יד.) 'עוד יעבדו כחצרות' וז' נח, (שם
שם.) 'יפתים ויפתים יחיד' - 'יולד נח שלשה בנים ויפת' אומר ר' יודן: יפת
שעם כל דורות הולידו למאה שנה וקצתם שנה, וז' הולידו לחמש מאות שנה
אלא אומר הקדוש ברוך הוא: אם רשעים הם, אין רצוני שיאבדו במקום; ואם
צדיקים הם, אטירת עלי ויפת שנה וקצתם שנה; וקבש הקדוש ברוך הוא
מצינו, והולידו לחמש מאות שנה, ר' חמיה קושם ר' אליעזר בנו של ר' יוסי
הגלילי אומר: אפילו יפח שהוא הגליל, לכשתבוא המבול אינו בן מאה שנה שראוי
לענישם.

CHAPTER VI

PARALLELS IN BERESHIT RABBAH, TANHUMA C,
AND MIDRASH HAGGADOL

Thus far, it has been demonstrated that the parallel passages in the various Midrashim were derived from a multiplicity of documents. Hitherto, this has been done by contrasting two works; now it will prove useful to compare the material common to all three.

In Example 1 are three explanations as to why the bet is the first letter in the Torah, and hence the first letter used in Creation, even though the Hebrew alphabet begins with aleph. In all cases, the text sees aleph as connoting "cursing" ("'arirah") or "accursed" ("'arur"), as opposed to bet, which implies "blessing" ("berachah"). Within this framework are three distinct styles of narration and three somewhat different meanings. In MH, God's statement implies that He will create the world with the bet, since the use of the aleph would condemn the world to destruction even before it comes into existence. In BR too, God states, "vehaleva'i ya'amod." However, it forms part of an additional interpretation of the "blessed-cursed" dichotomy, and is expressly portrayed as a refutation of an "Epicurean" doctrine. In T, the aggadah begins with the text from Proverbs 10:6, which is not found in the other two. In addition, God utters the words "umah keshenivra' bileshon baruch bene 'adam mach'isin leyotzram bileshon 'arur 'al 'apat kamah vechamah." These differences could only have resulted from the Midrashim having been culled from separate sources. In T and BR, but not MH, is the opinion (expressed in variant styles) that the bet symbolizes the creation of two worlds--this world and the next. This is especially noteworthy because in BR the mention of the "two worlds" precedes the discussion of aleph versus bet,

whereas in T, those items appear in the opposite order. Such a reversal of sequence is probably due to the compilation of each Midrash from a number of independent sources which were arranged according to the desires of the individual compilers.

Example 2 exhibits three versions of the famous aggadah which discusses the six things taken from Adam when he sinned, but which will be returned to mankind in the Messianic Age. In this case, it would appear that MH is almost a verbatim copy of T, with BR being derived from a variant text. In T and MH, the opening ascription mentions R. Berechiah and R. Helbo in the name of R. Samuel bar Nahman, while only R. Samuel bar Nahman appears in BR. The "equation" of the word "toledot" in Genesis 2:4 with the same word in Ruth 4:18 is in Hebrew in MH and T, but in Aramaic in BR. In addition, BR contains a long passage not found in the other sources, which discusses the "cursing" of the luminaries, Adam's fear of the nahash, etc. All these discrepancies have previously been pointed out at length in the preceding three chapters; it is not necessary to reiterate them here. However, it is important to take note of the fact that MH and T not only differ from BR, but from each other as well. The list of the six items is not in the same order. MH seems to be following BR rather than T, except that gan Eden is included in the enumeration. MH also employs the same proof-text as BR in connection with the "confiscation" of hayyav. When speaking of the removal of the me'orot, MH cites Ezekiel 32:7, while T quotes Isaiah 31:10. None of the three versions exactly matches either of the others. It might be argued that MH is a composite of what is found in BR and T, but there are difficulties involved. For instance, no two of these works read exactly the same when dealing with the restoration of komato, or with the meaning of the word kommemiyut.

T cites R. Simeon ben Jose as stating that kommemiyut implies man will attain a height of two hundred cubits, as opposed to an anonymous interpretation that it will be only one hundred cubits. MH merely states, "kishte komot ba'adam hari'shon, with no assigned numerical value. In BR, however, an almost identical opinion appears as a ma'amar by R. Judan: "me'ah 'amah ka'adam hari'shon," but it is part of a series of utterances. As has been shown before, a variant ascription is more than likely the result of the use of different texts. Thus, what is involved in this case is not an attempt by the compiler of MH to combine the versions in T and BR. Rather, it is the use of a separate text, just as the compiler of T and BR used independent versions.

Further evidence that all three Midrashim are composites culled from numerous independent sources is found in their diversified treatments of the snake's conversation with Eve. They all portray the serpent as stating that God's jealousy is the cause of the commandment given to Adam and Eve not to eat the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge. However, as can be seen in the selections in Example 3, no two of these variations are alike. MH simply states that God's injunction is due to "'ayin ra'ah." T accuses the serpent of speaking "lashon hara'," and in a statement attributed to rabbanan there is the proverb, "vechol 'uman sone' bene 'umanuto." In BR, R. Joshua of Sichnin says the identical thing in R. Levi's name, but there, the maxim is in Aramaic, not Hebrew! There is no reason for the compiler of one of these works to have purposely translated the phrase, especially since everything else in both cases is in Hebrew. Discrepancies such as this are, without doubt, the outcome of the three Midrashim having been taken from three independent series of aggadah-books.

One of the first things which becomes apparent when contrasting the selections in Example 4 is that the

passages in BR are spread out over four different sections and do not form one continuous narrative, but are "interrupted" by the aggadot (not given here) in BR XXII9-10. Furthermore, as in Example 2, even though MH and T are extremely alike, they are not identical. The discrepancies between them--such as variations in writing style and the fact that MH refers to Abel's twin, while T does not--have already been elaborated. Once again, it is apparent that there are a number of separate sources involved. The real question which arises when there are parallel versions of the same aggadot is, "which is the earliest form of the midrash involved?" In this case, is it the unbroken narrative of T, the one in MH (which contains some material omitted here), or the more fragmented BR? In connection with Example 2, it has been stated that although MH may appear to be a compendium of the material in T and BR, this is not necessarily the case. Nor do the dates of compilation of the three Midrashim provide any help, since direct dependence by one text on another cannot be proven. Rather, such dependence is often easily disproved. It is entirely possible for T, which is considered to have been compiled later than BR, to contain earlier material. While it is true that anonymous aggadot are generally viewed as having been committed to writing later than ascribed parallels, MH and T include statements which are not found in BR (or each other, see below), and which therefore may have been authored contemporaneously with or previously to sections of BR. Those parts of MH for which Margaliot could find no parallels at all (the passages labelled "mekoro ne'elam") certainly fall within such a category. The problem of dating the authorship or origins of material is one of the areas in the field of Midrash study which remains to be thoroughly investigated. One of the purposes of this thesis is to call attention to such questions.

In line with the difficulty of proving or disproving literary interdependence, Example 5 contains evidence to the effect that although MH often appears to be a collection of "the best aggadot from BR and T," it often contains material not to be found in either of the others. For instance, in this particular selection, MH includes a midrash which states that the 'ot put on Cain by God was one of the letters of the Tetragrammaton; it is an aggadah of which BR and T are seemingly unaware. In addition, the material in BR is not only widely scattered, as opposed to being a united whole in T, but is in an order opposite to that of the midrashim in T and MH. These, plus other discrepancies, are clear indications of the divergent sources and origins of the passages involved.

The same is true of the material in Example 6, where once again it is obvious that BR comes from a totally independent source. In BR, there is no mention of Lemech having killed anyone, and the story of his taking Adah and Zillah to court is attributed to R. Jose ben R. Hanina. Nor does BR seem to know the midrashim depicting the death of Cain or the destruction of the 'arba' mishpahot which are given in MH and T. On the other hand, although T and MH do appear to be identical in terms of material and style, there are discrepancies between them. The incident in which Hanoch, Erad, Mehuyael and Metushael are swallowed up by the earth is explained fully in T, whereas MH merely says, "shekevar nigzar 'al kayin la'akor lo 'arba' mishpahot." Close examination reveals that the disputation before Adam is "reported" differently in the two versions. While the ideas expressed are the same, the styles in which they are presented are not. In MH, Lemech is an active participant; in T, he is a most interested observer. Since compilers are unlikely to

have made modifications in the language of aggadot when they were in agreement with the philosophy expressed, such variations are undoubtedly attributable to the use of numerous diverse sources by the various compilers.

One final demonstration that MH, BR, and T are composites of separate sifre d'aggadta is based on Example 7. Although all three passages deal with 'androlomosiy'ah as the punishment for society-wide sexual immorality, here too dissimilarities occur. MH is an almost literal repetition of BR, but BR contains an additional statement by R. Azariah and R. Judah ben R. Simon in the name of R. Joshua ben Levi to the effect that God will be patient with any crime except zenut. T read similarly, but is not identical. T cites only R. Azariah, and there his opinion is that God will forgive ("mevater") any sin except illicit sexuality. "To forgive" is not the same as "to have patience" ("ma'arich 'apo"). Furthermore, in T, the ma'amar about 'androlomosiy'ah is anonymous, and as was discussed in Chapter III, there is a considerable difference between "zenut" and "zimah." Dissimilarities of this nature, namely, variant ascriptions and vocabulary, or the presence of material in one or two texts but not all three, can only be the result of the use of separate, multiple texts by the compilers of the various Midrashim.

The next part of this inquiry will discuss some of the evidence available solely within BR. It contains repetitions and indications of its composite nature which should be examined.

CHAPTER VI EXAMPLES

EXAMPLE 1

MH 11 (p. 1. 1. 17-18)

BR 110

דא למא בבית, שווא בלשון ברבא, ולא באלף.
שווא בלשון ארורה, אמר הקב"ה וואך העולם יכול לעמוד וזוהא נברא
בלשון ארורה, אלא הדין בורא אורא בבית, בלשון ברבא, אולי יעמוד.

25

(ט) בראשית ברא אור, וזה שאמר רבינו ברבא ברבא לראש צדיק, ופי' רשעים יכחד, חסם
(מנע י) לפי שמה בברית של עולם בברית ולא בארץ וזוהא א' ראש

וכי הארץ אלא לפי שהארץ לשון אור, ופי' לשון ברך אמר הקב"ה אברא את העולם
בלשון ברך ומה כשנברא בלשון ברך כפי' אדם כשנברא בלשון אור עובדי ויניד
לפי' נברא בבית, לפי' לברית שיהי' שני עולמות העולם וזה העולם רבא.

ד'רש ר' יהודה בן פזי כמעשה בראשית

קמא דבר מקרא, לקח נברא העולם בבר', להודיעו שיהי' שני עולמות: העולם
הזה והעולם הבא. דבר אחר: לקח בבר', שיהי' קשרין בברכה, ולקח לא בא,
שווא לשון ארורה, דבר אחר: לקח לא בא, שכל קשרין פתחון פה לאפיקו קשרין
לומר: הלא העולם יכול לעמוד וזוהא נברא בלשון ארורה: אלא אמר הקדוש
ברוך הוא: הרי אפי' בורא אורא בבית בלשון ברך, וזהו עמוד.

MH III4-5 (p. 11 צ.ד. 8-21)

EXAMPLE 3

BR XIX4

ו) ויאמר הנחש אל האשה לא מותר המותרין. כיון ששבע
הנחש דבריה כך מיד מצא לו פתח להיכנס בו. אמר לה והלא אין המצוי
הזה אלא עין רעה. שבשעה שאהם אוכלים מבני הדיו כמותו אלהות. שנאמר
(ה) כי יודע אלהים כי ביום אוכלכם ממנו ונפקחו עיניכם

והייתם כאלהים. ולא עוד אלא דרעי חולך ונגע בו. ואני נוקי. מיד
הלך הנחש ונגע בו והיה אותו אילן צווח רשע אל הנע בי. אל המבואי הנל
נאמר. ויד רשעים אל הנדני (מהלים לו יג). אמר לה הרי נעתי באילן ולא
מדי אף את הנע בו ולא חסרתי. מיד והרע האשה כי טוב העץ למאכל.
ר' יהושע דסבין בשם ר' לוי אפי' אמר הנחש לזהו לשם אן אהם אוכלין
מעץ ורעה. אמרה לו שצוננו. הקבוצה לא האכלו ממנו ולא הנע בו פן
תבוהו. בבאן אמרו כל המוסף נדע. שלא נצטוו אלא על האכילה והנשנו
נניעה. מה עשה הנחש דחפה עליו ולא מזה. אמר הנניעה תלמד לאכילה.
שלא צוה אהם שלא תאכלו ממנו אלא שלא תוכלו לברוח עולם כמותו.
שנאמר והייתם כאלהים יודעי טוב ורע:

כ' ק' י' א' ל' ק' א' - ר' יהושע דסבין בשם ר' לוי אמר:
יהחמיל אומר דלטריןא על בוראן, אמר: מאילן הוה אכל וקרא תעולם, והוא
אומר לקם: ילא תאכלו מקמי, ילא תבראן עולמות אמרין, דכל אינש ואינש
קיי בראשיתה.

18

רבנן אמרי קשה להו. שבויה מוח על אורחא שמיך נחש ואמר לאדם וזהו
כי יודע אלהים כי ביום אוכלכם ממנו ונפקחו עיניכם (נחשום ג) שכן המליץ הוה אכל כשברא
את עולמו. וכל אמן שומא בני אבותינו. והייתם כאלהים (נח)

EXAMPLE 4 -- CONTINUED

(MH IV8-13)

וכך אמר קין רבוט שלעולם אם אני הרגתי אותו אהה בראת כי יציר הרע.
 אתה שומר לו ולי ולכל העולם, למה הנחת אותי לרדתי. אהה הוא שדרגתי.
 שנקראת אנכי. שאלו קובלת קרבני כמנתי לא היתני מתקנא בני מיד
 השיבו הקב"ה

י מה עשית קול דמי אחיך צועקים.

צעקים אלי. אל תקרא אלי, אלי עלי. משל לשנים שעשו מריבה והרג
 אחד מתוך את חבורו. היה בנינון שלישי ולא הפריש בנינון. על מי הכל
 משיחתי. לא על השלישי. לכך נאמר צעקים אלי. אמר לו קין רבוט שלעולם
 לא ידעתי ולא ראיתי הרע מימי וכי היתני יודע שאני מכחו באבן והוא מת.
 השיבו הקב"ה

יא ועתה אהרן אתה מן האדמה.

יב כי תעבוד את האדמה לא תספ תת כחה לך.

נע ונר תהיה

בארץ. בין שומר עליו נע ונר כל מקום שהיה הולך היתה הארץ מודעת
 מתחתיו והיו חיות ובהמות מודעות ואמרותיו לו היו זה דוא קין שומר עליו
 הקב"ה נע ונר תהיה והן אמרות נלך אצלו ונאכלת והיו מתכנסין ובאין
 אצלו. באהה יעה ולע עינו דעות ואמר אלה אלקי מרוחק ואה מפניך
 אברת. אם אספ שמים שם אהה ואציעה שאל הנך. אשא כנפי שחר אשכנה
 בארצות ים גם שם ירך תנחתי ותאחזני ימיניך (תהליט קולו וי). ובא לו בפלילת
 על הקב"ה שגאמר

יג ויאמר קין אל ה' גדול עוני מנשוא. אמר לפני רבוט

שלעולם יש דלמודין ששלשין את האדם לפניך. אבי ואמי הרי הן בארץ
 ואני יודעין שאני הרגתי ואהה בשמים מנין אתה יודע. בנין שגאמר
 ואמרת מה ידע אל הבעד ערפל ישפוט (איוה כ. יג). אמר לו הקב"ה שגאמר כל
 העולם כולו אני סובל. אני עשיתי ואני אשא אני אסבול ואסלפ (ישיה מ. ד)
 וכך אני יודע. אמר לפני רבוט שלעולם כל העולם אתה סובל ועני אין
 אחי יכול לסבול. גדול עוני מנשוא. אמר לו הקב"ה הואל והרדית ועשית
 תשובה צא והגלה מן המקום הזה.

EXAMPLE 5

110

[illegible]

MH IV16 (p. 77) ll. 2-8)

וישם ה' לק"י! אמן.

יש אומרים שיש עמדה לפני הוציא בזה כבוד המא אחר וכתבו דהם פירי
ובין בני ישראל אחר הוא לעולם (שם לא יז), ויש אומרים בפעם הראה
במצדה: כבוד המא אחר וכתבו דהם וזה אם לא יאמנו לך ולא ישמעו
לקול הארץ ודמיון (שם ה ט), ויש אומרים קדן קצת במצדה: ויש אומרים
לקח הקדיה אחר פאחיות שמו וכתבו בפני שכל היה שרמא אחר
בורה מלפני.

МН IV17 (p.72p.1. 19-p.72p.1. 3)

ובין שדרגו קין להבל היה מושלך ולא היה

קורע פיל לעשות לה ויין אל הקביה שני עובות נחללות והרב אהרן מדינא אז חבירו וחפר ברעול קברו ומדון למד קין וחפר וקרר רבלי לפי כך וכו' העוסקת לכבוד את דאלי.

BR XXI112

[illegible]

BR XXI18

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִקְרָא וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִקְרָא וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִקְרָא

הוא יסבך ממנו יחממך ומחממך ממנו - ויחממך ויחממך ממנו

EXAMPLE 7

MH V32 (p. 10-12)

BR XXV15

אמר ר' שמעון
בב' מקום שאתה מוצא ונת' אנדרטוסיה באת לעולם והיה את חופים
ואת הרעים.

י'אמר ר' שקלא': ב'כל מקום שאתה מוצא ונת',
אנדרטוסיה באת לעולם, והנה' טובים ורעים, ר' עזריה (ר' יהודה ב'ר'
סימון ב'שם ר' יהושע בן לוי אמר: על הכל הנה' רשעים בדרך הוא מאריך אפן, חזק
מן חנניה.

פ12

(כ) וי'אמר ר' יוחנן ב'ר' חנניאל אמר: ונת' אנדרטוסיה באת לעולם וסמך וסמך
והרעים ור' עזריה אמר: הכל הקב'ה שומר חזק כן הוסיף.

CHAPTER VII

REPETITIONS IN BERESHIT RABBAH

This chapter briefly examines a sampling of the repetitions of material in BR. These duplications provide strong evidence for the fact that BR is an anthology of numerous documents. The same statements appear verbatim in different contexts. From this it can be inferred that the compiler (or compilers) worked from a multiplicity of sources which he combined as he saw fit, not hesitating to re-use material he felt was appropriate to more than one discussion. The textual dissimilarities which occur would indicate that BR was composed not by one person, but over a span of time by a number of people who possessed variant versions of the same aggadot, and that while there may have been one final "anthologizer," there was in no sense any attempt to reconcile or edit out discrepancies in the text.⁶⁶

For instance, there are the dissimilarities between the two selections in Example 1. In XII16, R. Simeon bar Judah speaks in R. Meir's name; in XI2, he is the traditionary of R. Simeon. In XI2, it is R. Ami who disagrees with rabbanan; in XII16, it is R. Jose. XI6 contains the phrase: "verabbanan 'amri lan kevodo 'imo umotza'e shabbat...", which is not found in XII16. Conversely, XII16 quotes Genesis 3:24 as well as Job 14:20 to prove that Adam was banished from the Garden of Eden, while XI2 cites only the verse from Job. In addition, the statements attributed to R. Judah ben R. Simon and R. Levi in the name of Bar Nezirah are given as supposedly direct quotations, but they differ widely in style and content. XII16 mentions "kevan shehata' 'adam hari'shon;" XI2 does not.

In both selections, starting from the words "meshaneh panav vateshalhehu" (Job 14:20), and continuing through "kevan sheshak'a hahamah be-motza'e shabbat hitil hahoshech memashmesh uva'," identical opinions ascribed to the same rabbis are presented in greatly divergent styles and vocabularies. All these discrepancies--and there are others--clearly indicate that this is not a case of the same midrash being quoted in two different contexts, but two distinct versions of that aggadah.⁶⁷

In Example 2, there are no textual discrepancies of note. Rather, what seems to be a unified passage in XXIV6 appears as two separate aggadot in XXIII6 and XXII, where they are comments on different verses. In this instance, the problem is determining which context is the original. The question asked of Abba Cohen Bar Dala in XXIII6 is much more appropriate for Genesis 4:26 ("uleshet gam hu' yulad ben") than for Genesis 5:1 ("zeh sefer toledot 'adam"). The same appears to be true of R. Simon's statement in XXII; it is more logical to apply it to Genesis 3:21. Therefore, the original forms of the aggadot in question are apparently those in XXII and XXIII6. These midrashim were subsequently taken by a later writer and applied to Genesis 5:1. In other words, two separate traditions and documents were joined together to form "one" discourse.

There are passages in BR which not only are repeated verbatim in separate contexts, but which are ascribed to different authors as well. For instance, both selections in Example 3 contain the phrase "batehilah bera'ah lo vera'ah 'otah mele'ah ririn vedam...," etc. However, in XVII7, the statement is attributed to R. Jose, whereas in XVIII4, R. Judah bar Rabbi is cited. This clearly indicates that there were two independent variant traditions concerning the authorship of the statement, both of which were ironically included in the same Midrash.⁶⁸

The material presented in Example 4 provides excellent proof that the Midrashim are culled from a multiplicity of sources. The ma'am in IX12 is found almost word for word in conjunction with an entire series of other statements, but in a completely different context, in VIII5. The former passage is a commentary on Genesis 1:31, the latter an exposition of Genesis 1:26. It could be argued that the omission of the phrase "hinun 'otiyot deden hinun 'otiyot deden" in VIII5 indicates two divergent sources containing the same statement, but the discrepancy could just as easily be due to a scribal error. Rather, the selections in Example 4 clearly indicate that BR is an anthology of sources. The aggadot in those sources were collected and arranged by various compilers, who cited the midrashim whenever they felt they were appropriate, not hesitating to use a specific statement more than once.

The final two selections in the chapter (Example 5) further illustrate the use of identical aggadot in more than one context. In XXII2, the opinions of R. Elazar ben Azariah and R. Joshua ben Karḥa are cited together as expositions of Genesis 4:1. In XXIV7, R. Elazar's view is combined with the statements of Ben Azzai and R. Akiba to explain Genesis 5:1. This situation could occur only if a series of different texts were commingled. It is true that XXIV7 reads, "hada' mesaye'a' lehahi' da'amar rabbi 'el'azar ben 'azaryah," which would seem to infer that the compiler is merely lending support to a previously stated opinion. However, since R. Elazar's ma'am is not separated from the other citations in XXIV7 by the words "davar 'aḥer," it can be assumed that it is intended to be an integral part of the discussion and not a separate interpretation. Therefore, it can be concluded that XXII2 and XXIV7 are the results of the interweaving of at least two separate sources. In fact, there were

probably three documents used--one containing R. Joshua's statement, one in which R. Elazar's opinion was originally found, and one which included what is clearly a conversation between Ben Azzai and R. Akiba.

The number of examples presented in the chapter was kept to a minimum in order to avoid the unnecessary repetition of arguments. Nevertheless, the analysis of the passages discussed has demonstrated that evidence for the existence of sifre d'aggadta can be found not only by comparing two or three separate Midrashim, but by contrasting repetitions of material within one Midrash. In this case, BR was the work dealt with, but the methodological principles involved would apply with equal validity to any other Midrash. Chapter VIII will be an examination of other forms of evidence for the composite nature of the Midrash literature and the existence of aggadah-books. This includes indirect proof, that is, inferences which can be drawn from both individual passages and the views of other scholars, and direct proof, namely, explicit references to sifre d'aggadta in the Talmud and Midrash.

EXAMPLE 2

BR XIIII 6

[illegible]

BR XXI 1

[illegible]

BR XXI V 6

[illegible]

EXAMPLE 3

BR XVII

1. *מִטְרֹנָה אֶת שְׁאֵלָה אֵת ר' יוֹסִי - אֲמַר לֹ: לְמַד
בְּמִנְיַת אֲמַר לֹ: מִשְׁלֵם אֶת הַפְּקָדִים אֲרִם לְיָדְךָ אֲנִיכָא שְׁל פְּסָף בְּהִשָּׁא, וְהַחֲזִירָה
לֹ: לְיִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁל וְהָב בְּפִרְקִינָא, וְהַגְבָּה: אֲמַר לֹ: לְמַד בְּמִטְרֹנָה אֲמַר לֹ: לֹ:
בְּמִחְלָה בְּרָאָה לֹ, וְרָאָה אֲמַת מַלְאָה רִירָן וְדָם וְהַפְּלִיגָה מִשְׁנָה, חֲזֹר וּבְרָאָה לֹ:
פַּעַם שְׁנִי. אֲמַר לֹ: מִן סִפּוֹת אֲנִי עַל דְּבִרְיָךְ - אֲמַר לֹ: הָיִיתִי לְהַנְשֵׂא לְאַחֵי אֲמַר
וְעַל יְדֵי שְׁנִי לְמַד עֲמֹ בְּבִיחַ הַתְּפִינָתִי בְּעִינִי, וְהִלְכִי וְנִשָּׂא לֹ: אֲשֶׁר אֲחִירָה, וְאַחֲרָה
נָאָה בְּמִנְיָה.

BR XVIII

ד. (ג.) וְיִשְׂרָאֵל הָאֲרִים זֹאת הַפְּעָם עָצָם וְגו' - ר' יְהוּדָה
פִּרְרָבִי אֲמַר: *בְּמִחְלָה בְּרָאָה לֹ, וְרָאָה אֲמַת מַלְאָה רִירָן וְדָם, וְהַפְּלִיגָה מִשְׁנָה,
וְחֲזֹר וּבְרָאָה לֹ: פַּעַם שְׁנִי, הִנֵּה הוּא דְּכִתְיָב: *זֹאת הַפְּעָם - זֹאת הִיא שְׁל אֲמַת
הַפְּעָם:

ԵՍՂԶԷ ԵՒԼ ԿՈՒ ԽՈՒ Լ, ԵՐԵՄԻԱՆ: ԽՈ ԿՈՒՍ ԵՒ՛ ԼԵ ԶՈՒ ԽՈՒ ԵՐԵՄ - ԵՒԼԱՍ
 ԵՍԼԵՍ - ԿՈՒՄ ԿՈՒԼ: ԿՈՒՄ ԵՐԵՄԵՍ՝ ԵՐԵՄ ԵՒԼ ԿՈՒ՛ ԿՈՒՄ ԵՐԶԶԷՍ՝
 ԵՒԼ ԵՍԼԵՍ Լ, ԿՈՒԼԱՆ ԿՈՒԼ: (ԿՈՒՄ ԿՈՒՍ) ԿՈՒԼԵՍ ԶԵՒԼ ԵՒԼ, ԵՒ ԵՐԶԷ ԵՒԼ
 ԿՈՒՍ՝ ԵՒ ԵՒԼ ԿՈՒՍ ԿՈՒԼԱՍ՝ ԵՒ ԿՈՒՍ ԿՈՒԼ: ԵՒ ԿՈՒՍ ԿՈՒԼԱՍ ԿՈՒՍ, - ԵՐԶԷ
 ԿՈՒԼԱՍ ԵՒ ԿՈՒԼԱՍ: ԿՈՒՍՍ ԿՈՒՍՍ ԿՈՒՍՍ ԵՒԼԱՍ - ԵՒ ԵՒԼ ԿՈՒԼԱՍ՝ ԵՒ ԵՒԼ
 ԵՒԼ ԵՒԼ ԿՈՒՍ ԿՈՒԼԱՍ ԿՈՒՍ - ԵՒԼԱՆ ԿՈՒՍՍ ԿՈՒՍՍ - ԵՒԼԱՍ Լ

BR IX2

[illegible][illegible]

BR VIIIS

EXAMPLE 4

[illegible]

CHAPTER VIII
FURTHER EVIDENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE
OF SIFRE D'AGGADTA

Thus far the evidence presented demonstrating that the various Midrashim are all compilations of sifre d'aggadta has been derived by comparing parallel aggadot. However, another method of analysis can provide additional proof, namely, the dissection of individual passages which are of a distinctly composite nature. In view of the multiplicity of instances in which such "compositeness" can be clearly discerned, such as BR XII6 (see the four preceding chapters), only a few examples will be mentioned.

The most common indication that the individual aggadot are themselves anthologies is that many of them contain lists of sayings by various rabbis who lived in different generations. For instance, BR IV6 includes ma'amarim by R. Johanan in the name of R. Jose ben R. Halaftha, R. Hanina, R. Samuel bar Nahman, R. Levi in the name of R. Tanhum bar Hanieli (Hanilai?), and others. R. Johanan is an Amora of the second generation;⁶⁹ R. Hanina an Amora of the first generation; R. Samuel bar Nahman of the second and third generations; R. Levi of the third. In addition, there is a story of R. Jose (ben Halaftha) and a Roman matron, and R. Jose is a fourth-generation Tanna! These various passages could only have been brought together from a collection of different sources. Similarly, in BR XXIII2 there are two discussions between R. Judah and R. Nehemiah, who are Tannaim of the fourth generation. One dialogue is "interrupted" by a statement by R. Levi, a third-generation Amora. The other exchange of ideas is followed by two ma'amarim of Rav (BAL),⁷⁰ which in turn are separated by an opinion ascribed to Abba Jose ben Kesari (date unknown). These interjections obviously result from a combination of several sources. The

inclusion of statements by R. Hanin (A3) and R. Levi (A3) in the name of R. Simeon ben Lakish (A2) in the passage, is further evidence of the composite nature of the material. In addition, the wide span of generations clearly demonstrates that the passage is not the record of a round-table discussion among all the rabbis involved.

Two additional examples of this genre will be sufficient to prove the composite nature of the Midrashim.⁷¹ BR XIV3 appears to be a unified discussion of the nature of man. But a closer inspection shows that it is actually a combination of two widely divergent sources. The first rabbis named are R. Joshua (Ta2) in the name of R. Hananiah (Ta2) and rabbanan in the name of R. Elazar (Ta2), whereas the second half of the passage is attributed to R. Tifdai in the name of R. Aha, who are A5 and A4, respectively. Obviously, the latter two could never have held any discourse with the first teachers cited. Rather, R. Tifdai's statement is used to solve a problem which is raised by the compiler himself. In BR XXI5, an exchange between R. Pappias (Ta2) and R. Akiba (Ta2) is followed by the opinions of R. Judah ben R. Simon (A4), Resh Lakish (A2), and R. Berechiah (A4) in the name of R. Hanan. Not only did the authorities cited live in widely divergent eras, but their opinions are hardly given in chronological order. This arrangement is not thematically haphazard; each opinion is a valid sequitur to the one preceding. However, the chronology clearly shows that these statements could neither have all been made in a common discussion, nor, since Resh Lakish is a predecessor of R. Judah ben R. Simon, were they originally intended by their authors as comments on the ma'amarim which occur previously. As it stands, the passage can only be an anthology of statements culled from a multiplicity of sources, which the compiler felt to be appropriate to the central idea he wished to express.

Another salient characteristic of the Midrash is

the presence in many passages of sections which are apparently out of context. For example, BR XIII9 contains a story in which R. Joshua and R. Eliezer demonstrate to Hadrian how the ocean can continuously receive additional water but never overflow. Yet this tale seems to have no connection with the rest of the passage, which explains how the earth obtained moisture before the creation of rain. The first portion is early Tannaitic, while the second half is a dialogue between the late Tannaim R. Judah and R. Nehemiah. This passage is, therefore, an obvious composite of several sources. The same is true of BR XXIV6. As was pointed out in the previous chapter, this midrash is a combination of BR XXII and XXIII6, which were originally parts of two separate and distinct sources. Lastly, BRXV7 is basically a series of opinions concerning the identity of the "forbidden fruit." However, included therein is a disagreement between R. Nehemiah and rabbanan over the proper form of the blessing for bread, and a discussion of the meaning of the word lefet,⁷² which is eaten with bread. While this digression is tangentially appropriate to the passage, since it immediately follows the opinion that the fruit eaten by Adam and Eve was wheat, it has no real relationship to the overall theme of the passage. It was no doubt taken from another source and inserted by the compiler specifically because the mention of wheat seemed to provide him with a good opportunity to include this discourse on the blessing for bread.

While the conclusions in this thesis have been arrived at independently, research shows that other scholars have observed the composite nature of the Midrashim and the existence of sifre d'aggadta. Moore remarks that BR is clearly compiled from previous collections.⁷³ Fischman points out that the Tikkune ha-Zohar contains a reference to "eighty sifre d'aggadta,"⁷⁴ and Strack mentions Origen and Jerome as referring to aggadah-books.⁷⁵

In his Mayo Letalmudim, Albeck maintains that parallel passages in the Talmud which are not perfectly identical due to contradictions, omissions, or additions, reveal the existence of different sources.⁷⁶ As he states elsewhere, the same is true of BR, the sources of which included "Targums and sermons, and also mishnayot, baraitot, sayings of Amoraim and the collections that were composed of them" (his italics), namely, sifre d'aggadta.⁷⁷ Similarly, Theodor writes that all aggadic Midrashim are the results of collections and revisions of contents which originated much earlier.⁷⁸ Both Tanhuma Bereshit and BR⁸⁰ display such characteristics. I. Weiss posits that the many variates lectiones in parallel sources come not from mistakes in oral transmission, but from the use of different written texts.⁸¹ The aggadot in the Midrashim are derived from the Talmuds "and some of them are clearly statements chosen from the aggada-books which already existed in the days of the Amoraim."⁸² For example, Weiss writes that the events in the story in Tanhuma Lech Lecha involving R. Eliezer and Agrippa could not have taken place. However, in Pesikta Rabbati (piska 23), the same episode is related of R. Eliezer and Aquilas. Tanhuma copied the mistake from some other source.⁸³

In terms of the antiquity of the sifre d'aggadta, I. Weiss traces them back to the Tannaitic period. He holds that every Tanna had a midrash collection from which he took sermons and lessons for his disciples. These compilations were later used as the bases for the Tannaitic Midrashim extant today.⁸⁴ Albeck attributes some of the parallels among BR, Josephus, and the apochryphal literature to sifre d'aggadta,⁸⁵ which clearly assigns to them at least a Tannaitic, if not pre-Tannaitic, date. Theodor maintains there were written sources at an early period.⁸⁶ A. Weiss also is of the opinion that aggadah-books existed in the first and second centuries C.E.⁸⁷ Finkelstein, too,

argues for the early existence of sifre d'aggadta. By means of textual comparisons, he demonstrates that the repetition of the same passage almost verbatim (but with some variations) in Mekilta Beshallah and Mekilta Bo shows that the compiler of the work quoted separate sources.⁸⁸ His view is that the Tannaitic Midrashim are "composed of different compilations which were brought together in some instances rather arbitrarily....Some of the compilations... were definitely put into written form before they were included in the present works."⁸⁹ The very fact that Tannaitic material is included in the Midrash indicates the existence of sifre d'aggadta from that period.

To prove the existence of separate, multiple sources, Finkelstein contrasts texts. I. Weiss takes a different tack. He indicates a number of instances in the Talmud (Makkot 24a, Kiddushin 80b, Taanit 8a among them) where there are allusions to stories of rabbis, but the tales are not recounted in toto. He infers from this that there were sources which were "collections of events (ma'asivot)," from which the whole event was copied if it was not well-known, and only referred to if it was famous.⁹⁰ Similarly, there are numerous instances in the Midrash where references are made to interpretations which are given elsewhere, or not at all. For example, BR XX5 assumes the reader's familiarity with aggadot concerning Cain, Korah, Doeg, Balaam, Gehazi, Absalom, and others. BR XXII8 presupposes a knowledge of the legend that Adam sacrificed a heifer to God. In BR 16, mention is made of the "yeme'avelut shel metushelah," although the midrash on which this phrase is based is not found anywhere in BR. Clearly, the compiler of BR is alluding to another source, one which he believes is so commonly known that he feels no compulsion to elaborate on his reference.

Sufficient evidence has been presented to demonstrate that the Midrashim are works compiled from numerous,

and often variant, sources. However, all that has been proven is the existence of such sources. It has been tacitly assumed that these sources were written, and not oral. Theodor maintains that there must have been documents because the sheer volume of aggadic material could not all have been preserved orally.⁹¹ Still, definite confirmation if needed to prove conclusively that such sifre d'aggadta actually existed.

The Talmud and Midrash themselves provide the prescribed evidence. There is a plenitude of specific references to aggadah-books. In a legal case which is mentioned thrice in the Talmud,⁹² Rava decides that some orphans must return to the original owner an aggadah-book which was "customary to lend and hire out." Obviously, these sefarim were popular and widely circulated. In fact, they must have been so popular that they cut into attendance at Sabbath sermons, for in Sofrim 16:2 and Talmud Yerushalmi Shabbat 16:15c, the great darshan R. Joshua ben Levi proclaims that whoever commits the aggadah to writing has no part in the world to come.⁹³ R. Joshua, according to his own testimony, refused to even look at the sifre d'aggadta, save for one instance. As he said, "I have never looked into a book of aggadah except once, when I looked and found written therein that the 175 sections of the Torah in which occurs any expression of speaking, saying, or commanding, correspond to the number of years of our father Abraham...."⁹⁴

Some rabbis considered the sifre d'aggadta to be valuable as resource and learning materials. R. Jacob bar Aha is reported to have consulted one,⁹⁵ and R. Johanan stated, "A covenant has been made: whoever learns the aggadah from a book will not soon forget it."⁹⁶ On the other hand, there were those who strenuously opposed the writing down of aggadic material. R. Zeira

called the aggadah-books "books of sorcery."⁹⁷ The majority, however, apparently favored them. R. Jeremiah instructed R. Zerika to go look in his "mekilta."⁹⁸ R. Hisda told R. Tahlifa ben Abina, "Go write down the words for 'hunter' and 'archer' in your aggadah (book) and explain them.... Write the word for 'overlord' in your aggadah and explain it."⁹⁹ R. Hiyya was once so absorbed in reading a sifra d'aggadta based on the Psalms, that he failed to acknowledge the presence of Rabbi.¹⁰⁰ The use of aggadah-books was not restricted to Eretz Israel; they were to be found in Babylonia as well. Rav Papa and Rav Huna bar Joshua are known to have read them.¹⁰¹

There are two more important facts which must be related. Firstly, those who wrote and/or employed the sifre d'aggadta were sensitive to the objections raised against them. Therefore, even though Resh Lakish and R. Johanan did not hesitate to read such books even on the Sabbath, they justified their actions by maintaining that it was better to transgress a prohibition--namely, that against writing down the oral tradition--than to allow the Torah to be forgotten.¹⁰² Secondly, the sifre d'aggadta were considered to be sifre kodesh. R. Johanan and R. Nahman bar Jacob would not carry them into a privy, but would leave them with their students instead.¹⁰³ Because the aggadah-books were considered to have a status of sanctity, the later compilers were not likely to make changes in their texts. Sources would be copied verbatim because they were holy. Therefore, divergent readings are due not to modifications made by compilers, but to variant texts.

This chapter has presented conclusive proof for the existence of sifre d'aggadta. The nature and contents of some of these aggadah-books will be discussed in the concluding chapter.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, the existence of sifre d'aggadta as sources of the Midrash has been established beyond the shadow of a doubt. What has not been determined is the contents of those books. Theodor wrote, "It is impossible to determine what traces they [the sifre d'aggadta] left in the old Midrash literature."¹⁰⁴ However, it is possible to discern the nature of these books.¹⁰⁵ Firstly, some of them are mentioned in the Talmud, and their very names indicate their contents. Among them are, "The Book of Creation" (Sefer Yetzirah),¹⁰⁶ "The Book of Dream Interpretations" (Sefer Pitron Halomot),¹⁰⁷ the "Scroll of Relations" (Megillat Yuhasin),¹⁰⁸ the "Scroll of 'Secrets' of the School of R. Hiyya" (Megillat Setarim Be Rabbi Hiyya),¹⁰⁹ and the "Second degree Marriage Prohibitions" (sheniyot) of Mar the son of Rabina."¹¹⁰ In addition, the Midrash itself provides clues to the various types of sifre d'aggadta that were in circulation.¹¹¹

One class of aggadah-books undoubtedly consisted of written versions of the sermons which were based on the weekly Torah portions and on the readings for special Sabbaths and holy days. Such homilies are now found in collections like the Tanhumas and Pesiktot. Some other sefarim were probably records of the discussions in the various academies. For example, in BR XIX5 is found the phrase, "debe rabbi yanna'i 'amri," "they of the school of R. Jannai say." Furthermore, rabbinic literature contains a plethora of references to "the school of Shammai" and "the school of Hillel."

As was discussed in Chapter VIII, the fact that in the Talmud some episodes in the lives of the rabbis

are told in full, while others are merely alluded to, leads I. Weiss to believe that there were collections of events, "ma'aseh-books."¹¹² Confirmation of this theory is to be found in MH Genesis 1122. The text reads, "ma'aseh berabbi yehudah bi-rabbi 'el'a'i... shuv ma'aseh berabbi yehuda bi-rabbi 'el'a'i." These are clearly two narratives drawn from a consecutive listing of events.

Another probable type of aggadah-book is the personal notebook maintained by each rabbi. In Shabbat 12b, R. Nathan relates that R. Ishmael wrote in his "pinkas," "I, Ishmael ben Elisha, read and tilted a lamp¹¹³ on the Sabbath." These pinkasim appear to have been widely used, and were known as "aggadta." R. Hisda is reported to have said to R. Tahlifa bar Abina, "Go write down the words for 'hunter' and 'archer' in your aggada and explain them.... Write the word for 'overlord' in your aggada and explain it."¹¹⁴ These personal journals thus served as mnemonic aids, "textbooks," and "exercise books," while also containing notes for use in lectures and sermons. I. Weiss dates the existence of such documents as early as the Tannaitic period.¹¹⁵

The books which now constitute the Apochrypha and Pseudepigrapha, as well as others which have been lost, were a form of sifre d'aggadta. Geza Vermes points out the midrashic nature of Jubilees,¹¹⁶ an observation which is easily confirmed. For example, Jubilees 12:9-14 is an aggadic explanation of the death of Abram's brother Haran. He dies be-'ur, a pun on "in [the city of] Ur," and "in fire." This pun is paralleled in BR XXXVIII13. Furthermore, Strack maintains that the oldest extant midrash is in IV Esdras 7:132-139."¹¹⁷ His dating may not be correct, but the aggadic nature of the passage is unquestionable:

I know, sir, that the Most High is now called

merciful, because He has mercy on those who have not yet come into the world, and gracious, because He is gracious to those who turn to His law, and long-suffering, because He is long-suffering to those who have sinned as His creatures, and bountiful, because He had rather give than exact, and of great mercy, because He multiplies mercies...¹¹⁸

This is obviously an exegesis of Exodus 34:6-7:

The Lord, the Lord, God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth; keeping mercy unto the thousandth generation...

In addition, Ben Sira is quoted in BR VIII2, and several other times in BR. Kohélet Rabbah 12:13 mentions a sefer ben tagla¹ which is no longer extant. All these non-canonical works undoubtedly served as sources for some of the Midrashim.

Books of biblical commentary and exegesis must also have been widely circulated. R. Hiyya is depicted as reading an aggadah-book based on Psalms,¹¹⁹ and the sifra d'aggadta consulted by R. Joshua ben Levi¹²⁰ (see Chapter VIII) seems to have been a biblical commentary. As was mentioned in Chapter II, Theodor points out that the section on parshat Bereshit in BR constitutes over one fourth of that Midrash. "This portion may have been taken from another and a larger haggadic work on Genesis..."¹²¹ In other words, some of the sources of BR were written commentaries on the Bible. Nor can the Dead Sea Scrolls, such as the Genesis Apochryphon and the commentaries on Psalm 37, Isaiah, Micah, Hosea, Nahum, and Habakkuk be discounted as examples of sifre d'aggadta.¹²²

Finally, there is a tremendous amount of evidence to show that there must have been numerous collections of sayings by individual teachers. Albeck refers to them,¹²³ and A. Weiss maintains that they were extant in Tannaitic times.¹²⁴ Weiss' dating is given credence by the series of ma'amarim in Pirke Avot which are introduced

by "he used to say." They clearly appear to have been selectively drawn from lists of aphorisms.

Part of New Testament scholarship can indirectly support the theory of collections of statements as sifre d'aggadta, especially since the Gospels (particularly Matthew) were compiled in the same cultural milieu.

Schleiermacher conjectures that the sources of the Gospels include a collection of the sayings of Jesus,¹²⁵ and most modern scholars agree that Matthew and Luke drew upon such a compilation, called the Quelle.¹²⁶ This Quelle is used by Luke and Matthew in different ways and in different contexts, but it accounts for many of the exact parallels in those two Gospels.¹²⁷

The likelihood that the Quelle is actually one example of a common form of sifre d'aggadta is strengthened both by the setting in which the Quelle was composed, and by certain characteristics of the Midrash itself. Firstly, as has been discussed, the Midrash uses identical aggadot in different contexts. Secondly, Ben Sira is quoted thusly: "Rabbi Elazar said in the name of Ben Sira."¹²⁸ It is as though Ben Sira were looked upon as a rabbi, and the book bearing his name is, of course, a collection of his sayings. Thirdly, the way in which the passages in the Midrash are constructed definitely indicates that they are anthologies of statements of individual rabbis culled from various sources. Often, two ma'amarim attributed to the same rabbi will be given consecutively, yet the ascription will be repeated. This occurs with two statements by R. Judah ben R. Simon in BR XIX4, Rav in BR XXIII12, R. Huna in BR XXIV4, R. Aibo in BR XXVI1, and R. Judah ben El'ai in BR XXVI6. The only reason for such a duplication is that the compiler is copying the aphorisms word for word from a list. Positive evidence to support this thesis is in Yerushalmi Berachot 5:9a:

R. Johanan said, "A covenant is established. He who studies his talmud in the synagogue will not soon forget it." R. Johanan... said, "A covenant is established. He who studies his talmud in private will not soon forget it." R. Johanan said, "A covenant is established. He who learns aggadah from a book will not soon forget it."

These statements, linked by the common phrases "a covenant is established" and "will not soon forget it," are obviously derived from a sifra d'aggadta consisting of the collected sayings of R. Johanan. Such a sefer was undoubtedly only one of a whole series of books, widely circulated, which were records of the ma'amarim of the various rabbis.

In conclusion, this thesis has attempted to prove several points. Comparison of parallel texts has brought to light variations in theological outlook, styles and vocabularies, details, and attributions of statements. These dissimilarities have been shown to be due not to modifications made by the compilers of various Midrashim, but to the use of different texts as sources. These sources, called sifre d'aggadta, were widely disseminated as early as the Tannaitic period and, in view of the fact that some may have been books of the Apocrypha, even earlier. Various types of such sifre d'aggadta have been discerned: biblical commentaries, personal notebooks, records of academy discussions, transcripts of sermons, and collections of sayings by various rabbis. Undoubtedly there were other types of sefarim, and this great variety of documents indicates a wide and active literary aggadic creativity. Simultaneously, it has been demonstrated that Comparative Midrash can prove to be a valuable tool for the analysis of the sources and perspectives of the authors and compilers of the midrashic literature, and perhaps even the dates of compilation of

the Midrashim. For example, why a compiler chooses one version of a specific aggadah over another, may often be the clue to his historical setting. There is much about the Midrash which is still to be learned and explained. The object of this thesis has been to stimulate the use of a hitherto totally underused methodology--comparative Midrash--in order to answer some of those questions. It is hoped that that goal has been at least partially attained.

FOOTNOTES

1Louis Finkelstein, "The Sources of the Tannaitic Midrashim." Jewish Quarterly Review, XXXI, No. 3 (1941), 211-243. (Hereinafter referred to as Finkelstein, "Sources.")

2Louis Finkelstein, "Studies in Tannaitic Midrashim." Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research, VI (1934-1935), 189-228.

3See the critical apparatus in Mordecai Margaliot, Midrash Haggadol: Sefer Bereshit (Jerusalem, 1947).

4Isaac Hirsch Weiss, Dor Dor Vedorshav ("Every Generation and Its Preachers") (6 vols.; Jerusalem, n.d.), IV, 184. (Hereinafter referred to as Weiss, Dor Dor.)

5Ibid., III, 49.

6George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era (3 vols.; Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1966), I, 166.

7Ibid., 164.

8H. Freedman, "Introduction," in The Midrash, ed. by H. Freedman and Maurice Simon (10 vols.; London, 1939), I, xxix.

9Ibid., xxvii.

10Ibid., xxix.

11Hermann L. Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash (New York, 1969), p. 218.

12Ibid., p. 217.

13J. Theodor, "Bereshit Rabbah," Jewish Encyclopedia, III, 64. (Hereinafter referred to as Theodor, "Bereshit Rabbah.") and J. Theodor, "Midrash Haggadah," Jewish Encyclopedia, VIII, 557. (Hereinafter referred to as Theodor, "Midrash Haggadah.")

14Theodor, "Bereshit Rabbah," p. 64.

15Ibid.

16Theodor, "Midrash Haggadah," p. 557.

17Ibid., and Theodor, "Bereshit Rabbah," p. 64.

18Moshe David Herr, "Genesis Rabbah," Encyclopedia Judaica, VII, col. 399. (Hereinafter referred to as Herr, "Genesis Rabbah.")

19Ibid.

20Ibid., and Moshe David Herr, "Midrash," Encyclopedia Judaica, XI, col. 1510. (Hereinafter referred to as Herr, "Midrash.")

21Herr, "Midrash," col. 1510.

22Herr, "Genesis Rabbah," col. 400.

23Moshe Aryeh Mirkin, Midrash Rabbah (11 vols.; Tel-Aviv, 1968) I, 17.

24Ibid.

25Reading לוי as לוי.

26Mirkin, I, 17.

27Ibid.

- 28Strack, p. 231.
- 29Solomon Fisch, "Midrash Ha-Gadol," Encyclopedia Judaica, XI, 1515.
- 30Saul Lieberman, Midreshe Teman ("The Midrashim of Yemen") (Jerusalem, 1940), p. 6.
- 31Strack, p. 212. My personal opinion is that the title Tanhuma comes from the fact that these are sermons specially written and/or selected because they are "tanhumim," "words of comfort," but to pursue that theory is not within the scope of this thesis.
- 32Leopold Zunz, Haderashot Beyisrael ("Sermons in Israel"), trans., ed., and completed by Hanoach Albeck (Jerusalem, 1954), p. 112.
- 33Solomon Buber, Midrash Tanhuma (2 vols.; Jerusalem, 1964), I, 9, 19.
- 34Ibid., 11.
- 35Ibid., 15.
- 36Ibid., 16-17.
- 37Weiss, Dor Dor, III, 230.
- 38Ibid., 237.
- 39Ibid., IV, 187.
- 40Zunz, p. 108.
- 41Ibid., p. 109.
- 42Ibid., p. 112.
- 43Ibid., p. 113.
- 44Ibid., p. 115.
- 45Theodor, "Midrash Haggadah," pp. 560-561.
- 46Ibid., p. 561.
- 47Jacob Z. Lauterbach, "Tanhuma, Midrash," Jewish Encyclopedia, XII, 45.
- 48Ibid., 46.
- 49Strack, p. 212.
- 50Moshe David Herr, "Tanhuma Yelammedenu," Encyclopedia Judaica, XV, 794.
- 51Ibid., 795.
- 52Ibid.
- 53Ibid.
- 54In both the body of the text and the examples in this and succeeding chapters, T will stand for Tanhuma C, parshat bereshit, as printed in Midrash Tanhuma (Jerusalem, 1970). The Arabic numerals indicate the section of the parashah.
- 55BR stands for seder bereshit in Mirkin, I. The Roman numerals indicate the parashah, and the Arabic numerals indicate the subdivision of the parashah.
- 56This may be evidence that BR was compiled while Eretz Yisrael was still under some form of Roman rule, and may therefore have needed to use Nebuchadnezzar as a symbol of the Roman emperors, while T was put together without such constraints, i.e., either in Babylonia, or in Eretz Yisrael after the Moslem conquest.

57In some cases of divergent attributions, the cause may be traced back to an original anonymous source. The compilers of the several anthologies may have, at some point, ascribed these ma amarim to specific teachers on the basis of which teachers they thought would most likely have made those statements. This is a process analogous to the searches in the Talmud for "tanna kamma."

58Clothing was often hitched up with a belt. By loosening the belt and letting down the bottom of the garment, one could change his appearance, as if he were wearing a "different" garment.

59Or, Accus. See Strack, p. 116.

60Midrash Haggadol will be abbreviated as MH. Citations are from Mordecai Margaliot, Midrash Haggadol: Sefer Bereshit (Jerusalem, 1947). Citations will be given according to chapter and verse of the book of Genesis (e.g., II8), and according to the page and line number of the Margaliot edition.

61Margaliot, p. 6.

62Fisch, "Midrash Ha-Gadol," col. 1515.

63Zvi Meir Rabinowitz, Midrash Haggadol: Sefer Bemidbar (Jerusalem, 1967), p. 6.

64Since the amount of parallel material available in these two Midrashim is so vast, this chapter will include only a few examples. Greater length would only lead to superfluous repetition of the same arguments.

65It is uncertain which R. Huna this is. Strack (p. 119) mentions a late Tanna named R. Huna who was a Babylonian Exilarch who emigrated to Palestine, and also (p. 129) R. Huna ben Abin, a fourth-generation Amora. Since the R. Huna in BR XXIV4 is mentioned in connection with R. Judan ben R. Ishmael and R. Tanhum ben R. Hiyya, the amoraic dating appears to be preferable. Even if the Tannaitic date were the correct one, the point that two separate source traditions are being used would still hold; there would still be a gap of a half century between the two teachers.

66To determine the chronology of the components of such a compilation is beyond the scope of this thesis. However, the basic point remains the same: BR is an anthology of many written documents.

67While not really germane to this thesis, it can be inferred from the discrepancies between XI2 and XII6 that these two sections were compiled (and authored?) by two different people, each of whom had available to him a variant version of the aggadot in question, each version arriving at a slightly different conclusion.

68By different compilers? See note 67, above.

69The chronology of the rabbinic generations follows that of Mordecai Margaliot, ed., Entziclopediah Lebachme Hatalmud Vehageonim ("Encyclopedia of the Talmudic Sages and the Geonim") (2 vols.; Tel-Aviv, 1970).

70"Ta" stands for "Tanna;" "A" for "Palestinian Amora;" "BA" for "Babylonian Amora." The numeral is the generation to which he belongs. Thus, "BA1" is a Babylonian Amora of the first generation.

71While only BR is discussed in this chapter, the same methodology is equally valid when applied to MH and T.

72 נביל. Jastrow translates it as "vegetables."

73Moore, I, 166.

74Judah Leib Ha-Cohen Fischman, "Mavo" ("Introduction") in Mordecai Margalit, Midrash Haggadol: Sefer Bereshit (Jerusalem, 1947), pp. 5-6.

75Strack, p. 14.

76Hanoch Albeck, Mavo Letalmudim ("Introduction to the Talmuds") (Tel-Aviv, 1969), p. 563. (Hereinafter referred to as Albeck, Talmudim.)

77Hanoch Albeck, Mavo Umaftehot Livereshit Rabbah ("Introduction and Indices to Bereshit Rabbah") (Berlin, 1939), p. 44. (Hereinafter referred to as Albeck, Mavo Umaftehot.)

78Theodor, "Midrash Haggadah," p. 551.

79Ibid., p. 560.

80Ibid., p. 557.

81Weiss, Dor Dor, III, 219.

82Ibid., IV, 184.

83Ibid., III, 238.

84Ibid., 223.

85Albeck, Mavo Umaftehot, p. 84.

86Theodor, "Midrash Haggadah," p. 552.

87Abraham Weiss, Al Hayetzirah Hasifrutit Shel Ha-Amoraim ("On the Literary Creativity of the Amoraim") (New York, 1962), p. 176. (Hereinafter referred to as Weiss, Hayetzirah.)

88Finkelstein, "Sources," pp. 216-217.

89Ibid., p. 214.

90Weiss, Dor Dor, III, 215.

91Theodor, "Midrash Haggadah," p. 552.

92Shevuot 46b; Baba Metzia 116a; Baba Batra 52a.

93This may well be an indirect attack on his contemporary and "competitor" R. Oshaya Rabbah, who was also known as a great preacher and, as was mentioned in Chapter II, a probable collector of written aggadot.

94Sofrim 16:10. It is ironic that R. Joshua's words themselves were eventually written down. In addition, there is a parallel passage in Yerushalmi Shabbat 16:15c which contains some dissimilarities to the one in Sofrim, thus showing that not only were R. Joshua's statements reduced to writing, but that there were different versions of what he said!

95Sanhedrin 57b.

96Yerushalmi Berachot 5:9a.

97Yerushalmi Maasrot 3:51a.

98Gittin 44a. This may not be the Mekilta extant

today. Nissim reads "megiltach," and Rashi insists that this is a "mishnah." Nevertheless, it was some sort of written document.

99Hullin 60b.

100BR XXXIII3; Yerushalmi Kilaim 9:32b. In addition, since Rabbi and R. Hiyya are both Ta4, this is evidence for the existence of sifre d'aggadta even earlier in the Tannaitic period, since the use of such books is apparently an accepted custom by this time.

101Shabbat 89a.

102Gittin 60a; Temurah 14b.

103Berachot 23a-b.

104Theodor, "Midrash Haggadah," p. 552.

105The Targums are not included in this chapter as being sifre d'aggadta. They may very well have been so, but there are a number of problems remaining to be solved which are beyond the scope of this thesis. The dating of the Targums is far from certain. As a result, it cannot be determined whether the parallels between them and the Midrash are due to their having derived from a common source or to their having borrowed one from the other.

106Sanhedrin 65b.

107Berachot 56a.

108Yebamot 49b.

109Shabbat 6b.

110Yebamot 21b.

111There were numerous types of aggadah-books. This chapter will mention only a few of them.

112Weiss, Dor Dor, III, 215.

113In order to get more light.

114Hullin 60b.

115Weiss, Dor Dor, III, 223.

116Geza Vermes, Scripture and Tradition in Judaism (Leiden, 1961), p. 229.

117Strack, p. 328, n. 6.

118Edgar J. Goodspeed, trans., The Apochrypha (New York, 1959), p. 72.

119BR XXXIII3

120Sofrim 16:10.

121Theodor, "Midrash Haggadah," p. 557.

122Solomon Zeitlin's article, "Midrash: A Historical Study," in the Jewish Quarterly Review, XLIV No. 1 (July, 1953), 21-36, purports to demonstrate that the Habakkuk pesher (and other Dead Sea Scrolls) cannot be dated to the Second Commonwealth. He maintains that there were no commentaries on the Prophets during that era. But the existence of commentaries on Psalms (as in BR XXXIII3, and that of Qumran) and other books, notably Genesis, argues against him. There is no reason for commentaries to have been written on one type of biblical book but not another. The weight of the evidence is against him.

123Albeck, Mavo Umaftehot, p. 44.

124Weiss, Hayetzirah, pp. 176-177.

125Paul Feine and Johannes Bohme, Introduction to the New Testament, Werner Georg Kümmel, ed. (New York, 1966), p. 38. Schleiermacher also posits the existence of narrative-collections concerning Jesus, i.e., ma'aseh-books.

126Ibid., pp. 50-58.

127Krister Stendahl and Emilie T. Sander, "New Testament Literature," in "Biblical Literature," Encyclopedia Britannica, 15th ed., II, 950-951.

128BR VIII2.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albeck, Hanoch. Mavo Umaftehot Livereshit Rabbah
("Introduction and Indices to Bereshit Rabbah").
Berlin, 1931.
- _____. Mavo Letalmudim ("Introduction to the Talmud").
Tel-Aviv, 1969.
- Bowker, John. The Targums and Rabbinic Literature.
Cambridge, England, 1969.
- Buber, Solomon. Midrash Tanhuma. Jerusalem, 1964
- Epstein, I. "Foreword." The Midrash. Edited by
H. Freedman and Maurice Simon. London, 1939.
- Epstein, Jacob Nahum. Mevo-ot Lesifrut Ha-Amoraim
("Introductions to Amoraic Literature").
Jerusalem, 1962.
- Feine, Paul, and Bohm, Johannes. Introduction to the
New Testament. Edited by Werner Georg Kummel.
New York, 1966.
- Finkelstein, Louis. "The Sources of the Tannaitic
Midrashim." Jewish Quarterly Review, XXXI, No. 3
(January, 1941), 211-243.
- _____. "Studies in Tannaitic Midrashim." Proceedings
of the American Academy for Jewish Research, VI
(1934-1935), 189-228.
- Fisch, S. Midrash Haggadol on the Pentateuch: Numbers.
Manchester, England, 1940.
- Fisch, Solomon. "Midrash Ha-Gadol." Encyclopedia
Judaica. Vol. XI.
- Fischman, Judah Leib Ha-Cohen. "Mavo" ("Introduction"),
in, Mordecai Margaliot. Midrash Haggadol:
Sefer Bereshit. Jerusalem, 1947.
- Freedman, H. "Introduction." The Midrash. Edited by
H. Freedman and Maurice Simon. London, 1939.
- Gaster, Theodor H., trans. The Dead Sea Scriptures.
Garden City, New York, 1964.
- Ginzberg, Louis. The Legends of the Jews. Philadelphia, 1968.
- Goldschmidt, Daniel. Haggadah shel Pesah Vetoledoteha
("The Passover Haggadah and Its History").
Jerusalem, 1969.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J., trans. The Apochrypha. New York, 1959.
- Herr, Moshe David. "Genesis Rabbah." Encyclopedia
Judaica. Vol. VII.

- Herr, Moshe David. "Midrash." Encyclopedia Judaica. Vol. XI.
 . "Tanhuma Yelammedenu." Encyclopedia Judaica.
 Vol. XV.
- Hoffmann, David Zvi, Midrash Haggadol: Sefer Shemot.
 Berlin, 1914.
- Horovitz, S. "Midrash." Jewish Encyclopedia. Vol. VIII.
- Kahana, Abraham, ed. Hasefarim Hahitzonim ("The
 Apochrypha"). Jerusalem, 1970.
- Lauterbach, Jacob Z. "Tanhuma, Midrash," Jewish
 Encyclopedia, Vol. XII.
- Liebermann, Saul. Midreshe Teman ("The Midrashim of
 Yemen"). Jerusalem, 1940.
- Mann, Jacob, and Sonne, Isaiah. The Bible as Read and
 Preached in the Old Synagogue. New York, 1971.
- Margaliot, Mordecai, ed. Entziclopediah Lebachme
 Hatalmud Vehageonim ("Encyclopedia of the
 Talmudic Sages and the Geonim"). Tel-Aviv, 1970.
 . Midrash Haggadol: Sefer Bereshit. Jerusalem,
 1947.
 . Midrash Haggadol: Sefer Shemot. Jerusalem, 1956.
Midrash Tanhuma. Jerusalem, 1970.
- Mirkin, Moshe Aryeh. Midrash Rabbah. Tel-Aviv, 1968.
- Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of
 the Christian Era. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1966.
- Rabinowitz, Zvi Meir. Midrash Haggadol: Sefer Bemidbar.
 Jerusalem, 1967.
- Schechter, Solomon. Midrash Haggadol. Cambridge, England,
 1902.
- Stendahl, Krister, and Sander. Emilie T. "New Testament
 Literature," in "Biblical Literature."
Encyclopedia Britannica, 15th ed. Vol. 2.
- Strack, Hermann L. Introduction to the Talmud and
 Midrash. New York, 1969.
- Theodor, J. "Bereshit Rabbah." Jewish Encyclopedia.
 Vol. III.
 . "Midrash Haggadah." Jewish Encyclopedia.
 Vol. VIII.
- Vermes, Geza. Scripture and Tradition in Judaism.
 Leiden, 1961.
- Weiss, Abraham. Al Hayetzirah Hasifrutit Shel Ha-Amoraim
 ("On the Literary Creativity of the Amoraim").
 New York, 1962.

Weiss, Isaac Hirsch. Dor Dor Vedorshav ("Every Generation and Its Preachers"). Jerusalem, n.d.

Zeitlin, Solomon. "Midrash; A Historical Study."
Jewish Quarterly Review, XLIV, No. 1 (July, 1953),
21-36.

Zunz, Leopold. Haderashot Beyisrael ("Sermons in Israel"). Translated, edited, and completed
by Hanoah Albeck. Jerusalem, 1954.