

The Petiḥtot of Lamentations Rabbah:

A Phenomenological and Contextual

Literary Analysis

Jill Colman Ruskin

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion

1983

Prof. Richard S. Sarason

Digest

In Lamentations Rabbah, the Palestinian Amoraim confront the Book of Lamentations as the Scriptural focus for Israel's mourning for her lost glory. Through application of specific hermeneutical techniques and infusion of their own rabbinic values, these rabbis recast earlier materials and develop original materials to discover the metaphysical process of theodicy which they believed to be revealed in Scripture.

In response to the destruction of the Temple and exile of the people, their perceived task was to determine how our acts as mortal humans affect the Divine execution of retributive justice. Is there an unswerving pattern of measure for measure, middah k^e neged middah, in the sin and retribution? The rabbis do not dwell on ancestral tales for the sake of idealizing the lore of their people. They seek within an ancient text the master plan which they believe is the blueprint of their contemporary situation.

In this thesis, a careful phenomenological and contextual literary analysis of this text is performed to understand the thirty-six petihtot of Lamentations Rabbah from various perspectives. They reflect common rabbinic values; they utilize common rabbinic methods; they share the same general structure and thematic concerns; and they are each individual homiletical units.

The first fifteen petihtot (actually 1-14, including 2a) plus petihta 23 are subjected to a four-part analysis.

First the petihta is translated and arranged in outline form to demonstrate the homiletical structure. This is followed by a more abstract outline which delineates the elements of the exegesis, including specific hermeneutical techniques. Notes on parallel passages, philological issues, elliptical passages, prooftexts, and miscellaneous problems are found in the next section. Finally a literary essay discusses the exegetical process, the homiletical structure, the possible editorial activity and the thematic revelations.

An abbreviated analysis is conducted on petihtot 15 - 22. With this analysis, the structure is briefly examined, followed by discussion of the thematic material, and the editorial placement in Lamentations Rabbah.

In the conclusion thematic patterns are identified. The techniques of hermeneutics are defined and illustrated. The unique characteristics of this document are noted. Through this phenomenological analysis, we develop insights into the concerns and objectives of the authors as well as the textual process of this particular piece of midrashic literature.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my husband Paul who has provided loving support, encouragement, and patience throughout all the years of my rabbinic studies, and to my children, Sammy and Shoshana who have shared me with this thesis for the past year.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank my teacher, Dr. Richard S. Sarason, for his conscientious guidance in the preparation of this work. His enthusiasm for the study of rabbinic literature provided me with the inspiration to examine this document of Lamentations Rabbah.

I also wish to thank my parents, Albert and Harriet Colman, who initiated my training for the rabbinate by instilling within me a love of the Jewish heritage, as well as a sense of responsibility towards the Jewish people.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....p. 1

Translation and Literary Analyses

Petihta 1.....	p. 16
Petihta 2.....	p. 28
Petihta 2a.....	p. 52
Petihta 3.....	p. 62
Petihta 4.....	p. 66
Petihta 5.....	p. 73
Petihta 6.....	p. 90
Petihta 7.....	p. 95
Petihta 8.....	p. 99
Petihta 9.....	p. 105
Petihta 10.....	p. 114
Petihta 11.....	p. 128
Petihta 12.....	p. 135
Petihta 13.....	p. 148
Petihta 14.....	p. 157

Abbreviated Analyses

Petihta 15.....	p. 162
Petihta 16.....	p. 165
Petihta 17.....	p. 168
Petihta 18.....	p. 172
Petihta 19.....	p. 174

Petihta 20.....	p.176
Petihta 21.....	p.179
Petihta 22.....	p.183
Petihta 23 (long analysis).....	p.189

Conclusion

Rabbinic Society:

Themes.....	p.225
Hermeneutical Techniques.....	p.241
<u>Family of Lamentations Rabbah</u>	p.252
<u>Individual Petihta</u>	p.255
<u>Final Summary</u>	p.258

Charts

Structural Breakdown, Figure 1.....	p.262
Editorial Activity, Figure 2.....	p.283
Hermeneutical Technique, Figure 3.....	p.286
Footnotes.....	p.289
Bibliography.....	p.291

Introduction

The appeal of the midrashic enterprise is that neither reason nor reality may restrict the creative attempt to understand the teaching of Scripture. For the sake of sensitivity to the nuances and hidden meanings of the Biblical text, for the sake of a deeper "logic" or "truth," all adherence to what we consider to be the rules of logic and propriety may be abandoned.

In midrash the truth of Scripture need not be bound by the laws of physics. Thus Nebuchadnezzar can anachronistically ponder the destruction of Rome or Alexandria, as the darshan ignores time and space to emphasize the reasons for the destruction of Jerusalem.¹ In midrash, the truths of Scripture need not be bound by the rules of grammar. Thus a word may be divided into three smaller words:

וְיִשְׁכַּח
 וְיִשְׁכַּח "I would take comfort" can be divided
 into וְיִשְׁכַּח "there are none who meditate."²

In midrash, the truth of Scripture need not be bound by rules of syntax. Thus the first phrase of a proverb can be read metaphorically as the consequence of the second phrase rather than as parallel stichs.³ In midrash, the truths of Scripture need not be bound by the laws of common sense. Thus the Israelites dined sumptuously on manna in the barren wilderness, yet were reduced to the state of starvation in their settlement in the land of milk and honey.⁴ In midrash, the truths of Scripture need not be bound

by the rules of propriety. Thus the Holy Temple may be compared to a leper, without fear of disrespect.⁵

All of the above colorful examples of midrash transcending the bounds of reason are found in the petihta section of Lamentations Rabbah. Thirty-six petihtot comprise this introductory unit, bound only by the formal petihta structure: an extraneous verse is subjected to a chain of expositions and interpretations until it arrives at the first verse of the pericope being expounded.⁶ In Lamentations Rabbah most of the petihtot conclude with the seder verse of Lamentations 1:1. Most of them reflect a common theme. But there is much more that can be said about the petihtot of Lamentations Rabbah.

It was their reverence for the power of Scripture which permitted the rabbis to take such liberties in interpreting it through fantasy and parable. And it is my own respectful affection for these petihtot which permits me to take the liberty to subject them to a midrashic metaphor. To illustrate an understanding of the petihtot of Lamentations Rabbah, we can anthropomorphize them. Thus we can make our acquaintance with them as with a human friend.

To fully understand the complex personality of a human being, one must take into account a person's various identities. One is simultaneously a member of the human species, a member of society, a member of a family, and a unique individual.

To fully understand the complex personality of the petihta of Lamentations Rabbah, one must also take into account all of its various identities. This petihta is a member of the species of literature in which folktales and myths are spun to explain and enhance the mysteries of human existence. All members of the human species have the same physical forms. As a member of the literature "species," the petihta incorporates the forms of that genre: language, imagery, metaphor, narrative and poetry.

The petihta is also a member of society. All members of a human society must subscribe to common values and laws. As a member of the rabbinic society, the petihta expresses the values and that society. In a human society, only a certain inventory of behaviors are acceptable. As a member of the society of rabbinic literature the petihta engages in certain hermeneutical behaviors, following only prescribed patterns.

The petihta is also a member of the family of Lamentations Rabbah. Members of a family share a common genetic makeup which controls their appearance and their behavior. Their relationship with each other is more intimate than that of members of a society or a species, resulting in a sense of interdependence. As a member of the family of Lamentations Rabbah, the petihtot share a common underlying theme, and manifest similar motifs. As human families share a common parentage, so do the petihtot in Lamenta-

tions Rabbah share a common seder verse. Together they comprise the number 36, which is the gematria for the word נצח, thereby increasing their bond to each other.

Finally we come to know the petihta as an individual. As individual human beings each combine physical, mental, and emotional characteristics in a unique way, so does each petihta combine its elements in its unique way. Each develops an original exposition on familiar materials.

In looking at these 36 petihtot which comprise the first section of Midrash Lamentations Rabbah we shall endeavor to get to know them from the perspective of their membership in a species: literature, a society: rabbinic values and methods, a family: Lamentations Rabbah and as individual, self-contained units.

Society

Value Concepts

Part of the development of the personality of the petihta of Lamentations Rabbah derives from its place in rabbinic society. This society had its norms and values as any other. Consequently, much has been written about "rabbinic theology" and "the rabbinic mind," Indeed, anthologies such as A Rabbinic Anthology by C. G. Montefiore and H. Loewe (London, 1938) and Sefer Haaggadah by H. N. Bialik and Y. Ch. Rawnitski (Odessa, 1908-11) glean illustrations

from a variety of halakhic and aggadic sources to demonstrate the rabbinic view. These anthologists and theologians tend to focus on this element of the personality as the sole determinant of the character of the material. We understand it as a contributing factor, not as the only influence.

Max Kadushin in The Rabbinic Mind spells out in great detail what he believes to be the underlying value concepts which shape rabbinic literature. "What is it," he asks, "which gives any historic group its special character different from any other group?"⁹ His answer is: value concepts. These are abstract concepts which are expressed in all of rabbinic literature.

"The complex of value concepts as a whole is meaningful enough and colorful enough to make of the individuals who employ it a unified group with a clearly recognizable character."¹⁰

Kadushin isolates four concrete concepts which have a special character. These are God's justice, God's mercy, Torah and Israel.¹¹ We see these ideas and their subconcepts again and again in every document. All of them are expressed in the petihtot of Lamentations Rabbah.

In my analysis of these petihtot I make note of the rabbinic values which are expressed therein. In the literary essays on petihtot 1-14 and in the thematic section of the abbreviated analyses, these concepts and their homi-

letic manifestation are discussed. In addition, the section on themes in the conclusion demonstrates how these value concepts are expressed in the petihtot of Lamentations Rabbah.

Hermeneutical Techniques

In Derkhey Ha'Aggadah, Isaak Heinemann states his purpose as "to describe and to explain the methods which the rabbis employed in both the most difficult passages and the most typical passages in the aggadah."¹² Heinemann sifts through all of aggadic literature, isolating the hermeneutical techniques employed by the rabbinic authors. By use of these techniques, the Scriptural passages are manipulated to yield all aspects of their message.

Of course we must always bear in mind that this was not a whimsical pastime for them but a sacred search for the Scriptural warrants which served as the foundation for their value system. As Heinemann continues in his statement of purpose: "How therefore can we explain this deviation from the truth (i.e., the literal meaning of the text), especially in the case of our sages who viewed Scripture as the revealed word of God and as historical facts delivered to us by divine messengers, that they see it also as metaphorical."¹³

It is apparent that the rabbis knew that they were engaging in this manipulation. The literal meaning is often considered in tandem with other homiletical interpre-

tations. The rabbis were aware of the process and advocated it "for the sake of Heaven." Scripture is not merely a collection of folktales and laws, it is holy writ. Because of their fervent belief in the oracular quality of the text, the rabbis felt compelled to use all these devices to extract the full extent of the Scriptural message.

The homiletical exegesis of Scriptural texts depends on the assumption that the integrity of letters, phrases, and sentences can be disregarded in the name of a sacred search for deeper levels of meaning. Heinemann calls this process "haznahat halogos," abandonment of syntactic logic. Heinemann wrote: "our sages engaged in haznahat halogos because of a belief in the autonomy of the letters and their collaboration in ways other than the literal meaning of Scripture."¹⁴ He described four ways in which they disregarded "scientific" philological rules: 1. they weakened the underlying concept which unifies the words, 2. they even ignored the underlying concept completely, 3. they removed the border which separates verses on the basis of their content, 4. they juxtaposed verses from different locations in Scripture on the basis of their sharing the same isolated, individual words.

On the basis of this concept of haznahat halogos, Heinemann catalogued the ways in which the rabbis reconstructed the syntax of Scriptural verses. As I proceed in analyzing each petihta I record the techniques employed in the exposition, using Heinemann's categorization with additions of my own.

These homiletical techniques are recorded in the outline section of the long analyses of petihtot 1 - 14 and 23, and in the charts on all petihtot. A chart gauging their frequency will be included in the conclusion. This is accompanied by an analysis of each technique and its application.

Family

As well as being members of the species of literature and the rabbinic society, these petihtot are also members of the family of Lamentations Rabbah. Accordingly, the distinct characteristics of Lamentations Rabbah must figure in our analysis.

As Sarason so aptly points out in his article "Towards a New Agendum for the Study of Rabbinic Midrashic Literature:" the anthological character of midrashic literature may easily lull us into overlooking the importance of focusing on the literary context of a particular document.¹⁵ Although this midrash may bear a strong resemblance to contemporaneous texts such as the Palestinian Talmud and Genesis Rabbah, editorial activity has sculpted Lamentations Rabbah into a unique document which treats themes, hermeneutical techniques, and Scriptural exegesis in a distinctive way.

Two rabbinic theses have been written about Lamentations Rabbah. In 1935, Henry Pastor wrote a thesis "Lamentations Rabbah: Its Composition and Contents Critically Considered," which presented an overview of the structure and themes of the document. In 1960, Charles Kroloff wrote a thesis

entitled "The Effect of Suffering on the Concept of God in Lamentations Rabbah." He examined in detail the treatment of the relationship of sin to retribution and the implications of theodicy.

While both Pastor and Kroloff focus on the unique characteristics of the document, Kroloff especially ascribes a specific theology to Lamentations Rabbah. He endeavors to ascertain what guidance Lamentations Rabbah had to offer to the Jews of that time. How did it help them to cope with the constant oppression by the Gentiles? How did it deal with the basic human problems of evil and suffering?

Thus Kroloff examines the "family" of Lamentations Rabbah from a thematic point of view. Another approach to the analysis of the document itself (rather than a comparative study) was done by Salomon Buber. Buber used several manuscripts of the midrash to compile his Vilna edition of Lamentations Rabbah, published in 1899. He wrote copious notes about parallel passages and philological commentary. In addition, he wrote an extensive introduction which traces the "source" of the midrash and points out structural details. For example, he records alphabetically the rabbis cited in the text, with all citations listed. He also points out that there is a pattern to the attributions of petiḥtot. The 36 petiḥtot are attributed: 1 - 3 to R. Abba bar Kahana, 4 - 7 to R. Abbahu, 8 - 11 to R. Issac, 12 - 15 to R. Hanina bar Papa, 16 - 17 to R. Abbahu, 18 - 19 to R. Abin, 20 - 21 to R. Alex-

andri, 22 - 23 to R. Joshua, 24 - 25 to R. Yohanan, 29 - 30 to R. Zabdi b. Levi, with each of the others to an individual rabbi.

What will be done in the course of this thesis is to take the work of Pastor, Buber and Kroloff one step further. Of course, only the petihta section will be analyzed. Each petihta will be examined to determine its structure, shape, and the reasons for its placement in Lamentations Rabbah. How were existing materials shaped to achieve the specific tone of this document? As Sarason writes: "It is not unusual when focusing attention on a single tradition as they appear in a great variety of documents, to give insufficient weight to the peculiar stylistic and redactional characteristics of a particular document as they affect the precise formulation of the tradition in that document."¹⁶

The detailed analysis in the essays written on petihtot 1- 23 examines how the petihtot may have been formulated to relay the specific message of Lamentations Rabbah. Where as Buber merely documents the patterns he observes in the structure of the midrash, we will attempt to recognize the evidence of and rationale for editorial activity. We will isolate specific characteristics which make this material a unique document.

So we shall come to make the acquaintance of the family of Lamentations Rabbah. As in all families, the members have a similar physical appearance. But the resemblance also goes

deeper: common goals, common values, common personality quirks. As members of the family of Lamentations Rabbah, these petiḥtot exhibit these familial traits.

Individual

Finally we meet the petiḥta itself. As each human being is special, someone who has never existed before, each petiḥta has its own unique identity. Besides being a member of society and a member of a family, each person represents a single genetic combination of familiar human characteristics. Thus each petiḥta in Lamentations Rabbah transforms the familiar techniques of Scriptural exegesis, the familiar rabbinic values, and the familiar message of Lamentations Rabbah into an individual.

Much has been written about the nature of the petiḥta. Joseph Heinemann describes it in terms of its putative function as an oral sermon. He also describes its structure:

"From a 'remote' verse, the preacher proceeds to evolve a chain of expositions and interpretations until at the very end of the proem, he arrives at the first verse of the pericope with which he concludes. The establishment step by step of a connection between the two passages, known technically as ḥarizah, 'stringing beads,' is the main object of the preacher, and is the chief challenge to his rhetorical skill."¹⁷

The petiḥta has a clearly defined form. While Heinemann and others have considered it to be the written record of an oral sermon, Sarason has recently challenged this in "The Pe-

tihtot in Leviticus Rabbah: 'Oral Homilies' or Redactional Construction?" He demonstrates that most of the petihtot in Leviticus Rabbah are editorial constructions, context-specific materials which have been formulated ^{as petihtot} in the process of the redaction of the document.¹⁸

In terms of our schematization of the petihtot of Lamentations Rabbah as members of a society, a family, and as individuals, Sarason emphasizes their identity as members of the family of a specific document. He identifies the transition to the seder verse as the "crucial stylistic indicator for the authenticity of the petihta."¹⁹

In our analysis of the 36 petihtot of Lamentations Rabbah we shall take into consideration both Heinemann's and Sarason's points of view. Each petihta is outlined according to its homiletical process. Then it is analyzed in terms of the integrity of the piece as a whole. Individual sections may be identified as extrinsic materials and special attention is paid to the transition to the seder verse. The findings are recorded both in the individual analyses of the petihtot and in the chart at the end as well. The charts reveal significant patterns in the structure of these petihtot as well as some striking dissimilarities.

Structure of the Work

Our analysis involves understanding the petihtot of Lamentations Rabbah on various levels. As a member of the species of literature, these materials engage in the descrip-

tive expression common to literature of every culture. No further analysis of this aspect of the petihta's identity is undertaken in this work.

However the other levels of identity are dealt with extensively. The rabbinic society identity of these materials is here represented by an identification of the rabbinic value-concepts inherent in this text. The rabbinic society identity is also illustrated by the distillation of common hermeneutical techniques which are utilized in the exegesis of Scripture in these petihtot. The Lamentations Rabbah family identity is the focus of the thematic analysis and also the examination of the editorial placement of these materials in this document. The individual petihta identity is understood by means of an investigation into the unique homiletical process which goes on in each petihta.

The first fifteen petihtot (actually 1 - 14, including 2a) plus petihta 23 are subjected to a four-part analysis. First the petihta is translated and arranged in outline form to demonstrate the homiletical structure. This is followed by a more abstract outline which delineates the elements of the exegesis including specific hermeneutical techniques. Notes on parallel passages, philological issues, elliptical passages, prooftexts, and miscellaneous problems are found in the next section. Finally a literary essay discusses the exegetical process, the homiletical structure, the possible editorial activity and the thematic revelations.

An abbreviated analysis is conducted on petiḥtot 15 - 22. With this analysis, the structure is briefly examined, followed by discussion of the thematic material, and the editorial placement in Lamentations Rabbah.

A chart on all 36 petiḥtot records the petiḥta verse, the parallel passages in other sources, the themes, the structure and hermeneutical devices employed, and the transition to the seder verse. Within the chart's section on the structure and hermeneutical devices is included the outline of all petiḥtot, including 23 - 34a as well.

Another chart on all 36 petiḥtot records whether there is a serial exegesis, whether there is clear evidence of editorial activity, the reason for placement in Lamentations Rabbah, whether the transition to seder verse is stereotypical and whether or not the unit is a formal petiḥta.

In the conclusion, all these materials are synthesized to demonstrate an understanding of the petiḥtot of Lamentations Rabbah from the perspective of the society, the family and the individual.

By focusing in on the detailed textual process as well as tracing the thematic threads which weave through these materials we will gain a fuller understanding of the gestalt of these petiḥtot. This phenomenological analysis will enable us to develop insights into the concerns and objectives of its authors as well as a greater grasp of how the text presents

itself to the reader. From this scientific technical study will arise a more intimate acquaintance with the "midrashic enterprise" as it transmits the distinctive message of Lamentations Rabbah.

Translation

(a) חֲכָמִים קְלִימִים (b) חֲכָמִים קְלִימִים
(c) חֲכָמִים קְלִימִים (d) חֲכָמִים קְלִימִים
(e) חֲכָמִים קְלִימִים (f) חֲכָמִים קְלִימִים

R. Abba bar Kahana patah: Cry with a shrill voice,
daughter of Gallim.

A. Jeremiah said to Israel: instead of your reciting songs and psalms before idols,

1. cry with a shrill voice in the words of the Torah.
2. cry with a shrill voice in the synagogues.

B. daughter of Gallim

1. Just as these waves stand out in the sea, thus do their ancestors stand out in the world.

2. Another interpretation of daughter of Gallim:
daughter of golim, daughter of wanderers.

a. daughter of Abraham, about whom it is written :
"There was a famine in the land and Abraham went down to
to Egypt." (Gen. 12:10)

b. daughter of Isaac, about whom it is written:
"And Isaac went to Abimelekh, King of the Philistines, un-
to Gerar." (Gen. 26:1)

c. daughter of Jacob, about whom it is written:
"Jacob listened to his mother and father, and went to
Padan-Aram." (Gen. 28:7)

C. Hearken

hearken to misvot, hearken to words of Torah,
hearken to words of prophecy, hearken to charitable acts,
hearken to good works.

D. Laish

1. If (you do) not (hearken) laisha, a lion will go up against you.

2. This is the wicked Nebuchadnezzar, about whom it is written: "A lion has gone up from his thicket and a destroyer of nations is set out, gone forth from his place to make thy land desolate that thy cities be laid waste without inhabitant." (Jeremiah, 4:7)

E. poor

poor among the righteous [poor in words of Torah].

poor in words of prophecy, poor in misvot and good works.

F. Anathoth

1. If not, then Anathoth.

2. The one from Anathoth will come and prophesy against you [with words of rebuke] as it is written:

"The words of Jeremiah, the son of Hilkiyah, of priests in Anathoth." (Jeremiah, 11:1)

When retribution came, he mourned for them: 'eykhah.

Outline

R. Abba bar Kahana patah: Isaiah 10:30.

A. Fill in ellipsis. Three possible objects of imperative verbs in (a).

Instead of unacceptable object

1. acceptable object

2. acceptable object

B. Place-name interpretation of (b).

1. mah-kakh analogy, ma'aseh 'abot siman l^ebanim

2. implicit 'al taqri, ma'aseh 'abot siman l^ebanim

a. example plus prooftext

b. example plus prooftext

c. example plus prooftext

C. Fill in ellipsis. Five suggested acceptable objects to imperative verb in (c).

D. Place-name interpretation. (a) and (c) and (d) are conditional involving reconstruction of Biblical syntax.

1. 'im lav ((a) and (c)) then (d)

2. petira with prooftext

E. Fill in ellipsis. Five suggested objects of adjective (e) to create adjectival phrase.

F. ((a) and (c) and (e)) and (f) conditional involving reconstruction of Biblical syntax.

1. 'im lav ((a) and (c) and (e)) then (f)

2. allusion from place to person, proof-text.
Variation on formulaic ending.

Notes

Parallels: Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa Dibre Yirmiah

b. Sanhedrin 94b-95a

A. Jeremiah: the petihta verse is actually from Isaiah.
The parallel passage in Pesiqta deRav Kahana lists no attribution, rather proceeds directly with the exegesis.

b. Sanhedrin 94b refers to "the words of the people."
The attribution of this exhortation to Jeremiah in Lamentations Rabbah probably is an additional editorial means of relating the petihta to Lamentations, which is pseudographically assigned to Jeremiah.

instead of: Hebrew 'ad še...

instead of your reciting songs. This section is not found in the early manuscripts of the parallel in Pesiqta deRav Kahana. Later manuscripts do contain this interpolation.

cry in a shrill voice. According to Lewis Barth's commentary on this petihta in Pesiqta deRav Kahana "the root שׁנ3 can bear the nuance of crying out in terror or in joy and is used in both senses in the Hebrew Bible. The tension between joy and terror is not accidental, for our

editor delights in ambiguity, comparison and contrast." 20

This interpretation reads soholi as an imperative which calls for a direct object. An unacceptable direct object is contrasted to an acceptable rabbinic value as a direct object: to cry aloud the words of Torah in the synagogue.

In A, C, and E, the Scriptural phrases are deemed to be elliptical, requiring a rabbinic interpretation to fill in the ellipses. A. gives the verb soholi two acceptable direct objects to fill out the phrase. C. gives the verb haq'sibi five direct objects to fill out an adverbial phrase. E. gives the adjective 'anyah five direct objects (balancing C) to fill out an adjectival phrase.

B. Both Gallim and Layisha are subjected to the technique of place-name interpretation. In the case of Gallim, both interpretations equate Gallim with the patriarchs or ancestors. This is the homiletical technique of ma'aseh 'abot siman l'banim. "Your ancestors, no matter how distinguished, went into Exile and so might you."

1. waves are a metaphor for the ancestors. This motif is also found in Genesis Rabbah 44: "Just as the islands stand out in the sea, so do Abraham and Shem stand out in the world." In b. Sanhedrin 94b it is written on this verse: "daughter of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob who

performed misvot as (numerous as) the waves of the sea."

2. daughter of golim: Both Lamentations Rabbah and Pesiqta deRav Kahana paraphrase this in Aramaic. Wanderers and exiles are here understood as synonymous. The 'al taqri technique is implicit here. Do not read gallim, read golim.

C. hearken: the adverbial ellipsis is here filled in with five direct objects expressing stereotypical rabbinic values. "Such statements attempt to encapsulate essential elements in the rabbinic world view, lacking which the continued existence of society cannot be imagined."

D. Laish place-name interpretation.

1. By reconstructing the syntax, the 'im lav conditional here connects (c) with (d): if you do not (c), then (d).

2. This petira is best understood with the additional materials found in b. Sanhedrin 94b-95a, where not only is Nebuchadnezzar identified as a lion, but "laish" and "aryeh" are both listed as names for a lion. In Lamentations Rabbah, this is implicitly understood.

E. Like A and C this section attempts to fill in the ellipsis of 'anyah, poor. Poor, an adjective, is now rendered as an adjectival phrase. As in C, these are stereotypical rabbinic value-concepts.

F. Anathoth is an allusion to Jeremiah, whose home was

there, by use of the literary technique of metonymy.

This is another 'im lav conditional connecting the disregard of A, C, and E with the consequence of F. The consequence of not doing A, C and E is that Jeremiah, the man from Anathoth, will rebuke you. Buber has added in square brackets [words of rebuke] as in Pesiqta deRav Kahana.

Barth points out "The interpretation of hearken and poor are each followed by threats of punishment, either Nebuchadnezzar or Jeremiah."²¹

In Pesiqta deRav Kahana, the petihta ends: "the words will be spoken to you by Jeremiah. Because of this, Scripture says "the words of Jeremiah, son of Hilkiah." (Jeremiah, 1:1). Thus the petihta ends with the seder verse of Jeremiah 1:1.

In Lamentations Rabbah, the transition is "because retribution came, Jeremiah mourned." This is closely related to the formulaic ending of the petihtot in Lamentations Rabbah: "when they sinned, they were exiled and Jeremiah began to mourn for them 'eykhhah."

Essay

This first petihta in Lamentations Rabbah illustrates the pattern which is followed throughout the entire petihta section in this document. An extraneous verse undergoes a serial

exegesis by parsing of each phrase. Moral imperatives are extracted which thematically relate to the Book of Lamentations. Finally, as a result of an editorially constructed transition, the first verse from Lamentations is connected to the exegetical materials on the extraneous verse, thus formally creating a petihta. Although the transitional material may not function as neatly as we would like, nevertheless this petihta is more formally sound than many. The patterns of exegesis are clear and concise and the editorial work, for the most part, is well executed.

Examining the exegesis of Isaiah 10:30, one notes first the ubiquitous hermeneutical technique which Heine-mann calls haznahat halogos. The original syntax of the verse is abandoned, which gives the midrashist free rein to create his own syntax. Scriptural words and phrases are manipulated until they yield the message the manipulator wants to convey. I do not mean to imply that the rabbis coldly calculated the projected outcomes of their exegetical activities. They proceeded always with the ever-present awareness of the sanctity of the text, indeed of the power of the text to reveal the ultimate truths in every time and place. To us, however, their manipulation of the texts reveals much about the rabbis themselves.

By means of the haznahat halogos, the composer of this petihta was able to read into the verse from Isaiah that if we engage in one kind of behavior instead of another, we will be punished. The doctrine of sin and retribution and its specific rabbinic interpretation--rejection of Torah leads to exile, are imposed upon this verse by a syntactic reconstruction. The verse is read as a conditional: If we do not engage in (a) of the verse, the consequence will be (b) of the verse. If we do not shout aloud the words of the Torah, if we do not fulfill the commandments, if we do not conduct ourselves properly, we will be visited with the consequences; Jeremiah will rebuke us with the prophecies of doom and Nebuchadnezzar will carry out these prophecies by destroying our Temple and exiling us. The events of history are governed by a simple cause-and-effect moral logic.

Haznahat halogos also invites the filling in of ellipses in the Scriptural verse, i, e., the creating of a new context for each phrase of the sentence. "Cry out with a shrill voice." Cry out what? "Hearken." Hearken to what? The darshan pulls no surprises; the ellipses are filled out with the stereotypical values of the rabbis. "Cry out" not in idolatry but in words of Torah. "Hearken" to the misvot, to prophecy, to good works.

The editor adapted fluid exegetical materials which are also recorded in b. Sanhedrin 94b-95a, and which probably existed orally before Lamentations Rabbah was put together. Sanhedrin 94b-95a contains the place-name interpretation on Gallim and Laish and the interpretation of Anathoth as "that man from Anathoth," Jeremiah. But none of the homiletically expressed moral conditionals, determined by reinterpretation of the syntax, are in the Talmudic version. The exegetical material, recorded in Sanhedrin, is shaped to convey the specific message of sin and retribution.

The location of this petihta in Lamentations Rabbah is clearly justified thematically. The editor added other elements to cement the relationship. The verse from Isaiah is attributed here to Jeremiah. Since in rabbinic tradition Jeremiah is the pseudepigraphic author of Lamentations, the attribution is contextually appropriate.

Additional editorial activity was necessary to fit this material into the standard form for petihtot in Lamentations Rabbah. Virtually all petihtot in Lamentations Rabbah end with the seder verse Lamentations 1:1, "How does the city sit solitary..."

Since the connection between Anathoth and Jeremiah is made explicitly in Jeremiah 1:1, this material could

have been, at an earlier stage, a serial exegesis on Isaiah 10:30. In Pesiqta deRav Kahana, it appears as a petihta to Jeremiah 1:1, as part of Pisqa Divre Yirmiahu.

The editor of Lamentations Rabbah added a transitional phrase following the citation of Jeremiah 1:1: "because of retribution, Jeremiah mourned 'How does the city...'" The connection with Lamentations Rabbah is established. "Anathoth" alludes to Jeremiah, Jeremiah rebukes the people, retribution comes in the form of Nebuchadnezzar and exile, thus causing Jeremiah to mourn. What does he mourn? Of course, he mourns with the ultimate lament of Lamentations beginning with chapter 1, verse 1.

The Pesiqta deRav Kahana context is primary but it is possible that the materials were not constructed at the outset specifically as a petihta to Jeremiah 1:1, but as a serial exegesis on Isaiah 10:30, the end of which just happens to use Jeremiah 1:1 as a proof-text. Lewis Barth's article, "Is Midrash a Literature? The Teaching of Rabbinic Biblical Exegesis," contains further discussion on this question.

It seems that several different editors adapted fluid exegetical materials on Isaiah 10:30, recorded in b. Sanhedrin 94b-95a, derived moral imperatives by rendering the syntactical construction as conditional, and injected the

Petihta 1, p. 12^{p. 27}

theme of sin and retribution to suit these materials to
Pesiqta deRav Kahana and Lamentations Rabbah.

Translation

”א' האיש החכם ויבן אל זמא אלז דבר פו ה'
אלז ויעד (ע' מה אבדה הארץ) צורה במדבר
מה' עבר: ואלז ה' (ע' צבא אלז ה') אלז
נחל ע' הם אלז ע' בקא אלז האל בה.
(ינא ה' יא-י)

Rabbi Aba bar Kahana patah: "Who is the wise man that he may understand this? And who is he to whom the mouth of the Lord has spoken that he may declare it? Why is the land perished and laid waste like a wilderness with none passing through? And God said because they have forsaken my Torah which I gave to them and they did not hearken to My voice and did walk in its way." (Jeremiah, 9:11-12)

A. (What does "forsaking Torah" imply?)

1. R. Simeon ben Yohai taught: if you see cities uprooted from their places in the Land of Israel, know that they did not maintain the duty of paying the wages of the teachers of Bible and the teachers of Mishnah. As it is written, "why is the land perished?" What is written after it? "Because they have forsaken My Torah." (Jeremiah, 9:11-12)

2. Rabbi sent R. Asa and R. Ami to go forth to the towns in the Land of Israel and inspect them. They went up to a city and said to them: "bring to us the guardians of the town" and they brought to them the chief of the police and the bailiff. They said to them, these are not the guardians of the town: "these are the destroyers of the town." They asked them, "who are the guardians of the town?" They said to them: They are the teachers of Bible and the teachers of Mishnah, for they meditate and teach and "guard" the Torah day and night. Because it is said, "This book of law shall not depart from your mouth but you shall meditate on it day and night so you may observe to do all that is written there, then shall you make your way successful and you shall be enlightened" (Joshua 1:8). And it is also said: "if the Lord does not build the house, the labor of its builders is in vain; if the Lord is not the guardian of the city, the watchman wakes in vain." (Psalm, 127:1)

3. R. Huna and R. Jeremiah and R. Samuel in the name of R. Isaac said: We have found that the Holy One, Blessed be He, will overlook idolatry, sexual immorality and bloodshed but He does not overlook the abandonment of (the study) of Torah, as it is written "for what will the land pe-

rish? ("...on forsaking My Torah") (Jeremiah 9:11-12)
"Because of idolatry," "because of sexual immorality,"
"because of bloodshed," this is not written here, rather
because of "forsaking My Torah."

Insert. 1. R. Huna and R. Jeremiah in the name of
R. Hiya. bar Aba said: it is written "they have forsaken me
and not observed My Torah" (Jeremiah 16:11). Would that
they had forsaken me and observed My Torah. By occupying
themselves with it, its light would have caused them to
return to the right path.

2. R. Huna said: Study Torah even if not for its
own sake for (studying it) not for its own sake will lead
to (studying it) for its own sake.

3. R. Joshua ben Levi said: every day a bat-kol
goes forth from Mt. Horeb and says "Woe to them, to the
people for their insult of the Torah."

B. 1a. R. Samuel taught in the name of R. Samuel b.
Ammi: when can the Kingdom issue a decree and the decree will
succeed? At the time when Israel casts words of Torah to
the ground.

Thus it is written: "The host was given over to it
together with the tamid through transgression and it cast
down truth to the ground and it prospered" (Daniel 8:12)

b. sabā host only refers to kingdoms as it is

written "then God will visit the host of heaven in heaven and the kings of earth on earth." (Isaiah, 24:2)

c. tamid continual offering, that is, Israel, as it is written: "Meditate on it day and night." (Joshua, 1:8)

d. b^efesa⁴ transgression, that is, transgression of Torah.

e. Every time Israel casts words of Torah to the ground the kingdom can issue a decree and it will succeed, as it is written "cast truth to the ground and it prospered." (Daniel, 8:2)

f. Torah is the only truth as it is written, "Buy the truth and do not sell it, also wisdom and instruction and understanding." (Proverbs, 23:23)

g. If you cast the words of Torah to the ground the kingdom will be immediately successful as it is written "it prospered." (Daniel, *ibid*)

2. R. Yehuda b. Pazi said, "Israel has cast off that which is good, the enemy shall pursue him." (Hosea 8:3)

Good can only imply Torah as it is written, "A good doctrine I gave to you, do not forsake it." (Proverbs 4:2)

3. R. Aba bar Kahana said: there were no philosophers among the peoples of the world like Balaam ben Beor and Oeonamos of Gedara. It was said to him (Oeonamos):

"can we meet this people in battle?" He said to them: Go back and forth to their synagogues and to their houses of study. If the children are shrieking with their voices you will not be able to overpower them, if not you will be able to overpower them. As their father promised them and said to them: "The voice is the voice of Jacob and the hands are the hands of Esau." (Genesis, 26:22)

Whenever the voice of Jacob [is shrieking] in the synagogues and the houses of study the hands are not the hands of Esau. Whenever the voice of Jacob is not shrieking in the synagogue and the houses of study, the hands are the hands of Esau.

4. Similarly it says "lakhen k'ekhol qas' l'son es'." Therefore as "the stubble devours the tongue of fire." So there is stubble which devours fire--is it not the nature of fire to devour stubble? But you say "the stubble devours the tongue of fire." Rather

a. the stubble is the house of Esau as it is said, "The house of Jacob is fire and the house of Joseph is flame and the house of Esau is stubble." (Obadiah, 1:18)

b. "tongue of fire," this is the House of Jacob, as he is represented as fire, as it is written: "The house of Jacob is fire."

c. "Chaff is consumed in flame." [This is the

house of Joseph; he is represented by flame as it is written, "the house of Joseph is a flame."] (Obadiah, 1:18)

d. "so their roots shall be rottenness," these are the forefathers for they are the root of Israel.

e. "their blossom shall go up as dust," these are the tribes, since they are the blossom of Israel.

f. Because of what? for they rejected the Torah of the Lord of Hosts and despised the words of the Holy One of Israel.

1. R. Yudan said, "for they rejected the Torah of the Lord of Hosts" means the written Torah

2. and "they despise the words of the Holy One" that is the Oral Torah.

When they cast the words of Torah to the ground, Jeremiah began to mourn for them: eykhah.

Outline

A. Rabbinic interpretations of 9:12a.

1. R. Simeon b. Yohai: statement about cause and effect, prooftext: Jeremiah 9:11c and 9:12a.

2. situational application illustrating above statement plus two prooftexts.

3. R. Huna and R. Jeremiah in the name of R. Samuel: masinu technique, specificity and exclusivity implied

between Jeremiah 9:11c and 9:12a.

✓ Insert. 1. exegesis of Jeremiah 16:11 related to above by attribution, theme and word usage.

2. dictum coordinated with 1 by theme and attribution.

3. R. Joshua b. Levi: another statement related thematically to 1 and 2 and above materials.

B. Exegeses about forsaking Torah punished by foreign domination.

1. a. R. Samuel: introduction to the following exegesis of Daniel 8:12 in the form of a rhetorical question, derived from 1e.

b. petira-like exegesis of Daniel 8:12 (a) with prooftext.

c. petira of (b) with prooftext.

d. fill in ellipsis of (c).

e. 1a in statement form, prooftext Daniel 8:12.

f. petira-like exegesis of (d) with prooftext.

g. conditional of (d) and (e) if (d), then (e).

2. R. Yehuda b. Pazi; coordinate exegesis of Hosea 8:3, verbs synonymous, petira with prooftext.

3. R. Abba b. Kahana: situational application illustrating theme of forsaking Torah--foreign domination; metaphorical illustration of Daniel 8:12 by rendering it con-

ditional.

4. petira of Isaiah 5:24 related to above by mention of some Biblical personalities.

a. petira on (a) with prooftext Obadiah 1:18.

b. petira on (b) with same prooftext.

c. petira on (c) with same prooftext.

d. petira through metaphor.

e. petira through metaphor.

f. syntax reconstructed as conditional, (a) - (e) are consequences of (f) and (g).

1. R. Yudah: petira of (f) and petira of (g) to differentiate between seemingly synonymous Scriptural phrases.

Ending: When Daniel 8:12, then Jeremiah mourned 'eykhah.

Notes

Parallels: Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa Eykhah.

y. Haggigah, 1:7

y. Rosh Hashanah, 3:8

Genesis Rabbah, 65:20

A. These materials are found in y. Haggigah Chapter 1, Halaha 7, from tny Rabbi Shimon to the end of 4b. The materials were not reformulated but appear exactly as they do in the Palestinian Talmud. The structure is as follows:

1. rabbinic dictum (not spelled out there but implicitly: neglect of the study of Torah brings about destruction) followed by 2. proof-text (Jeremiah 9:11c and 9:12a) illustrated by a 3. situational application. Thus the petihta verse is used as the proof-text for the rabbinic dictum in the Talmudic passage.

1. if you see cities uprooted 9:11c is given a rabbinic updating attributed to R. Shimon b. Yohai. "Land perish" = cities uprooted; "forsaking Torah" = not paying the wages of the teachers. The verse is understood as conditional: if you forsake Torah, then the land will perish. Translated into rabbinic understanding, the conditional is: if you neglect to pay the teachers' salaries, the cities will be uprooted.

2. Bring to us the guardians of the town: A paradoxical parable which serves as self-justification for the rabbis. Again, the study of Torah is deemed to have the dominant role in the culture.

Rabbi sent R. Asi: Aramaic. Some variations in y. Haggigah and Pesiqta deRav Kahana. Different sages were sent by Rabbi Judah in each version.

In y. Haggigah, the purpose of the mission is explained in more detail: "that they should pass through the city limits to the cities of the Land of Israel to

דן

(set in order: Jastrow) the teachers of Bible and Mishnah. They went one place and did not find there any teachers of Bible or Mishnah so they asked for the guardians of the city..." Thus in y. Haggigah the inspection was specifically for the purpose of finding out about the teachers of Bible and Mishnah. Since in Lamentations Rabbah we are not told the purpose of the inspection, the punch line of the story works better. Rhetorically, it makes for a more suspenseful story.

לְיָדָם is similar to לְיָדָם in the Palestinian Talmud version. Buber proposes לְיָדָם which is the reading in Pesiqta deRav Kahana.

y. Haggigah lacks the explanation of why the teachers are the guardians of the city (because they meditate and guard the Torah day and night). Thus the prooftext Joshua 1:8 is not in the Palestinian Talmud. Prooftext Psalms 127:1 is present in Lamentations Rabbah, y. Haggigah and Pesiqta deRav Kahana. Psalms 127:1 implies that the rabbis are God's watchmen.

3. We have found mašinu technique. Rabbis Huna and Jeremiah and Samuel read into this text: Since no other sin is mentioned in this verse, "forsaking Torah" is the only sin God will not overlook. The extreme examples of idolatry, sexual immorality and murder, traditionally the

three cardinal sins, give emphasis to the seemingly inappropriate weight ascribed to the study of Torah. The rabbis thus elevate the role of the study of Torah (their own enterprise) to the primary focus of God's retribution.

[Insert. The following exegeses are related to the above because of similar attributions, themes and word usage. 1. The Palestinian Talmud version differs in the attribution and other details. y. Haggigah attributes this only to R. Hiya bar Abba. Lamentations Rabbah gives an expanded version.

The verse is understood as follows: Better that you should do (e), than to do (f), if you must do one or the other. Not doing (f) will lead to not doing (e). "Studying Torah leads to the fear of God." This is how the syntax of (e) and (f) of this verse is read.

s'or This word is problematic. In the Soncino translation, it is rendered "light," read as ma'or. Buber has found some manuscripts of Lamentations Rabbah which read ma'or, and one manuscript of Pesiqta deRav Kahana which reads ma'or. Braude translates s'or as "innerforce." s'or could refer to dough which rises, i.e., dough is the study of Torah which rises to become the bread of the fear of God. Ma'or seems to be the better reading here.

right path; In Palestinian Talmud and Pesiqta deRav Kahana this reads "return to me." This is preferable.

2. R. Joshua b. Levi: this separate piece is connected thematically with forsaking Torah: "for their insult of Torah" and to retribution "woe." It is found in Avot 6.

B. 1. a. Samuel tny: From here through C2, most of the material is found in y. Rosh Hashana 3:8, with some exceptions as noted below.

When can the kingdom: Lamentations Rabbah begins this section with a rhetorical question which relates Jeremiah 9:12a to the subsequent exegesis of Daniel 8:12 and Hosea 8:3; Jeremiah 9:12a refers to casting Torah to the ground. This section specifies the consequence of casting Torah to the ground; the nations will be successful in their attempt to dominate Israel.

This introduction, by means of a rhetorical question, is not found in Pesiqta deRav Kahana or the Palestinian Talmud and is evidence of editorial activity in Lamentations Rabbah.

The Palestinian Talmud version begins with R. Samuel citing Daniel 8:12. From there, follows an exegesis of (c), (d) and (e) of the verse. (a) and (b) are not parsed

in the Palestinian Talmud. Lamentations Rabbah develops (a) and (b) as petirot.

b. saba' refers to the kingdoms which seek to overcome Israel. The prooftext from Isaiah 24:21 establishes that saba' and melekh are synonymous because of their location in the parallel stichs in this verse.

c. tamid refers to Israel. The prooftext Joshua 1:8 does not work here. In Joshua 1:8 tamid refers to Torah while here it should refer to Israel.

e. Palestinian Talmud context: Mishnah refers to Moses lifting his hands and Israel prevailing as a reference to the people's faith. Whenever Israel had faith in God, they would prevail. Whenever they would not have faith, they would fail to prevail. Similarly in this passage, whenever Israel would cast truth to the ground, i.e., not have faith, the kingdoms would have dominion over them. The context in Lamentations Rabbah is quite different, since casting truth to the ground is associated with study of Torah rather than lack of faith.

The rhetorical question in B1a is derived from this statement in Lamentations Rabbah and Pesiqta deRav Kahana. hisliyah: the antecedent here is deemed to be evil decree, the evil decree will succeed.

g. The Biblical syntax is reconstructed into conditional form: if Israel casts Torah to the ground, then the kingdom will succeed. This repetition in conditional form is not found in the Palestinian Talmud or Pesiqta deRav Kahana.

2. This exegesis of Hosea 8:3 reiterates the same syllogism: if Israel neglects the Torah, then the enemy will succeed in being victorious over them. Taslikh in Daniel 8:12 and zanah in Hosea 8:3 are read as synonymous. 'Emet in Daniel 8:12 and tob in Hosea are read as synonymous, thus equating the meaning of the two verses. The proof-text not only provides the connection between "good" and "Torah," it also contains the verb 'azab which refers back to the petihta verse.

גזמ

'al 'ozvam et torati	Jeremiah 9:12
v'oti 'azabu	Jeremiah 6:11
'al ta'azovu	Proverbs 4:2

3. R. Abba b. Kahana: Perhaps this petihta is attributed to him on the basis of this situational application. In Pesiqta deRav Kahana the situational application is located immediately following B. R. Joshua b. Levi, prior to the exegesis of Daniel 8:12. This situational

application is found in Genesis Rabbah chapter 65 as an exegesis on Genesis 26:22. Genesis Rabbah and Pesiqta deRav Kahana versions are identical. Lamentations Rabbah has slight variations.

The situational application is an illustration of the overriding theme of this petihta: when Israel neglects the study of Torah, the nations dominate them and they are exiled from the Land of Israel. In this particular situational application it is the studying of Torah by children which is the measure by which we are judged. This exegetical material on Genesis 26:22 is thus woven into the theme of our petihta.

Oeonanos of Gedara: He is mentioned as Nimas in b. Haggigah 15b, He is a pagan philosopher of the early second century, according to the Soncino translation.

Genesis 26:22 is read conditionally: if the voice of Jacob is not heard, then the hand of Esau will prevail. Thus the prooftext is understood metaphorically. voice of Jacob: the voice of the children of the descendants of Jacob studying Torah. hands of Esau: the military might of the "descendants" of Esau (Rome) will prevail. Thus Esau (Rome) can prevail militarily when Jews do not study Torah.

4. This exegesis by petira of Isaiah 5:24 is related to the above by the mention of Esau and Jacob. Isaiah 5:24 is determined to have the same message as many of the above exegetically treated verses: if Israel neglects the study of Torah (in this case, both the Oral and Written Law) the retribution will be domination of Israel by the nations.

Some of this material is found in Sifre Ekev 41 in conjunction with the petihta verses Jeremiah 9:11-12, along with the comment: "every time Israel abstains from performing misvot Esau will rule."

a. "the stubble devours:" The Hebrew text read in its sequential order, rather than its grammatically correct order, presents the paradox of stubble devouring fire.

a., b. & c. comprise a three-part petira based on Obadiah 1:18, thus the stubble and chaff of Esau (Rome) consume the fire and flame of Jacob and Joseph (Israel).

d. root rottenness: petira based on the metaphor of a root signifying our ancestors, who in the exegesis of the verse would undergo an evil fate.

e. blossom: metaphorically understood as the tribes who would also suffer a terrible fate.

f. because of what? after the petira, a connection is established with (f) and (g) of the verse. Because of (f) and (g), (a) - (e) came about. (f) and (g) refer to forsaking Torah, both written and oral, and (a) - (e) refer to the punishment which is a consequence of (f) and (g).

(f) and (g) seem to be synonymous. But the Torah could not be redundant so they are determined to refer to two separate entities. Pesiqta deRav Kahana ends here.

When they cast words. This editorially created petihta refers back to a phrase from Daniel 8:12 which has been shown to be equivalent in meaning to the petihta verse Jeremiah 9:11-12.

Jeremiah mourns 'eykhah: standard ending.

Essay

In petihta 2, exegetical materials are brought from the Palestinian Talmud and Genesis Rabbah and formed into an anthology of homiletical passages on the theme of sin and retribution. A common theme in rabbinic literature, sin and retribution is here understood specifically as the sin of forsaking Torah, and even more specifically, the sin of not studying Torah. Attention is

focused on the rabbinic enterprise of teaching Bible and Mishnah and upon children reciting their textual lessons in the rabbinically-organized schools. The importance of this method of study and the stature of these teachers in the Jewish community is stressed by Scriptural exegesis which reinterprets Biblical text according to the rabbinic norms.

In the petihta verse of Jeremiah 9:12, "forsaking My Torah" is presented as the reason for ~~the~~ destruction of the land of Israel. The rabbinic innovation is defining "forsaking" as "not studying," Personal observance is not enough. The rabbis are needed to properly fulfill the commandment of keeping, i.e., studying the Torah.

Since the rabbis were the authors of this midrash we cannot be sure that the community held them in as high esteem as they held themselves. Allusion is made to the unenlightened lay people who still believed that the police and government officials were the guardians of the town. They did not recognize what the rabbis considered to be the essential role of the teachers of the Written and Oral Law in preserving the community of Israel. "Forsaking Torah" involved not only neglecting to

study Torah, it extended to withholding the salaries of the teachers.

Indeed the rabbinic self-importance is carried to such an extreme as to border on blasphemy. "Forsaking Torah"--studying Torah, would never be overlooked by God when He comes to visit retribution upon the people. In contrast, proposes this exegesis of Jeremiah 9:12, since the sins of idolatry, sexual immorality and murder are not mentioned here in association with the "land perishing" (Jeremiah, 9:11), obviously God considers these to be less serious infractions of the Law.

Five seemingly unrelated Scriptural verses are deemed to have equivalent meanings, Jeremiah 9:11-12 (petihta verses), Daniel 8:12, Hosea 8:3, Genesis 26:22 and Isaiah 5:24. All five of these verses are read: if the Jews do not study Torah, God will bring retribution in the form of destruction and domination by foreign nations.

The exegetical material which understands these verses this way is brought from the Palestinian Talmud Haggigah 1:7, Palestinian Talmud Rosh Hashana 3:8, and Genesis Rabbah, chapter 65. Editorial activity cemented these materials together and added a petira on Isaiah 5:24 to create an exegesis on Jeremiah 9:11-12. The pas-

sage ends here in Pesiqta deRav Kahana, standing as an anthology of exegeses on a unified theme. Additional editorial activity constructed a transition which links it to Lamentations Rabbah by means of quoting Daniel 8:12 (which has been demonstrated to be equivalent to the petihta verse) and relating it through the formulaic transition phrase to Lamentations 1:1.

Besides the artificial transition to the Lamentations Rabbah formulaic ending, other editorial activity which has taken place in the adaptation of this material to Lamentations Rabbah is worth noting.

In the beginning of section B, which is derived largely from y. Rosh Hashana, the Lamentations Rabbah version gives an introduction which sets out the theme of the following material by use of a rhetorical question. This rhetorical question is derived from a statement a few lines down in the exegesis. This device sets the tone for the entire section to follow and enables the reader to look for the different ways in which the theme of the rhetorical question is expressed homiletically.

Additional editorial work in this section expands and clarifies the elliptical material from y. Haggigah, which has not been done in the Pesiqta deRav Kahana version.

The exegesis on Daniel 8:12 from y. Rosh Hashana is carried one step further. In y. Rosh Hashana and Pesiqta deRav Kahana the exegesis begins with the third phrase in the verse. Lamentations Rabbah carries the metaphor of the nations and Israel by presenting petirot of the first two phrases of the verse as well.

A wide variety of homiletical techniques are used in this petihta. The initial piece has been lifted, as is, from y. Haggigah, without any attempt to adapt it to the usual style of Scriptural exegesis. The petihta verse is the prooftext for the dictum, and not the object of the exegesis. The dictum and prooftext are followed by a situational application. The story is a paradoxical parable designed to surprise the reader with its twist on the obvious. Here paradox is used as a rhetorical device.

The next piece utilizes the masinu technique by taking a Scriptural verse and reading the quality of exclusivity into it: only because of "forsaking Torah will the land perish."

Next the syntax of Jeremiah 16:11 is reconstructed to yield a dictum about the priority of studying Torah even over fear of God since the study of Torah inevitably leads to God. Another analogous dictum expresses the value

of studying Torah, even without the requisite faith since inevitably study leads to study with kavvanah. This dictum attributed to R. Joshua b. Levi is related structurally and thematically to the above dictum, and thus was inserted here.

A quotation from Avot contains a rabbinic equivalent of the five Scriptural verses which are exegetically identical: "the people will suffer because of their neglect of Torah."

The next section illustrates through two petirot and a ma'aseh that the nations can be successful in their domination of Israel only when the study of Torah is neglected. The first petira is on Daniel 8:12 followed by a further identification of Daniel 8:12 with Hosea 8:3 by means of a heqesh with Proverbs 4:2.

A situational application attributed to R. Abba b. Kahana, found in Genesis Rabbah as an exegesis on Genesis 26:22, demonstrates the theme: not studying Torah leads to retribution by foreign domination.

Finally, a petira of Isaiah 5:24 uses Esau as the symbol for foreign domination. Thus ends the exegesis.

The formulaic transition phrase formally characterizes this as a Lamentations Rabbah petihta, and is obviously

an editorial construction.

Equivalent Verses

1. Why is the land perished? land perished = cities
because they have forsaken My uprooted
Torah. (Jeremiah 9:11-12) forsaking Torah = not paying
salaries of teachers, not
valuing the teachers as the
guardians of the city.
Source: y. Haggigah 1:7

2. The host was given domi- host = foreign kingdoms
nion over the perpetual of- perpetual = Israel
fering through transgression transgression: neglect of
and it cast down truth to the Torah
ground and it prospered. truth: Torah
(Daniel 8:12) Therefore it prospered: evil decree
the foreign kingdoms will of foreign kingdoms will
have dominion over Israel be successful
when they transgress by for-
saking the study of Torah.

3. Israel has cast off that good = Torah (prooftext Pro-
which is good, the enemy verbs 4:2)
shall pursue him (Hosea 8:3)
Therefore because Israel

has neglected (study of) To-
rah the enemy will pursue him.

4. The voice is the voice of voice of Jacob = shrill voices
Jacob, but the hands are the of Jewish children studying
hands of Esau. (Genesis, Torah.
26:22) Therefore hands of Esau = military
whenever the Jewish children might of foreign nations.
do not study Torah, the fo-
reign nations will be mili-
tarily victorious over
Israel.

5. As stubble devours the stubble = Esau, tongue of
tongue of fire, as chaff con- fire: Jacob. Flame = Jo-
sumes flame, so shall their seph (proof-text, Obadiah,
root be rottenness. And 1:18), root = ancestors,
their blossom go up as dust. blossom = tribes. Law of
Because they rejected the Lord of Hosts = Written Law,
Law of the Lord of Hosts and Word of Holy = Oral Law.
despised the Word of Holy One
of Israel. (Isaiah 5:24)

Therefore the foreign nations
will dominate Israel, the an-
cestors and tribes are rotten,
because of neglect of study of
the Oral and Written Law.

Translation

כה אמר ה' צבאל התבאנא וקדאל
 אגאלנא
 אגאלנא אלא החכמה עתה אגאלנא (ירמיה 9:16)

"Thus says the Lord of Hosts: consider ye and call for the mourning women that they may come and send for the wise women that they may come." (Jeremiah, 9:16)

R. Yohanan and R. Shimon ben Lakish and the Rabbis:
 A. R. Yohanan said: [God can be compared] to a king who had two sons.

1. He became angry at the first one, took the stick and knocked him down and exiled him.

2. He said: Woe to him, from what tranquillity is he exiled!

3. He became angry at the second and took the stick and knocked him down and exiled him.

4. He said: I am the one who reared them badly.

1/c. Thus were the ten tribes exiled and

2/c. the Holy One Blessed be He began to recite with reference to them this verse: Woe unto them for they have strayed from Me (Hosea, 7:13).

(3|c) When Judah and Benjamin were exiled,

(4|c) the Holy One Blessed be He said as it were,
Woe is Me for My hurt (Jeremiah, 10:19).

B. R. Shimon ben Lakish said [God can be compared]
to a king who had two sons.

1. He became angry at the first one, and took the
stick and knocked him down; he (the son) struggled in
convulsions and died.

2. He began to mourn for him.

3. He became angry at the second one, took the stick
and knocked him down; he (the son) struggled in convul-
sions and died.

4. He said: I no longer have strength in Me to
mourn for them, so call the mourning women (Jeremiah,
9:16) that they may mourn for them.

(1|c) Thus when the ten tribes were exiled.

(2|c) He began to mourn for them: "Hear ye this word
which I take up for a lamentations over you O House of
Israel (Amos, 5:1).

(3|c) But when Judah and Benjamin were exiled

(4|c) The Holy One Blessed be He said as it were: from
now on I have no strength in Me to mourn over them so
call the mourning women and they will come and send for

the wise women that they may come (Jeremiah, 9:16).

And let them make haste and take up a wailing for Us" (Jeremiah, 9:17).

5. a. For them is not written here rather for us

||וְזָרָה|| זָרָה for me and them.

b. "that eyes may run down with tears." It is not written here "that their eyes run down with tears" rather Our eyes

||וְזָרָה|| זָרָה Mine and theirs.

c. "their eyelids gush out with water" is not written here, rather "our eyelids" Mine and theirs.

||וְזָרָה|| זָרָה

C. The rabbis said: (God could be compared) to a king who had twelve sons. Two of them died, He began to comfort himself with ten. Two more died, He began to comfort himself with eight, two more died, He began to comfort himself with six, two more died, he began to comfort himself with four, two more died and He began to comfort himself with two. When they all died, only then did He begin to mourn over them, 'Eykhah.

Outline

Jeremiah, 9:16.

Exegetical dispute form: R. Yohanan, R. Shimon b. Lakish and Rabbis.

A. R. Yohanan's mashal l'melekh.

1 - 4 mashal

1 |c - 4 |c nimshal including two prooftexts.

B. R. Shimon b. Lakish's mashal l'melekh.

1 - 4 mashal; prooftext: petihta verse Jeremiah, 9:16.

1 |c - 4 |c nimshal, two prooftexts, second is petihta verse.

5. read across bar line to Jeremiah 9:17 as additional Scriptural support of mashal B.

C. Rabbi's! mashal l'melekh.

prooftext: Lamentations 1:1 seder verse.

Notes

Parallel: Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa Eykhah.

In manuscripts of Lamentations Rabbah, this petihta is a continuation of petihta 2. The petihta is clearly separate as the parallel in Pesiqta deRav Kahana makes clear. There it precedes Lamentations Rabbah petihta 2, found there as paragraph 4. Buber suggests that it did not appear as a separate petihta in Lamentations Rabbah because it does not begin with the standard "R. X patah." In his Vilna edition, he records it as petihta 2a, and so shall we. R. Yohanan and R. Shimon b. Lakish and the rabbis. Each of these present a king mashal in exegetical dispute form. Only B uses the petihta verse. A and B

fit well with the nimshal of the first son being the ten tribes and the nimshal of the second son being Judah and Benjamin.

A. 1. habat: Jastrow defines this as "pressing down, as on olives, to make them burst, or throwing down an animal before slaughter."

4. I am the One in Aramaic. דֵּי אֵל אֶלְדָּאֵר לְהַלְלָא
(1 - 4/c) These are the actual historical occurrences which parallel the analogy of the king and his sons.

(1/c) Just as the king became angry and exiled his son, so did God exile the ten tribes.

(2/c) Just as the king mourned over that which his son had lost because of his exile, so did God mourn for the ten tribes and what they had lost due to their forsaking God.

(3/c) Just as the king became angry and exiled his second son, so did God exile the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin.

(4/c) Just as the king took responsibility for the bad behavior of his son after having exiled both of them, so did God personalize the loss by mourning not for the son but for His own hurt.

B. 1. pirper: Jastrow defines this as "crumbled

bread, to struggle in convulsions." This word is found in Job 17:13 and is translated as "broke asunder."

(1|c - 4|c) As in A these are the historical and Scriptural antecedents for the king analogy.

(1|c) Just as the king became angry at his son, struck him and he died, God caused the ten tribes to be exiled.

(2|c) Just as the king mourned for his son, God mourned over the ten tribes as in Amos 5:1: "I have taken up a lamentation over you."

(3|c) Just as the king became angry and struck his son until he died, God caused Judah and Benjamin to be exiled.

(4|c) Just as the king said he had no strength to mourn over his son and called the mourning women, so did God also have no strength and called the mourning women to mourn over the destruction of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin.

5. And let them make haste and take up a wailing for us. This is a detailed look at the verse in Jeremiah which follows the petihta verse, a continuation of the exegesis of the Jeremiah verse. In (A4) and (A4|c) the idea is proposed that God not only mourns for Israel but

for His own personal loss as well. This exegesis of Jeremiah 9:17 continues with the development of this theme, not My eyes but Ours run down with tears, not My eyelids but Our eyelids gush with water. The Aramaic phrase

||ד'ר'ר' |ר'ר' is repeated after each phrase. God and Israel mourn together.

C. This is the mashal that the rabbis present. Instead of just two sons, the king has twelve, analogous to the twelve tribes. Curiously the analogy to Israel and Judah breaks down as two sons at a time die in contrast to the two destructions of Israel and then Judah, as in A and B. God takes comfort with remaining sons until He is left with none. Then only He mourns 'eykhsh.

Essay

Three king mashalim and the corresponding nimshalim about God's personal involvement in the mourning for the tribes of Israel and the tribes of Judah are the components of this petihta. Presentation of the three mashalim is in exegetical dispute form, although there is really little dispute going on between mashal A and mashal B.

In comparing mashal A attributed to R. Yohanan and mashal B attributed to R. Shimon b. Lakish, many similarities can be detected, as well as some differences. In

both mashalim, the king (God) is so angry at his first son that he strikes him. In mashal A, the son is exiled (like Israel), in mashal B the son dies (of course many members of the tribes of Israel died before the exile, so the analogy still holds). The king blames his first son for his fate in mashal A, balanced by a proof-text (Hosea 7:13) in the corresponding nimshal. In mashal B God mourns for his first son, balanced by a proof-text (Amos 5:1) in the corresponding nimshal. Both mashal A and B describe the king's anger at the second son and his exile or killing of him. But in mashal A the king now takes responsibility for the poor upbringing of his sons which led to their behavior. The prooftext in A does not reflect this shouldering of blame by God, rather indicates that God too is hurt by the exile of His people (Jeremiah 10:19). The petihta verse is used in the corresponding section in mashal B. The king and in the mashal, God, are so broken up over the death of their children that they need to call upon the mourning women.

While mashal A ends here, after the mashal and nimshal have been neatly presented, mashal B is followed by an exegesis of the next verse, Jeremiah 9:17, which is homiletically related to the theme of the mashal. In

this exegesis, the mourning women mourn not only for Israel but also for God. Has God too gone into exile? In both sections A and B God is personally hurt by the exile; He mourns not only for Israel but for Himself as well.

Attributed to the rabbis is a third mashal which shares certain elements with the first two mashalim. Like the others, a king with sons is the protagonist. Like the others, the theme is the mourning of God over His people. However, the analogy to the two exiles of Israel and Judah gives way to twelve sons, who die two at a time, without a corresponding historically accurate nimshal. God's role in mashalim A and B was as both dispenser of retribution and mourner. In this mashal, God is passive. The sons die without his intervention. Indeed, he takes comfort in the remaining sons. God's role here is as mourning father.

The petihta verse is only used in section B. A is only associated with the petihta verse by virtue of its structural and thematic relationship with B. C is also associated thematically and structurally, although more loosely. Thus the three mashalim are presented here together and formed into a petihta by extracting

the prooftext of B and making it the petihta verse,
and making the prooftext from C the seder verse. Ver-
ses Jeremiah 9:16 and Lamentations 1:1 are already re-
lated through the theme of mourning, thereby contribu-
ting to the integrity of the petihta.

Translation

(a)
(ג' 881/1 ענה קים 3102 'אנני' (א)
(372 'אנני' קים' (ב)
(ג' 1'6 ירמיה (141/1 ע83' (ג)

Rabbi Aba bar Kahana patah: "I sat not in the assembly of them that make merry nor rejoiced, I sat solitary because of Thy hand for Thou has filled me with indignation." (Jeremiah, 15:17)

A. Said the community of Israel before the Holy One, Blessed be He:

1. Master of the Universe, I have never entered the theaters nor the circuses of the nations of the world. Nor have I "made merry" with them, nor have I "rejoiced,"

2. because of your hand I sat solitary.

B. ("Because of your hand I sat solitary.")

1. The hand of Pharoah touched me and I did not "sit solitary."

2. The hand of Sennacherb touched me and I did not "sit solitary."

3. But when Your hand touched me, I did "sit solitary."

"How does the city sit solitary."

Outline

Petihta verse: Jeremiah, 15:17.

A. exegesis of (a) and (b) of verse.

1. Israel says verse to God: Hellenistic interpretation of Biblical verse.

2. (b) of verse reason for A1.

B. exegesis of (b) heqesh.

1. proposition a put forward and rejected.

2. proposition b put forward and rejected

3. proposition c put forward and accepted.

Eykhah.

Notes

Parallel Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa 'Eykhah.

A. Theaters and circuses: these are the Greek words which provide the timely Hellenistic interpretations of the Scriptural verse. Theaters and circuses: I have never indulged in pagan pleasures. I sat solitary: Israel has been isolated and protected by the covenant.

B. 27' This comment emphasizes that it is God's hand which has the only real power for Israel. It is not because of the military might of the nations that Israel

has been destroyed, rather due to the intervention of God (viz., not Rome, but Israel's God).

Two examples of leaders who sought to destroy Israel are presented and eliminated as actual threats. Finally it is only God who can truly act to save or destroy.

Essay

This petihta is an exegesis of the (a) and (b) phrases of Jeremiah 15:17. The phrase "badad ya'sabti" in Jeremiah 15:7 and "ya'sbah badad" in Lamentations 1:1 provide the relationship through heqesh which prompts the exegesis here.

The first section is a reference to the non-participation in Hellenistic entertainment which was forbidden to Israel. Israel was isolated by its covenant with God. Because of God's hand, they were set apart from the nations and bound to a certain way of life. This was both a specific prohibition of joining in the pagan athletic celebrations of the Greeks and Romans and also the general emphasis on Israel's separate and special identity of not being like the nations.

The second section is an exegesis of only the (b) phrase of the verse. Israel was not vulnerable to the attacks of its enemies as long as God was with them.

But when God struck the blow, then Israel was isolated,
"ya^hbah badad," and they were destroyed.

Translation

אננה כקא פאקא
(5:1 יע/ה) , א פאקא

"But they like Adam have transgressed the covenant,
there they have dwelt treacherously with me." (Hosea 6:7)

R. Abbahu patah: "they like Adam have transgressed
the covenant."

A. They like Adam: this refers to the first man, Adam.

1. Said the Holy One, Blessed be He, I caused the
first man (Adam) to enter the Garden of Eden.

2. and commanded him

3. and he transgressed My commandment

4. and I sentenced him with expulsion

5. and I sentenced him with sending forth

6. and I mourned for him eykhah.

(1 | c) I caused him to enter Garden of Eden as it is
written: "And the Lord God took man and put him into the
Garden of Eden to dress it and keep it." (Genesis, 2:15)

(2 | c) and I commanded him as it is written: "And
God commanded the man saying of every tree of the garden
you may eat but the tree of knowledge of good and evil you
may not eat of it." (Genesis, 2:16)

(3 c) And he transgressed My command as it is written: "have you eaten of the tree which I commanded you not to?" (Genesis, 3:11)

(4 c) I sentenced him with expulsion, as it is written: "So He drove out the man." (Genesis, 3:24)

(5/c) I sentenced him with sending forth as it is written: "and He sent him forth from the Garden of Eden." (Genesis, 3:23).

(6 |c) And I mourned for him 'eykhah, as it is written,
 "And he said concerning him, eykhah" (וַיֹּאמֶר |c =
 where are you?) (Genesis, 38:9).

B. [I did the same for] his children

1. I caused them to enter the Land of Israel, as it is written: "I brought you to a land of fruitful fields."
(Jeremiah, 2:7)

2. I commanded them, as it is said: "Command the children of Israel." (Leviticus, 24:2)

3. And they transgressed My command, as it said,
"all of Israel transgressed Thy law." (Daniel, 9:11)

4. I sentenced them with expulsion as it is written:
"because of the wickedness of their doings I will drive
them out of My house." (Hosea, 9:15)

5. I have sentenced them with sending forth as it is

written: "Cast them out of My sight and let them go forth." (Jeremiah, 15:1)

6. And I mourned for them, 'eykhah.

Outline

R. Abbahu patah: Hosea 6:7.

A. petira on first phrase, paradigm afor B.

1.- 6. God as narrator informs reader of His pattern of behavior.

1/c. - 5/c. God as narrator gives specific examples of each of His behaviors with prooftexts.

6/c. God as narrator gives specific example of His pattern of behavior with 'al taqri prooftext.

B. ma'aseh 'abot siman lebhanim.

1. - 6. God as narrator gives specific examples of His parallel behavior (parallel to A1 - 6, A 1/c - 6/c) in relation to descendants with prooftexts; the last prooftext is seder verse.

Notes

Parallels: virtually identical in Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa 15 Eykhah and Genesis Rabbah 19 on Genesis 3:11.

God <u>caused</u> Adam to <u>enter</u>	Garden of Eden (Genesis 2:15)
God <u>commanded</u> Adam	not to eat from tree (Genesis 2:16)
Adam <u>transgressed</u>	ate from tree (Genesis 3:11)
God <u>expelled</u> Adam	from garden (Genesis 3:24)
God <u>sent forth</u> Adam	from garden (Genesis 3:2)
God <u>mourned</u> for Adam	(Genesis, 3:9)
God <u>caused</u> descendants to <u>enter</u>	land of Israel (Jeremiah 2:7)
God <u>commanded</u> descendants	burn olive oil (Leviticus 24:2)
Descendants <u>transgressed</u>	all of Israel transgressed (Daniel 9:11)
God <u>expelled</u> descendants	drove out of My house (Hosea 9:15)
God <u>sent forth</u> descendants	cast out of My sight (Jeremiah 15:1)
God <u>mourned</u> for descendants	How does the city sit (Lamentations 1:1)

A. They like Adam: petira determines the general: human to refer specifically to the first human "Adam." They refers to the descendants, specifically to the Jews, of

Adam as illustrated in B.

1. Said the Holy One: God as the protagonist and narrator describes his behavior towards Adam.

1. - 6. each of these actions will be illustrated by two specific situations with Scriptural prooftexts.

1 /c. - 6 /c. how God manifested these behaviors towards Adam ending with God mourning נִסְּחָה /c, actually an'al taqri for נִסְּחָה /c. Heqesh between Lamentations 1:1 and Genesis 3:9.

A3, 4, A3, 4, B3, 4 in Genesis Rabbah the order is reversed. Sending forth precedes expelling. This is the order in the Biblical text.

B. [I did the same with] his sons: this is an example of ma'aseh 'abbot siman l'banim. More specifically, ma'aseh 'adam harison l'banim. Just as God behaved towards Adam, God will behave towards Adam's descendants.

In Genesis Rabbah, A1 - 6 is repeated. Also in Genesis Rabbah, B2 has a different prooftext, Exodus 27:20.

Essay

Was petihta 4 developed from the top down or from the bottom up?

From the top down, it is an exegesis on Hosea 6:7. The problem in this verse is the phrase k'adam. This

exegesis suggests that k^e'adam refers to Adam, and hemah refers to Israel, the descendants of Adam. Just as Adam transgressed his "covenant" by eating of the fruit of the tree, so did his descendants transgress their covenant by not observing the commandments.

From the bottom up, we have an exegesis on the word נָדָה. The word נָדָה in Lamentations 1:1 gives rise to an 'al taqri of Genesis 3:9 נָדָה. Both נָדָה and נָדָה have the same consonants, thus a further relationship can be homiletically derived from them. Since נָדָה in Lamentations 1:1 is the prototype of all mourning, so can נָדָה in Genesis 3:9 imply mourning. Genesis 3:9 is part of the story of Adam and Eve. Which elements of this story can be extracted to expand the parallel? In the Eden story, Adam and Eve transgress a commandment, and are punished for it by expulsion from the Garden. Lamentations 1:1 is an elegy in response to the exile of Israel, understood as the punishment for sin. Transgression of commandment leading to expulsion is the theme of both stories. Now the author has the basis for creating further parallels. Each element of the Eden story is determined to involve a specific behavior of God or Adam. These behaviors are

listed, and then specified with a proof-text. Now it is incumbent upon the darshan to find Scriptural examples of these behaviors directed towards Israel. No one chapter will include them all as in the Genesis story, but many examples can be found to illustrate these common motifs. Indeed, the Genesis Rabbah version of this petihta contains a divergent proof-text for one of the behaviors demonstrating the interchangeability of proof-texts for these common motifs. If the exegesis is developed from the bottom up, how did Hosea 6:7 become associated with the material? Hemah k'adam is a problematic phrase which seems to prompt the petira, equating it with Adam.

Perhaps this exegesis of Hosea 6:7 already existed and the petihta before us is the product of the merging of two exegeses. No matter what the original motivation for the material, the developed pattern makes for a tightly woven homiletical fabric.

The theme of sin and retribution in the form of exile is dominant here. We notice that God is the narrator of the material, thus it is God who mourns $\text{נשׁוּב} \text{ } \text{וְיָחַד}$. This motif of God mourning is also found in Petihta 2a.

Ma'aseh 'abot siman l'banim controls the message of this petihta. God says: My behavior is consistent. That

which I did to the first human beings when they broke their covenant with Me, so I will do to Israel when they transgress their covenant with Me. Adam's exile, and alienation from God becomes paradigmatic for the experience of Israel.

Translation

ע'כ'ן כה אחר ה' אלהים (אלו עיר הדמים)
 (ס'י' שלו חכמה בה) (א'חכמה א'א' יצא מ'מנה)
 (א'נ'מ'ה א'נ'מ'ה ח'צ'מ'ה) (א'א' צ'כ' א'ה' א'ה'כ')
 (כ'י' ד'מ'ה א'מ'כ'ה ה'ה) (א'כ' צ'ח'י' ס'כ' א'מ'הו)
 (א'א' ש'כ'מ'הו א'ה' הא' א'כ'מ'הו א'כ'ו א'כ'ה)
 (א'ה'א'ל' ח'מ'ה) (א'נ'ק'ם נ'ק'ם) (א'ג'ט א'ג'ד'מ'ה א'
 צ'ח'י' ס'כ' א'ב'ט' ה'כ'מ'ה)
 (א'כ'ן כה אחר ה' אלהים אלו עיר הדמים)
 (א'ם א'ני א'כ'ד'י' א'ה'מ'ד'ו'ה)
 (ה'נ'מ'ה ה'ע'צ'י'ם) (ה'ד'ע'יק הא'ל) (ה'ג'ם ה'ג'ש'
 א'ה'ר'ק'ה ה'מ'י'ק'ה) (א'ה'ע'צ'מ'ג' י'ח'ו)
 (א'ה'ע'מ'יד'ה א'מ'ח'י'ה ר'ק'ה) (א'מ'ע'ן ג'מ' א'ח'ר'
 נ'ח'מ'ה א'נ'כ'ה א'מ'כ'ה א'מ'מ'ה
 ח'מ' ח'כ'מ'ה)

101-1:30 6/3/21

"Thus says the Lord God: Woe to the bloody city, to the pot whose filth is therein and whose filth is not gone out of it. Bring it out piece by piece; no lot is fallen upon it.

For her blood is in the midst of her, she set it upon the ground, to cover it with dust.

That it might cause fury to come up, that vengeance might be taken. I have set her blood upon the bare rock, that it should not be covered.

Therefore thus says the Lord God: Woe to the bloody city. I also will make the pile great, heaping on the wood, kindling the fire, that the flesh may be consumed, and preparing the mixture that the bones also may be burned.

Then I will set it empty upon the coals thereof that it may be hot and the bottom shall burn and that the impurity of it may be molten in it that the filth of it may be consumed." (Ezekiel, 24:6-11)

R. Abbahu in the name of R. Yossi bar Hanina patah:

"Therefore thus says the Lord God: woe to the bloody city to the pot whose filth is therein and whose filth is not gone out of it! Bring it out piece by piece, no lot is fallen upon it."

A. ("Woe to the bloody city.") Woe will come from Me (God) to the city in whose midst they spill blood.

B. "the pot whose filth is therein" whose sediment is within it (Aramaic).

C. "and whose filth is not gone out from it" and the sediment has not gone out from it (Aramaic).

D. "bring it out piece by piece," they were exiled district by district (Hebrew).

1. How were they exiled?

a. R. Eleazar says, "The tribe of Reuben and the tribe of Gad were exiled first."

b. R. Samuel bar Nahman says, "The tribe of Zebulun and the tribe of Naphtali were exiled first, as it is written "as at the first time He made light the land of Zebulun and Naphtali." (Isaiah, 8:23)

c. And how does R. Eleazar concretize the verse of R. Samuel bar Nahman? Rather (at the same time) [as in the same manner] the tribes of Reuben and Gad were exiled, so the tribes of Zebulun and Naphtali were exiled.

Insert. "But the latter was dealt a more grievous blow" (Isaiah, 8:23). R. Abba b. Kahana said: swept away as with a broom as it is written: "I will sweep it with a broom" (Isaiah, 14:23).

E. "No lot has fallen upon it" (Ezekiel, 24:6). R. Nahman in the name of R. Aha said: What does this mean? "ne lot has fallen upon it?" Said the Holy One, blessed be He:

1. At the time when I cast lots on the nations of the world to exile them, they were not exiled.

2. So why were you exiled? "Because her blood is in the midst of her" (Ezekiel, 24:7).

F. What is the reason for this? "Because her blood is in the midst of her," "that it might cause fury to come up" (Ezekiel, 24:8).

1. R. Judah asked R. Aha. He said to him: where did Israel murder Zechariah, in the Court of Israel or in the Court of Women? He said to him: not in the Court of Israel or in the Court of Women, rather in the Court of Priests.

2. They did not treat his blood like the blood of a ram or the blood of a gazelle. For concerning the blood of a gazelle or the blood of a ram it was written: "pour out the blood and cover it with dust" (Leviticus, 17:13).

3. But in this case it is written: "Because her blood is in the midst of her" she "set it upon the ground to cover it with dust...but it was not covered."

G. "I also will make the bonfire great." I will increase the retribution.

H. "heaping on the wood," these are the legions.

I. "Kindling the fire," these are the kings.

J. "that the flesh may be consumed," this is the community.

K. "preparing the mixture."

R. Joshua and R. Nahman in the name of R. Aha said: Because all of Israel would say: "Nebuchadnezzar has gathered all the wealth of the world, will he need our wealth?"

The Holy One Blessed be He said: "By your lives, I will make your money as beloved to him as these spices (whose aroma) arises at a banquet."

L. "preparing the mixture and the bones may also be burned:" you find that when Israel was exiled, their bodies bubbled like a spiced broth.

M. "I will set it empty on the coals thereof." Said R. Eleazar: If it had been written "broken" it would never be able to be restored, but since it says "empty," any vessel which is empty may be filled.

N. To what end? That it may be hot and the bottom shall burn and the impurity of it may be molten that the filth may be consumed.

When they sinned they were exiled, when they were exiled, Jeremiah began to mourn over them--"eykhah."

Outline

R. Abbahu in the name of R. Yossi bar Hanina patah: Ezekiel, 24:6.

A. Targum type paraphrase of (a) includes expanding of ellipsis.

B. Aramaic paraphrase of (b).

C. Aramaic paraphrase of (c).

D. (d) understood metaphorically, extended Hebrew paraphrase.

1. elaboration of how D is carried out, in classical dispute form.

a. R. Eleazar's position.

b. R. Samuel b. Nahman's position plus proof-text.

c. How does R. Eleazar explain R. Samuel's proof-text?

Insert. R. Abba b. Kahana continues exegesis of R. Samuel's proof-text with play on words plus proof-text.

E. R. Nahman's situational application, reading across the bar line of verses 6-7. You were not exiled because of (e), rather because of (f).

F. (f) in verse 7 and (i) in verse 8 related in story of

Zechariah.

1. R. Judah asked R. Aha about location, Aha responds.
 2. proper response to Leviticus 17:13 commandment.
 3. juxtaposition of Ezekiel 24:8 (K) to Leviticus 17:13, demonstrating improper response to Leviticus 17:13 command.
- G. Metaphoric reading of verse 9 (m).
- H. petira on (n) verse 10.
- I. petira on (o).
- J. petira on (p).
- K. R. Joshua and R. Nahman in name of R. Aha: metaphor of (q) expressed in situational application.
- L. (q) and (r) 'at mose' associated with K.
- M. R. Eleazar (s). If a word in this phrase had been otherwise, the connotation would have been negative, but since it is written thus, the connotation is positive.
- N. p^{ea}sat syntactical connection between (s) and (t) in verse 11.

Formulaic ending.

Commentary

- A. Targum-type paraphrase of (a) which contains explanatory material not found in the paraphrase of (b) or (c). Could be setting the stage for Zechariah material if one

reads this as an integral piece. City of blood refers to the city in which blood is spilled: Jerusalem.

D. Tribe by tribe (Hebrew) metaphorical exegesis.

The form is that of paraphrase, as above.

1. How were they exiled? Elaboration of above by situational application, attributed to R. Eleazar and R. Samuel b. Nahman. The dispute is in classical form, found frequently in halakhic and aggadic literature. R. Eleazar presents his position. R. Samuel presents a different opinion, backing it up with a prooftext. Then it is asked how R. Eleazar deals with the prooftext of R. Samuel. The resolution involves a reconciliation of the two positions.

Insert. This probably had previously been attached to the exegesis of Isaiah 8:23a above. Although there is no thematic connection in this context this piece attributed to R. Abba b. Kahana may have accompanied the previous section, following the exegesis of (a). It is a philological comment supported by a prooftext (Isaiah, 14:23).

E. No lot: (e) and (f) of the verse understood as follows by R. Nahman: God did not destroy Israel capriciously: no lot has fallen upon it. Rather, Israel was destroyed

because of the sin of murder of Zechariah: because her blood was in the midst of her. The question: why were you exiled? is interjected between the two phrases to create the connection. Upon it, the antecedent of it is Israel.

F. Verse 7 (f) and verse 8 (i) are related in the story of Zechariah. her blood is in the midst of her is determined to be an allusion to the Court of Priests which is in the midst of Jerusalem; fury and vengeance are allusions to the vengeance for Zechariah's murder

Parallel material on Zechariah is found in Lamentations Rabbah Petihta 23, Pesiqta deRav Kahana Chapter 15, section 7, Lamentations Rabbah 2:4, Ecclesiastes Rabbah 3:16, Ecclesiastes Rabbah 10:4 and y. Taanit 4:5. A more complete analysis of the Zechariah story is presented below in my section on Petihta 23.

Each of the versions of the Zechariah story is woven into the various contexts in a different way. In this case, the serial exegesis of the Ezekiel verses leads to the designation of the Court of Priests as being the site of the murder in the midst of her. In the other contexts this Ezekiel verse is a prooftext. Here its position as a prooftext is maintained, and it also functions as the

exegetical verse. Whether or not this was the original context is unclear. Most likely there was a developed oral tradition about Zechariah's murder which has found its way into the several edited texts in different but related ways. All other versions continue with additional details about the aftermath of the murder while this version only contains the material pertinent to the exegesis of Ezekiel.

G. Metaphor: bonfire = retribution.

H. - J. petirot which could be read together.

K. preparing the mixture: Another situational application attributed to several rabbis. Mixture is a metaphor for Israel. God prepares the mixture for Nebuchadnezzar. Israel assumes that Nebuchadnezzar is not interested in conquering them but God arranges matters so that he will be. God directs the campaign of Nebuchadnezzar against Israel.

L. Material associated with K may have been inserted here because of mention of spices in K, or this could be an additional comment on the serial exegesis of Ezekiel.

M. This is the only piece of *לִנְנוּ* in the face of all the gory predictions. Although Nebuchadnezzar and retribution will come, the exile will not be permanent, the

vessel can be restored.

N. This is just a quotation of the last verse of Ezekiel 24:11, ending the exegesis with a direct quotation from the verse.

There is no transition to the ending. The formulaic Lamentations Rabbah ending seems to be appended by the editor, however all of the themes in the exegesis are reflected in this ending. Read: When they sinned by murdering Zechariah, they were exiled...

Essay

Is Petihta 5 an exegetical anthology on Ezekiel 24:6-11 or is it an integral unit? The structure is a serial exegesis on the verses from Ezekiel, utilizing various homiletical techniques with the formulaic ending common to many petihtot in Lamentations Rabbah. Although this material is not recorded in any other document, it could have existed previously as independent exegesis on Ezekiel. In this document other materials could have been added to editorially create the petihta, with the formulaic Lamentations Rabbah ending tacked on at the end.

On the other hand, there is a unity of theme throughout the exegesis, with the exception of a few digressions, arguing for the piece being at some point an integral unit. The theme is the familiar one of sin and retribution, which

is neatly summed up in the formulaic ending.

Editorial activity is obvious in both alternatives because of the use of the formulaic ending.

The exegesis proceeds as follows: the first few phrases are merely paraphrased in Aramaic. Woe will come from Me to the city in which they spill blood could be a separate Targum-type comment referring to the general sinful nature of the inhabitants of Jerusalem or it could be a specific reference to the Zechariah story, which is found below.

The next element in the serial exegesis views bring it out piece by piece as a metaphor for the way in which God exiled the tribes of Israel, exile clearly being one of the themes of the petihta as a whole. The following dispute between R. Eleazar and R. Samuel b. Nahman probably existed as a separate unit related to the prooftext Isaiah 8:23. It was inserted here as an elaboration on how the tribe-by-tribe exile was carried out, but is not necessary part of the serial exegesis. The comment by R. Abba b. Kahana on the continuation of the prooftext provides additional evidence that this piece existed prior to the creation of this petihta. This comment bears no thematic relationship rather it seems to have been associated with above materials prior to final redaction here.

The serial exegesis continues with the next phrase of Ezekiel 24:6 no lot has fallen upon it. Referring back to the comment on bring it out piece by piece, the lot is determined to have to do with the exile of Israel. R. Nahman gives a situational application which relates the idea of exile to that of no lots falling metaphorically upon Israel. The concept here is that Israel was exiled for a reason, not as a result of the casting of lots by chance. From here the introduction to the Zechariah story seems to follow quite logically. If Israel was not exiled by chance, then there must be a reason. The reason is indicated in verse 7: Because her blood is in the midst of her. Whose blood? Zechariah's, of course. Thus Israel is exiled not because a lot has been cast but because of their sin, specifically the sin of the murder of Zechariah. Although the Zechariah story does exist independently of this passage, it is well-integrated here. From the exegesis on no lot has fallen to fury to come up (Ezekiel, 24:8) we have an integral homiletical unit. This could have existed independently, or is part of the whole petihta as an integral unit--or prior serial exegesis, or is the result of some fine editor at work.

The serial exegesis continues with another Aramaic paraphrase and then a petira on three phrases, which can

and should be read as a unit: "I will increase the retribution by bringing on the legions and the kings so that the community may be destroyed."

The comment on preparing the mixture understands mixture as a metaphor for Israel. A continuation of the petira could have read: "this is Israel." Another situational application attributed to R. Joshua and R. Nahman elaborates on this metaphor. Nebuchadnezzar attacked Israel because God made their wealth attractive to him. The message here provides further support for the idea that the exile was not a chance occurrence, rather it was the result of the hand of God.

The next section attributed to R. Eleazar deviates from the theme of sin and retribution by offering a n^ehemba. However, as it is near the end of the piece, perhaps it follows the rule that we should end on a positive note. It functions as the close of the exegetical unit before 'eykhah is tacked on.

The exegesis ends with a quotation of the last phrase of the exegetical verses which seems to have no relationship with R. Eleazar's comment above. The tone is once again one of violent punishment through destruction. Perhaps this functions as a kind of peroration because of the transition phrase of "to what end?"

The formulaic ending is then appended to comport with the redactional context to create a formal petihta out of exegeses on Ezekiel 24:6-11.

This material can be read as in integral unit with the overall theme of sin and retribution. Zechariah's murder representing the sin of Israel, juxtaposed with the petira about God bringing on the legions and foreign kings form a middah k^cneged middah exposition. Exile was not a chance occurrence, rather it was God's plan of retribution for Israel's sin. God has the power to make the conquering of Israel an attractive objective for Nebuchadnezzar--thus executing the retribution. The message of R. Joshua and R. Nahman's situational application is: Israel should not be so self-assured. They have sinned and now God is in control of the inevitable punishment of destruction and exile.

With the exception of the metaphoric elaboration about the tribes of R. Eleazar and R. Samuel b. Nahman and the nehemta', the message of this petihta as a whole could be distilled thus: "Woe to Jerusalem, because it was the site of Israel's sin. God will exile Israel district by district. The exile was not merely as a result of chance, it came about as punishment for the murder of Zechariah, which took place in the Court of Priests in the center of

Jerusalem ("her blood is in the midst of her"). Their sin was further magnified by their not covering his blood with dust as is required of a sacrifice. Therefore vengeance is being taken against Jerusalem. God brings on the retribution by sending in the legions and inciting the kings to destroy the community of Israel. God will entice Nebuchadnezzar to attack Israel.

Translation

(אברהם דמה גמיה) (היום לבדחה)
 (גמיה דמה גמיה) (היום לבדחה)
 (היום לבדחה)

R. Abbahu in the name of R. Yosi bar Hanina patah:

1. "Ephraim shall be desolate."

2. When? "In the day of rebuke." כחה :

the day when the Holy One blessed be He will כחה
 dispute with them in judgment.

You find that at the time when the tribes were exiled,
 Judah and Benjamin were not exiled.

1. The ten tribes would ask:

a. Why did He exile us and not exile them?

b. [Perhaps it is] because they are the residents
 of his palace.

c. Perhaps there is partiality here?

2. God forbid! There is no partiality! Rather they
 still had not sinned. When they did sin, He exiled them.

3. The ten tribes said:

a. O our God, O our God, O Strong One, O Strong
 One, O Truth, O Truth.

b. Even towards the children of His house He shows

no favoritism.

When they sinned, they were exiled, when they were exiled, Jeremiah mourned 'eykhah.

Outline

A. R. Abbahu in the name of R. Yossi bar Hanina patah:

1. (a) of verse.

2. when? (b) of verse; play on words.

B. 'at mose' introduces maaseh illustrating (a), (b) and (c) of verse.

1. questions by protagonist.

a. evidence of premise.

b. proposed reason after premise.

c. accusation.

2. denial of 1 (a), (b) and (c), God's reason is otherwise; evidence for God's justice; illustration of (c) of verse (without quoting it).

3. affirmation by protagonist.

a. praise of God.

b. admission that premise if wrong.

Formulaic ending.

Notes

No parallels.

Hosea 5:9 parsed thus: 1.(a) when? (b) 2. maaseh illustrating (c).

A. 1. Ephraim: the ten tribes.

נִסְחָה - נִסְחָה the verb is read in the
hitpael thus meaning dispute instead of rebuke, implicit
'al taqri/

in judgment: The dispute was over the justice of
God. Did He show partiality or is He a just God?

B. 1. 'at mose': provides the setting for the dispute
between the ten tribes and Israel.

residents of His palace: since the tribes of Judah
and Benjamin reside in the regio of the Temple, perhaps
God shows partiality towards them.

2. Rather they still had not sinned: this is the
illustration of (c) of the verse, though it is not cited
here. God informs the ten tribes of what is really going
on. God establishes Himself as a fair judge.

When they did sin, they were exiled: This phrase is
repeated in the formulaic Lamentations Rabbah ending.

3. O our God...O Truth: exaggeration which emphasizes
the extent of the error committed by the tribes.

Essay

The formulaic Lamentations Rabbah ending: "when they
sinned, they were exiled, when they were exiled, Jeremiah
began to mourn over them נִסְחָה " controls the develop-
ment of petihta 6. The phrase "when they sinned, they were

exiled" is actually an integral part of the ma'aseh. This is the only case in the petihta section of Lamentations Rabbah where the formulaic ending actually may have influenced the development of the homiletical material rather than simply serving as a summary of the theme, seemingly tacked on by the editor to accommodate it to Lamentations Rabbah.

The theme is the familiar one of sin and exile. The relationship between them is designated here as absolutely contingent. When Israel sins, they are exiled. God exercises absolute justice, partiality has no place in God's just system.

The petihta verse is understood as follows: The ten tribes shall be remorseful in the day of their dispute with God, in which God makes known to them His absolute justice. Thus la'smah is understood as remorseful, illustrated in the ma'aseh by the tribes exclaiming "O our God, O Strong One, O Truth." "Tokhahah" through a play on the root is understood as "dispute" illustrated by the dispute between the tribes and God; they claim He shows favoritism, and He claims that He is just. "nodati ne'emanah" is illustrated by God's answer that when Judah and Benjamin sin, they will be exiled. In the ma'aseh, God enables the tribes to look forward in time to see that Judah and Benjamin will

receive justice.

The structure of the petihta is a simple exegesis on Hosea 5:9. After (b) is explained as an implicit 'al taqvi, all three phrases of the verse can be illustrated in a ma'aseh which adheres closely to the verse. The ending incorporates a quotation which is the lesson of the ma'aseh and links it to Jeremiah's mourning over the exiled people the traditional lament of 'eykhah.

Translation

(pen ^(d) ^(c) ^(b) ^(a)
(^(d) ^(c) ^(b) ^(a)) (^(d) ^(c) ^(b) ^(a)) (^(d) ^(c) ^(b) ^(a)) (^(d) ^(c) ^(b) ^(a))
(^(d) ^(c) ^(b) ^(a))

R. Abbahu in the name of R. Yossi bar Hanina patah:

"And her gates shall lament and mourn and utterly bereft
she shall sit on the ground." (Isaiah, 3:26)

A. Aninah is internal and abilah is external.

B. Her gates: the first destruction and the second destruction.

C. utterly bereft: bereft of words of Torah, bereft of words of prophecy, bereft of righteous people, bereft of misvot and good works.

D. Thus she shall sit on the ground. "They sit upon the ground and keep silence, elders of the daughters of Zion."
(Lamentations 2:10)

E. "How does the city sit alone."

Outline

R. Abbahu patah: Isaiah 3:26.

A. in (a) of verse differentiation between two apparent synonyms.

B. exegesis of (b) significance of plural form.

- C. exegesis of (c) filling in object of adjectival phrase.
- D. heqesh of (d) to Lamentations 2:10.
- E. then heqesh to Lamentations 1:1.

Notes

1. 'aninah is internal: There can be no redundancy in Scripture, so the Midrash distinguishes between synonyms. Reference to halakhic materials in b. Sanhedrin 46b;

לדל הן נאמרה וכן נאמרה
הן נאמרה וכן נאמרה

2. her gates: This is an explanation of the plural form.

3. bereft of ...: A filling out of the ellipsis by forming an adjectival phrase with stereotypical direct objects. See petihta 1, C and E.

4. they shall sit: (d) is related by heqesh to a verse in Lamentations, 2:10, and subsequently to Lamentations 1:1.

Essay

This short petihta offers an exegesis of a verse in Isaiah which bears a thematic relationship to 'Eykhah.

In this verse, mourning is associated with Jerusalem just as in the entire Book of Lamentations. The relationship is established between the petihta verse (Isaiah 3:26) and Lamentations 2:10 by means of heqesh. Both refer to sitting on the ground as a mourning practice. Lamentations 2:10 could neatly serve as the seder verse. Lamentations 1:1 also has the verb yašab providing an additional heqesh which adapts the petihta to Lamentations Rabbah.

Before the heqesh is established as a comment on phrase (d), there is a serial exegesis on (a), (b) and (c). In (a), a distinction is made between two seemingly synonymous terms of mourning. In b. Sanhedrin 46b 'aninut is characterized as the specific term to describe internal mourning rather than the outward signs of mourning. (Subsequent halakhic texts draw the distinction between 'aninut and 'abelut.) The principle in the exegesis is that no words are extraneous in Scripture; therefore a difference between the two seemingly synonymous terms must be found.

A similar principle is involved in the exegesis of (b). The plural form of "gates" is deemed to refer to two separate occasions which prompted mourning: the first des-

truction and the second destruction. The plural form could not just be left as an incidental detail; it gives rise to a midrashic interpretation.

A familiar pattern is observed in the exegesis of (c). An adjective is perceived to be elliptical, requiring its completion in an adjectival phrase. In petihta 1, the same technique is applied to both adjectives and adverbs. The direct objects of the phrases in the two examples of expansions in petihta 1 and the one example here all reflect typical rabbinic values.

The establishment of a heqesh between Isaiah 3:26 and Lamentations 2:10 involves an analogy of context as well as of phrase. In Isaiah chapter 3, there is a denunciation of the daughters of Zion for their haughtiness, a description of their subsequent punishment by removal of their finery, and their mourning for their loss. Lamentations 2:9 also deals with the mourning of the daughters of Zion.

This petihta does not follow the general thematic pattern of sin and retribution which we have observed in the previous petihtot in Lamentations Rabbah. The theme is strictly that of mourning, mourning for the destruction of Jerusalem by one who is utterly bereft of any hope or any positive values in their lives.

Translation

(לכ' קול נבי' נשמע בן ציון)
(אין קול נבי' נשמע בן ציון)
(בגלל חטאנו כי עזבנו את הארץ)
(כי העבירנו את אלהינו אל זרים) (ויכניח את ידו על עיניו)

R. Isaac patah: for a voice of wailing is heard out of Zion: "How we are undone! We are greatly ashamed because we have forsaken the land. Because our dwellings have cast us out." (Jeremiah, 9:18)

A 1. a. Indeed, can trees weep and can stones weep that you say, "the voice of wailing is heard in Zion"?

b. Rather, it [the sound] comes from the One who causes His presence to dwell in Zion.

2. How are we undone? How did this happen to us? From spoilers.

3. We are greatly ashamed because we have forsaken the land. That is the land of Israel, as it is written, "the land which the Lord God cares for." (Deuteronomy, 11:12)

4. Because our dwellings have cast us out: these are the synagogues and houses of study.

B. Another interpretation:

1. We are greatly ashamed because we have forsaken the land. These are the words of Torah of which it is said, "the measure thereof is longer than the earth." (Job, 11:9).

2. Because our dwellings have cast us out. These are the synagogues and houses of study.

C. Another interpretation:

1. We are greatly ashamed because we have forsaken the land. This is the Temple of which it says, "and from the bottom of the ground to the lower settle." (Ezekiel, 43:14)

2. Because our dwellings have cast us out. The destruction of the First Temple and the destruction of the Second Temple.

When they sinned, they were exiled, when they were exiled Jeremiah mourned for them, 'eykhah.

Outline

A. Serial exegesis of Jeremiah, 9:18.

1. Who is the subject of (a)?

a. rhetorical question beginning with vkhy?

b. answer beginning with 'ela.

2. Aramaic paraphrase converting exclamation (b) in-

to a question; ellipsis of question given as answer.

3. petira (c) plus prooftext.

4. petira (d) no prooftext.

B. Alternate exegesis of (c) and (d).

1. petira plus prooftext.

2. petira (same as A4).

C. Alternate exegesis of (c) and (d).

1. petira plus prooftext.

2. plural form given two antecedents.

Formulaic ending.

Notes

A. 1. a. Can trees weep and can stones weep: a rhetorical question based on the understanding of Zion as a physical place which is currently depopulated. The rhetorical question uses the vkhy--'ela formula. Can inanimate objects have a voice, can they wail? Obviously not, rather it is God Who dwells there who wails.

2. The exclamation is converted into a question and subsequently answered.

3. the land is understood obviously as the Land of Israel in a petira plus a prooftext (Deuteronomy, 11:12).

B. Only (c) and (d) of the verse are objects of exegesis.

1. words of Torah: This petira on land understands

it metaphorically. Since there is a relationship between the greatness of Torah and the measure of the land in Job 11:9, it follows that land could metaphorically refer to Torah.

C. 1. This petira is also established through heqesh. Land metaphorically refers to the Temple, by interpreting Ezekiel 43:14.

Essay

Petihta 8 consists of an exegesis on the first two phrases of Jeremiah 9:18 and three alternate interpretations of the last two stichs of the verse.

The voice of wailing is determined to refer to God's voice. Since the city of Jerusalem is depopulated, and stones cannot cry, the voice must be God's. As in petihta 2a, God is mourning for Israel.

Each of the exegeses of the latter half of the verse offers a reason for the wailing heard from Zion, which contextually we know to be the mourning after the destruction and exile. Thus each exegesis suggests that the verse implies a specific sin which brought about the exile. The phrase "azabnu 'eres" as elaborated through these petirot indicates the sins which prompted the exile.

In exegesis A, forsaking the land is understood li-

terally. 'Ereš signifies the Land of Israel. Thus forsaking the Land of Israel, promised to us in God's covenant with Abraham, was the sin which led to exile.

In exegesis B, forsaking the land is expressed through a petira as an elliptical metaphor for forsaking the study of Torah. In Job 11:9 there is a relationship between the greatness of the word of God (Torah) and the measure of the land. Therefore in this verse land is understood as a metaphor for Torah, by means of a heqesh. The petira on the next phrase establishes that dwellings refer to the synagogues and schools. This further modifies the forsaking of Torah: forsaking the Torah in the synagogues and schools means forsaking the study of Torah. This elevation of the rabbinic enterprise of Torah study to the primary sin responsible for the exile is a theme we saw in petihta 2. While in the Scriptural verse, literally interpreted, the wrongdoing is forsaking the covenantal Land of Israel, for the rabbis, the wrongdoing is forsaking the study of Torah.

Another rabbinic understanding of the sin which prompted the wailing for the exile is demonstrated in the third exegesis. Here, a petira shows that 'ereš implies the Temple. Again, the prooftext establishes the

relationship of 'eres to this metaphoric understanding by means of a heqesh.

'Eres implies the Temple. We know how important the concept of the Temple cult was to the rabbis. The forsaking of it leads to the casting out of our dwellings, understood as the destruction of the First Temple and Second Temple.

Thus exegesis A defines the sin as forsaking the Land of Israel, exegesis B defines it as forsaking the study of Torah, exegesis C defines it as forsaking the Temple Cult which leads to the destruction.

The formulaic ending is thematically appropriate, relating sin and retribution, but it is clearly an artificial editorial appendage.

Translation

(בַּיָּמֵינוּ כִּי שָׁמַעְנוּ חִרְפָּה) (כְּסִגְמָה כְּלָמֶה פָּנֵינוּ)
 (כִּי בָּאָה זָרוֹת עַל מִקְדָּשׁ ה' בִּירֵא) (יִרְשָׁה זָרֵינוּ)

R. Isaac patah: "We are ashamed because we have heard (slander), disgrace covered our faces because strangers have come upon the sanctuaries of the Lord's house." (Jeremiah, 51:51)

A. 1. You find that at the time when the enemies of Israel entered Jerusalem, the Ammonites and the Moabites entered with them, as it is said: "the adversary has spread out his hand upon all her treasures; for she has seen that the heathen are entered into her sanctuary concerning whom Thou did command that they should not enter in Thy congregation." (Lamentations, 1:10)

2. a. They entered the House of the Holy of Holies and found there the cherubim, took them and put them into a box, carried them around the streets of Jerusalem and said: Had you not said that this nation was not idolatrous? Look--see what we found which belongs to them, that which they had worshipped.

b. Thus all natures (divinities) are the same, as

it is written: "Because Moab and Seir do say: behold the house of Jacob is like the nations" (Ezekiel, 25:8).

3. At that time the Holy One, Blessed be He swore that He would exterminate them from the world, as it is written "[I have heard the taunt of Moab and the reviling of the children of Ammon wherewith they have scorned My people and have spoken boastfully concerning their border]. Therefore as I live, says the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, surely Moab shall be as Sodom and the sons of Ammon as Gemorah" (Zephaniah, 2:8-9).

When they sinned they were exiled, when they were exiled Jeremiah mourned over them, 'eykhah.

B. Another interpretation.

1. "We are ashamed because we have heard reproach."
This is the seventeenth of Tamuz.
2. Disgrace covered our faces: this is the ninth of Av.
3. For strangers are coming into the sanctuaries of the Lord's house: the first destruction and the second destruction.

When they sinned they were exiled, when they were exiled, Jeremiah mourned over them, 'eykhah.

Outline

R. Isaac patah: Jeremiah, 51:51.

- A. 1. 'at mose' situational application of petihta verse
(c); prooftext applying to both A1 and A2.
2. a. continuation of above story explaining (a).
b. erroneous conclusion plus prooftext.
3. God's response to erroneous conclusion; proof-
text reflecting middah k'neged middah; prooftext related
to petihta verse through heqesh. Formulaic Lamentations
Rabbah ending.

B. Alternative serial exegesis of petihta verse.

1. petira on (a), when (a) occurred.
2. petira on (b), when (b) occurred.
3. explanation of plural form.

Formulaic ending.

Notes

Parallel: Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa 19 'Anokhi.

R. Isaac patah: We are ashamed: in Pesiqta deRav Ka-
hane the petihta verse is Isaiah 69:21 rather than Jeremiah
51. The word herpah appears in both these verses as
well as in Zephaniah 2:8, so in both Pesiqta deRav Kahana
and Lamentations Rabbah the exegetical link is a heqesh.
However, contextually, the Jeremiah verse fits perfectly

with the situational application. The situational application is an exegesis on this verse, while in Pesiqta deRav Kahana, the Isaiah verse seems secondary to the story.

A. 1. You find that: this is an 'at mose' situational application. 'At mose' is defined by Bacher as an elaboration of a Scriptural verse. In this case the elaboration is a lengthy story which comprises most of the body of the petihta.

Ammonites and Moabites: these are mentioned in particular because in the prooftext which concludes the story, Zephaniah 2:8-9, Moab and Ammon are the objects of God's anger.

the adversary has spread: this prooftext is not found in the Pesiqta deRav Kahana version. It may have been inserted here because the verse is from Lamentations. As a prooftext it fits very well with the story and introduces the next paragraph with its mention of treasures. This verse could have been the exegetical verse upon which the story is based, were it not for the heqesh on herpah.

2. a. put them into a klibah: Buber suggests that this should be k^elikhah, and that the connotation is "bier."

b. Thus all natures: According to Jastrow, this

is a proverbial expression of distrust in God. This phrase is not found in Pesiqta deRav Kahana. Instead the phrase "vay vay kulan k^ehadah" is found in Pesiqta deRav Kahana, seemingly out of place, several lines down.

Because Moab and Seir: This verse fits well here as the taunt of the Moabites and Ammonites. In context in Ezekiel it refers to the Israelites' vulnerability to military conquest.

3. The Holy One...exterminates: God was angry at the Moabites and Ammonites for destroying the Temple and for accusing the Israelites of idolatry.

[I have heard...border] Buber inserts Zephaniah 2:8 because the heqesh of herpah is spelled out here. In Pesiqta deRav Kahana, Zephaniah 2:8 and 9 are cited. The passage in Pesiqta deRav Kahana ends here.

When they sinned: The formulaic Lamentations Rabbah ending is totally out of place here. This is not the end of the petihta, only the end of the first exegesis on this verse. The formulaic ending does not even summarize the themes above. Its misplacement here provides some evidence that it may also be artificial as the ending of other petihtot.

B. Another interpretation: Here is a separate exegesis on

Jeremiah 51:51. All three phrases are parsed with peti-
rot.

We are ashamed: When did we hear reproach? On the
seventeenth of Tamuz.

Disgrace: When were we disgraced? on the ninth of
Av.

Strangers: When did strangers come in to the Lord's
house? during the first and second destructions. The
plural mikdashay demands two antecedents thus: the first
and second destructions. All of these are systematic
parsing: filling in the "time frame."

Essay

Two separate exegeses of verse Jeremiah 51:51 are
wedded together to form this petihta. The exegeses are
independent both thematically and stylistically.

The first understands the verse through a heqesh
with Zephaniah 2:8-9. A situational application preceded
by the formula 'at mose' introduces a story which ingenious-
ly ties together the two verses. In Jeremiah 51:51, stran-
gers enter the Temple. In Zephaniah 2:8, Moab and Ammon
are the foreign nations mentioned. Thus in the situational
application story, it is specifically the Ammonites and
Moabites who enter the Holy of Holies. In Jeremiah 51:51

the Israelites hear slander, and in Zephaniah 2:8, both Moab and Ammon have taunted and reviled Israel. Thus in the story, Moab and Ammon accuse the Israelites of idolatry, the height of slanderousness.

The other prooftexts cited in the story are tightly woven into the narrative. Their relationship to the story is not tangential as we sometimes see elsewhere. Instead they seem to suggest the other details of the story not already suggested by Jeremiah 51:51 and Zephaniah 2:8-9. In Lamentations 1:10 the adversary spread out his hand upon her treasures when he entered the sanctuary.

Thus in the story, the Moabites and Ammonites removed the cherubim, obviously made of fine materials, and sacred objects of Temple worship. In Ezekiel 125:8, Moab and Seir say: Israel is like all the other nations. Thus in the story, the Moabites and Ammonites accuse Israel of being idolatrous like the other nations.

The exposition is governed by the concept of middah k'neged middah. Just as the Moabites and Ammonites slandered Israel and desecrated the Holy of Holies, God will destroy them like Sodom and Gemorah. Using the heqesh of herpah: just as the Moabites and Ammonites have shamed Israel (Jeremiah, 51:51), God will shame them (Zephaniah, 2:8-9).

This story preceded by the petihta verse Jeremiah 51:51 and ending with the Zephaniah verse form a well-integrated petihta based on a heqesh. The seder verse should be of course Zephaniah 2:8-9, not Lamentations 1:1. The version in Pesiqta deRav Kahana does not begin with the same petihta verse, nor does it contain Lamentations 1:10 as a prooftext. Thus the story does not fit so neatly with the Scriptural prooftexts. However, the material does end with the Zephaniah verses, comprising an exegetical unit.

In Lamentations Rabbah, following the citation of Zephaniah 2:8-9, the formulaic Lamentations Rabbah ending is inserted. It is totally out of place here, except as an indication that one exegesis is finished. The formulaic ending does not even summarize the themes above, as in many petihtot in Lamentations Rabbah. Its misplacement here provides some evidence that it may be artificially placed elsewhere as the ending to other petihtot.

A separate exegesis on Jeremiah 51:51 parses each of the three phrases through petirot answering the question "when?" It is a straightforward serial exegesis, followed by the formulaic Lamentations Rabbah ending. With the allusion to destruction of the Temples, the

formulaic ending is somewhat appropriate, providing a reason for the destruction. However, its location here is, as usual, probably an editorial construction to adapt the exegesis to this document.

Translation

(אכא^a אלל קראת יעקב) (כי יגעט בי יסראל)
 (אכא^c הגטל די עה עכא^dט) (אנצחיק אכא דבדמני)
 (אכא^e קניג די גנפ קנה) (אחכ^f זבחיק אכא הוואני)
 (אמ^g העבדמני בחטאלמ) (והא^h עמני בעלמני)
 (אכאⁱ העבדמני במנה) (אכא^j האלעגיק גכאני)
 (יעזיב אלל: דם)

R. Yitzhak patah: Yet you have not called upon me
O Jacob because (but) you have been weary of Me, O Is-
rael. (Isaiah, 43:22)

A. 1. R. Yohanan derives the meaning of this from ano-
 ther passage: The burden of Damascus. Behold Damascus
is taken away from being a city, and it shall be a ruinous
heap. The cities of Aroer are forsaken (Isaiah, 17:1).

a. He stands in Damascus and recalls Aroer. Is
 not Aroer in the region of Moab?

b. Rather there are 365 idolatrous houses of

worship in Damascus, in each one they worshipped [its god] once a year. There was a day in which they all were worshipped on the same day.

c. Israel made a unity of all of them and worshipped them. As it is written: "and the children of Israel again did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord and worshipped the Baalim and Ashtaroth and gods of Aran, gods of Zidon and gods of Moab and gods of the children of the Philistines and they forsook the Lord and served Him not" (Judges, 10:6).

2. (Judges, 10:6) not even together [with the other gods].

a. Said R. Abba bar Kahana: Should not a priest's wife be [treated] like [i.e., as least as well as] an innkeeper's wife?

b. Said R. Yossi bar Hanina: Would that My children treat Me like the dessert which comes at the end!

c. Said R. Yudan: A mashal of a king's servant who made a feast and invited all the members of his community and did not invite his master. The king said: Would that my servant considered me at least equal to the members of his community.

Thus says the Holy One, Praised be He: would that

my children considered Me at least equal to this dessert which comes at the end rather: "You have not called upon Me, O Jacob" (Isaiah, 43:22).

B. ("...But you have been weary of Me, O Israel (Isaiah, 43:22))

1. a. One stands idly looking out for business all day and does not weary.

b. But to stand and pray to Me, you are weary.

2 a. One stands idly looking for business all day and does not weary.

b. But if his friend says to him "come and pray" he says "I cannot."

3. a. Concerning Baal what is written? "They called the name of Baal from morning until noon saying: 'Baal, answer us.' But there was no voice, nor any that answered. And they limped around the alter which they had made."

(1 Kings, 18:26) "Oh, yet you have not called upon me, O Jacob!"

b. Would that I had known you, Jacob! Why? Be-
cause You have been weary of Me, O Israel (Isaiah, 43:22)
You have not brought Me the small cattle of your burnt of-
ferings, neither have you honored Me with your sacrifices.
I have not burdened you with a meal offering nor wearied

you with frankincense. You have bought me no sweet cane with money. Neither have you satisfied Me with the fat of your sacrifices. But you have burdened Me with your sins and wearied Me with your iniquities (Isaiah, 43:23-24).

1. You have not brought me the small cattle of Thy burnt offerings: the two continual offerings which were brought each day, as it is written: The one lamb shall you offer in the morning and the other lamb at dusk (Numbers, 28:4).

2. Neither have you honored me with your sacrifices, these are Most Holy Things.

3. I have not burdened you with a meal offering: + this is the handful of flour for the meal offering.

4. Nor wearied you with the frankincense: this is the handful of frankincense.

5. You have not bought me sweet cane with money:
R. Huna in the name of R. Joseph said: Cinnamon used to grow in Israel and goats and hinds ate it.

6. Neither have you satisfied me with the fat of your sacrifices: these are the fatty parts of the Lesser Holy Things.

7. But you have burdened Me with your sins, you have

wearied Me with your iniquities. See what your iniquities have caused Me to do: to burn My house and destroy My city and exile My children among the nations of the world, and to sit solitary by Myself eykhah.

Outline

R. Isaac patah: Isaiah 43:22.

A. 1. R. Yohanan introduces another passage (Isaiah, 17:1) through which he can derive the meaning of (a) of petihta verse.

a. question about locations mentioned in A.

b. situational application which will explain Isaiah 17:1, and answer question in A1 by referring to another proof-text, Judges 10:6.

2. Repeat proof-text above (Judges, 10:6) plus additional conclusion.

a. Abba b. Kahana: Mishnaic metaphoric saying based on 2.

b. Yossi b. Hanina: another metaphoric saying based on 2.

c. R. Yudah mashal l^emelekh--conclusion 2b, 'ela petihta verse (a).

B. Three contrastive elucidations of (b) of petihta verse.

1. a. for secular you do this

- b. for God you won't do this.
- 2. a. for secular you do this
 - b. for God you won't do this.
- 3. a. for idolatry you do this plus prooftext.
 - b. condemnation of Israel plus petihta verse (b).
- C. Serial exegesis of petihta verse (c) - (j).
 - 1. (c) petira plus prooftext.
 - 2. (d) petira.
 - 3. petira on (e).
 - 4. petira on (f).
 - 5. R. Huna: (g) is prooftext for elliptical example.
 - 6. petira on (h).
 - 7. Because of (i) and (j)--God did X transition to seder verse.

Notes

R. Yohanan derives the meaning. According to Bacher
šma: to derive meaning from a passage from another pas-
sage.

- 1. We stands in Damascus and recalls Aroer. Why
does Isaiah refer to both Damascus and Aroer in one verse?
The connection between the two places is that idolatry is
practiced in both as demonstrated in Judges 10:6 below.

That Arceer is in the region of Moab, we know from Jeremiah 48:19.

2. b. Israel made a unity. Buber suggests that the proper reading should be לֹא יִלְחָדוּ not לֹא יִלְחָדוּ. Jastrow agrees and translates it as concord or union.

Judges 10:6 prooftext which shows that Israel worshipped all the gods of every nation gives rise to the narrative about 365 gods.

3. repeat Judges 10:6 in order to understand the following comments Judges 10:6 is repeated with an interpolated clause. Thus it reads: "...they forsook the Lord and served Him not, not even together with other gods." This is the motif illustrated below, that not only did Israel worship the other gods, they did not worship God at all.

a. should not a priest's wife? b. Yebamot 122a. In this context, it means that Israel treated the gods of the nations (innkeeper's wife) better than God (priest's wife). It supports the above statement: they served Him (the Lord) not, not even together with the other gods.

b. Would that...like the dessert: Another saying with the same metaphoric meaning as above. This saying is derived from the mashal l'melekh which follows. This

saying is attributed to R. Yossi b. Hanina, while the ma-shal is attributed to R. Yudan.

c. In this mashal king's servant = Israel, all the members of the community = gods of nations, king = God. In the nimshal God refers to the dessert. Just as the king's servant did not invite the king, so Israel worships the gods but doesn't even worship God as an afterthought or dessert. The petihta verse is the conclusion of the nimshal: you have not called upon Me corresponds to "you did not invite Me to the feast."

B. This is an exegesis on (b) of the petihta verse, although it is not quoted here. Three contrastive elucidations are brought. The first two in Aramaic deal with everyday life as contrasted to worship. The third deals with idol worship as contrasted to worship of God and includes a proof-text I Kings 18:26.

C. Serial exegesis on Isaiah 43:23-24. All these petirot deal with the neglect of the cultic ritual by Israel.

5. deviates from the pattern of petirot. This line appears in Genesis Rabbah 65:17 in a totally different context. The statement is elliptical here. In expanded form, the connotation is: although cinnamon used to grow wild in Israel, and was so prevalent that goats and hinds ate

it, Israel did not gather it and bring it to the Temple for ritual purposes, as it is said, "you have not bought me sweet cane with money."

7. You have wearied Me with your iniquities. God continues in an accusing tone squarely placing the blame on Israel for sinning, thus forcing God to destroy Jerusalem and exile Israel and remain alone. Good transition to the ending.

Essay

In petihta 10, a serial exegesis of Isaiah 43:22-24 is divided into three distinct sections, each governed by a single homiletical technique. Although the sections could each stand alone, and indeed may have existed independently, the petihta works as an integrated exegesis leading smoothly into the sedar verse of Lamentations 1:1. The overriding theme of the idolatrous practices of Israel and disregard for the Temple cult is integrated to the petihta as a whole. The transition to Lamentations 1:1 is an extension of the exegesis on the last phrases of Isaiah 43:24. Although it does introduce the new theme of punishment for sin (the standard theme for Lamentations Rabbah) the literary transition does not seem

forced as it does in many other petihtot.

Looking at each of the sections separately we become aware of the different methods the rabbis used to manipulate Scripture to yield the message they sought.

In the first section, A, another verse (Isaiah 17:1) is immediately brought by R. Yohanan, introduced by the formula âma' m'hadan gere', implying that the meaning of the first verse can be derived from the second. That is not immediately clear since Isaiah 17:1 does not seem to shed any light on the understanding of Isaiah 43:22. However, with the juxtaposition of still another verse (Judges, 10:6), a situational application ties all three verses together and delivers the message of the exegesis of Isaiah 43:22. Note: This "message" (that Israel has ignored worship of God in favor of idolatry) is not spelled out here but the implication is clear.

The structure of this situational application is similar to the one in petihta 9. Elements of all three Scriptural verses are woven into the narrative. The mention of Damascus in Isaiah 17:1 is reflected in the setting of the tale in Damascus. The lengthy list of the gods of other nations Israel allegedly worshipped cited in Judges 10:6 is reflected in the number 365. The phrase "they for-

sook the Lord and did not serve Him" in Judges 10:6 parallels the petihta verse "You have not called upon Me, O Jacob" and is reflected in the additional comment (recorded in the translation under A2) "not even together [with the other gods]."

An interesting element of the first section is the interjection of the question about the location of Aroer. Though at first, the question seems out of place and irrelevant, it does provide a link between Isaiah 17:1 and Judges 10:6. The mention of both Damascus and Aroer in the same verse, though their geographic locations are so distant, seems to be a problem. However, the situational application and prooftext of Judges 10:6 establishes that these idolatrous houses of worship in Damascus were consecrated to the gods of many nations, including Moab, where Aroer is located. Aroer is read as a metonymy for "Moabite idolatry." Thus the connection is established between the two verses.

Following the situational application about the 365 houses of worship, we find several sayings which express the motif of God not receiving the proper treatment, indeed not even receiving the same reverence as the other gods receive from Israel. The saying attributed to R.

Abba b. Kahana is found in Mishnah Yebamot. The second saying, attributed to R. Yossi b. Hanina, appears again as the metaphoric nimshal of the king mashal which follows (attributed to R. Yudan). The king mashal has the same theme, only now it is God who accuses Israel of ignoring Him, as expressed in the prooftext, "You have not called upon Me." From now until the end of the petihta, God becomes the narrator.

To summarize, the first section is an exegesis on (a) of the petihta verse, composed of 1. situational application involving the juxtaposition of three Scriptural verses and 2. a king mashal.

The second section is much shorter and simpler in its structure. Three contrastive elucidations of stich (b) of 43:22 are presented. In each, the salient idea is that Israel has energy and enthusiasm for other activities, but is too tired for worship of God. The first two examples are almost identical and reflect an every day situation which most likely occurred in rabbinic times-- that a merchant or laborer can find the energy to do his business all day long, yet has no strength or enthusiasm for prayer. (Human nature has not changed in this regard as we look at our contemporary situation.)

The third example is quite different. The theme of idolatry taking precedence over the worship of God is dominant here. Israel has the energy to worship Baal, but as in our petihta verse, "you have been weary of Me."

Thus the second section of exegesis presents three contrasts between Israel's behavior towards the secular and towards God.

The third section of exegesis consists primarily of petirot. The number of phrases being explained is much greater, eight in this short section. The petirot all refer to elements of the Temple cult which Israel has neglected.

The transition to Lamentations 1:1 is quite smooth, as mentioned above, and adds the thematic element of retribution to the developed concept of the sin of idolatry, thus filling out the thematic message: the sin of idolatry and disregard of the Temple Cult will result in the destruction of the Temple and exile.

Petihta 9 also deals with Israel and idolatry. In marked contrast to petihta 9, which exonerates Israel of the practice of idolatry, this petihta points an accusing finger at Israel for its idolatrous practices.

Mention should also be made of two theological mes-

sages in this petihta. In B3b, God exclaims: "Would that I had never known you, Jacob." This desire on the part of God to disown His people is found also in petihta 15. In the ending, God is left alone and He is the one who mourns Lamentations 1:1. We have seen this in petihta 2a, where God is left alone to mourn after all 12 sons die. God hurts Himself as well when He hurts Israel.

גמל אלהים על עבדך אל ה' אלהיך בשמחה
אלהים אלהיך אלהיך אלהיך
בגדלך

R. Isaac patah: "Because you did not serve the Lord thy God with joyfulness, and with gladness of heart by reason of the abundance of things, therefore you shall serve your enemy." (Deuteronomy, 28:47)

If you had been worthy But now that you are not
you would have read in the Torah: worthy, behold, you read:

א "You bring them in, and plant them in the mountain of your inheritance." (Exodus, 15:17) "Let all your wickedness come before you." (Lamentations, 1:22)

ב "The peoples have heard, they tremble." (Exodus 15:14) "They have heard that I sigh." (Lamentations, 1:21)

ג "I have surely seen the affliction of My people in Egypt." (Exodus, 3:7) "'See, O Lord for I am in distress my inwards burn." (Lamentations, 1:20)

ד "And you shall call on that same day." (Leviticus, 3:21) "I called for my lovers but they deceived me." (Lamentations, 1:19)

3 "Justice, justice shall you pursue." (Deuteronomy, 16:20)

o "You shall surely open your hand unto your brother." (Deuteronomy, 15:11)

8 "These are the appointed seasons of the Lord." (Leviticus, 23:4)

o "We will go up by the highways." וְעָלֵנוּ (Numbers, 20:19)

j "And I have broken bars of your yoke." (Leviticus, 26:13)

N "Fire shall be kept burning upon the altar continually." (Leviticus, 6:6)

8 "In all the way that you went." (Deuteronomy, 1:31)

o "And you shall eat your bread until you have enough." (Leviticus 26:5)

"The Lord is righteous for I have rebelled against His word." (Lamentations, 1:18)

"Zion has spread her hands." (Lamentations, 1:17)

"For these things I weep." (Lamentations, 1:16)

"The Lord has set at nothing וְעָלֵנוּ all the mighty." (Lamentations, 1:15)

"The yoke of my transgressions is impressed by His hand." (Lamentations, 1:14)

"From on high He sent fire into my bones." (Lamentations, 1:13)

"Let it come to you, all you who pass by the way." (Lamentations, 1:12)

"All her peoples sigh, they seek bread." (Lamentations 1:11)

- 1 "Neither shall any one covet your land." (Exodus, 34:24) "The adversary has spread out his hand upon all her coveted treasures." (Lamentations 1:10)
- 6 "For on this day, atone- ment shall be made for you to cleanse you." (Leviticus, 16:30) "Her filthiness was in her skirts." (Lamentations, 1:9)
- n "From all your sins, you shall be clean before the Lord." (Leviticus, 16:30) "Jerusalem has grievously sinned." (Lamentations, 1:8)
- 3 "And you shall be remem-bered before the Lord your God." (Numbers, 10:9) "Jerusalem remembers in the days of her affliction." (Lamentations, 1:7)
- 1 "I will walk among you." (Leviticus, 26:12) "And gone from the daughter of Zion is all her splendor." (Lamentations, 1:6)
- 7 "The Lord will make you the head." (Deuteronomy, 28:13) "Her adversaries are become the head, her enemies are at ease." (Lamentations, 1:5)
- 7 "Three times a year shall all your males appear before the Lord." (Deuteronomy, 16:16) "The streets of Zion do mourn." (Lamentations, 1:4)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>c "And you shall <u>dwell</u> in your land." (Leviticus, 26:5)</p> | <p>"Judah is gone into exile because of affliction." (Lamentations, 1:3)</p> |
| <p>2 "It was a <u>night</u> of watching with the Lord." (Exodus, 7:42)</p> | <p>"She surely weeps into the <u>night</u>." (Lamentations, 1:2)</p> |
| <p>lc "How can I myself bear this people, for they are <u>nu-merous</u>." (Deuteronomy, 1:12)</p> | <p>"How the city sits <u>solitary</u>." (Lamentations, 1:1)</p> |

Outline

Rabbi Isaac patah: Deuteronomy, 28:47.

If you had been worthy:
Pentateuchal verse related
to Lamentations verse
through heqash or homile-
tically.

But since you were not wor-
thy: Lamentations Chapter 1
in reverse order, verse by
verse.

Notes

Buber points out several of the juxtapositions in which the appropriate letter of the alphabet is not found. In the case of nun the Pentateuchal verse does not contain a nun, nor in the case of daled, gimel or bet. The heqash is derived from concepts and their opposites in these par-
allels, rather than from identical letters or words.

Essay

"In the entire petihta, not one piece of aggadah is found, only the accounting and listing, in reverse alphabetical order, of a Pentateuchal verse opposite a verse from Lamentations, Chapter 1." Thus Buber dismisses petihta 11 as "merely" an exercise in matching verses. What a brilliant rhetoric it took to find the appropriate Pentateuchal verses which correspond to the text in Lamentations! If we understand Midrash as being the homiletical manipulation of Scripture, this technique of creating a moral juxtaposition of verses is Midrash at its best.

The darshan reverses the order of the 22 verses in Lamentations, Chapter 1 and treats them as the consequence clause of the 'ilu zakhitem v^e akhsav selo' zakhitem exposition. Then Pentateuchal verses are found which contain a positive message balancing the negative one in the Lamentations verse. The heqesh between the contextually unrelated verses is formulated by means of identical words, synonymous words or similar concepts.

The first six pairs match not only in their content but each of the Pentateuchal verses begins with the appropriate letter as well.

As Buber points out, certain of the Pentateuchal

verses do not contain the key letter or word which makes the alphabetical heqesh. However the conceptual relationship between the verses is always clear. As in many texts, where the material is best in the beginning paragraphs or chapters, the best material here is at the beginning where the parallels contain all elements of the heqesh; identical letters and words as well as concepts.

By meshing the petihta verse with the second clause of the 'ilu zakhitem exposition, we read: But now that you are not worthy because you did not serve the Lord thy God with joyfulness and with gladness of heart, by reason of the abundance of all things, therefore you shall (serve) your enemy) read verses from Lamentations. Thus the second clause is an exegesis on the petihta verse.

The literary structure contrasts the positive promises made to Israel with their consequences when Israel does not prove to be worthy, and shows that God's justice is strictly measure for measure. All that occurs to Israel has its basis in Scripture. Worthiness determines that which Israel will read in the Torah, but it is all there to be read.

Although there is no exegesis of verses, nor aggadic elucidations, this piece does fulfill the formal require-

ments of a petihta. The petihta verse is understood through the body of material which leads to the seder verse. This is a genuine petihta to the Book of Lamentations, as it uses homiletically all 22 verses of the first chapter.

As usual the theme is sin and retribution. Since Israel sinned they were unworthy and thus could not benefit from the promises in the Pentateuch. Instead they were subject to retribution and must fulfill another part of the Bible by mourning Lamentations. The 'ilu zakhitem exposition is found also in petihta 23.

This petihta is unique among the petihtot of Lamentations Rabbah. It indulges in no moralizing, nor contains tangential rabbinic comments, nor serial exegesis as we have found in all the other petihtot. By mere juxtaposition of Pentateuchal and Lamentations verses according to a homiletical formula "if you had been worthy you would have read in the Torah X, but now that you are unworthy, you read Y," the darshan demonstrates that Scripture is oracular. The relationship between verses of Scripture (here Lamentations and Torah) determine and reflect what happens to Israel in real life.

Translation

(ה' י"ח) (ה' י"ח) (ה' י"ח)
 (ה' י"ח) (ה' י"ח) (ה' י"ח)
 (ה' י"ח) (ה' י"ח) (ה' י"ח)

R. Hanina bar Papa patah: "As one who takes off a garment on a cold day and vinegar on nitre, so is the one who sings songs to a heavy heart." (Proverbs, 25:20)

A. R. Hanina and R. Jonathan both say:

1. To what may the ten tribes and the tribes of Judah and Benjamin be compared? To the two men who were covered with a new cloak during the rainy season. One tore here and one tore there until they ripped it.

2. Thus the ten tribes did not remove themselves from the idol-worship in Samaria nor the tribes of Judah and Benjamin in Jerusalem until they caused Jerusalem to be destroyed.

B. Another interpretation: as one who takes off a garment, R. Hanina bar Papa and R. Simon [differ in their exegesis of this verse].

1. a. R. Hanina bar Papa said: The day when Nebuchadnezzar met Israel in war, he removed from them two

garments: the garments of priesthood and the garments of kingship.

b. on a cold day: because they called ^{לך נא} the calf "this is your god, O Israel" (Exodus, 32:4).

c. vinegar on nitre: R. Joshua said: like one who had a cellar of wine. He checked the first jug and found vinegar, the second and found within it vinegar, the third, and found within it vinegar. He said: "This sample is enough to prove that all [the wine] is bad."

d. So is he who sings to a heavy heart. R. Berekhiah said: every melody which the singer sings does not enter the ear of the dancer. Every melody the singer sings, the foolish son does not hear.

2. a. R. Simon said: the day when Nebuchadnezzar met Israel in war, he removed two garments from them: the garments of priesthood and the garments of kingship.

b. on a cold day: and so it is written, "It came to pass that as He called ^{לך נא} and they would not hear, so they call and I will not hear" (Zechariah, 7:13).

c1. vinegar on nitre: R. Joshua bar Nehemiah said, like one who places vinegar on nitre and dissolves it ^{לך נא} thus they contradicted ^{לך נא} the words of Torah, as it is written: "But they mocked the

messengers of God [and despised His words and scoffed at his prophets]" (II Chronicles, 36:16).

c2. R. Abba bar Kahana said: like a cow which licks with its tongue:

d1. so is he who sings songs to a heavy heart.

R. Haggai in the name of R. Issac said: Because the mockers of the generation would mumble in their mouths, hint with their eyes and point with their fingers and say: "the vision which he sees refers to the distant future; he prophesies of times which are far off." (Ezekiel, 7:27)

d2. The Holy One, Praised be He, said: [I swear]... By your lives "that in your days, O rebellious house will I speak the word and will perform it." (Ezekiel, 7:25) Immediately, "He brought upon them the king of the Chaldeans who slew their young men with a sword." (II Chronicles, 36:17)

Insert. 1. as it is written: "He burnt the House of God," (II Kings, 25:9) that is the Temple.

2. "the house of the king" that is the palace of Zedekiah "and all the houses of Jerusalem" [these are the 480 synagogues which were in Jerusalem as it is written]:

R. Phinehas in the name of R. Joshua. 480 synagogues were in Jerusalem other than the Temple. From where do we

know this? From $\text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל}$ which is thus in gematria. Each of them had a school for Bible and a school for Mishnah. Vespanian went up and destroyed them all.

3. "every great man's house," this is the academy of R. Yohanan b. Zakkai. Why is it called a great one's house? Because there was taught praise of the Holy One, Praised be He.

When they sinned, they were exiled, and when they were exiled, Jeremiah began to mourn over them "eykhah."

Outline

R. Hanina bar Papa patah: Proverbs 25:20.

A. R. Hanina and R. Jonathan both gave a thematic mashal on (a).

1. mashal

2. nimshal

B. R. Hanina bar Papa and R. Simon exegetical dispute.

1. R. Hanina b. Papa's exegesis

a. situational application of (a) of petihta verse.

b. 'al taqri on (b) of petihta verse plus proof-text.

c. R. Joshua: mashal on (c) of petihta verse.

d. R. Berekhiah: situational application of (d)

of petihta verse.

2. R. Simon's exegesis

a. same situational application of (a) as in 1a.

b. [>]al taqri on (b) with different proof-text
from 1b.

c1. R. Joshua ben Nehemiah: play on words analogy with (c) proof-text II Chronicles 36:16.

c2. R. Abba bar Kahana: related to II Chronicles 36:16 (2c).

d. all the below exegeses^{es} pertain to II Chronicles 36:16 as well as the petihta verse.

d1. R. Haggai in the name of R. Issac: situational application relates II Chronicles 36:16 to another proof-text (Ezekiel, 7:27).

d2. Ezekiel 7:25-26 carries out Ezekiel 7:27
miyad II Chronicles 36:17 (continuation of 2c).

[Insert petirot on II Kings 25:9 with gematria.

Formulaic Lamentations Rabbah ending.

Notes

Parallels: circumscribed units in this petihta
have parallels in Genesis Rabbah 38:6, Pesiqta deRav Ka-
hana Pisqa 15, y. Megillah 3:1.

R. Hanina bar Papa. This is the first of a series of

four petihtot attributed to him. Each begins with a petihta verse from the Book of Proverbs.

As one who takes off: so cryptic, this verse cries out to be interpreted.

R. Hanina and R. Jonathan both say as opposed to B, where there will be an exegetical dispute between R. Hanina and R. Simon, these two agree in their presentation of a thematic mashal.

The mashal incorporates (a) and (b) of the verse. Without the exegesis being spelled out, (c) and (d) are understood to be the consequence of (a) and (b), representing the destruction.

The mashal is expressed in standard form: "to what may it be compared?" and the nimshal begins "thus."

takes off a garment: two men covered with one cloak rip it.

on a cold day: during the rainy season.

destruction of garment: destruction of Israel 32/2

Jastrow defines this as "tears."

B. R. Hanina bar Papa and R. Simon: exegetical form. To R. Hanina bar Papa and R. Simon are attributed what amounts to two different serial exegeses of Proverbs 25:20. The first element of each exegesis is identical (situational

application about Nebuchadnezzar). The differences begin with the prooftexts on on a cold day.

a. Nebuchadnezzar is the antecedent of "one."

b. called the 'al taqri here changes hey to aleph, changing the meaning of the phrase to "the day when they called the calf 'god'" This interchange presupposes an oral/aural context in which the distinction between hey and aleph is not pronounced.

c. like one who had a cellar. This mashal is also found in Genesis Rabbah 38:6 in a comment on the story of the Tower of Babel. It could equally apply to the story of Sodom and Gomorrah. The meaning is: if the first, second, and third are found to be bad, then all are assumed to be bad. If some of Israel sins, then all are assumed to be sinful, and all are punished. The same Aramaic phrase is used in both the Genesis Rabbah and Lamentations Rabbah passages.

The mashal is triggered by the word "vinegar" in the petihta verse.

2a. same as 1a.

b. Zephariah 7:13: the exegesis is the same, using an 'al taqri, and changing the hey to an aleph. However, a different prooftext is given, rendering the mean-

ing: "the day when they shall call and I will not hear."

c. dissolves...contradicts: an analogy using a play on the root 7 7 0. In the first clause, 7 7 0 means "dissolve" which is the effect vinegar has upon nitre, corresponding to "contradict." Thus vinegar upon nitre is a metaphor for Israel contradicting words of Torah.

The proof-text for this is II Chronicles 36:16 which becomes an integral part of the serial exegesis on the next phrase of the petihta verse.

d1. like a cow: a cow licking is a metaphor for one who mocks.

d2. because the mockers: another comment on II Chronicles 36:16 which is related to still another verse: Ezekiel 7:27. "They mocked the messengers of God...scoffed His prophets" (II Chronicles 36:16) is given the situational application of mockers who mumble and wink and point, saying that the prophet's vision is "of times far off." The consequence of this is in d3 Ezekiel 7:25 and II Chronicles 36:17 when God punishes the mockers by bringing on the king of the Chaldeans.

Insert. This entire section is found in y. Megillah 3:1 and is triggered here by the chronological similarity

of II Chronicles and II Kings.

"He burnt the House of God," petira:Temple .

"house of king," petira:Zedekiah's palace.

"all houses of Jerusalem" [these are the 480...] Buber inserts this phrase because it is found in y. Megillah and also in Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa 15.

Essay

Petihta 12 offers three exegeses on a cryptic verse from Proverbs. The first exegesis is in the form of a mashal, while the second and third are separate traditions of serial exegesis.

The mashal, attributed to both R. Hanina and R. Jonathan, reflects the familiar theme of the sin of idolatry leading to retribution in the form of the destruction of Jerusalem. As in petihta 10, the particular sin is idolatry rather than neglect of study, or not keeping the commandments. The form of the mashal is standard: to what may X be compared? Thus the nimshal is defined at the beginning, unlike the alternate form where the mashal is presented first and the nimshal follows or is implicitly understood by the reader.

Following the thematic mashal, we recognize the formula for an exegetical dispute between R. Hanina bar Papa

and R. Simon. Both exegeses begin with the identical situational application about Nebuchadnezzar, and the al taqri of $\text{נִרְפָּה} - \text{לִרְפָּה}$. They begin to diverge in the prooftext for the 'al taqri. The first exegesis offers Exodus 32:4 as a prooftext with its context of Israel calling the Golden Calf their god. The second exegesis offers Zechariah 7:13, where Zechariah predicts that the day will come when God will call and Israel will not hear. Both prooftexts reflect the same negative ideas but each specifies it differently.

From this point, both serial exegeses contain many different attributions. These attributions appear, however, to be secondary to the superstructure of the two serial exegeses.

These exegeses clearly originated separately. The issue is: who joined these materials together? Probably an editor juxtaposed the independent traditions and created an exegetical dispute between Rabbis Manina and Simon.

In the first serial exegesis, a mashal attributed to R. Joshua is triggered by the word vinegar. This mashal is also found in Genesis Rabbah with another nimshal. In the case of Genesis Rabbah the mashal refers to the

text about the builders of the tower of Babel who all spoke one language. The implication in Genesis Rabbah is that they did not actually all speak one language, but that their many languages were all equally bad. In this case the nimshal refers to Israel, though this is not explicit. David Stern, in "Rhetoric and Midrash: the Case of the Mashal" (Prooftexts, vol. 1, ps. 261-291, J. Hopkins University Press, 1981), gives examples of how the same mashal occurring in different contexts can transmit different messages. The message is determined by the nimshal. We see that the same phenomenon occurs here. In our context the nimshal implies that wine turning to vinegar is like Israel turning to sin.

The final comment in the first serial exegesis is attributed to R. Berekhiah. This is an allegorical proverb about the dancer not hearing the melody of the singer. The "foolish son" in the second part parallels the "dancer." We know that the foolish son refers to Israel. Thus the metaphor clearly means that Israel (the foolish son and dancer) is not heeding the word (melody) of God (the singer).

As mentioned above, the first two elements of the second serial exegesis are the same as those of the first.

Balancing the mashal in the first serial exegesis, in the second exegesis, there is an analogy based on a play on words attributed to R. Joshua b. Nehemiah. The form is kazeh-kakh, as is X, so is Y. The play is on the root

כחז which can mean both dissolve and contradict.

"Dissolving" with vinegar thus destroying something tangible is analagous to "contradicting" the words of Torah, also destroying something of worth.

The prooftext, interestingly enough, does not use the root כחז. Instead it provides an illustration of how Israel despised Torah by mocking the prophets. This prooftext (II Chronicles 36:16) now becomes an integral part of the exegesis on the next phrase of the petihta verse. The comment about a cow licking with her tongue is a metaphor for one who mocks (II Chronicles 36:16).

R. Haggai in the name of R. Isaac demonstrates how Israel "mocks the messengers of God" (II Chronicles 36:16). While gesticulating, they mock the prophet by claiming that his prophecies will not be fulfilled imminently. Instead they are "far off" (Ezekiel 7:27). This situational application shows that these mockers were wrong because in the adjacent verse God asserts that His word will be carried out. The proof is found in II Chronicles 36:17, the verse adjacent to the verse which we have seen as a proof-

text for the two above comments.

Following this interweaving of exegetical verses is a section which is found in y. Megillah 3:1. The historical relationship between II Chronicles and II Kings prompts this description of how the king of the Chaldeans carried out his attack. Two petirot fill in some historical details about the attack. The third petira is filled in by Buber to conform to the parallels in y. Megillah and Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa 15. "All the houses" is determined to be 481 derived from gematria of $\aleph \kappa \delta \nu$ (Isaiah 1:21). "Full" and "all" are equivalent. Following the gematria is a situational application about Vespasian destroying all the synagogues. This is clearly anachronistic to the above reference about the king of the Chaldeans. Both destructions however are considered to be punishment for sin. This section is located here because of its proximity in the other texts.

The formulaic ending is a summary of themes. However, there is no transition from the exegesis to the ending, indicating that it was just tacked on to adapt these materials to Lamentations Rabbah.

Translation

(מִכֵּי־אֶחָד) (לֹחֵם־עַל־יָדָיו)
 (כְּאִישׁ־עֹלֵה־בִּצְעָה) (עֹקֵר־עֵקֶר)
 (שֶׁנֶּחֱלָעָה) (לֹחֵם־מֵעַד־מָוֶה) (מִבֶּטֶחַ) (בְּלֶחֶד)
 (בְּיָמָיו צָרָה) (שֶׁנֶּחֱלָעָה) (כִּי־יָחַד)

A. R. Hanina patah: "As a scatterer and a sword and a sharp arrow, so is one that bears false witness against his neighbor." (Proverbs, 25:18)

1. Scatterer: because "the Lord shall scatter you among all the peoples." (Deuteronomy, 28:64)

2. A sword: because "I will draw out the sword after you." (Leviticus, 26:33)

3. A sharp arrow: because "when I will send you evil arrows of famine." (Ezekiel, 5:16)

4. a. Against whom is this all directed? Against the one who bears false witness against his neighbor.

b. This is Israel which responded by saying: "This is your God, O Israel." (Exodus, 32:4).

B. "Confidence in a faithless one on a day of trouble

is like a broken tooth and a foot out of joint." (Proverbs, 25:19)

1. a. Israel said before the Holy One, Blessed be He, Master of the Universe, when you come to feed us (or do evil to us), the tooth devoured broke in pieces everything in its wake [and the foot stamped].

b. Why does the evil tooth devour us and the foot stamp us? Because of the trust (*נֶאֱמַר*) in idolatry on account of which we were unfaithful (*לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ*) to our Rock (*אֱלֹהֵינוּ*).

"As one who takes off a garment in cold weather."
(Proverbs, 25:20)

[Misplaced line from Petihta 12, Zachariah 7:13.]

2. Another interpretation: broken tooth and foot out of joint: a shaking tooth and a wavering foot.

3. The Holy One Blessed be He said: I said to Israel

a. Foreswear *לִפְנֵי* idolatry and trust *בַּיהוָה* in Me.

b. But they did not do this. Rather they fore-swore Me and trusted in idolatry. As it is written, "Who say to a tree: 'you are my father.'" (Jeremiah, 2:27)

When they sinned, they were exiled, when they were

exiled, Jeremiah mourned eykhah.

Outline

A. R. Hanina patah: Proverbs 25:18-19.

1. through heqesh with a prooftext, (a¹) is the consequence of (b).

2. same as above with (a²).

3. same as above with (a³).

4. a. question and answer specifying logical causal relationship between (a) and (b).

b. petira of (b) plus prooftext.

B. exegesis on Proverbs 25:19.

1. a. multiple meanings play on words of (c¹) (with reference to uncited prooftext) related to (c²).

b. play on words on (d¹) and (d²) and (e) thematic.

2. paraphrase of (c¹) and (c²).

3. situation application of (d) through manipulation of syntax to fill in ellipses plus prooftext.

Formulaic ending.

Notes

No parallels.

A. R. Hanina: an exegesis of the 2 verses which precede

the verse of Petihta 12.

1. Scatterer: this verse from Deuteronomy describes God exiling Israel.

2. sword: this verse from Leviticus describes the exiling of Israel and the desolation of its land as well as military defeat.

3. sharp arrow: this verse from Ezekiel describes "the evil arrows of famine" as the manifestation of destruction.

4. to whom is this all directed? hakol l'mi, This phrase alters the original syntax of the verse by indicating that (a) is directed towards Israel as the warning of the consequences of their doing (b). The exegetical form is that of a petira and uses Exodus 32:4 as the proof-text. This same verse also is used in Petihta 12 as a prooftext describing Israel's idolatry.

B. When you came to feed us: this can also be understood as when you came to do evil to us. This entire section uses the midrashic technique of multiple meanings or equivocality. The root נחל from the word נחלנו in the verse is used in נחלנו "as God feeds us" and as נחלנו "broken" from the Aramaic as in the Daniel reference and as נחלנו "evil" describing the "tooth" as

evil in its devouring of us. (This root also is found in the two verses cited in the exegesis of 25:18 לִנְחֹר in Proverbs, 25:18 and $\text{פִּי־חַר אֲחֹרֶיךָ בֵּן}$ from Ezekiel, 5:16.)

the tooth devoured. Daniel 7:19 has similar references to teeth which are broken and a foot which stamps. "Then I desired to know the truth concerning the fourth beast...with teeth of iron and nails of brass which devoured, broke in pieces and stamped the residue with its feet."

trust in idolatry: The roots אִלַּח and אִלַּח and אִלַּח are manipulated here to render (d) and (e) the cause of the consequence of (c¹) and (c²).

[misplaced line from Petihta 12] Buber recognizes this as a copyist's error.

2. a shaking tooth and wavering foot: these phrases involve verbs in the חֻחַח form. The first חֻחַח could be another play on חַח , this time reversing the order of the letters. Jastrow defines חֻחַח as a "loose tooth." Jastrow defines חֻחַח as a wavering foot. Both verbs thus imply weakness. Our teeth and our feet are weak and even useless because of Israel's practice of idolatry.

3. Be faithful: the syntax of (d) and (e) is re-written by filling in ellipses as follows: trust in God and be unfaithful to idolatry was commanded, but instead Israel trusted in idolatry and was unfaithful to God. The prooftext for this idolatry is Jeremiah 2:27.

Essay

In this petihta, attributed to R. Hanina, the two cryptic verses from Proverbs which precede the petihta verse cited in Petihta 12, are subjected to exegesis by reconstruction of syntax. Heinemann calls this technique haznahat halogot (see explanation of this technique in the essay on Petihta 1). Indeed in Petihta 13 the original syntax of both verses is totally discarded. The darshan reads the prototypical Lamentations Rabbah message into each of these verses: the sin (of idolatry) leads to retribution, a theme which is not apparent at all from a literal reading of the verses.

Whereas in the literal reading of both Proverbs 25:18 and Proverbs 25:19, (a) is equivalent to (b), the homiletical interpretation reads (a) of each verse as the consequence of those who practice (b). Thus the relationship between the two clauses in each verse is understood as causal.

In the exegesis on verse 25:18 the following method of interpretation of Scripture is used: if word X has certain implications in verse Y elsewhere in Scripture, the use of X in this verse implies all the contextual details of verse Y. This is a type of heqesh, involving only one word rather than an entire verse in constructing its analogy. In this case (a¹), (a²) and (a³) all are parts of verses elsewhere in Scripture which describe exile and destruction. Thus the exile and destruction described in these prooftexts are deemed to be consequences of one who practices (b) of this verse. The question to whom is this all directed? establishes the connection between (a) and (b).

In petira form, Israel is identified as the one who bears false witness. The prooftext of Exodus 32:4 specifies what exactly the false witness claims. Idolatry is the false claim. Thus the verse is understood: to Israel who bears false witness by declaring the Golden Calf to be its God must come the punishment of exile, desolation of the land, military defeat and destruction.

The exegesis of verse 25:19 also determines the first phrase (c¹) and (c²) to be the consequence of the second phrase (d) and (e). The first phrase is understood

as the punishment of weakness, even impotence, while the second phrase is another reference to idolatry.

A specific method of reconstruction of syntax is applied to the exegesis of Proverbs 25:19. The technique of multiple meanings understands the root $\gamma\tau$ in the positive connotation of God feeding us or in the negative connotation of God doing evil to us. Daniel 7:19 is not quoted directly here but the reference is clear.

The implication is that God is our Shepherd ($\gamma\tau/\tau$) but we could not successfully eat with a broken tooth. Why does the evil tooth devour us instead of eating the food God has come to feed us and why does the foot stamp us out instead of helping us walk? This is answered in (c^1) and (c^2) and (d), by manipulating the roots of these three words to yield the meaning: we have trusted $\gamma\tau$ in idolatry for which we were unfaithful $\gamma\tau$ in our Rock $\gamma\tau$. Thus the syntax has been totally reconstructed on the basis of attaching new suffixes or prefixes to these roots.

The second interpretation of Proverbs 25:19 is probably a different tradition of the exegesis of this verse. The methods used are the same. The paraphrase of (c^1) and (c^2) involves playing with the letters and sounds of the

words to yield the connotation of weakness. A shaking tooth inhibits eating and a wavering foot inhibits walking.

Again the two roots of זדן and נצח are manipulated to achieve the implication of idolatry. Here each of the verbs is understood as part of a phrase. The exegesis gives each verb a direct object. Trust in God! Be unfaithful to idolatry! Instead of filling in the ellipses appropriately, Israel has mistakenly filled them in the opposite way, by practicing idolatry as expressed in the prooftext Jeremiah 2:27, and being unfaithful to God.

Thus both verses are understood as: the sin of idolatry brings about the punishment of exile, destruction and powerlessness.

The formulaic ending as usual is a summary of themes but is an artificial appendage.

Translation

(הַיָּחִיד עִלָּה) (וְעַל מִלֵּל)
(וְעַל מִלֵּל) (וְעַל מִלֵּל)

"A wise person has a controversy with (is judged with) a foolish person, whether he is angry or laughs there is no rest. (Proverbs, 29:9)"

R. Hanina b. Papa patah: A wise person is judged with a foolish person, whether he is angry or laughs, there is no rest.

A. R. Simon said: Anyone who judges a fool is himself judged, as it is written (in שְׁפָט) a wise person is judged, not "he judges" rather is judged.

B. Another interpretation: A wise person judges.

1. This is the Holy One, Blessed be He, as it is said: "He is wise of heart and mighty in strength." (Job, 9:4)

2. foolish person. This is Israel, as it is said, "My people is foolish." (Jeremiah, 4:22)

3. "whether he is angry or laughed. I was angry and there was no rest. I laughed and there was no rest.

a. I was angry at you in the days of Pekah, son of Remaliah, as it is said: "And Pekah, son of Remaliah slew in Judah 120,000 in one day." (11 Chronicles, 28:6)

b. I laughed with you in the days of Amaziah as it is said: "Amaziah took courage and led forth his people and went to the Valley of Salt." (II Chronicles, 25: 11) What is the Valley of Salt? Under the banks of salt, under the oppression of war.

4. "Ten thousand people the people of Judah carried away alive and brought them to the top of the rock and cast them down from the top of the rock and they broke into pieces." (II Chronicles, 25:12)

no rest. At the time the Holy One, Blessed be He, said: "for what they have done here, they will be exiled! Since they sinned...eykhah.

Outline


- R. Hanina b. Papa patah: Proverbs 29:9
- A. R. Simon: play on words involving ⁸² form, comment on (a) and (b).
- B. Serial exegesis on petihta verse.
1. petira of (a) plus prooftext
 2. petira of (b) plus prooftext
 3. God is subject of (c). When God was (c'), there was no (d). When God was (c²) there was no (d).
 - a. example of God being (c') plus prooftext

b, example of God being (c²) plus prooftext
c. additional material on above prooftext,
transition to 4.

4. continuation of above prooftext leading to exegesis of the (d) of petihta verse.

Formulaic ending.

Notes

A. 1. is judged: The original connotation in the Scriptural verse probably means "had a controversy with." The darshan reads the word in the  form, thus the passive form: is judged.

B. 1. & 2. wise, foolish: prooftexts are found which establish God as wise, and Israel as foolish.

3. a. I was angry: God expresses His anger by allowing 120,000 Judeans to be slaughtered.

b. I laughed: God expresses His positive feelings by allowing the Judeans to be militarily victorious.

Insert. This material establishes the location of the Valley of Salt and was probably attached to this prooftext in some other context. There is a play on words operating here, but neither Buber nor the Soncino translation are able to establish the meaning of the phrase.

Essay

Aside from the grammatical play on words at the beginning, petihta 14 is concerned with the relationship between God and Israel. God in the role of judge exiles Israel as punishment for their behavior. But we also get the sense that God feels betrayed. Even when God does Israel a good turn by facilitating a military victory, they break His commandments by committing terrible atrocities against their prisoners of war. God, as Judge, issues the sentence of exile. God as Parent, lashes out with hurt and exiles His recalcitrant children.

The petihta contains two sections. The first derives another proverb from this proverb by reading the word *nišpat* as a reflexive verb: "anyone who judges a fool is himself judged."

The second section is a serial exegesis. The verb *nišpat* is implicitly understood here in its active form: he judges. God is established as the wise One, by referral to a proof-text. Israel is established as the foolish one, by referral to another proof-text. Thus the wise One: God, judges the foolish one; Israel.

God becomes the narrator of the following section: whether I was angry at you and punished you, or whether

I was beneficent by granting you military victory, there was no rest; no cooperation and obedience. An example of God's anger and an example of God's beneficence are cited, both from II Chronicles.

The continuation of the second prooftext from II Chronicles is brought to illustrate the last phrase, "v'eyn nahat." Scriptural verse speaks for itself in its gruesome account of the Israelites' murder of ten thousand captives.

At this, God interjects His judgment and sentence of Israel: because they have done this, they shall be punished by exile.

The serial exegesis of the Proverbs verse could stand alone and end here. However, the transition to the formulaic Lamentations Rabbah ending does fit smoothly, forming an integrated petihta. Because this is the stereotypical Lamentations Rabbah ending, editorial activity is automatically suspected. Since the thematic transition is so smooth, however, it is impossible to ascertain the extent of the editorial activity.

Abbreviated Analysis


Structure

A. Instead of the standard form of exegesis, where the petihta verse is quoted and then interpreted, here the petihta verse functions as a proof-text to a dictum. We have also seen this in Petihta 2.

B. R. Shimon b. Lakish presents another verse from Proverbs which illustrates the petihta verse by casting God in the role of the scorner who gets for Himself shame. Internal to this illustration is an 'at mose' elaboration based on Ezekiel 36:20.

Thematic Commentary

A. A rabbinic updating of a Scriptural verse allows the rabbis to inject their own values into the exegesis. Only a teacher can raise up a wicked disciple, thus the message here is directed specifically towards the rabbis themselves.

B. God regrets His relationship with Israel because He realizes that the nations of the world are mocking Him. God corrects the scorner  which is Israel. The consequence of God trying to teach Israel muṣar is mocking by the Gentiles. The image of God standing at the door-

ways of the nations of the world, eavesdropping on their conversation is a daring anthropomorphism. God feeling embarrassment is a daring anthropopathism. The nations ask, "if these are God's people, why are they suffering?" God's act of retribution towards Israel is interpreted by the nations to signify that He is losing His strength.

The theological implications of God regretting His special relationship with Israel are some of the most dramatic in Lamentations Rabbah. We have seen God personified as mourning for His people. Now we encounter a God who is ashamed. God is actually affected by the derision of the nations. God Himself is hurt by Israel's misdeeds.

C. The exegesis of the (b) phrase of the petihta verse in the last section casts Jeremiah in the role of rebuker and the people as scornful of his prophecies. The words of Lamentations 1:1 are determined here to be words of reproof rather than mourning.

Editorial Placement

The transition to the seder verse is peculiar to this petihta. Since Jeremiah is the subject of the serial exegesis, and he is also the attributed author of Lamentations, a relationship is derived between the petihta verse and

seder verse. The petihta is integral in its exegesis connecting the petihta verse to the seder verse.

The only possible editorial tack-on is the phrase vomer lahem 'eykhah. It is impossible to ascertain whether this was originally an integral part of the exegesis or was tacked on to artificially create a petihta.

Abbreviated Analysis

Structure

A. A rhetorical question establishes the King-God identification in a modified form of King mashal. The words mashal l^emelekh or l^emelekh are absent here. However, this rhetorical question could easily be transposed into the standard mashal form without changing the meaning at all. The rhetorical question establishes the common assumption which stands in contrast to the paradoxes which follow.

All the (a) verses indicate God's miracles in the wilderness which provided for the needs of the Israelites. All the (b) verses indicate contrastively the lack of provision of needs in the settled area. All the (b) verses are from Lamentations.

After the three pairs are presented, another rhetorical question refocuses attention onto the petihta verse which provides the reason for the paradoxes.

B. All three petirot concentrate strictly on the one word libbekha. Each petira is supported by a prooftext.

This is clearly not a petihta. There is not even an editorial attempt to artificially create a petihta. The last verse quoted functions as the prooftext for the last of the petirot and is not even from Lamentations.

However, this is not simply a serial exegesis on Jeremiah 4:18. The Lamentations verses quoted in the first section are crucial elements in the exegesis. The Jeremiah verse thus is read with reference to Lamentations.

Thematic Commentary

Three pairs of thematically related verses are juxtaposed to point out the paradox of the modified King mashaal. Instead of Israel prospering in their settled communities, God has provided for His people more luxuriously in the wilderness, as illustrated by Exodus 16:4, Psalms 78:20 and Psalms 105:39. The petihta verse provides the explanation for this situation; Israel is responsible for its own disasters: your way and your doings. God not only has the power to be generous in the unlikely setting of the wilderness, God also has the power to withhold a predictable occurrence. Israel provokes God into doing this by its sin.

In the first petira, "because they angered Me, My heart is not towards the governors of Israel," the implication is that the Sanhedrin no longer exists because Israel angered God with its sin, causing God to allow the Sanhedrin's demise.

The third petira is interesting here. God is Israel's

heart. They have hurt God, as it were, "destroyed" God, just as they have brought about the destruction of the Sanhedrin and Temple.

Editorial Placement

Despite the absence of a seder verse from Lamentations, three factors establish a relationship between this petihta and Lamentations Rabbah. The first is the thematic relationship of sin and retribution as described above. Secondly, the petihta verse is from Jeremiah which is common in Lamentations Rabbah because of the attribution of the authorship of Lamentations to Jeremiah. The petihta verse introduces the theme of Israel bringing about its own destruction by its sinful acts. Last and most important are the prooftexts from Lamentations integrated into the body of the petihta, introduced by the phrase w'hakha ktib "here in Lamentations it is written."

This may have existed as an exegesis on the Jeremiah verse and have been placed in Lamentations Rabbah because of the citation of three verses from Lamentations. Or the piece could have been designed specifically to incorporate Lamentations verses as prooftexts to adapt it to Lamentations Rabbah. Why the editor did not make the effort to add the formulaic transition to adapt it to the structure of the petihtot in Lamentations Rabbah is a mystery.

Abbreviated Analysis

Structure

A. 1. A petira introduces the situational application: those who sit = nations of the world, gates = theaters and circuses.

2. Expansion of (c) establishes that the nations sit in their theaters and circuses, drunkenly mocking the Jews. (a) - (d) are four examples of the mocking. The first is in Aramaic. The following three are in what I term "vaudeville dialogue," since one party sets up the joke for the other.

B. 1. A petira introduces this second serial exegesis with the exact wording as in A1. This provides a contrast between the two interpretations, as will be discussed below. Technique of contrastive parallels.

2. In similar fashion, this balances A2, also pointing out the contrast between these two interpretations. Technique of contrastive parallels. The transition to the seder verse is very smooth, contextually integral with the final exegetical comment.

Thematic Commentary

Who is mocking whom in this petihta? The Gentiles

in their theaters and circuses derive their entertainment from mocking the Jews. The rabbis may be mocking the Gentiles for being ignorant of the deep religious meaning underlying Jewish rituals. And maybe the rabbis are even mocking themselves by subjecting Jewish ritual to ridicule.

The identical structure of the A and B exegesis emphasizes the contrast between the amusements of the Gentiles and the amusements of the Jews. "They sit in the theaters and circuses" while we "sit in synagogues and houses of study." "After they sit and eat and drink and become intoxicated, they sit and mock the Jews," while "after we sit and eat and drink and become intoxicated on Tisha b'Av, we read Lamentations." This technique of contrastive parallels points out this striking contrast which illustrates the theme of the petihta: how we perceive them, how they perceive us, and how we perceive them perceiving us.

The actual examples of the Gentiles mocking of the Jews focus on the poverty of the Jews and the rituals of the Jews. That Jews eat carobs is an indication that they are poor. The dialogue about living as long as the Sabbath shirt of a Jew probably is an allusion to the fact that this shirt is only worn once a week, thus it would

last a long time (Buber and Soncino agree on this). The next dialogue about the camel can be explained as follows: during the Sabbatical year, the Jews are so hungry that they are reduced to eating thorns. Since the camel would thus be deprived of his food source he puts on his shirt of sackcloth as a sign of mourning for the loss of his food. The last dialogue needs some expansion. Because the Jews have not been good merchants by not pursuing business on the Sabbath, they have a shortage of fuel. This necessitates the use of their bedsteads for firewood, thus causing them to sleep on the ground. Since they become dusty sleeping on the ground, they use precious oil to clean themselves. Consequently, they have no oil with which to anoint their hair, so they must shave their heads. All this is designed to demonstrate the foolishness of Jewish observance and the ridiculous consequences which could have been avoided had the Jews refrained from their observance. So are the rabbinic authors making fun of the Gentiles or are they making fun of themselves?

In the second section, reference is made to the feast of Tisha b'Av which precedes the mourning and fasting.

Editorial Placement

In the parallel found in Lamentations Rabbah 3:14, the phrase from Lamentations 3:14 *šhoq l'khol 'ami* is followed by the quotation of this entire petihta with no changes. The editor of Lamentations Rabbah needed an exegesis to Lamentations 3:14 so he plugged in this petihta which shares the concept of derision and mocking. Thus most likely this petihta existed before the final editing of Lamentations Rabbah, chapter 3. This alone does not provide evidence that the petihta section preceded the exegetical section, because the editor could also have transferred this petihta from the existing exegetical section to the newly created petihta. What is interesting here is that the entire petihta in petihta form is found in Lamentations Rabbah 3:14 and the verse Lamentations 3:14 is never again cited as part of the exegesis.

The mention of Tisha b'Av provides the logical transition to the seder verse of Lamentations 1:1. The petihta is not artificially constructed and is derived integrally from the second serial exegesis of Psalm 69:13.

Abbreviated Analysis

Structure

This petihta takes the first phrase of Lamentations 3:15 as referring to Passover, and the second phrase as referring to Tisha b'Av. Since the phrases in Lamentations are equivalent, a relationship is established between the two holidays: as God did thus for me on Passover, (a) of the petihta verse, so did God do thus for me on Tisha b'Av, (b) of the petihta verse.

Thematic Commentary

The (a) and (b) phrases are equivalent because bitterness and wormwood are synonymous. God fills us with bitter herbs on Passover and with bitter wormwood on Tisha b'Av (a sign of mourning). Thus a further relationship can be found between Passover and Tisha b'Av. Both of them occur on the same night of the week. The implication is that there is some cosmic plan which has established an internal connection between these two Jewish holy days. Their occurrence and observance is not incidental, but intentional.

Editorial Placement

This petihta is basically a serial exegesis on Lamentations 3:15, artificially constructed as a petihta by tack-

ing on the phrase: "on account of this, Jeremiah mourned 'eykhah." The same material is found in Lamentations Rabbah as an exegesis on Lamentations 3:15. As in petihta 17, the material there is found in petihta form. In this case it is a direct exegesis on the petihta verse, instead of an extraneous verse as in petihta 17. The same questions arise as to the precedence of the petihta in this section or the exegetical section. It is also interesting that petihtot 17 and 18 occur right next to each other in Lamentations Rabbah 3:14 and 3:15.

Abbreviated Analysis

Structure

The petihta is composed of two 'ilu zakhitem expositions, the second of which leads smoothly into the seder verse of Lamentations 1:1.

The structural problem is that the petihta verse seems to have little to do with the two 'ilu zakhitem expositions. The only possible connection is that since God is responsible for the changing of the times and seasons, God is also responsible for the change in Israel's fortunes: "from the waters of Shiloah to the waters of the Euphrates." If this indeed is the connection, it is not well developed.

Thematic Commentary

The unworthiness of Israel and the subsequent punishment of exile fits the thematic pattern of sin and retribution so familiar in Lamentations Rabbah. Drinking the sweet waters of Shiloah is a metaphor for living the good life in the Land of Israel, while drinking the waters of Euphrates is a metaphor for the misery of the exile.

Likewise Israel sang praises to God in the Land of Israel, while in Babylon they utter lamentations.

Editorial Placement

The fact that the petihta verse does not seem to flow into the exposition is an indication that this may not have originally been a petihta. The two 'ilu zakhitem sections with Psalms 138:1 as the final prooftext could stand as a unit. The opening of "R. Abin patah Daniel 2:21" and the citation of Lamentations 1:1 as a second prooftext could have been the work of an editor who was trying to adapt appropriate thematic materials to this section of petihtot in Lamentations Rabbah.

On the other hand, the citation of Lamentations 1:1 as a second prooftext to the second 'akhšav šelo' zakhitem is contextually appropriate because of the reference to qinot. Thus a definite conclusion cannot be drawn about the extent of editorial activity.

Abbreviated Analysis

Structure

A. 1. The first serial exegesis of Psalms 102:8 begins by identifying God as the subject of the phrase [^]saqadti. Instead of [^]saqadti meaning "I watched," this interpretation understands it as "I hastened." When God [^]saqad, something occurred to leave Him alone: (b) of verse. There seems to be a sentence missing here which would indicate what it is that Israel did to cause God to be alone. The Soncino translation suggests that the text is defective and that a phrase such as this was deleted: "but as soon as they left Egypt, they sinned in the matter of the spies...." Yet, formally, ~~comparing the~~ two serial exegeses of the verse with each other, the two (b) parts comport with each other.

2. Following this situational application, we encounter the first of two mah[~]kakh analogies. The sparrow mentioned in (b) is expanded into a description of a sparrow's activity. This is deemed to be analogous to the Israelites. This piece is parallel to the Mekhilta. The prooftext of Numbers 33:3 reads the plural form as referring to a lack of unity.

3. Another prooftext (Exodus, 29:2) using the singular

form refers to the unity of Israel.

B. The second serial exegesis follows the same structural pattern.

1. As in A, God is the subject. Instead of eagerly bringing Israel into the Land of Israel, now God eagerly causes the Shekhinah to dwell in the Temple. As in A1, the ellipsis is filled with a direct object.

2. A mah-kakh analogy, leads thematically to the ending and seder verse.

Thematic Commentary

As in petihta 10 which has the identical ending as petihta 20, the salient theme is that God is alone. Lamentations 1:1 refers to God sitting alone.

In this petihta, the theme of the loneliness of God is apparent from the first comment: God acted to bring Israel into the Land of Israel and then like the sparrow alone on the house top, God is left alone. The theme is picked up again at the end when God "burns His house, destroys His city, exiles His children and sits solitary." This is a significant piece of theology. Without His people, God is left alone. Thus God is dependent upon Israel for companionship, and feels Israel's absence.

In the first mah-kakh analogy, Israel is divided until

they reach Sinai which is to be the location of their unification. God refrains from giving them the Torah until He sees that they are unified.

Editorial Placement

As mentioned above, this petihta bears a resemblance to petihta 10 in its ending, and in its thematic material. The transition to the seder verse is well-integrated into the second mah-kakh analogy. There is no evidence of editorial activity accommodating this petihta to this document. Its location is well-founded.

Abbreviated Analysis

Structure

A. The petihta verse is subjected to a routine serial exegesis beginning with three petirot on the first three phrases. The prooftext of the second petira is not found in Scripture. The author may have remembered a verse incorrectly without checking the citation. Buber suggests that the correct verse may be Ezekiel 5:11, which has a similar meaning.

Following the three petirot, another verse is juxtaposed to (d) of the petihta verse. In the petihta verse, (d) refers to the hair of a leper growing loose. This extraneous verse is connected by a reference there to the "covering" being "bare." An Aramaic Targum-type paraphrase is as cryptic as the verse itself.

The next phrase (e) is given a situational application which begins with a phrase familiar to us from the formulaic ending: "kevan [^]segalu."

The repetition of the word "tame'" gives rise to a plural antecedent: the First Temple was unclean, and the Second Temple was unclean.

B. Following the serial exegesis is an expanded middah k^cneged middah exposition attributed to R. Jose b. Halaf-

ta, with additional examples attributed to R. Yohanan and R. Shimon b. Lakish. This section appears to bear no relationship to the petihta verse until we reach the final comment attributed to R. Alexandri, to whom the entire petihta is attributed--probably on the basis of this saying at the end of it. In R. Alexandri's comment a heqesh is drawn between the verse subsequent to the verse and the seder verse. This heqesh may have been the seed from which this entire petihta germinated. The word "plague" determined to allude to idolatry in the first petira is understood to mean the same in Leviticus 13:46. This connects the second element of the serial exegesis to the entire exposition on idolatry preventing the arrival of the Messiah.

Thematic Commentary

A. In the first element of the serial exegesis we are confronted with the shocking comparison of the Temple to a leper. Just as a leper was once a healthy human being which has become unclean due to a disease, so the Temple was once a holy place now rendered unclean by the "plague" of idolatry which has defiled it. This theme of idolatry in the Temple is further developed in petihta 22.

In the situational application: "when Israel was

exiled among the nations," Israel was also exiled from the Torah, as words of Torah could not come forth from their mouths.

The mention of the destruction of the First and Second Temples is the punishment for the defilement of the Sanctuary by idol worship.

B. R. Jose b. Halapta sets up a middah k^eneged middah between the number of years that Israel practiced idolatry and the number of years until the Messiah will come. The amount of time Israel wasted in worshipping idols will be the amount of time the Messiah's arrival will be delayed. Three verses are brought which contain implicit middah k^eneged middah messages.

In the exegetical discussion between R. Yohanan and R. Shimon b. Lakish, R. Yohanan actually defines the process as middah k^eneged middah. In the verse he brings, the twofold expression indicates that the punishment will equal the duration of the sin. R. Shimon b. Lakish brings a verse which contains the word l^eneged, thus conforming to the middah k^eneged middah.

The final comment by R. Alexandri leads into the heqesh between Leviticus 13:46 and Lamentations 1:1. As the leper sits alone, "tame' hu badad yeseb" so does the

Temple "ya[^]sbah badad." The verse in Lamentations actually refers to Jerusalem, the site of the Temple, but this does not detract from the poignant comparison of the diseased leper to the defiled Temple.

Editorial Placement:

The petihta is drawn together by the final heqesh between the two verses Leviticus 13:46 and Lamentations 1:1, establishing this as a true petihta to Lamentations 1:1. The fact that the petihta is attributed to R. Alexandri and that this key heqesh is also attributed to R. Alexandri indicates that this heqesh probably existed prior to the editorial construction of the petihta. Some of the middah k^eneged middah materials could also have existed previously. These verses have been brought here as Scriptural evidence for the process of middah k^eneged middah, rather than the theme of idolatry delaying the Messiah.

Thematically, the material is appropriate to Lamentations Rabbah. The heqesh at the end provides a smooth transition to Lamentations 1:1, creating an integral petihta.

Abbreviated Analysis

Structure

The overall structure is an exegetical dispute between R. Yohanan and R. Shimon b. Lakish. In the course of R. Yohanan's exegesis, R. Shimon b. Lakish is cited. This seems to break the symmetry between the two separate exegeses. One manuscript does not contain this particular attribution and preserves the symmetry. Note: petihta 21 also includes the pair of R. Yohanan and R. Shimon b. Lakish.

A. R. Yohanan's exegesis is short, simple and thematically integral. In the comment on (a) of the petihta verse, a situational application establishes the specific wrongdoing for which God chastises Israel. With God as the speaker, (d) of the petihta verse is deemed to be the consequence of (a); one who lends money to another with the intention of dispossessing him will be punished by God by having to dwell alone, in other words live in exile.

The following comment is a kazeḥ-kakh analogy based on the first phrase of the subsequent verse in Isaiah. This comment must be read in consonance with the above since they are thematically connected.

B. R. Shimon b. Lakish's exegesis is long and complex, yet thematically integral. The interpretations of many other rabbis are included under this superstructure of R. Shimon's side of this exegetical dispute, evidence that this exegetical dispute is editorially constructed.

The first comment understands the first phrase of the petihta verse metaphorically. "House" refers to the Temple; thus "joining house to house" is understood as joining the destruction of the First Temple to the Second Temple. A proof-text (Jeremiah, 26:18) which applies to the First Temple is determined to apply to the Second as well.

The comment on (c) of the petihta verse triggers a homiletical pattern which continues almost until the end of the petihta. The phrase "efes maqom" is expanded into the statement that there was "no place" where idolatry was not practiced. Following this thematic statement the progressively more public locations of idol worship are listed and supported by proof-texts. The pattern is: "because they were not restrained from doing this" (practicing idolatry in a specific place), they next practiced it (in another location), plus a proof-text.

One of the proof-texts (Hosea, 12:12) is subjected to

additional exegesis by Rs. Judan, Aibu and Tabi in the name of R. Joshua, and R. Phinehas and R. Hilkiyah in the name of R. Hoshai. Although these exegeses are thematically consistent, they do deviate from the homiletical pattern. Thus they are listed as an insert in the structural outline on the chart.

After the above-mentioned exegeses, the pattern is resumed. The locations of idol worship approach the city of Jerusalem. Finally the question is interjected "ad 'ematai?" The answer is given: "Holy of Holies." This is followed by a proof-text (Ezekial, 8:5). Here the homiletical pattern ends.

R. Aha's comment on "babiah" is found in Leviticus Rabbah 17 and Deuteronomy Rabbah Vaethanan 20. The Hebrew word is read as the Latin: vae, vae. Thus idolatry in the entrance of the gate of the altar prompts the exclamation of "woe, woe."

The reason for the introduction of the following exegesis is not clear. Perhaps the connection is thematic. Most likely these two exegeses were linked in some previous context and thus are included together in this document.

R. Berekhiah understands Isaiah 28:20 as a metaphor

for Israel's dual loyalty to God and to idolatry. The metaphor is derived by the method of notarikon. The word m^ehi^starea is split into three words: 'i^sa v^etrey re' e: a woman and her two lovers. Thus the verse is understood as the bed (Temple) being too short for a woman (Israel) and her two lovers (God and idolatry).

In the second phrase of Isaiah 28:20 the word "ma-sekhah" is understood in its alternate meaning. Instead of "covering" it is interpreted as "image," thus continuing to read the theme of idolatry into this verse. The prooftext of Psalms 33:7 contrasts the word kehitkane^s in reference to idolatry with kone^s in reference to God. In Isaiah 28:20 kehitkane^s refers to one curling in a fetal position in a short bed. In Psalms 33:7 kone^s refers to God's power to gather the waters.

Thematic Commentary

A. The familiar theme of sin and retribution is here understood in a different context than that in the other petihtot in Lamentations Rabbah. The specific wrongdoing which is read into the petihta verse is the dispossession of people from their land when a loan is not repaid. God chastises the people: "do you really think that this is your land? This is My land. I have the power to make

you dwell alone as punishment for being so presumptuous and so inconsiderate of your neighbor." The cry of the dispossessed is heard in the ears of the Lord. The allusion to dwelling alone refers to the exile.

B. Sin and retribution is understood in the second exegesis in its most common interpretation. Through the sin of idolatry, Israel has "joined" the destruction of the First Temple to the Second Temple.

The homiletical pattern of "because they were not restrained, they next practiced idolatry..." suggests that the Jewish authorities did not prohibit the worship of idols. At first Israel worshipped idols in private. Gradually the practice of idolatry became more and more public until it reached the entry to the Holy of Holies, the ultimate blasphemy.

The final section of exegesis through notarikon and plays on words also develops the theme of Israel simultaneously worshipping other gods and God.

Editorial placement

The theme of sin and retribution firmly justifies the placement of this material in Lamentations Rabbah. The formulaic ending fulfils a common role here. It is a summary of the theme of sin and retribution without any

transition from the immediately previous material.

The editor adapted relevant thematic material into the petihta form with this formulaic ending.

Translation

(אזכר את בוראיק בימי בחורותי)
 (עזר אשר עא יבאל ימי הרעה)
 (אחרי שנים אשר מאמר אין כי בהם חפץ)
 (עזר אשר עא מתק השם והאל והיה והבוכים)
 (אשר העבים את הים) (הוא שיער שמי הביא)
 (והגלגל את ימי החי) (הטחט הטחט) (כי מעט)
 (אחרי הנאל בארצות)
 (אשר דברים באר) (אשר קא הטחט)
 (איקא עקא הציפור) (אשר כה הנה השיר)
 (אשר משה ויחל) (אחרי שנים בדוק)
 (אשר השקד) (אשר החכה) (אשר האבן)
 (כי השק אדם אה בוג עאמא) (אשר בשק הסופדים)
 (עזר אשר עא ירחק מהם הכסף) (אשר עקא הציפור)
 (אשר כד עה השבוע) (אשר השקא אה האר)
 (אשר העבי עה האר) (אשר כשה)
 (אשר מאה אה האלהים אשר נתיב)

R. Joshua of Siknin in the name of R. Levi patah:
(Ecclesiastes, 12:1)

I. Solomon said to Israel: Remember your creator.

Remember your creator.

A. while your youth ָ ָ ָ (your having been
chosen) (lasts).

B. while the covenant of priesthood lasts --
as it is said: "and I did choose him of all the tribes
of Israel to be my priest." (I Samuel, 2:28)

C. while the covenant of the Levites lasts--as
it is said: "For the Lord your God has chosen him of
all the tribes." (Deuteronomy, 18:5)

D. while the covenant of the kingship of the house
of David lasts--as it is said "and he chose David his
servant." (Psalms, 78:70)

E. while the covenant of Jerusalem lasts --as it
is said "the city which I have chosen." (I Kings, 11:32)

F. while the covenant of the Temple lasts--as it
is said: "For now I have chosen and hallowed this house."
(II Chronicles, 7:16)

g. while you last--as it is said: "The Lord, your
God has chosen you to be a special people." (Deuteronomy,
7:6)

II until the evil days: these are the days of Exile.

III and the years approach when you shall say I have no pleasure in them: neither good nor evil.

IV before the sun is darkened: of the kingship of the House of David--as it is written "and his throne as the sun before Me." (Psalms, 87:37)

V and the light and the moon and the stars

A. the light, this is Torah, concerning which it is written "the commandment is a lamp and the law is a light." (Proverbs, 6:23)

B. and the moon, this is the Sanhedrin concerning which is taught in the Mishnah, the Sanhedrin is like a half-circle threshing floor (courtroom) (M. Sanhedrin, 4:3).

C. and the stars, these are the rabbis--as it is written: "they who turn the many to righteousness are like the stars forever and ever." (Daniel, 12:3)

VI and the clouds return after the rain: you find that all the worst of the prophecies which Jeremiah prophesied concerning them were fulfilled only after the destruction of the Temple.

VII in the days when the keepers of the house shall tremble: these are the watches of the priests and the Levites

[in the Temple].

B. and the strong men shall bow themselves: these are the priests.

1. R. Abba bar Kahana said: Aaron anointed 22,000 priests in one day--as it is said, "Aaron offered them for a sacred gift before the Lord." (Numbers, 8:21)

2. R. Hanina said: The crop of birds weighs little and the priest used to throw it backwards thirty-two cubits on the ramp leading to the altar.

VIII A. and the grinders cease: these are the great collections of Mishnah, like the Mishnah of R. Akiva and the Mishnah of R. Oshaia and the Mishnah of Bar Kappara.

B. because they are few: this is the Talmud, which is included in them.

IX and those who look out the windows be darkened: you find that when Israel was exiled among the nations of the world, not one of them could remember his studies (cf petihta 21).

X and the doors be shut in the street: these are the doors of Nehustan, son of Elnatan, which are open to the public.

XI and the sound of grinding is slow: because they did not occupy themselves with words of Torah.

A. R. Samuel b. Nahman said: Israel is compared to millstones. Just as millstones never desist (from grinding), so does Israel never desist from (the study of) Torah, not by day or by night. As it is said, "you shall meditate therein day and night." (Joshua, 1:8)

XII and shall arise in response to the voice of a bird:
this is the wicked Nebuchadnezzar.

A. R. [Levi] said: for 18 years a bat kol used to come forth from the palace of Nebuchadnezzar and say: Wicked servant, go and destroy the House of your Master for his children do not obey him (Aramaic).

B. and all the singing ladies be brought low: he went up and silenced the song in the house of drinking-- as it is written, "they drink not wine with a song."
(Isaiah, 24:9)

C. they shall be afraid of that which is high: he feared the Highest of the Universe, (Nebuchadnezzar) said: He wants to force me, to do to me what he did to my grandfather.

D. and shall fear on the way: R. Abba b. Kahana and R. Levi.

1. R. Abba b. Kahana said: the dread of traveling fell upon him.

2. R. Levi said: He began to consult charmers on the way.

Insert. [c For the King of Babylon stood at the parting of the way." (Ezekiel, 21:26)

i. an arm that branches off at the crossroads:
ii. "at the head of the two ways," (Ezekiel, 21:26),
i.e., it mediates between two ways, one goes to the desert and one goes to Jerusalem.

iii. "to use divination," began to work divination.

iv. "to shake the arrows."

a. he began to shake the arrows in the name of Rome and it did not work, in the name of Alexandria, and it did not work, in the name of Jerusalem, it did work for him.

b. he planted seeds and planted plants in the name of Rome, it did not work for him, in the name of Alexandria, it did not work, in the name of Jerusalem, it worked and they did grow.

c. He lit torches and lanterns in the name of Rome, they did not ignite, in the name of Alexandria, they did not ignite, in the name of Jerusalem, they did ignite.

v. "he inquired of the teraphim," viz, his idolatrous

deities--as it is written, "and stubbornness is as idol-
atry and teraphim." (I Samuels, 15:23)

vi. "he read the liver."

a. R. Levi said: like that Arab who slaughtered
a lamb and looked at the liver.

vii. "In his right hand is the lot of Jerusalem."

a. the lots of Jerusalem appeared in his right
hand.

viii. "To set captains" $\pi\alpha\lambda\epsilon\mu\alpha\chi\omicron\varsigma$ generals (Greek)

ix. "to open the mouth with slaughter."

a. executioners (Greek)

x. "to raise the voice in shouting."

a. trumpets (Greek)

xi. "put battering rams against the gates."

a. guards of observation (Greek)

xii. "to cast a mount."

a. stones of a catapult (Greek)

xiii. "to build a fort."

a. seige ladders (and all the rest)

xiv. "and it shall be unto them a false divination
in their sight who [have sworn oaths]" [who have weeks
upon weeks].

Ezekiel said to Israel: if you had been worthy you would have read in the Torah, which can be interpreted seven times seven. Now that you are unworthy behold Nebuchadnezzar comes to divine against you seven times seven--as it is written, "who have weeks upon weeks."

xv. "he will recall the iniquity taken."

[Insert. ⁷ This is the sin of the murder of Zechariah--as it is written, "the spirit of God clothed Zechariah the son of Jehoiada the priest, and he stood above the people." (II Chronicles, 24:20)

1. was he above the heads of the people that you say "above the people?"

Rather he saw himself as higher than the whole nation, son-in-law of the king, a high priest, prophet and judge, he began to speak in self-important tones--as it is written, "he said to them: thus says the Lord: why do you transgress God's commandments and you will not prosper. Because you have forsaken the Lord, He has forsaken you." [Therefore] "they conspired against him and stoned him with stones." (II Chronicles, 24:20)

2. (a. They did not treat his blood like the blood of a deer or the blood of a ram--as it is said, "he shall

pour out the blood thereof and cover it with dust." (Leviticus, 17:13)

b. However here ["her blood is in the midst of her] she set it upon the rock, she poured it not upon the ground, to cover it with dust." Why? "to cause fury to come up to take vengeance, I have set her upon the top of the rock that it should not be covered") (Ezekiel, 24:7)

3. R. Yudan asked R. Aba "where did the Israelites murder Zechariah? In the Court of Women or the Court of Israelites?" He said to him: neither in the Court of Women or the Court of Israelites, rather in the court of Priests.

4, a, And they did not treat his blood like the blood of a deer or the blood of a ram. "He shall pour out the blood thereof and cover it with dust." (Leviticus, 17:13)

b. However here: "she set it upon the top of the rock, she poured it not upon the ground to cover it with dust." Why? "To cause fury to come up to take vengeance." I have set her blood upon the top of the rock that it should not be covered. (Ezekiel, 24:7)

5. Israel committed seven transgressions on that day. They killed a priest, a prophet, a judge, and they shed

innocent blood, profaned God's name, defiled the Court, it was the Sabbath and Yom Kippur.

6. When Nebuzardan went up (against Israel) the blood began to bubble. He said to them: what is the nature of this blood? They said to him: the blood of cattle, rams, and lambs which we slaughtered.

Immediately he sent forth and brought the blood of sacrifices and it was not similar to it. He said: "You had better tell the truth or if not we'll comb the flesh of these people with iron combs."

They said to him: "what shall we say to you? He was a prophet who reproved us; we rose up and killed him. It is now some years that his blood has not rested."

He said to them: "I will appease it." He brought before him (the member of) the Great Sanhedrin and the Lesser Sanhedrin and killed them, until their blood mingled with the blood of Zechariah to fulfill that which is said: "They break all bounds and blood touches blood." (Hosea, 4:2)

And still the blood bubbled. He brought young men and women and killed them upon it, and it did not rest. He brought school children and killed them upon it and it did not rest. He brought 80,000 trainees for the priest-

hood and killed them until their blood touched the blood of Zechariah. Still the blood bubbled.

He said: "Zechariah, Zechariah, I have destroyed the best of them. Do you want me to kill them all?"

As soon as he said this, it immediately stopped. At that moment he considered repenting for his life, reasoning: "if this occurs because of (the murder of) one life, how much the more so for the man who killed all of these people." He fled and sent a farewell gift to his home and converted.

xiii. and the almond tree shall blossom.

A. This is the prophecy of Jeremiah as it is written: "Moreover the word of the Lord came to me saying 'Jeremiah, what do you see?' And I said 'I see a rod of an almond tree'" (Jeremiah, 1:11)

B. R. Eleazar said: What is the significance of this almond tree? Twenty one days elapse from the time when it blossoms until the time it finishes. Similarly, there are twenty one days from the 17th of Tamuz to the 9th of Av.

xiv. And the grasshopper shall drag itself along.

A. This is the image of Nebuchadnezzar, as it is written: Nebuchadnezzar made an image of gold whose

height was three score cubits and breadth of six cubits." (Daniel, 3:1)

1. R. Yohanan said: how can anything stand which is 60 cubits high and 6 cubits wide? If the breadth is not a third of the height it cannot stand. And you say "he set it up in the plain of Dura." (Daniel, 13:1)

2. R. Levi said: Like a reed, they would set it up and it would fall, and they would set it up and it would fall. How long did this go on?

3. R. Haggai in the name of R. Isaac said: until they brought all the silver and gold which they had brought from Egypt and poured a layer of it at his feet, to fulfill that which had been written: "they shall cast their silver in the streets and their gold shall be as an unclear day." (Ezekiel, 7:19)

xv. and the caperberry ^{דגל} shall fail: this is the merit of thy forefathers.

xvi. because man goes to his original home: they were from Babylon and to Babylon they returned.

xvii. and mourners go about in the street: this is the exile of Jeconiah. You find that when Nebuchadnezzar returned from Jerusalem and the exile party of Zedekiah was with him, the exile party of Jeconiah left covered with

black on the inside and dressed in white on the outside. They would praise him: "captor of Barbarians" and they would ask "what was done to my father? What was done to my brother? What was done to my children?" And they would say to him, "Such as are for the death to death and such as are for sword to sword." (Jeremiah, 15:2)

They would praise him with one hand and mourn with one hand to fulfill that which was said "Your tires shall be on your heads and your shoes on your feet. You shall not mourn and you shall not weep." (Ezekiel, 24:23)

xviii. before the silver cord is snapped: this is the chain of geneological relationship.

xix. and the golden bowl is shattered: these are the words of Torah, which "are more to be desired than gold, than much fine gold." (Psalms, 19:11)

xx. and the pitcher is broken at the fountain: Two Amoraim. One said: The pitcher of Baruch at the fountain of Jeremiah. One said: the pitcher of Jeremiah at the fountain of Baruch--as it is written: "Baruch said to them: he said all these words unto me with his mouth." (Jeremiah, 36:18)

xxi. the wheel falls into the pit: this is Babylon which is the receptacle of the world.

[Insert. ²

A. 1. R. Yohanan said: "that says to the deep, be dry."
(Isaiah, 44:27) This is Babylon.

2. Why is its name called Zula? Because there the waters of the flood sank--as it is written: As Babylon has caused the slain of Israel to fall, so at Babylon fell the slain of all the land." (Jeremiah, 51:49)

B. Resh Lakish said: It is written: "And they found a plain in the land sinar and they settled there" (Genesis, 11:2). Why is the place called ¹sinar?

1. Because there the [dead] of the generation of the flood emptied out.

2. Another interpretation of ¹sinar. They (viz, the Babylonian exiles) are emptied of all the mizvot, of the mizvot of terumah and tithes.

3. Another interpretation of ¹sinar: they die by strangulation without a lantern or without cleansing.

4. Another interpretation, ¹sinar, that they died while they are young.

5. Another interpretation, ¹sinar a city whose officials are young, who trample on the Torah.

6. Another interpretation, sinar, it raised up an ² enemy and an enemy ³ to the Holy One, Blessed

be He. This is Nebuchadnezzar.

xxii. and the dust returned to the earth as it was
and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it: this is
the Holy Spirit.

When the Holy Spirit departed, they were exiled,
when they were exiled, Jeremiah mourned for them
'eykhah.

Outline

R, Joshua of Siknin in the name of R. Levi patah:
Ecclesiastes, 12:1.

I. (a) of petihta verse, reread in second person plural.

A. play on words, root: נחנח

read here as "chosenness," not "youth."

B. continuation of play on words applied to another
example of lasting covenant, proof-text using

C. another example plus proof-text using נחנח

D. another example plus proof-text using נחנח

E. another example plus proof-text using נחנח

F. another example plus proof-text using נחנח

G. another example plus proof-text using נחנח

this final example is equivalent to A.

II. (b) in petira.

III. (c) antecedent of plural form.

IV. (d¹) as metaphor with prooftext.

V. (d²)(d³)(d⁴)

A. petira of (d²) plus prooftext.

B. petira of (d³) plus prooftext from Mishnah.

C. petira of (d⁴) plus prooftext.

VI. (e) 'at mose' elaboration.

VII. A. petira of (f).

B. petira of (g).

1. what is the force of hayil?

R. Abba b. Kahana gives example to define it plus prooftext.

2. R. Hanina defines it differently, gives example.

VIII. A. petira of (h).

B. petira of (i) associated with above.

IX. (j) 'at mose' elaboration.

X. petira of (k)

XI. relates exegesis of (h) to exegesis of (l).

R. Samuel b. Nahman: metaphoric elaboration plus prooftext.

XII. petira of (m).

A. R. [Levi] : situational application.

B. continuation of situational application incorporating (n) plus prooftext.

C. (o) antecedent of "high."

D. (p) exegetical dispute form, R. Abba b. Kahana and R. Levi.

1. R. Abba b. Kahana: p^cšaṭ interpretation.

2. R. Levi: heqesh between Ecclesiastes 12 and Ezekiel 21:26.

Insert. |c Exegesis on Ezekiel 21:26-28 with same reference as above: Nebuchadnezzar.

i. (a) of Ezekiel verse, explanation of derekh; object of heqesh.

ii. (b) of Ezekiel verse, two antecedents of plural form, focus on choice between the two antecedents.

iii. (c) of Ezekiel verse paraphrase.

iv. (d) of Ezekiel verse.

Three examples of practice of (c).

a. (d) as one example of (c) leading to conclusion.

b. another example of (c) leading to same conclusion.

c. another example of (c) leading to same conclusion.

v. (e) of Ezekiel verse, paraphrase definition of Hebrew term plus prooftext.

vi. (f) of Ezekiel verse. R. Levi: situational

illustration.

vii. (g) of Ezekiel verse, understood as another example of (c) p sat paraphrase.

viii. (h) of Ezekiel verse, Greek paraphrase.

ix. (i) of Ezekiel verse, understood metaphorically. Greek paraphrase.

x. (j) of Ezekiel verse, understood metaphorically, Greek paraphrase.

xi. (k) of Ezekiel verse, understood metaphorically, Greek paraphrase.

xii. (l) of Ezekiel verse, understood metaphorically, Greek paraphrase.

xiii. (m) of Ezekiel verse, understood metaphorically, Hebrew paraphrase.

xiv. (n) and (o) of Ezekiel verse. Play on words of $\gamma \approx e$. 'ilu zakhitem exposition, middah k^e neged middah.

xv. (p) of Ezekiel verse, petira plus prooftext, leading to Zechariah story.

Insert \approx

1. rhetorical question focusing on literal or figurative meaning of above prooftext.

Answer: figurative plus prooftext.

2. (Buber claims, probably correctly, that this passage is out of place here, since it is identical to 4, and makes more sense there.)

3. R. Yudan asks location question of R. Aha.

R. Aha answers.

4. parallel triggered by 3. achieved by juxtaposition of two Scriptural texts.

5. Number 7 used for emphasis.

6. narrative about consequences of xv. Zechariah story with resolution.

XIII (q) of petihta verse.

A. petira plus prooftext.

B. R. Eleazar (q) temporal metaphor.

XIV (r) of petihta verse.

A. petira plus prooftext followed by three rabbis discussion about verse leading to situational application.

1. R. Yohanan questions feasibility of prooftext in light of (b) of prooftext.

2. R. Levi agrees and asks for solution.

3. R. Haggai provides situational application plus prooftext.

XV (s) of petihta verse in petira based on play on words

XVI. (t) of petihta verse, what is the antecedent of "original home?"

XVII. (u) of petihta verse petira leading into at mose elaboration, prooftext 1 and prooftext 2.

XVIII. (v) of petihta verse in petira.

XIX. (w) of petihta verse in petira plus prooftext.

XX. (x) of petihta verse anonymous exegetical dispute about two antecedents of nouns in phrase (x); second position uses prooftext.

XXI. (y) of petihta verse petira triggering Insert .

Insert C .

A. 1. R. Yohanan: text plus petira same as XXI.

2. place name interpretation plus prooftext.

B. Resh Lakish: brings another text which can be understood by place name interpretation.

1. explanation of place name play on words

2. another explanation of place name, play on

words

3. another explanation of place name, play on

4. another explanation of place name. play on

5. another explanation of place name, play on

6. another explanation of place name, notarikon

leading to petira.

Je plus

XXII. (z) quoted but not object of exegesis.

(aa) of petihta verse in petira.

Formulaic ending, incorporating above petira.

Notes

Parallels: Ecclesiastes Rabbah, 12.

Zechariah story: y. Taanit 4; Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa 15; Lamentations Rabbah, petihta 5, 2:2, and 4:13; Ecclesiastes Rabbah, 10:4, 3:16; b. Gitim, 57b; b. Sanhedrin, 96b; last section: y. Berakhot, 27.

With the exception of insert ^{lc}, the Zechariah story, this entire serial exegesis is found in Ecclesiastes Rabbah with a few notable differences. In Ecclesiastes Rabbah, the attribution is to R. Joshua ben Levi.

The opening sentence is

וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע ה' אֶת הַקּוֹל
עֲרֵב נֶאֱמָר

This is in contrast to the exegesis of the same verses which immediately precedes this passage in Ecclesiastes Rabbah. It also refers to the Sanctuary.

The other major distinction, which is discussed in the essay, is that the seder verse in Ecclesiastes Rabbah is Ecclesiastes 12:8, not Lamentations 1:1.

Other minor differences will be noted below.

I. Solomon said: in Ecclesiastes Rabbah the reading is

"the prophet said." This is picked up at the end when the verse Ecclesiastes 12:8 is attributed to Jeremiah.

your creator: conversion from second person singular to second person plural.

A. while your youth: play on נדנא which contextually means "youth" and homiletically is understood as chosenness. Thus the verse is understood as "while your signs of chosenness last." In B-G, the meaning is "chosenness" and all the prooftexts reflect this reading of נדנא .

III Antecedent of plural form them is understood as two opposites: good and evil.

IV. sun is darkened: "sun" is a metaphor for the house of David, established through heqesh with Psalms 87:37. The "sun" of the kingship of the House of David is "darkened" during the days of exile.

V. light, moon, stars: Each of these petirot has a proof-text. The reference from Mishnah Sanhedrin is treated exactly like a proof-text. Mishnah Sanhedrin 4:43 refers to the seating in the room in which the Sanhedrin met. It was in the shape of a half-moon. Hence the relationship here.

VI. you find that: The 'at moše' elaboration, according to Bacher, p. 228, signifies an expansion of a verse or story with other Scriptural stories, or aggadic stories.

Clouds returning after the rain is taken as a metaphor: the clouds, the worst of Jeremiah's prophecies, occurred after the rain of the destruction of the Temple. Thus the whole Scriptural phrase has a metaphoric meaning. Troubles follow troubles.

VII. B. these are the priests: another petira with reference to priests, thus both "keepers of the house" and "strong men" hayil refer to priests.

1. What is the force of hayil? According to R. Abba b. Kahana hayil refers to numerical strength, with proof-text.

2. R. Hanina gives an example of hayil meaning physical strength. The priest who is able to throw an object a long distance onto an exact spot, demonstrates that he has physical strength. Thus each of the rabbis understands hayil to refer to priests but in a different way. This difference in interpretation of hayil is common, contrasting numerical strength and physical strength. R. Abba b. Kahana is cited quite frequently in this petihta. The interpretation attributed to R. Hanina is found in b. Zebahim 64a, attributed to R. Yohanan.

VIII these are the great collections: the "grinders" are the Rabbis. In other manuscripts of Lamentations

Rabbah and Ecclesiastes Rabbah, other Rabbis are mentioned: e.g., R. Hiya and R. Hoshiya, bar Kappara, Rabbi Hunya. In Pesiqta deRav Kahana in Pisqa Eykhah there is a similar reference to these collections in an exegesis on Isaiah 1:21.

B. this is the Talmud: in Ecclesiastes Rabbah
 8182 instead of 8180. Soncino translates
 it as "which is mingled with them."

IX. you find that when...: this is another 'at moše' exposition. Again the exegetical verse is understood metaphorically. "Windows" refers to the knowledge of Torah. When the window is "darkened," this is the Exile, when study of Torah is forgotten. Whereas the 'at moše' in III was a Biblical expansion, this is clearly an exposition of rabbinic materials, with a theme appropriate to rabbinic concerns, the study of Torah. Thus a contemporary event, study of Torah, is read back into the earlier times of the exile.

remember his studies: other manuscripts read lisbor et talmudo as does Ecclesiastes Rabbah.

X. these are the doors: We have here an allusion to a legend which was clearly well known by the editor. Nehustan was the daughter, not son, of Elnatan, and the

mother of Jehoichin, according to II Kings 24:8. She used to keep her doors always open as a sign of hospitality. Thus if her doors are shut, it is a signal that great misfortune is befalling Israel.

XI. occupy themselves with Torah: the same image of grinding as studying which we saw in VIII is found here, namely sifting the tradition, masticating them.

A. The dictum of R. Samuel b. Nahman also contains the grinding motif by metaphoric elaboration. The reference is to VIII "when grinders cease." Here Israel's study of Torah never ceases. The prooftext from Joshua demonstrates the constant study of Torah.

So VIII when grinders cease is contrasted to the unceasing study of Torah in this comment. Thus the same motif receives two different interpretations.

XII. and shall arise in response to the voice of a bird: The petira: this is Nebuchadnezzar introduces this section of narrative exegesis on phrases (m), (n), and (p), all of which are determined to deal with Nebuchadnezzar.

In the first comment which incorporates (m), (n) and (o), God communicates with Nebuchadnezzar.

A. R. [Levi] said. Buber inserts "Levi" on the basis of the parallel in Ecclesiastes Rabbah.

In this situational application, God communicates with Nebuchadnezzar by means of a bat-kol. The "bat-kol" corresponds to the Scriptural phrase: voice of a bird. Note that God is referred to as Nebuchadnezzar's master. This narrative alternates between Hebrew and Aramaic.

B. singing ladies. This may be a reference to Israelite revelry, in which they combine the drinking of wine with singing, thus defying the verse from Isaiah.

C. shall be afraid...which is High. Nebuchadnezzar perceives God as being the Highest of the Universe.

wants to force me. The reference is to Sennacherib. Aramaic.

D. fear on the way, exegetical dispute form. R Abba b. Kahana and R. Levi are introduced as the interpreters. Both of them are cited often in this petihta.

1. Abba b. Kahana takes the word פ'אןאן from the Biblical verse and understands it as אאאן which Jastrow explains as "the dread of travelling."

2. R. Levi: it is not really clear what R. Levi is suggesting. Buber accepts Jastrow's explanation of "consulting charmers" פ'אן אאן. This contextually offers the best transition to the following section.

Ecclesiastes Rabbah reads פ'ללך ו'ללכך.

Leviticus Rabbah 18a contains a variant: פ'ה נא ואלו

Both of these are ways to convey "fear." Thus R. Abba b. Kahana and R. Levi would not be in disagreement. Both offer p^e₁at paraphrase of the verse.

Insert |c. Ecclesiastes 12:5 is juxtaposed to Ezekiel 21:26 by means of a heqesh of the word derekh, thereby justifying R. Levi's designation of Nebuchadnezzar as the subject of Ecclesiastes 12:5. In the Ezekiel verse, the subject is "the king of Babylon," easily understood as Nebuchadnezzar.

Insert /C is an independent exegesis on Ezekiel 21:26-28 which could be removed from this petihta without changing its force.

This exegesis is not found in any other rabbinic source, except for the parallel in Ecclesiastes Rabbah. It is similar to petihta 5 which is also a serial exegesis on a passage from Ezekiel (Chapter 24, vs 6-11). Interestingly, petihta 5 and petihta 23 also both contain the Zechariah story.

i. parting of the way, arm which branches: the verse in Ezekiel is followed by a Targumic explanation in Aramaic.

ii. two ways implies choice. Nebuchadnezzar had to make a decision as to which road to travel. All roads did not lead to Jerusalem. divination would determine which road to take.

iii. divination: only one method of divination is cited in the Scriptural verse, "shaking the arrows." Two more are added here to create a threesome. The reference to Rome and Alexandria here are anachronistic. They, of course, are the powerful nations at the time this passage was edited, rather than during Biblical times.

b. plant seeds, c. lit torches: both of these were probably common means of divination in rabbinic times. Ecclesiastes Rabbah mentions other methods of divination.

v. teraphim: the prooftext from I Samuel 15:23 defines teraphim as objects of idolatry.

vi. at the liver: Buber attributes this comment to R. Levi on the basis of other manuscripts and Ecclesiastes Rabbah. R. Levi explains in Aramaic that there is a known practice among Arabs, also Greeks and Romans, to slaughter an animal and examine its liver as a means of divination.

vii. in his right hand: since the right hand is the symbol of power, the fact that the lot of Jerusalem was in

his right hand was another sign that he should attack Jerusalem.

viii-xii. Greek paraphrases present well-known military terminology to correspond to the Biblical phrases. An instance of updating.

viii. ^{0157N180} Buber found many corruptions of this term in various manuscripts of Lamentations Rabbah and also in Ecclesiastes Rabbah. This Greek word meaning "generals" is a straight paraphrase, non-metaphoric.

ix. executioners: another Greek word which understands the text metaphorically.

xi. another way of understanding karim. In this case, it is understood as "guards," rather than as "generals" in viii.

xiii. seige ladders: Hebrew paraphrase, in same style as above.

xiv. sworn oaths...weeks upon weeks: this comment focuses on the phrase ^{1/82e '82e} which through a play on words is determined to mean 49 (seven times seven). In this 'ilu zakhitem exposition (cf. Petihta 11), Ezekiel is understood to be the preacher. The Torah can be interpreted 49 ways (this number also appears in Pe-

siqta deRav Kahana Pisqa Parah.

xv. a petira ends this section in Ecclesiastes Rabbah with the mere allusion to the murder of Zechariah. Lamentations Rabbah launches into the full Zechariah story. This is absent from the version in Ecclesiastes Rabbah, although it is found in other locations in Ecclesiastes Rabbah. In all parallels, the Zechariah story is in Hebrew.

The parallels are as follows:

Lamentations Rabbah petihta 5. Contains section beginning: "R. Yudan asked R. Aha," through the end of the juxtaposition of Ezekiel 24:7 and Leviticus 17:3.

Lamentations Rabbah 4:3. Contains: "R. Yudan... Court of Priests" and continues until the end of the Taanit passages, then adds "seven transgressions..."

y. Taanit 4, hal 5 and Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa Eykhah each begin with "R. Yudan...Court of Priests" and end with a passage not found here about God being impressed with the compassion of Nebuzardan and therefore causing the blood to stop bubbling.

Ecclesiastes Rabbah 3:16 is similar to y. Taanit and Pesiqta deRav Kahana. Exceptions: R. Yohanan instead of R. Yudan. Reference is made to 252 years of bubbling

blood, from the reign of Joash to Zedekiah. Passages about seven transgressions added at the end.

Ecclesiastes Rabbah 10:4 contains the same transitional piece that is found here (petihta 23). The text is then the same as Taanit plus the passage about the seven transgressions.

Zechariah

The transition from: "this is the sin of Zechariah" is an exegesis of II Chronicles 24:20 which demonstrates that Zechariah was arrogant. This transition is also found in Ecclesiastes Rabbah 10:4.

"Was he above the heads of the people?" means: did he literally stand above their heads? Me'al is interpreted to mean "arrogant" instead of "above." Because Zechariah had so many ties to authority figures, he began to be arrogant. The Israelites became angry at his self-importance and killed him. This is an interesting twist to the Zechariah story. The people were provoked, though not justified, into killing him.

The one feature of the Zechariah story unique to this petihta is the conversion of Nebuzardan. Nebuzarden shames the blood into stopping its bubbling by threatening to kill everybody. When the blood stops, Nebuzardan becomes

frightened, aware that his own sins far outweigh the sin of the murder of Zechariah. He repents for the killing of all the innocents, sends a farewell present to his household and converts.

In the y. Taanit version, God is so impressed with Nebuzardan's compassion, that He then causes the blood to stop bubbling.

2. (they did not treat...) Buber correctly recognizes that this passage is out of place. In the correct order, which is found in other sources, this passage follows R. Yudan and R. Aha's discussion about the location of the murder.

3. Court of Priests. The gravity of the crime is emphasized by this location. The murder took place in the Court of Priests like a sacrifice in the cult.

4. they did not treat the blood. This is another emphasis on the gravity of the crime. Even an animal's blood is covered after slaughter. But Zechariah's blood was left open to the air, and thus began to bubble.

The discussion of the treatment of blood in both Leviticus 17:13 and Ezekiel 24:7 is the connection between the two juxtaposed verses, leading to a contrastive comparison.

5. seven transgressions: This passage is located at the end of the Zechariah section in all other sources. The number 7 is used to emphasize the extent of Israel's sin. Israel's sin is magnified by (1) the place of the murder, (2) the treatment of the blood, (3) the various titles of Zechariah, e.g., priest, prophet, (4) the date, (5) the innocence of Zechariah, (6) the Israelite's lie.

6. Nebuzardan: The Israelites lie to Nebuzardan about the nature of the blood which is bubbling. They inform him that it is from sacrificial animals, whereas it is really that of a murdered priest. When he discovers that it is not the blood of animals, he threatens them (in Aramaic). They finally admit the truth. Nebuzardan reasoned that the way to appease the blood was to kill Israelites: blood for blood. So he killed thousands of Israelites and still the blood bubbled. Only when he shamed the blood did it stop. Nebuzardan, now realizing the consequences of taking a human life feels that he must make repentance, for he had shed so much blood. Although God is not mentioned here, we see that Nebuzardan implicitly becomes aware of God's power. Once he has seen the light, he must convert.

XIII, and the almond tree: We return to the exegesis on Ecclesiastes.

A. The prooftext of this petira involves a multiple meaning play on words of ^{אָפֿע}, meaning both "almond" and "hasten." The prophecy of Jeremiah is, of course, destruction and exile, consonant with the theme of this petihta.

B. R. Eleazar's comment focuses on the duration of the blossoming of the almond tree. The duration of this blossoming is the duration of the siege of Jerusalem. Even an almond tree can be a symbol of the destruction.

XIV. וְנִיב: Jastrow: row or layer of stones as in a public bath.

XV. and the caperberry: this petira is a play on ^{אֲבוֹתָם} interpreting it as referring to the forefathers.

XVI. eternal home from Babylon. In Ecclesiastes Rabbah, the reference to Babylon as Abraham's home is repeated in the later comment on the wheel shatters into the pit with the prooftext Genesis 12:1.

XVII. with one hand. One hand was raised in salute to Nebuchadnezzar and the other beat the breast in mourning. Thus the mourners go out into the street.

Captor of Barbarians: Buber believes this means a "foreign nation." Manuscript variations include .
In Rashi's commentary on Ecclesiastes, he fills in all the details of the story, e.g., that the exile of Jeconiah

preceded the exile of Zedekiah.

XXI. the wheel falls into the pit. Buber says zuta² is the lowest place of the world. Jastrow lists but does not define it. The Zechariah parallel passage in y. Taanit 4:5 contains the phrase: "Babel hi² zuto ha⁶olam" in another unrelated section. Zuto is translated by Jastrow as receptacle. y. Berakhot 27 also contains the phrase "Babel hi² zuto ha⁶olam" as a transition to the next section on the meanings of the names of the places sulah and sinar. The reading in y. Berakhot reads: "R. Yohanan said: 'that says to the deep, be dry'" (Isaiah, 44:27). This is Babylon which is the receptacle of the world. R. Yohanan said: "Why is its name called sulah?" The rest continues exactly as here in petihta 23.

A. 2. sulah: comes from root ססז , to sink.

1. based on root נחל , to empty out. This is parallel to the above A. "because the waters of the flood sank." B. "because there the dead of the generation of the flood emptied out."

3. root נחל means strangulation re: Exodus, 14:27, "God overthrew the Egyptians."

4. root נחל young.

5. play on נחל officers plus נחל young.

6. notarikon נחל and נחל both meaning enemy.

All of the above material is found in y. Berakhot 4:1 and Genesis Rabbah 37 and Shabbat 103b. In y. Berakhot, it is part of a series of reinterpreted place names. In Genesis Rabbah it is a comment on Genesis 11:2. XXVII. (dust returned...) Buber places this verse in parentheses because there is no exegesis. In Ecclesiastes Rabbah there is an exegesis.

Conclusion

Themes

In our attempt to understand the personality of these petiḥtot from various perspectives, we recognize that themes are reflected in the societal, familial, and individual aspects.

The rabbinic value concepts as described by Kadushin and others find expression in the petiḥtot of Lamentations Rabbah in stereotypical ways. In this sense, we have understood the personality of these petiḥtot from the perspective of their reflecting the values of the rabbinic society. Thus many of the themes discussed in this section are general rabbinic themes.

On the other hand, in our understanding of the personality of these petiḥtot from the perspective of their membership in the family of Lamentations Rabbah, we recognize that these general themes have been shaped in a unique way to attune them to the nature of this particular midrash.

Thus an analysis of the thematic materials in the petiḥtot of Lamentations Rabbah characterizes them as simultaneously the loyal members of the society of rabbinic values and the devoted member of the family of Lamentations Rabbah. As any family modifies the values of the society by its own familial idiosyncracies, so does the documentary/editorial context of Lamentations Rabbah shape rabbinic value-concepts in its own unique way.

There is yet another level of understanding the themes inherent in these petiḥtot. As individuals, each petiḥta personalizes the family perspective on the societal values. So an individual petiḥta may treat one of these values with a peculiar twist and still not deviate from its membership in the family or in the society. For that reason we will look at how some individual petiḥtot offer particular responses to general issues.

Sin and Retribution

By far, the most common theme among these petiḥtot is sin and retribution. Twenty-two of the thirty-six petiḥtot develop this theme.²² From the society perspective, we recognize this as one of the four key value concepts isolated by Kadushin: God's justice, middat hadin. We also recognize that by its very nature as the midrash on the Book of Lamentations, sin and retribution is bound to be the primary concern of the family of Lamentations Rabbah.

Middah k^eneged middah is described below as a hermeneutical technique. As well as a technique for explicating the Scriptural text, middah k^eneged middah is an expression of the underlying value concept of God's justice. As Israel has wronged God by their sins, so shall God visit Israel with retribution. There is a perfect fairness and balance to retributive justice. Accordingly, in addition to the three petiḥtot which utilize this hermeneutical technique, all the petiḥtot with the theme of sin and retribution also contain this

theme of middah k^eneged middah.

Retribution is Intentional

Retribution is not a random, capricious action. Exile and destruction are the calculated means by which God punishes His people for their transgressions. Examples from three petihta demonstrate the hand of God in directly meting out this punishment.

In petihta 5, the comment on the phrase no lot shall fall upon it (Ezekiel, 24:6) is: "R. Nahman in the name of R. Aha: the Holy One, Blessed be He, said 'When I cast lots on the nations of the world for the purpose of exiling them, Israel was not exiled.' Why were they exiled? Because her blood is in the midst of her (Ezekiel, 24:7).

We see from this example that Israel was not exiled by the mere chance of a lot falling upon her. Rather the specific sin of the murder of Zechariah brought about God's action of exiling Israel.

In petihta 6, the formulaic ending is an integral part of the petihta, in the body of the petihta as well as at the end. This formula spells out the concept of sin and retribution being absolutely contingent: when they sinned, then they were exiled; God betrays no partiality towards Judah and Benjamin because of their residence in the region of the Temple. As with the ten tribes, His justice is absolute, unswayed by chance or partiality.

In petihta 16, three sets of thematically related pairs

of paradoxical verses demonstrate that the events of destruction and exile could not possibly have been the natural order of events. God performed miracles for us in the wilderness and one would expect that He would sustain us in the land of Israel. Not because of God's neglect, but because of Israel's "evil ways and rebellious acts," did the unusual and horrible events of the destruction come about, so vividly described in Lamentations: "the tongue of the suckling child cleaves to the roof of his mouth for thirst," "their skin is shrivelled on their bones." These terrible images contrasted with the generous nurturance in the wilderness create the tension of the exegesis of Jeremiah 4:18: "your ways and your doings have procured these things for you." A literal reading of the exegetical verse itself demonstrates this concept: that Israel's sins are directly responsible for God bringing about the siege, conquest, and exile.

Specific sins which provoked the punishment of exile

Petiḥta 8 suggests three major categories of transgressions. All are derived from interpretation through heqesh of the phrase: "‘azabnu ‘ereṣ "(Jeremiah 9:18). Forsaking the Land of Israel, forsaking Torah, forsaking the Temple cult, are the three sins which brought on the exile. This is a recognition that not one, but many sins are responsible for the exile.

Idolatry

The sin most commonly cited as the provocation for exile

is idolatry. Five petiḥtot focus on 'abodah zarah as the direct cause of retribution.

In petiḥta 10, the Israelites worshipped the gods of every nation around them. The number of gods is given as 365. God was not even worshipped with the other gods but was neglected altogether. Two sayings: "should not a priest's wife be treated as an innkeeper's wife?" and "would that you considered Me equal to the dessert at the end of the meal!", demonstrate the total neglect of the worship of God. The last section of this petiḥta illustrates the elements of the Temple Cult which have been forgotten in favor of 'abodah zarah. Thus God claims: I have no choice! "See what your iniquities have caused Me to do, to burn My house..."

In petiḥta 12, idolatry is expressed through the metaphor of tearing the garment which covered Israel. Just as a garment may be ripped by pulling it in the wrong direction, so did idolatry cause Jerusalem to be destroyed, by pulling it away from worship of God.

Through a play on words in the second half of Proverbs 25:19, Israel is shown to be faithful to idolatry and unfaithful to God. This provokes the consequence outlined in the exegesis on the first phrase of the verse.

In both petiḥtot 21 and 22, the ultimate blasphemy has occurred. Idolatry has approached and entered the Temple itself. The punishment can be none other than the destruction

of the defiled Temple.

Not Harkening to Prophets

Another wrongdoing on the part of Israel which is marshalled by this collection of petiḥtot is: not hearkening to the exhortations of the prophets. Four petiḥtot cite this as a sin which may have caused the exile.

In an exegesis on II Chronicles 36:16 "they mocked the messengers of God and despised His words and scoffed at His prophets," petiḥta 12 draws a direct cause and effect relationship between the "mockers of the generation mumbling in their mouths, hinting with their eyes and pointing with their fingers," and the subsequent verse, II Chronicles 36:17: "He brought upon them the king of the Chaldeans, who slew their young men with a sword." Thus mocking the prophets leads to destruction.

In the last section of petiḥta 15, the people scorned Jeremiah as he reproved Israel in the exegesis on Proverbs 9:7. Scorning Jeremiah brought on the exile.

In petiḥta 31a, it is written: Israel ought to have learned from the city of Nineveh to which God sent one prophet, qal v^eḥomer, Jerusalem to which God sent many prophets. But Israel ignored them, "they hearkened not," thus they were exiled.

In petiḥta 34 in a comment on the phrase "they hear not the voice of cattle" דִּבְרֵי הַבְּהֵמָה " it is written "because they did not listen to the voice of ...the words of prophecy, but

[they only listened to] ^{דן רמ} m^eqaneh, the seducer."
 (Jeremiah, 9:9) Thus Israel is exiled because of succumbing
 to the seduction of idolatry.

Sin of the Murder of Zechariah

Two of the petiḥtot in Lamentations Rabbah focus on the murder of Zechariah as the sin which provoked the exile. The calamity of 586 BCE and 70 CE must be explained in terms of what the people had done wrong. The story of the murder of Zechariah has many elements which qualify it as a transgression worthy of great retribution. When he was dying, Zechariah said "may the Lord see and avenge." Thus the ground was set for the development of the later story which included many details which served to magnify the crime: the murder's location in the Court of Priests, the fact that the blood was not covered, the occurrence on the Sabbath and Yom Kippur.

The narrative of the murder of Zechariah in petiḥta 5 contains only the description of the sin, while in petiḥta 23, the description of the retribution is also recorded. Nebuzardan, officer in Nebuchadnezzar's army, is the protagonist of the story. As the agent of God, he is the avenger of the murder, and he carries it out by murdering thousands of Israelites.

Charles Kroloff, in his rabbinic thesis on "The Effect of Suffering on the Concept of God in Lamentations Rabbah," suggests that the reason this story had such great appeal to the authors of Lamentations Rabbah (which repeats the story

four times) is because the blood is swallowed up by the earth and does stop seething. Thus the sin has been avenged.

"The implication of these references to Zechariah is that the sin which the Christian homilists would utilize to prove that Israel was forsaken is shown by the rabbis in the Midrash to Lamentations to have been atoned for, measure for measure, and that the last remainder of the transgression, the seething blood, swallowed up into the earth."²³

Not Studying Torah

The sin of not studying Torah which is mentioned in three petiḥtot is a good example of a rabbinic value concept being expressed through exegesis of Scripture. In all three of these petiḥtot, the interpretation is dependent upon imposition of rabbinic values onto a Scriptural context which originally conveyed another message more attuned to Biblical times. As with the other sins of Israel, its commission brought on the exile.

Petiḥta 31 is the best example of the effect the neglect of the study of Torah has upon the fate of Israel. In the form of a homiletical anthology in Lamentations Rabbah, this material also appears in several contemporaneous sources: the Palestinian Talmud, Genesis Rabbah, and Pesiqta deRav Kahana. The exegesis of Jeremiah 9:11c is linked to 9:12a to create the thematic formula which is expounded throughout the petiḥta: "Why is the land perished? Because they forsake My Torah." By injection of the rabbinic value of study, this verse is

understood as "because they forsake studying MyTorah."

Through exegesis, four verses from diverse locations in Scripture are found to bear the same message as a petihta verse. Careful editorial work has brought disparate exegetical pieces together to create an anthology with a strong unified theme: when Israel neglects the study of Torah, they become vulnerable to foreign domination, destruction, and exile. This anthology comprises petihta 2.

We recognize within this petihta an element of self-justification on the part of the rabbis. One aspect of the rabbinic value concept of Torah is the study of Torah. This became more than a theoretical value concept to the rabbis. It was their *raison d'être* as well. Studying Torah and teaching Torah was their business. No wonder they attached so much importance to this enterprise. In this petihta, the rabbis are referred to as "the guardians of the city," and the lack of the hum of the children's voices studying Torah facilitated the conquest over Israel by the foreign nations. Thus, not studying Torah is the great sin which led to destruction and exile.

War Atrocities

In petihta 14, a scenario as gory as the Zechariah narrative describes the ruthless murder of thousands of prisoners of war by the Judean army. God exclaims: for such a horrible deed, they must be exiled. The mention of this incident recorded in II Chronicles 25:12 is another attempt to

ascertain what Israel has done to prompt the exile and destruction.

Not Observing Misvot

Petiḥtot 4 and 32 make reference to non-observance of the commandments as precipitating the exile and destruction.

Dispossession

In petiḥta 22, the practice of making a loan on someone's house with the intention of dispossessing him is condemned. God reminds Israel that the land is not theirs anyway. He has the real ability to dispossess and will punish dispossession measure for measure with exile.

God and Israel

Sin and retribution as a middah k^eneged middah process is the primary aspect of the God-Israel relationship which is expressed in Lamentations Rabbah. We can also learn much about the perspective of the authors of Lamentations Rabbah towards other aspects of the God-Israel relationship.

God acts directly in destruction

God's hand in the destruction and exile is implicit in all the petiḥtot involving the theme of sin and retribution. But in two petiḥtot, God is cast as the narrator describing why and how He brought about the destruction and exile.

The closing section of petiḥtot 10 and 20 are similar. In petiḥta 10, as a comment on the word: "b'avonotekha" the ending is "see what your iniquities caused Me to do: to burn My house, destroy My city, and exile My children among the

nations of the world, to sit solitary by Myself." In a comment on Psalm 102:8, petihta 20 reads "just as when you take away its young, a sparrow is left solitary, so said the Holy One, Blessed be He, I burn My House, destroy My city.." Thus God Himself acts directly to punish Israel.

God controls history

In three other petihtot, rather than acting as both Judge and Executioner, God uses the Babylonian ruler Nebuchadnezzar and Nebuchadnezzar's general Nebuzardan as His agents. In these passages, Nebuchadnezzar is not characterized as the historical conqueror, rather as the agent of Israel's destiny as determined by God. This is already a Biblical theme: "Babylonia, the rod of My anger."

In petihta 23, several references are made to Nebuchadnezzar and Nebuzardan as the agents of God. In a comment on "and he shall arise at the voice of a bird" (Ezekiel, 12:4), it is determined that a bat kol addressed Nebuchadnezzar, commanding him to destroy the Temple. The appellation for the Temple is "thy Master's house," implying that God is indeed Nebuchadnezzar's Master in this matter. In the following section, Nebuchadnezzar consults all manner of oracles through divination to determine whether he should attack Jerusalem. The implication is that the results of the divination are controlled by God.

In the Zechariah passage, Nebuzardan is cast as the avenger of the murder of Zechariah, thus he too is an

agent of God's retribution.

Petihta 30 contains the same motif. God commands Nebuchadnezzar: "go and destroy the Temple." Nebuchadnezzar fears that God intends to entrap him as he did Sennacherib. So Nebuchadnezzar sent Nebuzardan. When Nebuzardan could not succeed in capturing Jerusalem and wished to turn back, it was God who implanted the idea in his mind which resulted in the conquest of Jerusalem.

Thus in both these petihtot, Nebuchadnezzar and Nebuzardan are God's agents. With a difference twist, God abets Israel's conquest by Nebuchadnezzar in petihta 5. The Israelites claim that Nebuchadnezzar would not find them desirable victims because he had already captured all the wealth of the world. God retorts that He will make Israel's wealth attractive to Nebuchadnezzar thus instrumenting the military conquest and victory.

A similar motif is reflected in petihta 3. Only when God permits it can the nations be successful in the campaign against Israel. Pharaoh's and Sennacherib's efforts alone cannot succeed in conquering Israel. It is only when God's hand attacks that Israel can be conquered.

Historical events are perceived by the authors as being under the control of God. God either calls upon the nations directly to be His agents or arranges the course of history for the purpose of punishing Israel.

Also in petihta 30, we see God's hand in the military

victories of Israel. Israel's kings: David, Asa, Jehoshaphat, and Hezekiah, are incapable of pursuing and overtaking their enemies without God's intervention. Hezekiah even goes so far as to say: "I have the strength neither to slay or pursue nor to utter a song, but I will sleep upon my bed, and you perform all these things." Again, the implication is that God is controlling the events of history, this time for the benefit of Israel. The message is that history revolves around God's plan for Israel.

God's personal relationship with Israel

The God portrayed in these materials obviously is not a deistic God. This God intervenes in the historical process to teach a moral lesson through history. But this is not merely a God who exacts retribution for the flouting of His commandments. God has a personal relationship with the people Israel. When Israel is exiled, God is alone. God reacts to loneliness by grieving. These anthropomorphisms are means by which these authors express the intimate nature of the relationship between God and Israel.

In four *petiḥtot*, God is characterized as being "alone" without Israel, *petiḥtot* 2a, 10, 20, 29. God Himself is therefore caught in a paradoxical situation. In *petiḥta* 2a, three *mashalim* are cited, only one of which bears a direct relationship to the *petiḥta* verse. All three of the *mashalim* demonstrate God's loneliness after He causes Israel to be exiled. In the first two *mashalim*, God blames Israel for forcing Him

to exile them. But after He is forced to exile Judah, God no longer indulges in blaming His people. Rather He grieves for His own loneliness. God is imprisoned by His own laws.

In petihta 29, the Shekhinah and Israel were originally separate. When Israel was redeemed from Egypt, the Shekhinah and Israel were united. When, however, Israel was exiled the Shekhinah and Israel resumed their separate existences. Thus the exile results in the Shekhinah dwelling alone.

In both petihtot 10 and 20, the phrase "yašbah badad" is deemed to refer to God who is alone, now that His people is exiled.

When God is left alone, as His people are exiled, the midrash anthropopathically refers to God as mourning for Israel.

In petihta 2a, the prooftext: call the mourning women is read across the "bar line" into the following verse. In Jeremiah 9:17 for us is written. God is included as a mourner. God's eyes run with tears. God's eyelids gush out with water.

In petihta 4, God is the narrator. Adam's sin and subsequent expulsion from the Garden of Eden is paralleled by Israel's sin and subsequent exile. In both situations, God mourns נִכְנַח when He is forced to exile Adam and Israel.

The exegesis of the petihta verse in petihta 8 establishes by use of a rhetorical question that the subject of the verse is not an anonymous voice of wailing. God is the

mourner whose voice is heard out of Zion.

In petihta 24, God withdraws to Heaven, now that the Temple is destroyed. He weeps and exclaims: "Woe is Me, what have I done?"

We must note here that God is not only mourning for Israel. God is also feeling sorry for Himself. God fears that He will be the object of ridicule of the nations because He has allowed His habitation to be destroyed. This same motif is reflected in petihta 15 where God eavesdrops on the conversation of the nations who mock Him.

In both these petihtot, God regrets the special relationship with Israel. Perhaps the authors of these petihtot advance this daring piece of theology to explain what they perceive to be a rupture in the God-Israel relationship.

Charles Kroloff comments on this characterization of God:

"At first glance, such a feeling of displeasure on God's part would seem to suggest a deterioration in relationships. In truth, it serves to reaffirm that no matter what the exigency, the relationship may not be dissolved. Coupled with God's eavesdropping, the midrash serves to place God in a rather degrading position, dependent not only upon Israel, but upon the comments of the nations."²⁴

The strength of the covenant between God and Israel is illustrated in petihta 3. While the nations engage in frivolous amusements, Israel "sat alone" because of the cove-

p. 240
nantal relationship with God.

In the initial exegesis in petihta 23, the root נחן is understood through a play on words as "chosenness." What follows is a comment on the covenant between God and Israel which implies that as long as Israel remembers the covenant, the covenant will endure.

The long and unique petihta 24 discussed above involves a further anthropomorphism. God summons Jeremiah and asks him to call the patriarchs to weep for Israel. Instead of weeping for Israel, Abraham comes to plea for mercy. Following the patriarchs, Moses comes, as do the twenty-two letters of the alphabet. Finally God responds to Rachel's pleas for mercy. Because Rachel had pity upon her sister, God decides to take pity on Israel and redeem them.

Petihta 9 is distinctive in its approach to idolatry. Instead of condemning Israel for its idolatrous practices, in petihta 9, Israel is falsely accused of idolatry by the nations. The Ammonites and Moabites claim that the cherubim are idols. God responds that He will exterminate these people who slander Israel. Thus God serves as the avenger of slander perpetrated against His people.

We see that theodicy is the central theme which is the focus of these petihtot. The sin-and-retribution explanation of Israel's suffering is treated in a variety of ways which we have noted above. Israel's relationship with God is tested both by the extent of Israel's sin and by the severity of the

Divine retribution.

Rabbinic Society

Hermeneutical Techniques

As described in the introduction (p. 6) I applied Isaak Heinemann's categorization of hermeneutical techniques to the exposition in these 36 petihtot. I also identified some additional techniques. All of these have been recorded in the outlines of petihtot 1 - 14 and 23 and in the charts on each of the petihtot, under the heading: "Structure and Hermeneutical Devices."

An additional chart (figure 3) entitled "Hermeneutical Techniques" demonstrates the frequency with which individual techniques are employed. All of the petihtot involve some reconstruction of syntax, thus this is not listed as a technique. Descriptions of the techniques are as follows:

1. Serial exegesis. The petihta verse is interpreted in a sequential manner, sometimes atomistically, taking one phrase at a time. Often a petihta contains two or more serial exegeses on the same verse, preceded by "dabar 'aḥer," e.g., 8, 12, 15. Sometimes the two serial exegeses are structurally identical, an editorial attempt to emphasize the contrasts between the two exegeses. For example, in petihta 17 the first serial exegesis of "they who sit in the gate talk of me, I am the song of drunkards" (Psalms, 69:13) begins: "This refers to the nations of the world who sit in theaters and circuses." The second exegesis begins with the same sentence structure

but reaches a contrasting conclusion: "this refers to the Israelites who sit in the synagogues and houses of study." Twenty-seven of the thirty-six petihtot contain some serial exegesis of the petihta verse.

2. Petira. A petira consists of the quotation of a word or phrase from the verse being exegeted, followed by the word zeh or 'elu. The reference is usually a metaphor backed up by a proof-text which establishes a relationship between the exegetical phrase and its metaphorical understanding. An example from petihta 23 is "and the light and the moon and the stars" (Ecclesiastes, 12:2). the light: this is Torah as it is written "the commandment is a lamp and the law is a light" (Proverbs, 6:23).

Not all petirot are metaphors and not all have proof-texts. Some merely provide an antecedent for a pronoun or fill in an ellipsis. An example from petihta 15 is "the one who corrects: this is Jeremiah." There is no proof-text here, only an implicit understanding of the relationship.

The petira is the most common technique utilized in this exegetical material, found in seventeen petihtot.

3. Analogy. The use of analogy is a common illustrative technique in the literature of many cultures. Three specific types of analogy can be isolated among these materials. The first is a "mah-kakh" analogy, also known as the "kazeh-kakh." An example from petihta 20: "mah" just as when you take away its young, a sparrow is left solitary "kakh" so

spoke the Holy One, Blessed be He "I burnt My house...and I sit solitary."

4. Mashal. The mashal is an extended analogy preceded by the formula "l^emah hadabar domeh?" or "mashal l^e..." The nimshal is not always spelled out but is usually quite clear from the context. In contrast to the analogy described above a mashal usually takes the form of a parable.

An example from petihta 12: "To what may the ten tribes and the tribe of Judah and Benjamin be compared? To two men who were covered with a new cloak during the rainy season. One tore here and one tore there until they ripped it. Thus the ten tribes did not remove themselves from the idol worship in Samaria nor the tribes of Judah and Benjamin in Jerusalem until they caused Jerusalem to be destroyed."

5. Mashal lemelekh. This is a specific form of mashal, very common in aggadic literature. It is usually preceded by the phrase "mashal lemelekh." God is the king and His son is Israel. Occasionally other characters are included but these are the primary ones. This example is from petihta 2a which includes a series of three mashalim. "[God can be compared] to a king who had two sons. He became angry at the first, took the stick and knocked him down and exiled him. He said: Woe to him, from what tranquillity is he exiled... Thus were the ten tribes exiled and the Holy One, Blessed be He began to say this verse with reference to them: "Woe unto them for they have strayed from Me' (Hosea, 7:13)"

6. Mose' elaboration. Bacher describes this as follows: "this comes to expand a narrative from the stories of Scripture or an aggadic concept." These stories are always preceded by the formula "at mose'" or "mašinu." Nine petiḥtot contain this type of exposition. An example from petiḥta 29: "at mose'" you find that before the Israelites were delivered from Egypt they lived apart by themselves and the Shekhinah was by itself, but when they were delivered, they were joined. When, however, they were exiled, the Shekhinah resumed its separate existence and the Israelites theirs."

7. Exegetical dispute form. This is a technique which probably derived from halakhic materials. Two or more rabbis are cited as offering differing opinions about an exegesis. Often in these petiḥtot the exegeses do not deviate until some late point, an indication that these may be just slightly different traditions of exegesis. The image of two rabbis sitting across a table, offering to each other their different interpretations of a verse, is probably a romanticized version of what is probably an editorial process.

An example from petiḥta 22: "R. Yohanan and R. Shimon b. Lakish comment on this verse : R. Yohanan said Woe unto them who join house to house, woe to them who make a loan on a man's house and field to take them from him... R. Shimon b. Lakish: Woe unto them who have joined the destruction of the first Temple to the second Temple."

8. Anthology of Talmudic materials. This is another technique which makes use of halakhic materials. In both petihtot 2 and 33 material is brought from both Talmuds on a particular theme in the form of anthology. The petihta form is imposed on these materials, rather than the materials deriving from an exegesis on the petihta verse. In petihta 33, passages about the ninth of Av and the fifteenth of Av are collected from y. Taanit and b. Taanit.

exegetical
materials which
originate in
Talmud or a non-
exegetical context

9. Petihta verse as prooftext for dictum. Similar to the above technique, in this case the petihta verse functions as a prooftext for a rabbinic dictum in a Talmudic text and is transferred here wholesale without any attempt to adapt it into an exegetical framework. An example from petihta 2: R. Shimon b. Yohai taught: if you see cities uprooted from their places in the land of Israel, know that they did not maintain the duty of paying the wages of the teachers of Bible and teachers of Mishnah. As it is written "why is the land perished? Because they have forsaken My Torah" (Jeremiah, 9:11-12). This identical passage is found in y. Haggigah 1:7.

better: non-exegetical

10. Aramaic paraphrase. This appears usually as one of the elements in a serial exegesis. Instead of a phrase being understood metaphorically, it may be subjected to a Targum-like paraphrase. This is the type of exegesis found in the Targum. This paraphrase can take the form of a direct translation or a clarifying explanation. Of course Aramaic

is also used in several of the long narratives. An example of an Aramiac paraphrase which provides some additional elucidation is in petihta 5: "Woe to the bloody city: woe to the city in which they spill blood."

11. Updating with Greek or Latin. Just as a paraphrase into Aramaic, a familiar spoken language, may have helped the reader/listener to understand a difficult passage, a translation into Greek or Latin would also be a way to update Biblical materials to a contemporary setting. In addition, current Hellenistic realia from the surrounding world found their way into Scriptural exegesis. In petihta 3, the contemporary interpretation of "I sat not in the assembly of them that make merry" (Jeremiah, 15:17) is "never did I enter the theaters and the circuses of the nations of the world." Both theaters and circuses are Greek words and Greek concepts.

12. Qal v^ehomer. This hermeneutical technique, common throughout rabbinic halakhic and aggadic literature, translates roughly into "how much the moreso." The one example in these petihtot comes from petihta 31a. "Ought she not have learnt from the city of Jonah, Ninveh? One prophet I sent to Ninveh and she turned in penitence; but to Israel in Jerusalem, I sent many prophets."

13. Haabot siman l^ebanim. The actions of one generation influences what happens to the succeeding generations. The merit of our ancestors can be called upon in our prayers to

God. Likewise we can attribute all that which has happened to us to our ancestors' proper behavior or in the case of petihta 4, their sins. In petihta 4, God responds to Adam's sins by evicting him from the Garden of Eden. Similarly, God responds to Israel's sins by exiling them from the Land of Israel; i.e., the story of Adam is paradigmatic.

14. Rhetorical question. This technique asks a question about a point in the Scriptural verse leading into the exegesis. An example from petihta 8 asks for clarification on the phrase from Jeremiah 9:18, For a voice of wailing is heard out of Zion. Then, can trees weep and can stones weep that you say: a voice of wailing is heard in Zion? Rather it comes from the One who causes His presence to dwell in Zion.

15. Paradox. The element of surprise through paradox is utilized in petihtot 2 and 16. In petihta 2 in a paradoxical parable, the guardians of the city are revealed to be the rabbis instead of the city officials.

16. Middah k^eneged middah. Besides serving as a hermeneutical technique in three of the petihtot, middah k^eneged middah is reflected in the theme of sin and retribution which underlies so many of these petihtot. As a theme: Israel wronged God with their sins and God will repay them with the punishment of exile. As a technique: it reads into the Scriptural text a measure-for-measure message. An example from petihta 27: Then I will chastise you seven times more for your sins (Leviticus, 26:18). You committed seven trans-

gressions before Me (enumerated by Rashi on Leviticus, 26:15) ... therefore Jeremiah came to utter over you Lamentations consisting of verses the initial letters of which form a sevenfold alphabet.

17. 'Ilu zakhitem. A version of middah k^eneged middah, this technique contrasts a positive promise or event in Scripture with a negative event by use of the formula: if you had been worthy you would have...but now that you are not worthy... Three petiḥtot incorporate this technique. In both petiḥtot 11 and 19 this technique forms the entire body of the exegesis.

In petiḥta 19 we read: if you had been worthy, you would be dwelling in Jerusalem and drinking the waters of Shiloah, whose waters are pure and sweet (Isaiah, 8:6), but now that you are unworthy, you are exiled to Babylon and drink the waters of the Euphrates whose waters are impure and evil-smelling (Jeremiah, 2:18).

18. Grammatical Analysis: Plural antecedents. Often a noun or verb from Scripture is found in the plural form for no apparent reason other than literary style. Because of the assumption of haznaḥat halogos, even a plural form which does make sense in context can be subjected to this technique. Each plural form is determined to have at least two antecedents. The most common example is found in petiḥta 17: because our dwellings have cast us out (Jeremiah, 9:18) this refers to the destruction of the first and second Temples.

19. Reconstruction of syntax: causal. The syntax of the sentence is rewritten so that one phrase becomes the condition upon which the other phrase is dependent. An example from petihta 32: Though I would take comfort against sorrow, my heart is faint within me (Jeremiah, 8:18). After "take comfort" is understood through metaphor (see introduction, p. 1) to mean one who does not keep the commandments it is written: for all that, my heart is faint within me. Thus phrase (a) as exegetically understood is the cause of phrase (b).

20. Filling in ellipsis. Because of the assumption of haznaḥat halogos, a word in a Scriptural verse can be read as part of an elliptical adverbial or adjectival phrase. The Scriptural word is given a direct object or modifier by the darshan. An example from petihta 1: "hearken (Isaiah, 10:30) hearken to commandments, hearken to words of Torah, hearken to words of prophecy, hearken to charitable acts and hearken to good works."

21. Play on Words. As Heinemann wrote in Darkhey Ha-Aggadah, our sages believed in the autonomy of the letters, and that they could collaborate in ways other than the literal.²⁵ Thus the root נחא in petihta 23 can be understood in the connotation of "chosen," as well as the denotation of "youth."

Several types of plays on words are found in these petiḥtot. The first is based on the root, as in the above example.

Eight petiḥtot have this type of play on words. The other categories will each be dealt with individually below.

22. 'Al taqri. The 'al taqri play on words involves imposing different vowels onto a Scriptural word. Since the text was originally unpointed, this is an obvious exegetical method. The best example in this material is in petiḥta 4, where the word **אִי־קָה** in Genesis 3:9 is found to be equivalent to the word **אִי־קָה** in Lamentations 1:1. The phrase 'al taqri means: rather than reading the text literally as X, read it homiletically as Y.

23. Place-name interpretation. By use of this technique, unusual place names are given a homiletical meaning based on a possible Hebrew root. Thus in petiḥta 1, daughter of Gallim, a geographical location, is understood as daughter of waves or wanderers.

24. Notarikon. With this technique, the darshan could violate the integrity of a word by dissecting it into two or more smaller words thus imbuing it with an entirely new homiletic meaning. In an example from petiḥta 22, the word

נְהַרְרָה is divided into **נְהַרְרָה / רַחֲמֵי** meaning a woman and her two lovers (Israel, God and idds).

25. Gematria. Each letter has a numerical value. By use of this technique, the numerical value of the letters in a word are added up. Then the word is determined to be a symbol or sign based on this numerical value. The example in petiḥta 12 is based on the word **לֹא־כִסֵּן** from Isaiah 1:21.

p. 251

אלכסן has the numerical value of 481. When the text reads "full of law" לגמול אלכסן, it is understood as full of the study of law. Thus there were 480 synagogues and houses of study of the Law, plus the one Temple in Jerusalem.

26. Hegesh. This technique is also known as gezera savah or sivyon. The darshan transposes that which is written about one matter to another matter based on the fact that both Scriptural contexts contain a common word or phrase. Eleven petiḥtot in Lamentations Rabbah utilize this technique. In petiḥta 9 the word הרבה appears in the petiḥta verse of Jeremiah 51:51 and in the proof-text to the 'at moṣe' ma'aseh, thus providing the connection which generated this exegetical narrative.

27. Hegesh between petiḥta verse and seder verse. Three petiḥtot in Lamentations Rabbah derive their exegesis from a hegesh between the petiḥta verse and seder verse. This method creates the most well-integrated petiḥta. The relationship between the petiḥta verse and the seder verse is clearly the determinant of the exegesis, rather than editorial adaptation of materials into a petiḥta form. In Joseph Heinemann's article, "The Proem in the Aggadic Midrashim" he cites petiḥta 21 in Lamentations Rabbah as an example of a petiḥta based on a "verbal tally" between petiḥta verse and seder verse.²⁶ In this case the hegesh is between the leper who must

לע לע and the city of Jerusalem who לע לע.

28. Contrast of Scriptural Contexts. This is a specific use of the heqesh technique with special attention paid to the Scriptural context of each verse subjected to the heqesh. In petihta 4, six verses from Genesis chapter 3, the story of Adams's sin and eviction from the Garden are contrasted with verses elsewhere in the Bible about Israel's sin and eviction. The context of the verses is as important as the heqesh of the individual word. In petihta 11, verses from Lamentations with negative connotations are juxtaposed by heqesh with verses in the Pentateuch with positive connotations. In petihta 16, verses about Israel's wellbeing in the desert are contrasted by heqesh to verses from Lamentations about Israel's suffering during the destruction. In this instance as well, the context of the Book of Lamentations is essential in understanding the exegesis.

29. Verse equivalence. In petihta 2, five seemingly unrelated verses are determined through various techniques of exegesis to have the same meaning. In this case the meaning of Jeremiah 9:11-12, Daniel 8:12, Hosea 8:3, Genesis 26:22, and Isaiah 5:24 all are determined to mean: when Israel forsakes the study of Torah, the foreign nations can dominate.

By use of all these hermeneutical techniques, the rabbis seek to extract all the oracular pronouncements of Scripture.

Family of Lamentations Rabbah

These 36 petihtot are editorially placed as the introductory section of the Midrash of Lamentations Rabbah. Buber

maintains that the petiḥta section and the five chapters of verse by verse exegesis have two different authors, while Theodor holds that the collection of petiḥtot was compiled by the author of the exegetical chapters.²⁷ The question can be debated on the basis of evidence of identical materials which appear in both sections. For our purposes, we observe that there are parallel passages between the petiḥta section and the exegetical section, and we note the similarities and dissimilarities. Six of the petiḥtot have parallels in the exegetical section of Lamentations Rabbah. Petiḥtot 17 and 18 have exact parallels in Lamentations Rabbah 3:14-15. All of petiḥta 28 is found in Lamentations Rabbah 3:1. The version in Lamentations Rabbah 3:1 contains some additional exegetical material and has an internal attribution to R. Hama bar Hanina besides the petiḥta attribution. Petiḥta 30 is attributed to Zabdi b. Levi, while Lamentations Rabbah 4:12 contains the identical passage without an attribution. The Zechariah portions of petiḥtot 5 and 23 are also found in Lamentations Rabbah 2:2 and 4:13. No conclusion as to the priority or authorship of the petiḥta section or the exegetical section can be absolutely ascertained.

What seems clear in our analysis of these petiḥtot is that they have been editorially shaped to conform to a thematic pattern and a stereotypical homiletical structure.

The overriding theme operating in 24 of the 36 petiḥtot is that of sin and retribution. Although this is a common

theme throughout rabbinic literature, Lamentations Rabbah adopts this as its primary focus. In other midrash collections, the motifs run the gamut of the rabbinic value concepts identified by Kadushin. Because of its relationship to the Book of Lamentations read on Tisha b'Av, the anniversary of the destruction of the Temples, Lamentations Rabbah explores the reasons for the destruction. The development of this theme of sin and retribution is elaborated above in the section of themes beginning on p.226.

The motif of Tisha b'Av appears in five of the petiḥtot: 9, 17, 18, 23, and 33. The structure of the Book of Lamentations is the subject of petiḥtot 11, 16, 17, 27 and 28. Thus certain themes and motifs are the hallmarks of the family of the Lamentations Rabbah petiḥtot.

Beside the common thematic thread there is a stylistic indicator which functions as a unifying factor among the petiḥtot of Lamentations Rabbah: the formulaic transition phrase to the seder verse at the end of the petiḥta. In his work on Leviticus Rabbah, Sarason identifies this stereotypical transition phrase as the means by which a redactor adapts existing rabbinic materials to the specific document. He suggests that 67 out of 122 petiḥtot in Leviticus Rabbah (perhaps as many as 83) can be accounted for in this way.²⁸

Of the petiḥtot in Lamentations Rabbah, 15 end with the following transition phrase: "when they sinned, they were exiled; when they were exiled, Jeremiah began to mourn for

them: Lamentations 1:1." Another five petiḥtot end with a variation on this formulaic transition phrase. The chart in figure 2 indicates in which petiḥtot the ending is obviously tacked on (17 of 19). Only in petiḥtot 6 and 14 does the formulaic ending seem to be integral. In most cases it seems to function as a summary of the theme of sin and retribution and appears as an artificial appendage.

An example of the use of this formulaic transition phrase to adapt existing material to Lamentations Rabbah is petiḥta 33. This petiḥta contains materials from the Talmud about the significance of the 15th of Av. A sentence about the connection between the 9th of Av to sin is added and then the formulaic transition phrase: "when they sinned, they were exiled..." is appended.

Another example is petiḥta 2. All of this material is found in Pesiqta deRav Kahana, Pisqa' Eykhah. A variation on the formulaic ending "when they cast the words of Torah to the ground, Jeremiah mourned Lamentations 1:1" adapts these materials to Lamentations Rabbah.

Thus we have seen that members of the family of Lamentations Rabbah petiḥtot share a common theme and common homiletical structure.

Individual Petiḥta

Finally, we come to know each petiḥta as an individual. All petiḥtot which appear in the "classical midrashim" (Genesis Rabbah, Leviticus Rabbah, and Pesiqta deRav Kahana

p. 256

as well as Lamentations 'Rabbah) have the same structure; the petihta verse is subjected to exegesis beginning a process which eventually leads to the seder verse which begins the Torah or Haftorah reading.

Yet each petihta has its own unique twists and turns in its creative use of the tension between these two seemingly unrelated verses. Of the 36 petihtot before us in this document no two have the identical structure, though the similarities may be striking. We never become bored with the same old themes and the same old techniques of exegesis because the combinations are always unique. Just as each individual person has interesting qualities, each petihta has its own interesting qualities.

Lewis Barth explains this well:

"A petihta then may contain some extraneous comments, exempla, parables, proverbs and word plays which serve to explain a verse in a more or less thematic way. The result is that this unique homiletic form in the final stage of its development in the 'literary sermon' forces the reader to analyze each unit of tradition in itself, and then to attempt to determine its relation to the petihta verse as a whole, to the lection verse, to the surrounding traditions and to the material drawn together in the larger sermonic chapter."²⁹

Thus we have analyzed each of these petihtot according to Barth's description. Each petihta has been outlined and the exegetical elements and aggadic passages identified. The

essays on petiḥtot 1 - 14 offer a more in-depth analysis of how the components of each petiḥta have been editorially woven together to form a unified homiletical structure.

Looking at this collection of petiḥtot we can make the observation that five of them are not petiḥtot at all: 16, 24, 25, 28, and 34. They all begin with the formula "R. X. pataḥ" but none of them have a transition phrase leading to the seder verse of Lamentations 1:1. Petiḥta 16 contains three verses from Lamentations juxtaposed as contrasting parallels to other verses from Scripture to illustrate the petiḥta verse, thus its placement here in Lamentations Rabbah is justified. However the usual seder verse of Lamentations 1:1 is not cited at all. Petiḥta 24 also reflects a familiar Lamentations Rabbah theme of mourning and lamentations. Its long narrative section ends with the final prooftext which expresses a n^ehemta message. Petiḥta 25's placement in Lamentations Rabbah can be justified only by its thematic reference to exile in the last section of exegesis and its general tone of grief. Petiḥta 28 is a discourse on the relationship between Jeremiah 36:32 and the first word of each section of the scroll of Lamentations Rabbah. Thus its presence in this text is clearly justified. However it is not a petiḥta, and could fit better into the exegetical chapters. Petiḥta 34, the final one in this collection, certainly bears a thematic relationship to Lamentations Rabbah. It ends with an eschatological message: "in the hereafter all will return."

p. 258

All five of these "handicapped" petiḥtot bear a thematic relationship to the family of Lamentations Rabbah. In the case of petiḥtot 16, 24 and 25, the formulaic transition phrase and seder phrase could have been editorially appended. As in many other petiḥtot it would have been a thematic summary without the integral flow of the exegesis into the seder verse. Why there was this lapse in the editorial process is unclear.

Of the 36 petiḥtot, 17 have no parallels at all in rabbinic documents that have been dated as earlier or contemporaneous with Lamentations Rabbah. Parts of seven other petiḥtot appear in other sources. The remaining twelve have exact parallels either in exegetical or aggadic form or as petiḥtot. The sources of these parallels are Pesiqta deRav Kahana, Palestinian Talmud, Babylonian Talmud, and Genesis Rabbah. All of the parallels are cited on the charts and within the Notes section on each petiḥta.

Each petiḥta thus combines familiar techniques of exegesis and hermeneutics into a unique combination, setting it apart from all other petiḥtot.

Final Summary

From the midst of all the detailed documentation of the textual characteristics of the petiḥtot of Lamentations Rabbah, emerges an essential question. Why did the rabbis engage in such close scrutinization of Scripture? Why did they indulge in the intricate manipulations of words and let-

ters? Why did they weave such fanciful tales about kings and sons, about angels, patriarchs and matriarchs, about the visions of foreign conquerors?

In every civilization throughout history, people have sought an explanation for their destiny. Some attributed it to the whims of the gods. Some perceived it as fate determined by birth. Oracles were consulted, signs and symbols were deciphered in an attempt to find the answer.

הבב הב והבב בב דככה בה

Ben Bag Bag (Abot, 5:27).

Within the Torah was contained not only a law code for the wilderness, not only miracle tales of redemption, not only the chronicles of the monarchy, not only the rites of an obsolete cult, but the very blueprint for the past, present and future existence of the Jewish people.

As we peruse the data we have accumulated on the petihtot

p.260

of Lamentations Rabbah we recognize that the rabbis read out of the text what they wanted to read into the text. The line between exegesis and homiletics fades in the search for metaphysical reality.

In the case of Lamentations Rabbah the metaphysical reality which is sought is ~~that of~~ theodicy. How do our acts, as mortal humans, affect the divine execution of our fate? Is there an unswerving pattern of middah k^eneged middah? Is there a necessary contingency between our ancestors' actions, and our destiny, illustrated by ha'abot siman l^ebanim? The rabbis were not dwelling on ancestral tales for the sake of idealizing the lore of their people. They were seeking within an ancient text the master plan which was played out in their own contemporary situation. The Temple had been destroyed, and they were now forging a religion without a central cultic focus. The terrible reality of the destruction and exile of 70 CE was read back into the terrible reality of 586 BCE. One tragedy is superimposed upon another as Nebuchadnezzar becomes the prototype for Rome and all oppressors.

No one theology springs forth from this collection of petiḥtot, although the editors constantly test the limits of middah k^eneged middah. Theodicy is the burning issue throughout. Many answers are proposed. None is accepted as the absolute solution.

By approaching the petiḥta section of Lamentations Rabbah from the perspective of all its identities, we have come

p. 261
to know it well, phenomenologically and contextually. As a member of the species of literature, it utilizes the literary techniques common to all peoples in their folklore. Approaching it as a member of the rabbinic society, we have seen how the rabbinic value concepts of Divine Justice and the covenantal relationship between God and Israel have infused the Scriptural exegesis. The common rabbinic hermeneutical devices, as we have identified them, are the means by which Scripture is understood by this rabbinic society. Approaching it as a member of the family of Lamentations Rabbah we have made note of the shaping of existing materials and the innovation of new materials by editorial activity specific to this document. And finally, each petihta as an individual homiletical unit has been analyzed to reveal its unique character.

Underlying all of the four identities is the belief on the part of the rabbis in the importance of their enterprise in uncovering the truths conveyed by Scripture. These were not merely static truisms of the past, rather the very determinant of their contemporary reality.

Figure 1

	<u>Petihta verse</u>	<u>Paralléls</u>	<u>Structural and Hermeneutical Devices</u>	<u>Petirot</u>	<u>Transition</u>	<u>Themes</u>
1	Isaiah, 10:30	Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa 13, Dibrey Yir- miah. (b. Sanhedrin, 94b-95a)	Serial exegesis of Isaiah 10:30. A. Fill in ellipsis of first place B. Homiletical interpretation of place name; mah-kakh analogy, implicit 'al taqri. C. Fill in ellipsis with object of imperative verb. D. Homiletical interpretation of place names, (e) and (d) read as conditional. E. Fill in ellipse of adjective. F. (c) and (d) conditional. Good transition to Lamentations 1:1.	Laish = Nebuchad- nezzar; prooftext = Jeremiah, 4:7.	"the one from Anathoth will prophecy," Jeremiah, 1:1, then "Because retribution came, he mourned for them Eykhah Lamentations 1:1."	<u>sin</u> of not studying Torah and not observing misvot leads to <u>retribution</u> of Nebuchadnezzar attacking.
2	Jeremiah, 9:11c, 9: 9:12a.	Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa 15, Eykhah. y. Haggigah 1, hal 7. y. Rosh Hasha- na 3, hal 8. Genesis Rab- bah, 65:20.	Anthology of materials on sin of for- saking study of Torah which allows the foreign nations to dominate. A. lifted from y. Haggigah 1:7, petih- ta verse is prooftext not exegetical verse. Form: dictum, prooftext, paradoxical parable; masinu technique. Insert: related exegeses. B. Other exegeses of homiletically equivalent verses; y. Rosh Hashana, 3:8.	Daniel, 8:12; host = secular kingdom; offering= Israel; transgres- sions = neglect of Torah; truth = To- rah; will prosper= evil decree will succeed. Isaiah, 5:24: stubble = Esau;	"Because they cast words of Torah to the ground (Da- niel 8:12) Jeremiah mourn- ed Lamentations 1:1." Daniel 8:12 is one of five homiletically equivalent verses; this is an edito- rial attempt to relate one of the exegetical verses to the formulaic ending of Lamentations Rabbah.	1. forsaking the study of Torah leads to foreign do- mination, <u>sin</u> and <u>retri- bution</u> . a. Rabbinic enterprise elevated to ultimate good. b. Rabbis are guardians of the city. c. When children stop studying Torah, this paves way for military

<u>Petihta Verse</u>	<u>Parallels</u>	<u>Structural and Hermeneutical Devices</u>	<u>Petiot</u>	<u>Transition</u>	<u>Theme</u>
		<p>1. petira on Daniel, 8:12.</p> <p>2. coordinate exegesis of Hosea 8:3.</p> <p>3. situational application maaseh based on Genesis, 26:22. Metaphoric illustration of Daniel 8:12 by rendering it conditional (Genesis Rabbah, 65:20)</p> <p>4. petira of Isaiah 5:24; first three elements-same prooftext.</p> <p><u>Equivalent verses</u></p> <p>All verses below are determined to mean: when Israel forsakes the Torah, the foreign nations will dominate: Jeremiah, 9:11c, 9:12a (petihta verse) Daniel, 8:12 (object of petira and prooftext).</p> <p>Hosea, 8:3 (analogy and prooftext).</p> <p>Genesis, 26:22 (through a maaseh).</p> <p>Isaiah, 5:24 (petira plus a shared prooftext).</p>	<p>tongue of fire = Jacob; flame = Joseph; root = ancestors; blossom = tribes; Law of Lord of Hosts = Written Law; Word of Holy One = Oral Law</p>	<p>Note: in Pesiqta deRav Kahana this is not a petihta, there is no transition or ending.</p>	<p>victory by foreign conquerors.</p>
2a	Jeremiah, 9:16. Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa 15.	<p>Three mashalim in exegetical dispute form.</p> <p>Only second mashal uses petihta verse</p> <p>Second mashal continues with exegesis on following verse, Jeremiah 9:17.</p>	None	<p>"God began to mourn over them Lamentations 1:1" Well-integrated.</p>	<p>1. God punishes Israel, then mourns for them.</p> <p>2. God mourns for his own loss.</p>

P. 263

	<u>Petihta Verse</u>	<u>Parallels</u>	<u>Structural and Hermeneutical Devices</u>	<u>Petirot</u>	<u>Transition</u>	<u>Themes</u>
3	Jeremiah, 15:17.	Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa 15.	A. Exegesis of (a) through updated story (Hellenistic overtones). B. Exegesis of (b). Three propositions, answer: (b); only when God, then b. Heqesh between petihta verse and seder verse.	None	From heqesh with petihta verse "badad yashabti" to "eykhah yasvav badad." Well-integrated through heqesh.	1. Isolation of Israel in its separate identity and covenantal relationship to God. 2. Condemnation of Hellenism. 3. Nations can only conquer Israel when God permits it.
4	Hosea, 6:7.	Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa 15.	Petira establishing analogy between Adam and Israel. A. God lists six behaviors towards Adam. B. prooftexts for above six behaviors; last prooftext is Genesis, 3:9 C. maaseh abhot lebbanim; each six behaviors has its counterpart with Israel. Six prooftexts, last one is Lamentations 1:1	p7k = first man Adam.	Last prooftext "And I mourned for them: 'how does the...'" Structure of petihta depends on seder verse and heqesh-al taqri with Genesis, 3:9.	Sin and retribution. 1. Adam and Eve sinned and were expelled. 2. Israel sinned and was exiled. 3. God mourns.
5	Ezekiel, 24:6.	Zechariah: Lamentations Rabbah, petih- 23. Pesiqta deRav	Serial exegesis on Ezekiel, 24:6 - 11. A.- C. Aramaic paraphrases. D. situational elaboration on metaphoric understanding of Scriptural phrase.	Heaping on the wood wood = legions; kindling the fire = kings; flesh consumed = community.	Formulaic Lamentations Rabbah ending. No transition from exegesis of Ezekiel, but is a summary of theme of sin and retribution.	1. Sin and retribution. 2. exile is not determined by chance but is purposeful act of God. 3. God controls Nebuchadnezzar's campaign.

p. 264

<u>Petihta Verse</u>	<u>Parallels</u>	<u>Structural and Hermeneutical Devices</u>	<u>Petirot</u>	<u>Transition</u>	<u>Themes</u>
	Kahana Pisqa 15. Lamentations Rabbah, 2:4. Ecclesiastes Rabbah, 3:16, 10:4. Y. Taanit, 4 hal 5	E. situational application reading across bar line of Ezekiel 24:6-7 ex- pressing theme of exile being pur- poseful, not chance. F. Exegesis of 24:7 leads into Ze- chariah story involving juxtaposition of Ezekiel verse and Leviticus 17:13 to indicate sinfulness of Israel. G. - J. petirot. K. situational application demonstra- ting that God controls Nebuchadnezzar's campaign against Israel-based on metaphor derived from Scriptural verse. L. 'at moše' associated with K. M. n ^e hemta. N. p ^{sa} t syntactical connection.			
6 Hosea, 5:9	None	A. (a) and (b) associated through play on words. B. 'at moše' ma'aseh illustrating (a), (b) and (c) of verse, God accused and absolved of partiality. C. contains formulaic ending as in- gral part of ma'aseh.	None	Formulaic Lamentations Rabbah ending. Thematic transition in- tegral. Formulaic ending controls development of the petih- ta.	Sin and exile absolutely contingent relationship. When they sin, then they are exiled. Absolute jus- tice, no partiality of God.

p. 265

	<u>Petihta Verse</u>	<u>Parallels</u>	<u>Structural and Hermeneutical Devices</u>	<u>Petirot</u>	<u>Transition</u>	<u>Themes</u>
7	Isaiah, 3:26.	None	Exegesis of Isaiah 3:26 which has thematic relationship to Lamentations. A. differentiation between apparent synonyms. B. antecedents of plural forms. C. filling in ellipsis of adjectival phrase. D. heqesh between petihta verse and Lamentations 2:10; quotation of Lamentations 1:1	None	Formulaic Lamentations Rabbah ending. No transition. Thematic relationship of mourning, clearly editorial construction.	Mourning for destruction of Temple.
8	Jeremiah, 9:18.	None	Three serial exegeses of Jeremiah 9:18. A. rhetorical question and answer. Aramaic paraphrase. Petirot plus prooftext establishing first definition of sin. B. petirot establishing second definition of sin. C. petirot establishing third definition of sin.	The land = Land of Israel; dwellings = synagogues; the land = words of Torah; dwellings = synagogues; the land = Temple; dwellings = first and second destructions.	Formulaic Lamentations Rabbah ending. Summary of themes, no transition.	Sin and retribution. Sins: 1. forsaking land. 2. forsaking Torah. 3. forsaking Temple Cult. God mourns.
9	Jeremiah, 51:51.	None	Two separate exegeses on Jeremiah 51:51. A. 'at mose' situational application incorporating petihta verse, two intermediary verses, and a closing verse related to petihta verse by heqesh.	Hear slander = 17th of Tamuz; disgrace = 9th of Av.	Formulaic Lamentations Rabbah ending. No transition.	1. Israel is not idolatrous. 2. God will punish nations for slandering Israel. 3. Destruction of Temple.

p. 266

	<u>Petihta Verse</u>	<u>Parallels</u>	<u>Structural and Hermeneutical Devices</u>	<u>Petirot</u>	<u>Transition</u>	<u>Themes</u>
10	Isaiah, 43:22.	None	<p>1. Middah keneged middah exposition.</p> <p>2. Formulaic Lamentations Rabbah ending out of place.</p> <p>B. Serial exegesis of petihta verse, petirot, antecedent of plural form.</p> <p>Serial exegesis of Isaiah, 43:22-24.</p> <p>A1. situational application, secondary verse brought to explain petihta verse with proof-text.</p> <p>2. mashal lamelekh.</p> <p>B. Three contrastive elucidations on (b) of petihta verse contrasting Israel's desire for secular vs. energy for worship of God.</p> <p>C. petira serial exegesis of Isaiah, 43:23-24, neglect of Temple Cult. God is solitary.</p>	<p>Small cattle = two continual offerings</p> <p>sacrifices = holiest sacrifices;</p> <p>meal offering = handful; frankincense = handful; fat of sacrifices = less holy.</p>	<p>"Your iniquities caused me to burn My house and destroy My city and exile My children among the nations of the world, and to sit by Myself solitary." (Lamentations 1:1). Integral, smooth.</p>	<p>1. Israel is idolatrous and ignores God.</p> <p>2. Israel ignores Temple cult.</p> <p>3. Sin and retribution.</p> <p>4. God is alone.</p>
11	Deuteronomy, 28:47.	None	<p>Moral juxtaposition of positive Pentateuchal verses and negative verses from Lamentations.</p> <p>Structure: if you had been worthy you would have read in the Torah; Pentateuchal verse. But now that you are not worthy, you read: Lamentations verses in reverse alphabetical order of first chapter</p>	None	<p>Reverse alphabetical list of Lamentations, Chapter 1, thus Lamentations 1:1 is the last verse.</p>	<p>Sin and retribution; worthy-reward; unworthy-punishment.</p>

p. 267

	<u>Petihta Verse</u>	<u>Parallels</u>	<u>Structural and Hermeneutical Devices</u>	<u>Petirot</u>	<u>Transition</u>	<u>Themes</u>
12	Proverbs 25:20.	Genesis Rabbah, 38:6. Song of Songs Rabbah, 5:3. Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa 15. y. Megillah, 3 hal 1.	1. Thematic mashal. 2. serial exegesis. a. situational application. b. 'al taqri, c. mashal. d. metaphoric saying. 3. alternate serial exegesis. a. situational application. b. 'al taqri. c. play on words analogy. d. exegeses on 2c prooftext interwoven with exegesis on petihta verse. Insert. Related chronologically to 2c prooftext. Petirot, gematria, situational application.	II Kings, 25:9. House of God = Temple; house of king = Zedekiah's palace; all houses of Jerusalem = 480 synagogues plus Temple; "every great man's house" = academy of R. Yohanan b. Zakkai.	Formulaic ending. No transition. Summary of theme.	1. Sin and retribution. sin = idolatry.
13	Proverbs 25:18.	None	A. Reconstruction of syntax (a) is consequence of (b) with heqesh through prooftext. B. Plays on words, manipulation of syntax, (a) is consequence of (b).	One who bears false witness = Israel.	Formulaic ending. No transition. Thematic summary.	Sin of idolatry leads to retribution.
14	Proverbs 29:9	None	A. Play on words by reading verb in niphal form of (a) and (b) of petihta verse. B. Serial exegesis of petihta verse. 1. petira of (a) plus prooftext.	A wise person = Holy One, Blessed be He; foolish person = Israel.	Formulaic ending. Good transition from last phrase of exegesis: "for what they have done here (II Chronicles 25:12) they will be exiled."	1. It is not wise to judge a fool. 2. sin and retribution.

p. 268

Petihta Verse	Parallels	Structural and Hermeneutical Devices	Petirot	Transition	Themes
15 Proverbs, 9:7.	None	<p>2. petira of (b) plus prooftext.</p> <p>3. when (c) then (d)</p> <p> a. example plus prooftext.</p> <p> b. example plus prooftext.</p> <p>4. continuation of above prooftext leading to exegesis of last phrase of petihta verse.</p> <p>A.1. R. Isaac's dictum: Scriptural verse updated to reflect rabbinic value of study.</p> <p>2. (a) of petihta verse as prooftext.</p> <p>3. illustration of dictum by analogy if one does X in one setting, consequences are Y; if one does X in another setting, consequences are Z.</p> <p>B. R. Simon B. Lakish: another verse from Proverbs; God identified as subject of verse in a related exegesis at moše' elaboration: anthropomorphism of God based on Ezekiel 36:20, both Proverbs 20:4 and Ezekiel 36:20 active in this narrative.</p> <p>C. Serial exegesis of petihta verse.</p> <p>1. (a) of verse, two petirot plus</p>	<p>One who corrects = Jeremiah; scorner = generation of scorners (Israel) during time of Jeremiah.</p>	<p>Good transition from Jeremiah reproving Israel to his saying 'eykhah; Jeremiah 15:10, Proverbs 9:7, "he that reproves a wicked man, it is his blemish," he reproved Israel, and said over them 'eykhah.</p>	<p>1. Talmid ^{AC}rasa, importance of being a good teacher.</p> <p>2. God regrets relationship with Israel because nations mock Him.</p> <p>3. Jeremiah reproves, Israel scorns him.</p>

p. 269

	<u>Petihta Verse</u>	<u>Parallels</u>	<u>Structural and Hermeneutical Devices</u>	<u>Petirot</u>	<u>Transition</u>	<u>Theme</u>
			proof-text. 2. (b) of verse: Jeremiah identified as both subject of proof-text in C1 and of petihta verse. Israel identified as object of verse--transition of 'eykhah.			
16	Jeremiah, 4:18.	Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa Hahodesh on last petira.	A.1. Rhetorical question to establish what the common assumption is about a king's powers. Modified form of mashal 1 ^e melek. 2. Three sets of thematically related pairs of paradoxical verses which contradict above common assumption. The second verse in each pair is from Lamentations. 3. the reason for this unexpected outcome is (a) of petihta verse. B. three different petirot and proof-texts on the last word of petihta verse.	Three petirot plus proof-text comprise the second section. All comment on libbekha: 1. your heart = Sanhedrin. 2. your heart = Temple. 3. your heart = God.	None. Not a petihta. Closing verse is proof-text for last petira in serial exegesis (Psalms, 73:26)	Sin and retribution: the horrible conditions described in Lamentations came about as a result of Israel's sins, not because God was unwilling to provide for them.
17	Psalms, 69:13.	Lamentations Rabbah, 3:14; exact parallel in petihta form.	Two serial exegeses on Psalms 69:13. A. Situational application providing metaphoric understanding of petihta verse. 1. petira identifying metaphoric sub-	Those who sit at the gates = nations of the world; those who sit at the gates = Israel.	"at the fest of Tisha b'Av they sit and read dirges and lamentations and 'Eykhah."	1. How we perceive them. How they perceive us. How we perceive them perceiving us. 2. Mocking the Gentiles

<u>Petihta Verse</u>	<u>Parallels</u>	<u>Structural and Hermeneutical Devices</u>	<u>Petiot</u>	<u>Transition</u>	<u>Themes</u>
		<p>ject and location corresponding to (a) and (b) of petihta verse.</p> <p>2. metaphoric details of (c) of petihta verse; four examples of nations mocking Israel:</p> <p>a. first example in Aramaic, theme: Jews are poor.</p> <p>b. second example, vaudeville dialogue form, theme: mocking the Sabbath.</p> <p>c. third example, vaudeville dialogue with props, theme: mocking sabbatical year.</p> <p>d. fourth example, vaudeville dialogue with props, theme: mocking Sabbath.</p> <p>B. Serial exegesis of Psalms 69:13.</p> <p>1. petira identifying subject and location of (a) and (b) of petihta verse.</p> <p>2. situational application of (c) of petihta verse.</p> <p>A and B are contrastive parallels.</p>			<p>for their ignorance about the religious meaning of Jewish rituals.</p> <p>3. Tisha b'Av.</p>
18	Lamentations Rabbah, 3:15	Lamentations Rabbah, 3:15 exact.	Serial exegesis of Lamentations 3:15.	None	"on that account Jeremiah mourned Eykhah," artificial transition derived from
		1. (a) of petihta verse occurs when? Passover.			Relationship between Passover and Tisha b'Av.

p. 271

<u>Petihta Verse</u>		<u>Parallels</u>	<u>Structural and Hermeneutical Devices</u>	<u>Petirot</u>	<u>Transition</u>	<u>Themes</u>
19	Daniel, 2:21	None	<p>2. (b) of petihta verse occurs when? Tisha b'Av.</p> <p>3. since (a) = (b), there is a relationship between Passover and Tisha b'Av.</p> <p>4. Passover and Tisha b'Av occur on same day of week.</p> <p>No apparent relationship between petihta verse and exegesis-see analysis.</p> <p>A.1. 'ilu zakhitem (ref. to Isaiah, 8:16).</p> <p>2. 'akhšav šelo' zakhitem plus proof-text.</p> <p>B. 1. 'ilu zakhitem.</p> <p>2. 'akhšav šelo' zakhitem plus proof-text.</p>	None	<p>relationship between Tisha b'Av and Jeremiah reciting Lamentations.</p> <p>"you are exiled to Babylon where you utter lamentations, Alas 'by the waters of Babylon' Eykhah." Could be editorial activity placing Lamentations 1:1 here as a secondary proof-text.</p>	Unworthiness of Israel and punishment.
			<p>A. Serial exegesis of Petihta verse.</p> <p>1. God is subject. When God did (a) fill in ellipsis, the result is (b).</p> <p>2. mah-kakh analogy between expanded (b) and Israel and proof-text.</p> <p>3. proof-text indicates the reverse of process described in (b).</p> <p>B. Serial exegesis of petihta verse.</p> <p>1. God is subject of (a). Fill in</p>		<p>"just as when you take away its young, a sparrow is left solitary, so said the Holy One: 'I burnt My house, exiled My children among the nations and I sit solitary, Eykhah."</p>	
20	Psalms, 102:8.	Mekhilta Jethro (when Israel left Egypt, they were divided).		None		

<u>Petihta Verse</u>	<u>Parallels</u>	<u>Structural and Hermeneutical Devices</u>	<u>Petirot</u>	<u>Transition</u>	<u>Themes</u>
		<p>ellipsis giving (a) a direct object.</p> <p>2. mah-kakh analogy with God as subject.</p> <p>3. illustration of God being analogous to (b); thematic transition to ending.</p>			
21	Leviticus 13:45.	None	<p>A. Serial exegesis of Leviticus 13:45.</p> <p>1. petira of (a)</p> <p>2. petira of (b) plus artificial prooftext.</p> <p>3. petira of (c).</p> <p>4. (d) connected to other verse, Aramaic interpretation of second verse.</p> <p>5. (e) metaphoric situational application.</p> <p>6. (f) plural antecedents.</p> <p>B. R. Jose b. Halafta sets up middah k^eneged middah and presents three verses to illustrate it.</p> <p>C. R. Yohanan and R. Shimon b. Lakish give other verses.</p> <p>1. R. Yohanan: middah k^eneged middah plus prooftext.</p> <p>2. R. Shimon b. Lakish: middah k^eneged middah plus prooftext.</p>	<p>Leper = Temple;</p> <p>plague = idolatry;</p> <p>rent clothing =</p> <p>priestly vestments.</p> <p>Heqesh between Leviticus 13:46 and Lamentations 1:1</p> <p>"All the days the plague is in him, he is defiled, he is unclean, he shall dwell alone: badad ye^Aseb, 'eykha^A yasbah badad."</p>	<p>Sin and retribution: idolatry lengthens time until the Messiah will come.</p> <p>Motifs:</p> <p>1. Israel cannot recite Torah in exile.</p> <p>2. idolatry profanes Temple.</p> <p>3. destruction of Temple.</p>

<u>Petihta Verse</u>	<u>Parallels</u>	<u>Structural and Hermeneutical Devices</u>	<u>Petirot</u>	<u>Transition</u>	<u>Themes</u>
22 Isaiah, 5:8	Passage on babiah: Leviticus Rabbah 17. Deuteronomy Rabbah, Vaethanan 20.	<p>3. R. Alexandri: heqesh between Leviticus 13:46 and Lamentations 1:1.</p> <p>Exegetical dispute between R. Yohanan and R. Shimon b. Lakish on serial exegesis of petihta verse.</p> <p>A. R. Yohanan.</p> <p>1. (a) of verse situational application.</p> <p>2. (d) of verse is consequence of (a).</p> <p>3. (R. Shimon b. Lakish) kazeh-kakh analogy on subsequent verse.</p> <p>B. R. Shimon b. Lakish.</p> <p>1. metaphoric reading of (a) plus prooftext.</p> <p>2. (c) comment on phrase "efes maqom" repeating homiletical pattern: "Because they were not restrained, they next..." plus prooftext.</p> <p><u>Insert.</u></p> <p>a. R. Yudan et al. give situational application to above prooftext.</p> <p>b. R. Phinehas et al. give another situational application on this proof-text.</p> <p>After <u>Insert</u> pattern continues until</p>	None	Formulaic ending tacked on with no transition	<p>1. Sin and retribution: dispossession for non-payment of loan leads to God dispossessing Israel.</p> <p>2. sin and retribution: idolatry leads to destruction of Temple.</p> <p>3. idolatry is practiced everywhere even in the Temple.</p>

<u>Petihta Verse</u>	<u>Parallels</u>	<u>Structural and Hermeneutical Devices</u>	<u>Petirot</u>	<u>Transition</u>	<u>Themes</u>
23	Ecclesiastes, 12:1.	<p>ad 'amatay?</p> <p>3. a. R. Aha: notarikon into Latin dictum about idolatry.</p> <p>b. R. Berekhiah</p> <p>1. divides word in Isaiah 28:20 (a) into three words.</p> <p>2. (b) of Isaiah 28:20 multiple meanings play on words.</p> <p>Citations of Psalms, 33:7.</p> <p>Serial exegesis on Ecclesiastes 12:1.</p> <p>I. play on words of נחל plus prooftexts.</p> <p>II. petira.</p> <p>III. antecedent of plural form.</p> <p>IV. metaphor.</p> <p>V. petirot plus prooftexts.</p> <p>VI. 'at mose' elaboration.</p> <p>VII. petirot.</p> <p>1. what is the force of hayil: prooftexts as examples.</p> <p>VIII. petirot.</p> <p>IX. 'at mose' elaboration</p> <p>X. petira</p> <p>XI. relates exegesis on one phrase to another.</p>	<p>Ecclesiastes 12:1: evil days = days of exile.</p> <p>Ecclesiastes 12:2: light = Torah plus prooftext; moon = Sanhedrin plus prooftext; stars = rabbis plus proof-text.</p> <p>Ecclesiastes 12:3. keepers of house: Levites and priests</p> <p>Strong men = priests plus proof-text; grinders =</p>	<p>Formulaic with variation: "since Holy Spirit departed, they were exiled..."</p> <p>No transition.</p>	<p>Sin and retribution.</p> <p>Motifs:</p> <p>1. chosenness of Israel.</p> <p>2. covenant relationship between God and Israel threatened by exile.</p> <p>3. Nebuchadnezzar as agent of God.</p> <p>4. Nebuchadnezzar and Nebuzardan understand God's ways to be better than Israel.</p> <p>5. Exiled Jews still identify with their families left in Palestine.</p> <p>For the sin of the murder</p>

P. 275

Petihta Verse Parallels

Ecclesiastes
Rabbah 10:4
plus Babylo-
nian Talmud:
Gitin 57b.
Sanhedrin 96b.
Tanhum: Vayik-
ra.
sulah and
A^c
Sinar
Y. Berekhot
4:1.
Genesis Rabbah
37.

Structural and Hermeneutical Devices

XII. petira
 situational application
 exegetical dispute
 hegesh between Ezekiel 21:26-28
 and Ecclesiastes 12.
[Insert. Serial exegesis on Ezekiel,
21:26-28.
Insert.
1. Aramaic paraphrase.
2. situational applications about
divination.
3. updating with Greek terms.
4. 'ilu zakhitem exposition.
[Insert Zechariah story.
1. transition based on literal
figurative meaning of Scriptural term
in prooftext.
2. location of Zechariah's murder.
3. juxtaposition of two Scriptural
texts as emphasis for gravity of crime.
4. number 7 used for emphasis of gra-
vity.
5. Zechariah narrative with resolution
of Nebuzardan repenting and converting.
XIII. A. petira plus prooftext.

Petirot
collections of
Mishnah.

Transition

Themes
of Zechariah, the Temple
was destroyed.

<u>Petihta Verse</u>	<u>Parallels</u>	<u>Structural and Hermeneutical Devices</u>	<u>Petirot</u>	<u>Transition</u>	<u>Themes</u>
		<p>B. exegetical verse as metaphor for destruction of Jerusalem.</p> <p>XIV. A. petira plus prooftext.</p> <p>Three rabbis contribute to situational application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. R. Yohanan questions prooftext in light of other prooftext. 2. R. Levi agrees and asks for solution. 3. R. Haggai provides application and prooftext. <p>XV. petira based on play on words.</p> <p>XVI. metaphoric antecedent for exegetical verse.</p> <p>XVII. petira leading to 'at mose' elaboration</p> <p>XVIII. petira.</p> <p>XIX. petira plus prooftext.</p> <p>XX. exegetical dispute form, anonymous second has prooftext.</p> <p>XXI. petira leading into Insert which is a series of hadrasat [^]smot m^eqomot.</p> <p>XXII. petira.</p>			

Petihta Verse	Parallels	Structural and Hermeneutical Devices	Petirot	Transition	Themes
24	Isaiah, 22:1. b. Megillah, 13b. Genesis Rabbah 70. Both for Rachel story.	1. Serial exegesis on Isaiah 22:1-12. 2. Long exegesis on 22:12 with long narrative sections.. Much use of word plays in both sections.	In serial exegesis section Isaiah 22:1 many petirot.	Not a petihta. Ends with Jeremiah 31:15-16, the end of the story of the plea with Israel. Ends with nehemta.	1. Sin and retribution-- sin; stubbornness; retribution; the Tetragrammaton was removed from their weapons. 2. God is afraid nations will mock Him. 3. God tells Jeremiah to summon the patriarchs and Moses to weep for Israel. 4. Torah and alphabet called to testify, but refuse. 5. Moses accuses God of breaking His own commandment by allowing both the mother and son to be killed on the same day. 6. Redemption because of Rachel.
25	Jeremiah 13:16. b. Rosh Hashana 31a. Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa 13, Dibre	Serial exegesis on Jeremiah 13:16-17. 1. Jeremiah 13:16 understood through II Chronicles 32:33; exegetical dispute. 2. Ten journeys of Shehinah, each	None	Not a petihta, ends with exegesis on Jeremiah 13:17.	1. Sin and retribution. 2. Shekhinah in exile. 3. repentance will bring redemption. 4. all of Israel was

<u>Petihta Verse</u>		<u>Parallels</u>	<u>Structural and Hermeneutical Devices</u>	<u>Petirot</u>	<u>Transition</u>	<u>Theme</u>
		Yirmiahu.	with prooftext, mashal 1'melekh. Pesiqta deRav Kahana parallel. 3. continuation of Pesiqta deRav Kahana parallel which fits into exegesis of Jeremiah 13:17. 4. masinu exposition on singular form of "flock" in Jeremiah 13:17. Serial exegesis on Isaiah, 29:1. 1. Aramaic paraphrases. 2. hadraṣat ṣmot m ^e qomot. 3. word plays.			exiled, including priests and Levites, no one was special.
26	Isaiah, 29:1	None		None	Formulaic ending, editorial construction. Formulaic ending triggered by mention of Temple's destruction.	1. Destruction of Temple.
27	Leviticus 26:8.	First section Sifra B ^e huqotay, Chapter 5.	Serial exegesis on Leviticus 26:8. 1. exegetical dispute involving al taqri word play on 78. 2. middah k ^e neged middah, seven transgressions are balanced by the sevenfold alphabet of Lamentations.	None	"you committed seven transgressions so Jeremiah comes to mourn over you lamentations which are a sevenfold alphabet--eykhah." Integral to Lamentations Rabbah.	1. Sin and retribution. 2. middah k ^e neged middah. 3. explanation for structure of Lamentations.
28	Jeremiah 36:32.	Lamentations Rabbah 3:1. Almost identical Lamentations Rabbah contains additional material	Comment on Jeremiah writing scrolls of Lamentations . Petirot.	All petirot each word or phrase in Jeremiah 36:32 refers to chapter in Lamentations.	Not a petihta. Ends with a comment on the last phrase of petihta verse.	Structure of the Book of Lamentations.

p. 279

	<u>Petihta Verse</u>	<u>Parallels</u>	<u>Structural and Hermeneutical Devices</u>
29	Psalms, 68:7	None	<p>Hegesh between Psalms 68:7 and Lamentations 1:1 of y^ehidim and badad.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 'atah mo^e situational application. 2. metaphoric reading of (b) of verse as equivalent to (a) of verse.
30	Lamenta- tions, 4:12	Lamentations Rabbah 4:12; different attribution.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Four kings who illustrate this verse, each is weaker than previous king with prooftext for each. God compensates for their weakness by bringing about military victory Himself. 2. Hezekiah account leads into number-letter play involving five different opinions about the number of survivors of Hezekiah's attack. 3. Nebuchadnezzar survived. God tries to use him as agent of retribution. 4. Nebuchadnezzar becomes agent of God. One story leads smoothly into the next. Section 2 could be removed without altering the meaning.

<u>Petirot</u>	<u>Transition</u>	<u>Themes</u>
None	Metaphoric relationship between (b) of petihta verse and seder verse Lamentations 1:1, could have existed without Lamentations 1:1, but fits well as petihta on Lamentations 1:1.	Before redemption from Egypt--Shekhina alone and Israel alone. After redemption they were united. In exile they are separated again.
None	Formulaic ending. Parallel in Lamentations Rabbah 4:12 does not have formulaic ending. This is really an exegesis on Lamentations 4:12 with the formal structure of a petihta imposed upon it.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. God's role in Israel's military victories. 2. Nebuzardan is agent of God.

<u>Petihta Verse</u>		<u>Parallels</u>	<u>Structural and Hermeneutical Devices</u>
31	Proverbs, 20:14.	None	Serial exegesis of (a) and (b) of verse. Verse understood as metaphor for God and Israel. 1. 'at mose' elaboration of (a) explaining metaphor plus prooftext. 2. waw ⁷ understood as "but" contrasting (a) with (b) as metaphor for God and Israel.
31a	Zephaniah 3:1-2.	None	Serial exegesis on Zephaniah 3:1-2. 1. series of word plays; syntactical reconstruction. 2. final word play on ^{דג} leads to theme, implicit qal v ^e homer plus prooftext. 3. another prooftext on same theme.
32	Jeremiah, 8:18.	None	Serial exegesis on Jeremiah 8:18-19. 1. notarikon making (a) and (b) conditional plus examples plus prooftexts. 2. Jeremiah 8:19 situational application.
33	Job, 30:31.	Mishnah b. Taanit 26b. y. Taanit 4:7.	Materials from Talmud contain many different rabbinic opinions about the significance of the 15th of Av.

<u>Petirot</u>	<u>Transition</u>	<u>Themes</u>
None	Formulaic ending triggered by mention of exile.	Same as 2a, God praises Israel after exile.
None	Formulaic ending, editorially linked to prooftext immediately preceding ending.	Sin and retribution. Israel did not hearken to prophets or to God, therefore they were exiled.
None	Formulaic ending	Sin and retribution. Sin; not observing misvot. Israel's sins drove God out of Jerusalem.
None	Formulaic ending. Ninth of Av and sin mentioned in preceding section.	Significance of the 15th day of Av, how the joy of the 15th of Av led back-

<u>Petihta Verse</u> <u>Parallels</u>		<u>Structural and Hermeneutical Devices</u>
	All except petihta verse and attribution and 9th of Av transition to formulaic ending.	The petihta opening and closing section adapt these materials to the 9th of Av by editorially inserting the concept of sin which naturally leads to the formulaic ending
34	Jeremiah 9:9. Pesiqta deRav Kahana Pisqa Dibre Yirmiahu, Chapter 13. y. Taanit 4:8	Exegeses on verses from Jeremiah 1. ma'aseh about Nebuchadnezzar's attempted protection of Jeremiah and Jeremiah's identification with suffering. 2. random exegesis of Jeremiah, verses about sin and retribution. 3. opinions of rabbis about details of exile and restoration of Land of Israel. 4. cryptic eschatological ending.

Petirot

None

Transition

Not a petihta.
Cryptic, Ezekiel 36:34, nehemta.

Themes

wards to the mourning of the 9th of Av.

Sin and retribution.
Sin: not hearkening to prophecy or Torah.
Redemption.

p. 282

Figure 2

	Serial	Evidence of	Placement in Lamentations	Formulaic	Tacked	Petshhta
	Exegesis	Editorial Activity	Rabbah	Ending	on Ending	or Not
1	yes	yes	thematic sin and retribution	variation	yes	yes
2	no	yes	thematic sin and retribution	variation	yes	yes
2a	no	yes	thematic mourning	no	no	yes
3	yes	no	heqesh of "badad yasabti"	no	no	yes
4	no	no	heqesh of $\text{בְּיָמֵינוּ} - \text{בְּיָמֵינוּ}$	no	no	yes
5	yes	yes	sin of Zechariah and retribu- tion of exile	yes	yes	yes
6	yes	yes	sin and retribution (exile)	yes	also in prior posi- tion in exegesis	yes
7	yes	yes	mourning, seder verse should be Lamentations 2:10 (last prooftext)	no	yes	yes
8	yes	yes	sins: forsaking land, Torah, Temple Cult and retribution God mourns	yes	yes	yes

	Serial	Evidence of	Placement in Lamentations	Formulaic	Tacked	Petihta
	Exegesis	Editorial Activity	Rabbah	Ending	on Ending	or Not
9	second	yes	Ninth of Av, destruction of	yes	yes	yes
	part		Temple			
10	yes	yes	sin and retribution	no	maybe	yes
11	no	no	Book of Lamentations	no	no	yes
12	yes	yes	sin and retribution	yes	yes	yes
13	yes	yes	sin and retribution	yes	yes	yes
14	yes	yes	sin and retribution	yes	maybe	yes
15	part	yes	reproval of Jeremiah	no	no	yes
16	yes	no	Book of Lamentations	no	no	no
17	yes	no	9th of Av	no	no	yes
18	yes	yes	9th of Av	variation	yes	yes
19	no	no	mourning	no	no	yes
20	yes	no	heqesh of 332	no	no	yes
21	yes	yes	heqesh of badad yeseb	no	no	yes
22	yes	yes	sin and retribution--des-	yes	yes	yes
			truction of Temples			

p. 284

	Serial Exegesis	Evidence of Editorial Activity	Placement in Lamentations Rabbah	Formulaic Ending	Tacked on Ending	Petihta or Not
23	yes	yes	sin of Zechariah	yes	yes	yes
24	yes	yes	sin and retribution	no	no	no
25	yes	yes	sin and retribution (exile)	no	no	no
26	yes	yes	destruction of Jerusalem, mourning	yes	yes	yes
27	yes	no	Book of Lamentations	no	no	yes
28	yes	no	Book of Lamentations	no	no	no
29	no	no	synonymity of פִּיזְנוֹ' and 332	no	no	yes
30	no	no	destruction of Jerusalem	yes	yes	yes
31	yes	no	exile	yes	yes	yes
31a	yes	yes	sin and retribution	yes	yes	yes
32	yes	yes	sin and retribution, exile	yes	yes	yes
33	no	yes	9th of Av	yes	yes	yes
34	no	yes	Nebuchadnezzar, Jeremiah, Nebuzardan kannj	no	no	no

Serial exegesis

1,3,5,6,7,8, part 9,10,12,13,14, part 15,16,17,18,20,21,22,
23,24,25,26,27,28,31,31a,32.

Petira

1,2,4,5,8,9,10,12,13,14,15,16,17,21,23,24,28.

Analogy

1,15,18,20,22.

Mashal

2a,10,16 modified,25,

Mosé⁷ elaboration

2,5,6,9,15,23,25,29,31.

Exegetical dispute form

2a,21,22,23,25,27.

Anthology of Halakhic materials

2,33.

Petihta verse is prooftext for rabbinic dictum

2,15.

Aramaic paraphrase.

5,8,21,23,26.

Updating with Greek and Latin

3,22,23.

Qal v^e homer

31a.

Ma'aseh 'abot siman 1^e banim

1,4.

Rhetorical question

2,5,8,16.

Paradox

2,16.

Middah k^e neged middah

9,21,27.

Plural antecedents

7,9,21,23.

Reconstruction of syntax; causal.

2,13,20,32.

Filling in ellipsis

1,7,20.

Play on words

6,12,14,22,23,24,26,31a.

Play on words; 'al tagri

1,4,12,27.

Play on words; place-name interpretation

1,23,26.

Play on words; notarikon

22,32.

Play on words; gematria

12.

Heqesh

3,4,5,7,9,11,13,16,21,23,29.

Heqesh between petihta verse and seder verse

3,21,29.

Contrastive Scriptural contexts

4,11,16.

> Ilu zakhitem

11,19,23.

Verse equivalence

2.

Footnotes

p.289

1. Petihta 23.
2. Petihta 32.
3. Petihta 13.
4. Petihta 16.
5. Petihta 22.
6. Joseph Heinemann, "The Proem in the Aggadic Midrashim: A Form Critical Study" in Scripta Hierosolymitana XXII, 1971, p. 101.
7. Richard Sarason, "Toward a New Agendum for the Study of Rabbinic Midrashic Literature" in Studies in Aggadah, Targum, and Jewish Liturgy in Memory of Joseph Heinemann. Magnes Press, HUC Press, Jerusalem, 1981. In footnotes Sarason writes: "I refer to the 'rabbinic theologies' of Schechter, Heschel, and Urbach."
8. ibid. In footnote 6, Sarason writes "I refer to the studies of Kadushin, Slonimsky, and J. Heinemann."
9. Max Kadushin, THE Rabbinic Mind. New York: 1952, p. 77
10. ibid., pp. 2-3.
11. ibid., p. 15.
12. Isaak Heinemann, Darkhey ha'aggadah, Jerusalem, 1950, p. 1 (translation mine).
13. ibid., p. 2 (translation mine).
14. ibid., p. 108 (translation mine).
15. op. cit., Sarason, p. 58.
16. ibid., p. 60.

17. op. cit., Joseph Heinemann, p. 101.
18. Richard Sarason, "The Petiḥtot in Leviticus Rabba: 'Oral Homilies' or Redactional Constructions?" in Journal of Jewish Studies, Vol. XXXIII, nos. 1-2, Oxford: Spring-Autumn, 1982, p. 558.
19. ibid., p. 561.
20. Lewis Barth, "Is Midrash a Literature: The Teaching of Rabbinic Biblical Exegesis." Unpublished paper.
21. ibid., p. 13.
22. Petiḥtot 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 31a, 32, and 34.
23. Charles Kroloff, "The Effect of Suffering on the Concept of God in Lamentations Rabbah." Rabbinic thesis, HUC, 1960, p. 15.
24. ibid., pp. 54-55.
25. op. cit., Issak Heinemann, p. 108.
26. op. cit., Joseph Heinemann, p. 101-102.
27. Theodor in Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 5, p. 85.
28. op. cit., Sarason, "The Petiḥtot in Leviticus Rabbah," p. 562.
29. op. cit., Barth, p. 7.

Bibliography

Text

Midrasch Echa Rabbati, ^{edited by} Salomon Buber, 1899, Vilna. This edition Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, Hildesheim, 1967.

Pesikta de Rav Kahana

Genesis Rabbah

Ecclesiastes Rabbah

Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael

Leviticus Rabbah

Sifre Deuteronomy

Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds

Midrash Rabbah-Lamentations. Translated by Rev. Dr. A. Cohen, Soncino Press, London: 1939.

Background Sources

Abrahams, Joseph. The Sources of Midrash Echa Rabbah. J. Gorzelanczyk: Berlin, 1883.

Barth, Lewis. "Is Midrash a Literature? The Teaching of Rabbinic Exegesis." Unpublished paper.

Buber, Salomon. Introduction to Midrasch Echa Rabbati. Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung Hildesheim, ^{Vilna 1899} 1967.

Heinemann, Isaak. Dar^khey ha-aggadah. Hebrew University, Jerusalem: 1953.

- Heinemann, Joseph. "Happetihtot bemidrase ha-aggadah meqoran wetapqidan" in Papers of the Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies, 1965, II, pp 43-47..
- Heinemann, Joseph. "The Proem in the Aggadic Midrashim: a Form Critical Study" in Scripta Hierosolymitana, XXII, 1971, pp. 100-121.
- Geertz, Clifford. The Interpretation of Cultures. Basic Books, New York, 1970.
- Kadushin, Max. The Rabbinic Mind, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York, 1952
- Kroloff, Charles. "The Effect of Suffering on the Concept of God on Lamentations Rabbah." Rabbinic thesis, HUC-JIR, Cincinnati, 1960.
- Neusner, Jacob. "Form and Meaning in Mishnah." In Method and Meaning in Ancient Judaism. Scholars Press (Brown Judaic Studies), Missoula, ¹⁹⁷⁹ pp. 155-181.
- Paster, Henry. "Lamentations Rabbah: Its Composition and Contents Critically Considered," Rabbinic thesis, HUC-JIR, Cincinnati, 1935.
- Sarason, Richard. "The Petihtot in Leviticus Rabbah: Oral Homilies or Redactional Constructions." In Journal of Jewish Studies, Vol. XXXIII Nos. 1-2, Oxford: Spring-Autumn, 1982, pp. 557-567.
- Sarason, Richard. "Towards a New Agendum for ^{the} Study of

Studies in

Rabbinic Midrash Literature", in Memory of Joseph
Heinemann, Magnes Press, HUC, Jerusalem, 1981.

Stern, David. "Rhetoric and Midrash: the Case of the
Mashal." Prooftexts, Vol. 1, Johns Hopkins Press,
Baltimore, 1981, pp. 261-291.

Urbach, Ephraim. The Sages. Jerusalem, 1975.

Zunz, Leopold and Albeck, Theodor. Hadderašot beyisrael,
Jerusalem, 1947.

Encyclopedia Articles

"Lamentations Rabbah" in Encyclopedia Judaica, Volume
10. Keter: Jerusalem, 1971, pp. 1376-1378.

"Ekaḥ Rabbati" in Jewish Encyclopedia, Volume 5, Funk &
Wagnalls: New York, 1901, pp. 85-87.

