



Three Midrashim:

A Review of the Secondary Literature  
and Comparison of Chapters in  
Vayikra Rabbah, Pesikta d'Rav Kahana  
and Pesikta Rabbati

Paul Lewis Tuchman

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion  
Cincinnati, Ohio

1977

Referee, Dr. Edward Goldman

## Digest

This thesis takes up various aspects of three homiletical midrashim: Vayikra Rabbah, Pesikta d'Rav Kahana and Pesikta Rabbati. The first two are similar in chapter structure, language and provenance. The two Pesiktas are both organized around the annual cycle of festivals and special Sabbaths.

The first three chapters consist of a review of the scholarly literature in English and Hebrew pertaining to Vayikra Rabbah, Pesikta d'Rav Kahana and Pesikta Rabbati. This survey covers the research from Zunz to the present (1976) on the name, contents, provenance, manuscripts, editions, sermon structure, homiletical methods and basic themes of each of these midrashim. The second chapter, which concerns Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, also contains a section on the checked history of this important collection.

The issue of parallel passages occupies Chapter Four, in which reasons for their existence are discussed and their derivations are traced.

Chapter Five offers a comparison of Chapter Three in Pesikta d'Rav Kahana with Chapter Twelve of Pesikta Rabbati, both of which are based on Parashat Zachor. The chapters are first compared with each other. Then each is analyzed according to models derived from the work of Margulies and Heinemann on Vayikra Rabbah, and Goldberg on Pesikta d'Rav Kahana. The purpose of these analyses is to determine the utility and value of the models. Margulies' and Heinemann's models prove to be quite useful, but Goldberg's is imprecise and limited in its applicability.

Brief evaluations of the work of nine scholars, who are cited at length in this thesis, are offered in Chapter Six. The thesis concludes with some observations regarding the transmission of the oral tradition after the tannaitic period.

for Dalya  
who saw me through  
with love

## Preface

A critical understanding of the rabbinic tradition has been slow in developing. Studies in Bible, Jewish history and Jewish philosophy have proceeded rapidly and far, but the era of Zunz in rabbinic scholarship lasted for over a hundred years. Much was done in that time to prepare the ground for the work that is now being done. Because we inevitably stand on the shoulders of those who preceded us and build on their achievements, we must first come to know what those achievements are. With regard to three midrashim, I have tried to set forth the base upon which future research will build.

Despite my best efforts, some inconsistencies of punctuation, spelling and terminology remain. They are minor, however, and should not be too vexing to the reader.

I would like to thank a number of people without whom this work would have been impossible. Dr. Edward Goldman suggested the topic and gave sound guidance in digesting the material and setting the results down on paper. Dr. Lewis Barth, my first teacher in midrash, inspired me by his profound scholarship and his infectious love for the subject. Dr. Stephen Passamaneck taught me two basic principles: a) Trust the text; and b) Treat the text as the author's answer, for which you must find the question. All the members of the HUC-JIR faculty under whom I have studied have imparted knowledge upon which I have drawn, often unconsciously, in writing this paper. I am grateful for my education.

My parents have supported me in many ways since I decided, ten years ago, that I wanted to become a rabbi. I am warmed by their wisdom, love and pride. My loving and lovely wife, Dalya, has sacrificed much and worked very hard with and for me. Her moral support and her assistance in typing and editing the paper have been invaluable--an exemplary labor of love. I am a lucky man.

2 July 1976  
4 Tammuz 5736  
Erev Shabbat Korah

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE . . . . .	ii
Chapter I. Vayikra Rabbah . . . . .	1
Name . . . . .	1
Contents . . . . .	2
Date of Composition . . . . .	6
Place of Composition . . . . .	10
Manuscripts and Fragments . . . . .	12
Editions . . . . .	18
Structure and Methods . . . . .	20
Basic Themes . . . . .	32
II. Pesikta d'Rav Kahana . . . . .	34
Name . . . . .	34
Contents . . . . .	36
Date of Composition . . . . .	54
Place of Composition . . . . .	56
Transmission, Disappearance and Rediscovery . . . . .	56
Manuscripts and Fragments . . . . .	61
Editions . . . . .	69
Structure and Methods . . . . .	73
Basic Themes . . . . .	77
III. Pesikta Rabbati . . . . .	79
Name . . . . .	79
Contents . . . . .	81
Date of Composition . . . . .	90
Place of Composition . . . . .	95
Manuscripts . . . . .	96
Editions . . . . .	97
Structure and Methods . . . . .	99
IV. Parallel Passages . . . . .	104
V. A Textual Comparison . . . . .	111
VI. Conclusions . . . . .	170
NOTES . . . . .	182
Chapter I . . . . .	182
Chapter II . . . . .	188
Chapter III . . . . .	199



Table of Contents. (Continued)

Chapter IV . . . . .	205
Chapter V . . . . .	207
Chapter VI . . . . .	209
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	210

LIST OF TABLES

Table	
I. Order of Contents of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana . . . . .	38a
IIa. Order of Manuscript Contents Compared Against Order of Mandelbaum's Edition . . . . .	40a
IIb. Non-Authentic Portions of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana in Various Manuscripts . . . . .	40b
III. Parallelism in Kahana 3 and Rabbati 12 . . . . .	120-120a

## CHAPTER I

## VAYIKRA RABBAH

Name

A number of similar names have been recorded for Vayikra Rabbah. Zunz mentioned הגדה ויקרא<sup>1</sup>. Albeck pointed to the usage הגדה דויקרא by R. Hai Gaon, who was the first scholar to cite the midrash by name, and by R. Nissim. R. Hanan'el called it אגדה דויקרא רבה, and this name also appears at the end of MS ל (London). MS ג (Rome) used the name אגדתא דויקרא רבה, and according to another gaonic source it was אגדה של ויקרא. R. Nathan of Rome was the first to call it ויקרא רבה, as did Rashi, and this name also appears at the beginning of MS ל.<sup>2</sup>

Vayikra Rabbah means "the long (or large) midrash on Leviticus," but it would appear that the designation "Rabbah" gained currency only during the 11th century, when there were aggadic midrashim on almost all the books of the Torah and the five megillot.<sup>3</sup> Given the importance of these Biblical books in liturgical usage and the lengthy sum of the aggadic midrashim based on them, we may assume that the whole came to be considered as one "Midrash Rabbah," with each constituent part also called "Rabbah," no matter what its length.

Theodor suggested that the name "Rabbah" was first attached to the exegetical midrash on Bereshit, and "was then applied to the

midrashim to the other books of the Pentateuch." These midrashim were copied together and called Midrash Rabbot, which Theodor explained as "Midrash of the Rabbot," with the midrashim on the five megillot added later. He described the title "Midrash Rabbah" as "inexact and misleading."<sup>4</sup>

### Contents

All scholars agree that Vayikra Rabbah contains thirty-seven chapters based on weekly readings from Leviticus in the Palestinian triennial cycle. Heinemann suggested that not all of the chapters are authentic, i.e., part of the midrash as it was originally edited, because Vayikra Rabbah "reflects a division of pericopes somewhat different from the 'triennial cycle' known to us from other sources."<sup>5</sup> In particular, Heinemann addressed himself to three questions:

a) Why, in this midrash, is Leviticus divided into 37 pericopes, when all other sources give only 20-25 readings? (Not all lists are the same; therefore 27 distinct readings have been isolated from the various sources.) b) Why are there three pairs of chapters (1 and 2, 4 and 5, and 20 and 21), each member of which is based on the same pericope? And c) Why are there five chapters which are identical in Vayikra Rabbah and Pesikta d'Rav Kahana?<sup>6</sup> Because the same chapters occur in all manuscripts and many of them are indicated in the genizah fragments, it is apparent that the midrash has consisted of the same 37 chapters from a very early date and, therefore, any additions to the original midrash must date from the period just after its composition.<sup>7</sup>

We would expect to find at least 21 verses allotted to each pericope indicated in Vayikra Rabbah, but between the first verses of some consecutive pericopes there are as few as twelve, eight, or even five (!) verses. Albeck observed that the indicated Torah portions do not always correspond to those of "our" tradition. Some of these readings, otherwise unknown, appear also in Tanhuma, and a different and earlier minhag may be indicated. For those pericopes which are very short, Albeck suggested that in actual practice it was permissible to add to them verses from the next Torah portion, thus removing the problem of their brevity.<sup>9</sup>

According to Heinemann, it is likely that the chapters based on previously unknown pericopes are original, and correspond to the minhag of dividing Leviticus which was observed by the author of the midrash. After the original author completed his work, another author who observed a different minhag composed homilies for the "missing" pericopes, with the intention of "completing" the midrash. On this basis Heinemann doubted the authenticity of Chapters 4, 8, 14, 19, 31, 37<sup>9</sup> and possibly 10.<sup>10</sup> In a later article, he indicates the inauthenticity of Chapter 10 in a chart, but he does not mention it in a note on that chart in which there is a list of all "doubtful" chapters of Vayikra Rabbah.<sup>10a</sup>

Of the five chapters shared by Vayikra Rabbah and Pesikta, Heinemann assigned Chapters 20, 29 and 30 of the former to Pesikta, leaving Chapters 27 and 28 as original sections of Vayikra Rabbah.<sup>11</sup> In a later article, he reassigned Chapter 27, this time to Pesikta.<sup>12</sup>

The last remaining issue is that of the pairs of chapters based on the same pericope. One of these, Chapters 20 and 21, has already

been broken down by assigning Chapter 20 to Pesikta. Chapter 5 was originally associated by copyists with the same pericope on which Chapter 4 is based, but Chapter 5 is actually based on a previously unknown reading beginning with Lev. 4:13. Chapter 4, based on a recognized pericope, is less authentic.<sup>13</sup> Finally, Chapter 2 is less authentic than Chapter 1, because its composition is not up to the typical high standard of this midrash. It is also atypical in its inclusion of material which is repeated elsewhere in Vayikra Rabbah.<sup>14</sup>

To sum up: the "chapters of doubtful authenticity" in Vayikra Rabbah are Chapters 2, 4, 8, 14, 19, 20, 27, 29, 30, 31, 37 and possibly 10--a total of eleven or twelve chapters. This hypothesis reflects a more ample distribution of pericopes by the original author of the midrash. Most of these dubious chapters are of a literary quality inferior to that of the rest of the midrash, and these excisions eliminate all but one brief instance of repetition of material among the chapters of Vayikra Rabbah, circumstances which support Heinemann's evaluation of its literary merits.<sup>15</sup>

No question exists as to the arrangement of homilies within the midrash, for they occur in sequential order according to the verses in Leviticus upon which they are based.

Most scholars have believed that Vayikra Rabbah--and the other homiletical midrashim--consist of complete sermons on one verse, usually the first, of the appropriate Torah reading for a given day, and that the sermons are set down in the midrash as they were actually delivered in the synagogue.<sup>16</sup> Margulies agreed that each chapter is "an address on a definite theme which the preacher tries to present from all sides, wholeheartedly and with all his powers of expression."<sup>17</sup>

However, Margulies also found within some chapters problems of thematic unity, of extensive digression, and of the insufficiency of one verse as the basis for an entire sermon. Despite these difficulties, "it is clear that the intention of the editor of the midrash was to compose a collection of sermons on definite themes, and not merely an anthology of explanations of selected verses."<sup>18</sup>

From the two preceding statements, separated only by a single page, one can see that Margulies could not decide whether to regard the chapters of Vayikra Rabbah as transcriptions of actual sermons or as literary creations. Did the editor choose and compile from among the complete sermons available to him the best and most thematically coherent, or did he compose the sermons themselves? Heinemann maintained that the sermons of Vayikra Rabbah were never preached from a pulpit in their entirety; rather, the various sections of each chapter were almost certainly parts of sermons which were handed down to the author of the midrash by means of oral tradition. The fusing of these disparate parts into a larger organic whole is the product of the author's own talent. Heinemann credited the author/editor of Vayikra Rabbah with the creation of a new form: the literary homily.<sup>19</sup> The same classification may also apply to the chapters of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana and Pesikta Rabbati. When it is said, in the chapters of this thesis about the two latter midrashim, that a given chapter "is for" a certain occasion, the reader will understand that the chapter is appropriate to, but not necessarily preached in its entirety upon, that occasion.

Date of Composition

The age of Vayikra Rabbah has usually been estimated by comparing it with other aggadic works, particularly Bereshit Rabbah, Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, Tanhuma and portions of the Palestinian Talmud. Zunz established the pattern for this type of investigation by contrasting the regular structure of Vayikra Rabbah's chapters based on a mere 37 texts with Bereshit Rabbah's freer exegesis of an entire book. The greater sophistication displayed by Vayikra Rabbah points to its later compilation in the middle of the seventh century.<sup>20</sup>

Albeck cited passages in Vayikra Rabbah which were quoted from Sifra, the Palestinian Talmud, Bereshit Rabbah and from baraitot. Despite parallel passages in Mechilta, Sifre Bamidbar and Sifre D'varim, Albeck could not conclude with certainty that the editor drew on any halachic midrash other than Sifra.<sup>21</sup> Those midrashim which used Vayikra Rabbah include Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, Pesikta Rabbati, Tanhuma and Echah Rabbati. Albeck concluded that Vayikra Rabbah was compiled shortly after Bereshit Rabbah, and suggested the end of the fifth century or the sixth.<sup>22</sup>

Margulies made extensive comparisons between Vayikra Rabbah and three other midrashim. In matters other than form and structure, Vayikra Rabbah and Bereshit Rabbah are much alike, particularly in the use of the same Aramaic dialect, usage and mixture of Aramaic and Hebrew, frequency of Greek expressions, midrashic terminology, use of the same sources and the method of citing them. Parallel passages are attributed to the same tannaim and amoraim in both. Where a series of rabbis is quoted in parallel passages, the same rabbi speaks first in each midrash. Sages rarely cited in one are rarely cited in

the other. From these shared traits, Margulies concluded that these two midrashim belong to the same creative circle, although they are independent of each other. "It is possible to say that the two of them came out of one study-house, if not from one editorial hand."<sup>23</sup> The two midrashim share much of their content, but shaped within each work to the appropriate editorial purposes. Margulies found no evidence for assigning Bereshit Rabbah an earlier date than Vayikra Rabbah. Although they may have borrowed from each other, they may also have drawn from a common source in older aggadic books.<sup>24</sup>

Pesikta d'Rav Kahana is the closest in its characteristics to Vayikra Rabbah of all midrashic works. There are similarities of structure, form, language and style. Among the large amount of shared material, five entire chapters occur in both. The discussion among scholars as to which of these works was compiled first merely illustrates their similarity. Margulies called Vayikra Rabbah and Pesikta d'Rav Kahana "twin brothers who came out of the very same study-house," and declared it "reasonable" that one person arranged and edited both with full knowledge of the parallel passages and chapters.<sup>25</sup>

Midrashim of the Yelammedenu-Tanhuma family, however, are quite dissimilar to Vayikra Rabbah and Pesikta. The Tanhuma midrashim employ different terminology; use Hebrew more extensively (including translations of the Aramaic in Bereshit Rabbah and Vayikra Rabbah); enlarge, elaborate, divide and combine homilies from their sources; use oratorical devices and embellishments which sometimes lead to misconstruction of the text; and delete the names of the rabbis associated with various homilies, giving these passages anonymously or with an introductory *אמר רבתינו*. According to Margulies, these character-



istics, and especially those which show a weakening concern with the chain of tradition, point to the relative lateness of the Yelammedenu-Tanḥuma midrashim.<sup>26</sup>

Although Albeck, in his introduction to the critical edition of Bereshit Rabbah, proposed the linguistic and stylistic analysis of midrashic literature in order to determine dates of composition and stages of development, he did not attempt the task. Margulies, however, used Wilhelm Bacher's list of midrashic technical terms from the totality of rabbinic literature in order to demonstrate the differences between Vayikra Rabbah and Tanḥuma, and the similarities of the former to Bereshit Rabbah and Pesikta.<sup>27</sup>

Margulies also posited an ancient aggadic source or sources, drawn upon by Vayikra Rabbah, Bereshit Rabbah, Pesikta and the Palestinian Talmud. This theory contradicts the commonly held view that the Palestinian Talmud served as an aggadic source for these three midrashim. However,

. . .It is reasonable that the Palestinian Talmud was only filled with aggada at the time of its editing from these . . . /older/ midrashic collections, for at the beginning, before the Palestinian Talmud was written down and it was transmitted only in an oral version, it was shorter and principally contained halacha. . . .The Palestinian Talmud is not a source for midrash, rather the opposite.<sup>28</sup>

Margulies' evidence is drawn from parallel passages in Vayikra Rabbah and the Palestinian Talmud, most of which are distinguished by a larger amount of material in the midrashic text than in the talmudic. The inference is that the midrash could not have drawn from the Talmud material which the Talmud itself does not contain. Margulies also cited a passage in Sanhedrin X, p. 27d, parallel to Vayikra Rabbah 36:3

and 36:6, which contains a proem with a typical proemic conclusion, and a *חז"ל*. These midrashic forms are out of place in a talmudic text. Margulies suggested that the Palestinian Talmud copied this material--and the other parallels--from an earlier midrash on Leviticus, which one might think of as a first edition of Vayikra Rabbah. While it is possible that the midrashic editors were acquainted with the Palestinian Talmud and quoted some passages from it, most of the aggadic material in the midrashim and in the Palestinian Talmud derives from midrashic sources which predate them all.<sup>29</sup>

Other sources for Vayikra Rabbah include the Mishna, the Tosefta, collections of homilies and sayings ascribed to R. Ishmael and R. Hiyya, Mechilta d'Milu'im, baraitot, Ben Sira and Targum Aqilas. Since all these are also quoted in Bereshit Rabbah, and most of them in Pesikta, one could say that they were also quoted in the (hypothetical) ancient midrashim. Other midrashim used Vayikra Rabbah as a source, e.g., Echah Rabbati, Shir ha-Shirim Rabbah, Kohelet Rabbah, and the Yelammedenu-Tanḥuma midrashim. Margulies also enlarged upon the parallels to Vayikra Rabbah in the *piyyutim* of Yannai. According to Margulies, this *payyetan* lived in sixth-century Palestine. Sefer v'Hizhir, a Palestinian collection of she'iltot, copied many pages from Vayikra Rabbah, although it altered its source considerably. R. Aḥai Gaon was apparently the first Babylonian to use this midrash, but its appearance in Babylonian literature is limited. R. Nathan of Rome was the first of a long line of European scholars who recognized the importance of Vayikra Rabbah.<sup>30</sup>

In arriving at a specific date for the composition of Vayikra Rabbah, Margulies also relied on the great degree of commonality in

the citation of rabbinic authorities in this midrash, Bereshit Rabbah and Pesikta, and the parallelism in their appearance in these three works. The last of these sages lived at the beginning of the fifth century. He also considered the shift to the new mode of composition reflected in the Yelammedenu-Tanhuma midrashim. Because echoes of this style penetrated into the Babylonian Talmud without influencing the Palestinian, Margulies assumed that this mode of composition began in the middle of the fifth century. He therefore concluded that the (hypothetical) older version of Vayikra Rabbah was in existence by the end of the fourth century.<sup>31</sup> Although Margulies gave no specific date for the current version of Vayikra Rabbah, ca. 425 C.E. would certainly be in accord with the data he supplied.

Heinemann agreed with Margulies to the extent of calling Vayikra Rabbah a fifth century work.<sup>32</sup> However, Heinemann believed that Bereshit Rabbah was compiled two or three generations before Vayikra Rabbah, and that the author of Pesikta may have been a "younger contemporary" of the author of Vayikra Rabbah.<sup>33</sup>

#### Place of Composition

Albeck stated that the pericopes of Vayikra Rabbah reflect the Palestinian practice of reading the Torah on a triennial cycle.<sup>34</sup> He also refuted the contention of I. H. Weiss, that Vayikra Rabbah shows signs of Babylonian influence, particularly in its use of the technical terms גרפא and תנר רבנן. As used in the Babylonian Talmud, גרפא means that that which was mentioned above incidentally now becomes the main subject. Albeck, however, explained that when גרפא appears in Vayikra Rabbah, it indicates that the body of the sermon, as opposed to the

proems, is about to begin. Although the London and Rome manuscripts do not have גופא in the places which Weiss indicated, the term does appear at other points in the London MS, always after the proems.<sup>35</sup>

Either a) the word גופא was used in every chapter by the original editor, but not included by subsequent copyists; or b) it is a later addition. In any case, it does not indicate Babylonian influence.

Nor does תנו רבנן appear in all manuscripts, even in parallel passages. Where it occurs, it was probably added later.<sup>36</sup>

Margulies found a great deal of evidence to prove that Vayikra Rabbah originated in Palestine. a) The great majority of sages quoted were Palestinian. The only Babylonian sages who appear are of the first generations of Amoraim (e.g., Rav, Samuel, Huna, etc.). b) Many sages are named with the cities they lived in, and these cities are all in Palestine, mostly in Judea and Galilee. The same or similar place names appear in the various aggadot. c) There is mention made of situations, problems and festival customs peculiar to Palestine. All laws and customs parallel those described in the Palestinian Talmud. d) Although isolated passages of the Babylonian Talmud may appear from time to time, the occurrence of such a passage in any given manuscript is never paralleled in any of the others. All such quotations are later additions. e) Both the Hebrew and the Aramaic of Vayikra Rabbah are Galilean, as they are known from the Palestinian Talmud and from other midrashim. The usage of Greek corresponds with that in all Palestinian rabbinic literature, as does the technical terminology employed. No correspondence is found with the terminology of the Babylonian Talmud. For all these reasons, Margulies called Vayikra Rabbah "an exemplary Palestinian creation."<sup>37</sup>

Even beyond this general determination, Margulies believed that Vayikra Rabbah was edited in Tiberius. The language and the place names favor this hypothesis, but even stronger is the reference to Tiberius itself as אֶרֶץ, "here."<sup>38</sup> Margulies extended this theory to include Bereshit Rabbah, Pesikta d'Rav Kahana and the Palestinian Talmud.<sup>39</sup>

#### Manuscripts and Fragments

Margulies described seven manuscripts of Vayikra Rabbah and 17 groups of genizah fragments. The London MS, which is in the British Museum as Add. 27169 No. 340, contains both Bereshit Rabbah and Vayikra Rabbah. Theodor and Albeck used this manuscript as the basic text for their critical edition of Bereshit Rabbah, and it also served as the basic text for Margulies' critical edition of Vayikra Rabbah. Its age has not been determined,<sup>40</sup> but it was apparently copied from a manuscript which dates from before 1000 C.E. On the whole, its readings are superior to those of all other manuscripts. The scribe left out some blocks of material, but he also provided, in the place of these omissions, references to parallel passages in Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, Shir ha-Shirim Rabbah, Kohelet Rabbah and Midrash Sh'muel. Margulies filled in these missing passages from other manuscripts, and indicated this in his notes. In the variant readings, this manuscript is assigned the letter ל.<sup>41</sup> Albeck noted that this manuscript contains two names for the midrash, ויקרא רבה at the beginning of the text and אנדה דויקרא רבה at the end. It would be of interest to know whether the scripts are identical in both cases.<sup>42</sup>

The Rome MS is also known as Vatican Ebraico 32, and a photo-reproduction, used by Margulies, is deposited at the Israel National Library, Phot. 36. This manuscript seems to have been written in the eleventh century. Some pages are missing at the beginning, and at two points in the middle of this document. Most of its readings are like those in MS 7, and all passages which are shortened in or missing from MS 7 received the same treatment in this manuscript as well, proof that both of these MSS derive from the same earlier copy. Margulies symbolized the Rome MS by the letter 7.<sup>43</sup> Of MSS 7 and 7, Albeck observed that the proems begin directly with the extraneous verses, and not with ש"ד, the text-verse, and זשי"ה or זשי"ד as in the printed editions. The Torah-verses are lacking even at the beginnings of the chapters.<sup>44</sup>

The Paris MS is No. 149 in the National Library of Paris. Written in 1291 in Arlady,<sup>45</sup> it also contains Bereshit Rabbah and the first five chapters of Bamidbar Rabbah. Although this manuscript is later than and inferior to MSS 7 and 7, Margulies designated these three MSS as one manuscript family on the basis of their common textual tradition. The Paris MS, whose symbol is 8, repeats most of the "errors" which occur in MSS 7 and 7. MS 8 seems to be more dependent on MS 7, but other copies of the midrash were made between them, on the basis of which MS 8 corrects some of the "errors." At the ends of Chapters 1, 2, 3, and 7, there are additions from Seder Eliayahu Rabbah. A large gap exists in Chapter 22; apparently the copy from which this MS was made was missing a page, and the copyist paid no attention.<sup>46</sup>

The three manuscripts of the second manuscript family all contain the five Rabbot to the Torah. MS  $\aleph$  is in the Bodleian Library of Oxford University, Neubauer 147. It is written on paper in a late Sephardic hand, probably of the 16th century. Despite its lateness, it has many original readings, but it also includes many errors. There are additions in this manuscript from the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds, Tanḥuma, and the writings of Rabbenu Bahya.<sup>47</sup>

MS  $\beth$  is also in the Bodleian Library, Neubauer 2335. Its script and textual additions are similar to those in MS  $\aleph$ , but apparently the copyist also used a manuscript similar to MS  $\delta$ , from which he copied in several places.<sup>48</sup>

The National Library of Israel owns one manuscript of the entire Midrash Rabbah, Heb. 8<sup>o</sup> 515, designated by Margulies with the letter  $\aleph$ . Many pages are missing from it, including parts of Vayikra Rabbah. This manuscript developed from the same earlier copy as MSS  $\aleph$  and  $\beth$ . Each of the three MSS  $\aleph$ ,  $\beth$  and  $\aleph$  contains some good readings which do not occur in the other two members of the family. Although these manuscripts are more recent than those of the first division (MSS  $\aleph$ ,  $\beth$  and  $\delta$ ), some of their readings were helpful to Margulies in determining the original version of the midrash.<sup>49</sup>

The single member of the third manuscript division is identified only as Munich 117, and it is symbolized by the letter  $\beth$ . Although it was written relatively recently, in I Adar 1433, it is important because of its hundreds of original readings, often corresponding to genizah fragments and to MSS  $\aleph$ ,  $\beth$  and  $\aleph$ . However, the originality of MS  $\beth$  is impaired by signs of elaboration, many additions from the Babylonian Talmud, completion of Scriptural citations

and the tendency to omit the names of rabbinic authorities. MS D corresponds to MS 7 from the beginning of the midrash and continuing through part of Chapter 9. This circumstance led Margulies to believe that MS D was copied from two different manuscripts of Vayikra Rabbah.<sup>50</sup>

The 40 pages of genizah fragments which Margulies described exhibit differences in size, age, calligraphy and orthography.<sup>51</sup> Their readings are often better and more original than those in the manuscripts. Parallel readings in the fragments differ from those in other fragments and in the various manuscripts and printed editions. Some fragments have readings which can be traced to the Palestinian Talmud, other midrashim, the Aruch, et al. Some material has been added, deleted, rearranged, stylistically altered, or presented without the traditional citation of rabbinical authority. Apparently the various copyists took great liberties with the text. Margulies believed that these changes came about in the few centuries immediately following the composition of Vayikra Rabbah.<sup>52</sup> Details of the genizah fragments follow:

1) From Oxford's Bodleian Library, MS. Heb. C. 18. F. 17-22 is the largest and most important group of fragments. This is the oldest genizah material from Vayikra Rabbah. It consists of three pairs of consecutive pages, in a ninth century script, including vocalization and punctuation. Notes between the lines and in all four margins indicate corrections and supplementary material of various kinds. In some places a letter, a word, or even a whole line has been erased and a different text substituted.<sup>53</sup> Because the text



and the notes seem to be in the same hand, we may infer that the scribe was using two copies of the midrash.<sup>54</sup>

2) Five non-consecutive pages. The first and third are in the Cambridge University Library, T-S Box C 2.162; the second page, also at Cambridge, is T-S Box C 2.52. The fourth and fifth are in the Adler Collection of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City. This manuscript was written carelessly and contains many errors due to the confusion of homonymous words.

3) Four small pages. The first and fourth are in the Taylor-Schechter Collection at Cambridge. The second and third, which are consecutive, are deposited in three different places at Oxford, where the handwriting is variously characterized as Sefardic or Syrian.

4) Three non-consecutive pages, the first of which is heavily damaged. They are deposited in the Klosterneuburg Library in Austria, but Margulies found photo-reproductions at the Institute for the Preparation of a Complete Israeli Talmud in Jerusalem.

5) Three non-consecutive pages in the Taylor-Schechter Collection. The second is not deposited with the other two.

6) Two consecutive pages in the Cambridge University Library. Despite the carelessness and mistakes in the copy, original versions may be discerned here.

7) Two consecutive pages in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. Their original readings are sometimes unique.

8) Two non-consecutive pages in the Taylor-Schechter Collection. Scriptural verses are usually shortened to only three vocalized words. Any material already copied is indicated with a שׁוּב and not repeated.

9) One page in the Adler Collection whose readings correspond to a passage in the Palestinian Talmud, but not to any variant readings in the MSS of Vayikra Rabbah.

10) One page in the Taylor-Schechter Collection whose readings correspond to passages in other midrashim, but not to any variant readings in the MSS of Vayikra Rabbah.

11) Another single page in the Taylor-Schechter Collection.

12) Two non-consecutive pages in the library of Westminster College, Cambridge. This is a more recent fragment, for it contains an addition from Seder Eliyahu.

13) Two damaged, consecutive pages in the Adler Collection.

14) One page in the Adler Collection.

15) Two consecutive pages in the library of Dropsie College, Philadelphia.

16) Two non-consecutive pages in the Taylor-Schechter Collection.

17) One page in the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

Margulies assigned the following letters in the variant readings to the genizah fragments:  $\aleph$  to 1);  $\beth$  to the last page of 4); and  $\gamma$  to the first three pages of 2), the first and third pages of 5), and also 7), 9), 11), the first page of 12), and 13). The remaining pages from groups 2)-10) did not reach Margulies in time for inclusion in his edition, and they were published in Vol. 5.<sup>55</sup> Margulies found nothing unusual in groups 14)-17), and he did not print them.<sup>56</sup>

In addition to the manuscripts and genizah fragments of Vayikra Rabbah, Margulies referred to other works in the variant readings. Both Yalkut Shm'oni and Yalkut Machiri quote from Vayikra Rabbah in a version similar to MS D, and they are cited with the letters

ט and ט, respectively. R. Nathan of Rome used at least three manuscripts of Vayikra Rabbah in compiling the Aruch, although his primary source was a copy similar to MS ט. The Aruch is assigned the letter ט in the variants.<sup>57</sup>

#### Editions

The first two editions of Vayikra Rabbah were printed in Istanbul (1512) and in Venice (1545). Margulies referred to them in the variant readings by the symbols  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$  respectively. Where these two editions agree, Margulies merely used the letter ט. Later printed editions have no special importance.<sup>58</sup>

The editors of the first printed edition used several manuscripts, among which was one similar to MS ט. The extraneous additions to the ends of the first three chapters were explicitly described as such (e.g., *נוסחא אחרתא שנמצא בסוף פרשה א*) and placed at the end of the first edition. The editors added many original readings, as well as material from the Babylonian Talmud and Tanhuma. They also inserted some commentary by one R. Meir with the caveat *אינו מן הספר*.<sup>59</sup>

Margulies chose MS ל as the basic text for his critical edition because it combines age with the best preservation of Palestinian orthography. Using the other manuscripts and the first editions, he filled in omissions and corrected errors, indicating his emendations with the symbol \* in the variant readings. "In this manner I completed fragmentary words and the like, where there was no doubt about the completions. . . ."<sup>60</sup> At the beginnings of chapters, Margulies added the verses of Leviticus on which the homilies are based, accord-

ing to the printed editions and some of the manuscripts. However, this was not done in Chapters 13 and 32-37.<sup>61</sup> "I did not insert into the text the readings which seemed original to me which I found in the remaining versions and in the genizah fragments, except in extraordinary circumstances when I thought that the reading in MS 7 was in error. I made notes about those readings which are acceptable to me, and let him who wishes make a choice. I saw my duty in the preservation of all the traditions of all the versions, so that no original reading would be lost."<sup>62</sup>

In the variant readings Margulies quoted from all the other manuscripts, including genizah fragments, as well as the first two printed editions, Yalkut Shim'oni, Yalkut ha-Machiri and the Aruch. However, parallel passages and quotations from Vayikra Rabbah in other works appear in the notes. Margulies avoided quoting too extensively, in order not to sacrifice clarity or lose the flow of the discussion. Instead, he tried only to note the main points of correspondence and difference. The last volume of Margulies' edition concludes with seven pages of supplementary and corrective material, indices to Scriptural verses and to the names of tannaim and amoraim, and a general index.

Margulies maintained that it is a practical impossibility to restore the original form of Vayikra Rabbah, nor did he want to produce an eclectic text. He only claimed "to transmit one of the oldest editions of Vayikra Rabbah, which is MS 7, edited in a precise manner and compared with all the other versions."<sup>63</sup>

### Structure and Methods

The discussion of structure and methodology in Vayikra Rabbah generally falls into two sections: a) Heinemann's work and b) that of all other scholars. Heinemann has explored aspects of this midrash which have not, so far, been touched in other works. His methods and conclusions thus have a singular importance. We turn first, however, to the earlier scholarship.

Zunz concerned himself only with the most superficial features of Vayikra Rabbah. He identified three phrases with which chapters open: a) *הדא הוּא רבתיב* in 21 chapters; b) *זה שאמר הכתוב* in eight chapters; and c) *פתח ר' פלוני* in eight chapters. He also matched to each chapter of the midrash the Biblical book from which its first proem-verse comes. Having commented that the chapters of Vayikra Rabbah are constructed like mosaics, Zunz briefly discussed the comforting standard conclusions of the chapters, most of which speak of future redemption.<sup>64</sup>

Albeck was more emphatic than Zunz in pointing to the sermonic nature of the chapters of Vayikra Rabbah. Albeck also listed three instances in which a verse is expounded other than the first verse of the pericope; these are identical with the three "double chapters" whose authenticity was discussed by Heinemann.<sup>65</sup> Albeck's only comment on sermon structure relates to the proem(s) with which each chapter begins, most of which (the proems) are complex rather than simple. He identified 126 proems in Vayikra Rabbah, and gave the source of each proem-verse, showing that all but 20 of them come from the Writings.<sup>66</sup>

Margulies explained the basic structure of the chapters of

Vayikra Rabbah. Each chapter begins with one or several proems, continues with homiles on the first verse(s) of the pericope, and ends with a *ḥatimah*, "a short conclusion with words of blessing and comfort." A chapter's dominant theme is always drawn from the pericope on which it is based. Sometimes the theme is literally related to the first Torah-verse(s), or the Torah-verse may be used in a midrashic or associative way in constructing a theme. In some cases, a chapter is based on the mere mention of a name.<sup>67</sup>

Agreeing with Albeck on the meaning of the term *גורפא* as used in Vayikra Rabbah,<sup>68</sup> Margulies said without misgiving that *גורפא* occurred in every chapter of the midrash. He based his opinion on genizah fragments which Albeck had not seen. Margulies explained that later copyists, unable to apply the term in its Talmudic sense, omitted it as a mistake. Nevertheless, it has "survived" at various points in some manuscripts and printed editions.<sup>69</sup>

The author of Vayikra Rabbah also used certain technical phrases to introduce quotations from various sources. Passages from the Mishnah are usually preceded by the words *תנינן* or just *תנינן*; various baraitot are quoted in the names of their speakers with the formula *תני ר' פלוגי*, among which a collection attributed to R. Ḥiyya stands out. R. Ishmael's comments on Leviticus are quoted either with the formula *תני ר' ישמעאל* or anonymously; the Tosefta and *Mechilta d'Milu'im* are also quoted anonymously.<sup>70</sup>

Albeck equated the methodologies of Vayikra Rabbah and Tanhuma, especially with regard to the citation of a preceding pericope with the phrase *מה בחיב למעלה מן העניין*.<sup>71</sup> Margulies objected that Albeck generalized on the basis of only one or two instances, and without

reference to manuscripts. If Albeck had consulted texts other than the printed editions, which were themselves influenced by Tanhuma, he would not have come to the same conclusions.<sup>72</sup>

According to Margulies, the typical chapter of Vayikra Rabbah focuses on the first verse of the pericope, which is bound to a certain theme. In this way, the chapter as a whole is an address on a definite theme.<sup>73</sup> However, Margulies found that not every chapter of Vayikra Rabbah is a complete thematic sermon, and he noted a number of deviations from the normal pattern. Sometimes other material must be introduced into the chapter to supplement a Torah-verse which is insufficient for constructing a sermon. The first verse of the pericope is occasionally expounded in many ways and with many different and wide-ranging themes. Even in a sermon with a single theme there may be many digressions and incidental homilies. A series of complex proems in which the Torah-verse is thematically expounded only at the end may take up a considerable part of the chapter. The body of the sermon may also contain digressions from the theme.<sup>74</sup>

These irregularities are all the more apparent in a midrash which is distinguished for its structure and style. Heinemann attempted to deal with these problems by treating Vayikra Rabbah as a literary creation.

Until the composition of Vayikra Rabbah, all the extant midrashim were exegetical, proceeding from verse to Scriptural verse with commentaries. Although the imprint of the editorial hand may be seen in them, they remain diffuse and disconnected, held together as literary creations only by the sequence of the text on which they are based. As such, they reveal the influence of the study-house rather than of the synagogue. Bereshit Rabbah, the first aggadic midrash,

shows the use of homiletical devices, particularly the proem. But Vayikra Rabbah, for the first time, definitely bears the mark of the pulpit, for it is based on the Book of Leviticus as read in its weekly sections in the synagogue. More precisely, as mentioned above, the chapters of this midrash are based on only the first verse(s) of the weekly portions. With this limitation, each chapter can take up "one clearly defined, specific subject" and develop it through an entire discourse. The material can be shaped to fit the sermonic structure which was pointed out by Margulies,<sup>75</sup> as though it were a sermon. The various component parts of each chapter were almost certainly excerpts of actual sermons which came down to the author through the oral tradition. However, the fusing of these disparate parts into a larger organic whole is the product of the author's own talent. Heinemann credits him with the creation of a new form which later authors copied: the "literary homily."<sup>76</sup>

Heinemann claimed that "editing can. . . be a creative art," producing no mere collection or anthology, but a work of discernment and purpose, born of the desire to create an inner unity and a distinctive personal flavor. He proposed to uncover and investigate everything that testifies of an independence of choice and arrangement, and the goal of attaining a perfect composition. For this purpose, each chapter must be analyzed as to the details of its structure and method of composition. Heinemann set out to clarify the editor/author's concept of a complete sermon, how he created one, and the essential differences between a public oral sermon and its literary counterpart.<sup>77</sup>



Let us look more closely at the development of the homilies in Vayikra Rabbah. Each section of each chapter in this midrash is itself composed of separate *aggadot*, each one of which represents a single but complete point of view. These aggadic units were created mainly by sages in their schools as they expounded the Bible to their students. Although contemporary preachers created new *aggadot* of their own, their principal contribution to the development of midrash was the use in their Sabbath and festival sermons of the aggadic units created in the schools, reshaped stylistically according to their homiletical needs, and combined into larger blocks of material of more or less unified content and of "excellent structure and well-considered form." Thus was the exegesis of the study-house transformed into the sermon of the synagogue.<sup>78</sup>

This process engendered an oral sermonic tradition whose elements were transmitted only in short summations. The public sermons themselves had limits of scope and time imposed by the congregations' patience and power of concentration.

The midrashic editors, however, were not content with the mere repetition of sermons. They wanted to give their readers something "richer in content and more varied in ideas." In the absence of constraints imposed by synagogue worship, the reader of the "literary sermon" can return to the text at will, and devote as much effort as he pleases to understanding it. The editors, therefore, drew into single chapters homilies from many sermons, with the condition that the materials used share thematic relationships. The editors' primary task was selection and arrangement, not the creation of new *aggadot*.<sup>79</sup>

Much evidence exists to support the theory that individual midrashic chapters were derived from many sermons. a) It is highly unlikely that an actual sermon in the synagogue would begin, as many chapters in the homiletical midrashim do, with multiple proems. A preacher's use of more than one proem would destroy the intended suspense and resolution inherent in the form.<sup>80</sup> To be successful, such a device can only be used once in a sermon. b) Given aggadic units may be repeated within a chapter, as if they were variants of the same tradition. These variants are likely to be embedded in larger aggadic blocks, and the editors were probably quite punctilious in quoting the various available traditions. "If variants like these are common within one chapter, we must acknowledge, despite ourselves, that this chapter is also composed of blocks" which were taken from the addresses of different preachers. Like Zunz, Heinemann compared the result of joining these blocks to a mosaic. c) Most of the longer proems contain much material which bears no relation to the themes of the chapters which include them. Such proems appear only for the sake of a few concluding lines which bear on the subject of the midrashic discourse. The mere volume of such "irrelevant" material indicates the origin of such proems in sermons on other themes.<sup>61</sup>

The editor of Vayikra Rabbah was bound by a set of restrictions, one of which can be deduced from the large amount of "irrelevant" material referred to above, namely, his strict adherence to tradition as he received it.<sup>82</sup> This theory is supported by the editor's refusal to use certain material from the Mishnah and the halachic midrashim, which were certainly known to him and appropriate to his theme. Apparently, the editor did not permit himself to

insert stray bits of material into the homiletical blocks as he received them.<sup>83</sup> He was also restricted (Heinemann would say that he restricted himself) by the external structure of the chapters: proem(s), body and comforting הַיְמִינִי, although the body itself had no defined or unified structure. Finally, the editor must have felt himself subject to the division of pericopes current in his own time and place.<sup>84</sup>

Offsetting these strictures was the freedom of the editor to choose the themes of his literary sermons, a choice that was possible because of the great amount and variety of material at his disposal through the tradition. He freed himself from having to deal with the subject of the pericope itself--no light task when working with Leviticus--by focusing only on its first verse, or even phrases or single words in the verse.<sup>85</sup> If it is true that "the editor of Vayikra Rabbah was the one who created the structure of the literary sermon," this invention was accomplished primarily to overcome the difficulties of the material.<sup>86</sup> Thus the strict form of the chapter of Vayikra Rabbah was and remained a liberating tool in the hands of its creator.<sup>87</sup>

"It is reasonable that this new form, which was designed to make possible the concentration of discussion on the first verse of the pericope and on a theme which arises from it, . . . should of itself draw after it the use of a great number of proems in each chapter, which thus deal, by their very nature, precisely with the beginning of the pericope, and also conclude with its first words."<sup>88</sup> The proem was part of the oral homiletical tradition inherited by the editor of Vayikra Rabbah, "created for and used in the live sermon. . . ."<sup>89</sup>

The success of the proem depends on tension and its release, as the preacher works from a verse extraneous to the day's Torah reading to the first verse of that reading. Several techniques are used to make the necessary connections: a) the verbal tally, in which a word in the (extraneous) proem-verse or its sequel is the same as a word in the first Torah-verse; b) the sequel to the proem-verse provides the connection to the Torah-verse and also, perhaps, to the theme of the sermon; c) the proem-verse is applied to a number of subjects all of the same class, e.g., Biblical personalities, the last of which provides the connection with the Torah-verse. Beyond the practical aims of establishing a link with the Torah-verse and of holding the congregation's--and reader's--attention, the proem-verse is also meant to shed new light on the Torah-verse and its pericope, to provoke a new chain of ideas and associations.<sup>90</sup>

The usual citation of the Torah-verse at the beginning of the proem is not according to the original form. In the synagogue, citation of the Torah-verse at the beginning of the proem would have been unnecessary, for the congregation would already have been familiar with it. To quote the Torah-verse at the outset would also have destroyed the possibility of building tension or excitement in the congregation. The preachers would therefore have begun their sermons directly with the proem-verse, but later editors or copyists added the Torah-verse at the beginning of a series of proems to indicate the commencement of a chapter or pericope.<sup>91</sup>

Heinemann identified several compositional methods used by the editor/author of Vayikra Rabbah. Chief among them is the "dialectical approach," in which the subject of a chapter is presented in contrast-

ing aspects, with all the contradictions which arise from various points of view. For example, Chapter 3 explores and balances positive and negative impressions of the priesthood. Paradox, where it occurs, is emphasized. Even where a given theme could have been presented unequivocally and in a uniform light, the editor seems to have deliberately gone out of his way to present it with all its aspects and connotations. This dialectical approach deepens the various facets of an issue. "Often the emphasis on contrasts and opposites is first and foremost a stylistic device for knitting together more closely the different aggadot making up the constituent parts of the homily."<sup>92</sup>

Secondary themes are often employed to increase suspense and to create an unexpected climax. Contrasts, e.g., between Israel and "the nations of the world," are used to make a point. Digressions end in a return to the main theme. Two themes may be interwoven, or a secondary theme may both open and close a chapter, providing a "frame" for the primary theme. The concluding הַחִימָה is not an artificial addition, but is almost always an organic growth out of the themes of the entire chapter.<sup>93</sup>

Aside from thematic considerations, the editor used several arrangements of material. Sometimes, as in Chapter 1, the aggadot are in a "rising order" so as to create a climax. There are occasional surprising twists and impressive conclusions. The sequential order of Torah verses may be ignored, as in Chapter 12, in favor of arrangement by subject.<sup>94</sup>

Heinemann attempted to assess the degree of editorial success or failure in each chapter, using the category of "integration" as his

principal criterion: To what degree is a chapter a solid, integrated unit? This criterion can be satisfied by thematic unity throughout the chapter or by the consistent illumination of the primary theme by the secondary theme; by a logical, or at least associative, progression from point to point; and by the purposeful and effective arrangement of material. In Heinemann's opinion, the degree of the editor's success depended upon his adherence to these specifications.

In the following chart,<sup>95</sup> Heinemann classified each chapter of Vayikra Rabbah according to the degree of success he believed the editor had achieved. The chart is in two parts, "Homogeneous Material" and "Heterogeneous Material," which is more easily understood as "one primary theme" and "more than one theme," respectively. Chapters of either type are susceptible of three degrees of editorial success. "Homogeneous" chapters may be 1) mere compilations, 2) integrated or 3) fully integrated. "Heterogeneous" chapters, by nature, may attain only to 4) partial integration, but with less success there may be only 5) a weak connection among the aggadot, or 6) no integration at all. Numbers in parentheses indicate those chapters whose authenticity is in doubt.<sup>96</sup> A question mark after a number indicates Heinemann's uncertainty that a given chapter actually belongs in its current classification.

סיווג הפרשות לפי טיבת הצלחת העריכה

(0) 4	(פ"ב), (פ"ד), (פכ"ט), (פ"ל)	1 ליקוט גירא	חומר הומוגני
(3) 3	פ"א, פט"ו, פל"ו	2 אינטגרציה	
(13) 15	פ"ג, פ"ה, (פ"ד), פ"ו, פ"ח, (פ"כ), פכ"א, פכ"ב, פכ"ג, פכ"ד, פכ"ח, פל"ב, פל"ג, פל"ד, פל"ה	3 אינטגרציה כלאה	
(7) 9	פ"ו? פ"ז? (פ"י), פ"א, פ"ב, פ"ג, פט"ו, פכ"ה, (פל"א)	4 אינטגרציה חלקית	חומר הטרוגני
(2) 4	פ"ט? פכ"י, (פכ"ז)? (פל"ז)	5 קשר רופף	
(0) 2	(פ"ח), (פ"ט)	6 אין אינטגרציה	

The numbers with no parentheses at the ends of the rows represent the total number of chapters of Vayikra Rabbah in each of the six success-classifications. The numbers within parentheses similarly refer to the total number of authentic chapters in those classes.

Heinemann commented that the 27 chapters which display some measure of integration (i.e., those in Classes 2, 3, and 4) offer sufficient proof that the editor of Vayikra Rabbah was striving "to create complete and crystallized chapters."<sup>97</sup> However, this interpretation of the data is a little wide of the mark. Of the 27 integrated chapters, four have been designated inauthentic. The more important result of this tabulation is the complete absence of authentic chapters from Classes 1 and 6; all authentic chapters exhibit, at the very least (Class 5) an attempt at integration, whatever the degree of success.

Insisting that the chapters of lesser quality are, nevertheless, works of craftsmanship, Heinemann cautioned against faulting the editor, who was not always able to find an inner relationship among the various aggadot in a chapter. Several explanations for such "failure" are possible: a) Some of the aggadot were of such great importance in themselves that the editor felt they could and should stand alone. b) The editor had material connected to the pericope which was too good to omit. c) A verse which is distant from the beginning of the pericope was necessary for thematic development or a climax. d) The preacher cited the previous pericope with the logical expectation that his auditors remembered the previous week's lesson. e) Finally, some "irrelevant" passages were included because

of the editor's reluctance to lose any of the tradition.<sup>98</sup> These explanations accomplish three purposes. First, they account for those few authentic chapters which are classed as editorial failures. Second, they account for the chapters of "doubtful authenticity" in the event that they are proved to be authentic. Most importantly, however, these explanations constitute a reply to the difficulties raised by Margulies.<sup>99</sup>

A further consideration is the editor's choice of material. There can be little doubt that the editor tended to bias the case in favor of the lesson he wished to convey, despite his dialectical approach. For example, he chose only aggadot which speak highly of Moses for Chapter 1, even though unfavorable traditions were available.<sup>100</sup>

Additional proof of the editor's care in selecting his materials comes from his treatment of legal matters, which is cursory, at best. In Chapters 14-19, which deal with distinctly unpleasant subjects, these topics are circumvented and, if possible, "beautified."<sup>101</sup>

Another characteristic of Vayikra Rabbah is the insertion of popular stories and legends, adding to the freshness and vitality of the whole midrash as well as entertaining, encouraging and teaching. They serve to exemplify the intellectual and traditional doctrines of the midrash. It was part of the editor's intention to present his midrash in a popular and attractive way, so he included such stories wherever possible.<sup>102</sup>

Heinemann suggested that when we find the name of an amora associated with a poem, it may only be to honor the rabbi, and not to report



what he actually said. He is not certain whether the names were assigned to the proems in the oral tradition, or by the editors of this and other midrashim.<sup>103</sup> However, consistency would demand such assignment by the oral tradition, for Heinemann has described the reverence for tradition by the editor of Vayikra Rabbah.

The question of structure and method in Vayikra Rabbah goes beyond the individual chapter and into the midrash as a whole. Why, for example, are aggadot which would be appropriate to two chapters quoted only in one of those chapters? Heinemann believed that the editor may have taken proems and aggadot from their original pericopes and placed them with others, or fashioned proems out of originally non-proemial material. Whatever the exact procedures, the editor had the freedom to establish the contents of each chapter and to apportion his material among the chapters according to the demands of conceptual structure and form. We can even attempt to understand the motives of the editor in placing certain aggadot in particular positions.<sup>104</sup> The distribution of similar material sometimes results in thematic relationships among chapters, for instance, the portrait of the ideal priest in Chapter 3 is qualified by the negative descriptions in Chapter 5.<sup>105</sup>

#### Basic Themes

Heinemann detected a number of themes which run all the way through Vayikra Rabbah, making their appearance in several chapters. One of these is a strain of anti-Roman and anti-Christian polemic, with the exhortation to observe all the mitzvot despite derision and persecution.<sup>106</sup> Other recurrent themes in Vayikra Rabbah cover almost all areas of religious thought, and try to guide the Palestinian

Jewish community through confusion and doubt by teaching the contemporary relevance of Torah. This is especially important with regard to the impossibility of sacrificial atonement in Jerusalem, and the paradox of Jewish suffering despite God's love for Israel.<sup>107</sup>

Other topics are conspicuous by their very absence, topics which were common matters of conjecture and debate in the 2nd-4th centuries, and which are treated at length in *Pesikta d'Rav Kahana*.<sup>108</sup> One of these is speculation about the time of the coming of the Messiah, and how to hasten it. The editor of *Vayikra Rabbah* refused to name any single mitzvah which would bring the End closer, just as he would name no single sin which was responsible for the destruction of the Temple and the Exile. However, one finds indirect testimony to the great longing for redemption, although the editor did not want to encourage vain hopes.

Nor did the editor wish to encourage visions of the restoration of a Jewish monarchy, or of independence achieved through military action or rebellion. He did not even enlarge on or glorify military heroism in the past; rather, he sought other explanations for military victory.<sup>109</sup> The combination of passivity vis-a-vis the ruling powers and the reluctance to speculate in practical terms about the advent of the Messiah indicate a theological-political stance which bears further study.

## CHAPTER II

## PESIKTA D'RAV KAHANA

Name

Zunz explained the word "Pesikta" as having the same meaning as פסיקתא or פסיקא or פסיקתא . Originally, the word פסיקתא or פסיקא applied only to each individual chapter, as we see in the Aruch, but it eventually came to signify the whole collection. It is likely that later writers used the name "Pesikta d'Rav Kahana" to refer to the collection consisting of or including the twelve haftarot of retribution, comfort and repentance. The first of these, דברי ירמיהו , begins with the words אבא בר כהנא פתח , so that the name of the entire collection is a shortening or corruption of this name.<sup>1</sup>

Buber thought that the name "Pesikta" was used because the various midrashim are based on different portions of many Biblical books, rather than on any one complete book, as if to say: דרושים נפרדים ונפסקים ; yet he agreed with Zunz that it has the same meaning as פסיקתא . Buber also mentioned the interesting, although totally incorrect, theory of Solomon Judah Löb Rapoport, that the name "Pesikta" is used because most of the sermons are based on sections of the Torah or Prophets with which the liturgical Scriptural reading concluded.<sup>2</sup>

It seems to have been clear to early medieval writers that a Rabbi Kahana redacted this midrash. The first mention of R. Kahana in connection with the Pesikta appears in a responsum of Rabbenu Meshullam b. Moshe. Buber identified R. Kahana as the finest disciple of Rav. In the time of R. Hiyya, he migrated from Babylonia to Palestine to study with R. Yoḥanan, where he edited a collection of Palestinian aggadot. Buber repeated the reference to "R. Kahana" in דברי ירמיהו, with the added information that this chapter begins one of the manuscripts with which he worked. However, he stated the relationship between דברי ירמיהו and the name of the midrash without conviction.<sup>3</sup> Strack said that this theory is "hardly justified,"<sup>4</sup> and Theodor called the ascription of the midrash to R. Kahana "erroneous."<sup>5</sup>

Mandelbaum considered the argument from דברי ירמיהו unlikely, but he also found that in two of the manuscripts he used in his critical edition of the Pesikta, the chapter for Rosh ha-Shanah begins by citing R. Kahana. Although both these citations are unclear, the significant fact is the mere reference to R. Kahana "in the opening words of the chapter on Rosh Hashanah in two manuscripts." This discovery obviates the dependence on a shortened or corrupt form of the name אבא בר כהנא as it appears at the beginning of דברי ירמיהו. In line with his theory that in its original form, Pesikta d'Rav Kahana began with the homily for Rosh ha-Shanah, Mandelbaum assumed that this name "was based on a version which made its first reference to this second generation amora, Rav Kahana, in its opening lines."<sup>6</sup> Braude was convinced that the

midrash was compiled by a R. Kahana, without knowing which one.<sup>7</sup>

We will defer comment on the names given to the midrash in medieval writings, until we come to examine the "disappearance" of the whole collection.

### Contents

While all agree that the homilies in Pesikta d'Rav Kahana are related to the annual cycle of Scriptural readings for festivals and special Sabbaths, there is much dispute over other aspects of the collection's contents. These include a) the number of chapters, b) the original and authentic order of their arrangement within the midrash, c) the occasions they serve, and d) lacunae and appendices. We will take up these subjects in order.

In researching the Aruch, Zunz found thirty different names used with the word פסיקתא. Two of these refer to the same chapter, וילקחתי לך and סיבה. Therefore Zunz fixed the number of chapters at 29.<sup>8</sup>

While there are 31 entries in Buber's table of contents, there is some inconsistency in Buber's reasons for placing them there. Chapter 24 (דרשר) appeared only in the Carmoly manuscript and in Tanhuma, but not in the other three manuscripts which Buber used, nor in the Aruch.<sup>9</sup> Buber also listed separately an alternate chapter for Sukkot (No. 29), found only in the "Luzzatto" (Safed) manuscript, with parts of it appearing also in the Babylonian Talmud, in the Yalkut, and in other medieval sources. Buber himself said that "the style of its language testifies about it that it is new."<sup>10</sup>

However, there are two items which do not appear in the table of contents, although they are both designated as "other" (אחרת), and their footnotes are numbered independently of the chapters which precede them. The first of these is פסקא אחרת דשרש אשיש, pp. 148b-149b, which Buber found in the Carmoly and Parma manuscripts. He printed the Carmoly text, and noted variant readings from Parma.<sup>11</sup> The other is נוסחא אחרת מפסקא ביום השמיני עצרת, pp. 194b-195b, which Buber copied from the only Oxford manuscript which was available to him.<sup>12</sup> The chapter for Sh'mini Atzeret which is printed on pp. 189b-194a follows the "other version" in this Oxford manuscript.

Why were these two latter items not given full independent status in the table of contents? If one objects that their openings are irregular, one need only look at the beginning of פסקא אחריתא דסוכות to find an irregular beginning.<sup>13</sup> Buber offered no explanation. If, however, one deletes Nos. 24 and 29 from Buber's table of contents, one is left with 29 entries, the same number--and the same homilies--that Zunz predicted from his researches.

The two manuscripts described by Friedmann contain a great deal of material not previously associated with Pesikta d'Rav Kahana. This circumstance led him to deny the possibility of establishing the exact number of chapters in the midrash.<sup>14</sup>

When Albeck listed the contents of Buber's edition, he showed Buber's No. 29 (פסקא אחריתא דסוכות) as a sub-item of No. 28 (ולקחתם לכם / סוכה), thus reducing Buber's numbering to 30 items.<sup>15</sup> Mandelbaum would have reverted to Zunz's original count of 29 chapters, but

he could not accept *וְזֵאת הַבְּרִכָּה* as part of the authentic annual Palestinian cycle of special Scriptural readings.<sup>16</sup> Therefore, he printed it as an appendix, and the number of authentic chapters in *Pesikta d'Rav Kahana* now stands at 28.

The task of discovering the original and authentic order of the chapters of *Pesikta d'Rav Kahana* has aroused more confusion and debate than any other problem connected with this midrash. Goldberg called it "the central question in all discussion about the *Pesikta*."<sup>17</sup> The primary complicating factor is the lack of complete congruence in the order of contents between any two of the seven known manuscripts. The overriding concern has been to establish which homily came first.

Speculation on this issue was begun by Zunz, who had not seen any manuscript of the midrash, not to mention a printed edition.<sup>18</sup> Working from references in the *Aruch* to the haftarot read between 17 Tammuz and Sukkot, Zunz concluded that the order of the *Pesikta* corresponds to the order of the Scriptural readings for festivals and special Sabbaths.<sup>19</sup> In addition, Zunz found that the homily for Rosh ha-Shanah was designated as *רֵאשׁ פְּסִקוֹת*, and decided that this chapter is the first "piska" of the *Pesikta*.<sup>20</sup> The remainder of his list appears in Table I.

The assignment of the various chapters to their places in this reconstruction of the contents is, of course, dependent on Zunz's judgment as to the occasions they served. Thus, for example, while he believed that *שׁוּר אֵר כְּשֵׁב* was read on the second day of Pesah as well as on the first day of Sukkot, he placed it with the latter

Table I. Order of Contents of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana.

	Zunz	Buber	Mandelbaum
1.	בחדש השביעי	ויהי ביום כלות משה	בחדש השביעי
2.	סליחות	כי תשא (שקלים)	שרבו;
3.	שרבה	זכור	סליחות
4.	אתרי מות	פרה אדומה	אתרי מות
5.	ולקחתם לכם	החודש	ולקחתם לכם
6.	שור או כשב	את קרבני לחמי	ביום השמיני עצרת
7.	ביום השמיני עצרת	ויהי בחצי הלילה	ויהי ביום כלות משה
8.	וזאת הברכה	העומר	כי תשא (שקלים)
9.	ויהי ביום כלות משה	שור או כשב	זכור
10.	כי תשא (שקלים)	ויהי בשלח	פרה אדומה
11.	זכור	עשר תעשר	החודש
12.	פיה אדומה	בחדש השלישי	את קרבני לחמי
13.	החודש	דברי ירמיהו	ויהי בחצי הלילה
14.	את קרבני לחמי	שמעו	מצרח העומר
15.	ויהי בחצי הלילה	איכה	שור או כשב
16.	העומר	נחמו	עשר תעשר
17.	ויהי בשלח	ותאמר צירן	ויהי בשלח
18.	בחדש השלישי	ענייה סוערה	בחדש השלישי
19.	עשר תעשר	אנכי אנכי	דברי ירמיהו
20.	דברי ירמיהו	רני עקרה	שמעו
21.	שמעו	קומי אורי	איכה
22.	איכה	שרש אשיש	נחמו
23.	נחמו	בחדש השביעי	ותאמר צירן
24.	ותאמר צירן	דרשו	ענייה סוערה
25.	ענייה סוערה	שרבה	אנכי אנכי
26.	אנכי אנכי	סליחות	רני עקרה
27.	רני עקרה	אתרי מות	קומי אורי
28.	קומי אורי	ולקחתם לכם	שרש אשיש
29.	שרש אשיש	ביום השמיני עצרת	
30.		וזאת הברכה	



because the holiday's main theme is sacrifices, while that of Pesah is redemption.<sup>21</sup>

Buber presented his arrangement of the contents of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana without commenting on it in his introduction.<sup>22</sup> However, it is clear that he wished to follow the order of the manuscript which he obtained from the library of S. D. Luzzatto. Many chapters were missing from that manuscript, and Buber filled in the rest of the homilies from the Carmoly manuscript, according to his conception of the occasions which they serve. For the most part, the manuscripts confirm Zunz's assumption that the order of the Pesikta follows the order of the cycle of festivals and special Sabbaths through the year. Buber chose to begin with the chapter for Hanukkah, largely because that is the starting point of his basic text, the Luzzatto manuscript. Other than this, certain differences may be noted between Zunz's arrangement and Buber's: a) Buber added דרשו; b) Buber placed שוכה before סליחות; c) he placed שר או כשב among the homilies for Pesah, rather than among those for Sukkot; and d) he placed עשר חנוכה before בחדש השלישי.

Friedmann, after setting down the order of the chapters in the manuscripts used by Buber (א, ב, ג, and ד in Table II),<sup>23</sup> described two more manuscripts made available to him by Solomon Schechter (ה and ו), with the order of their chapters.<sup>24</sup> Because there is no consistency of arrangement among them, Friedmann concluded that there is no definite overall order in the midrash. Albeck concurred in this evaluation.<sup>25</sup> Furthermore, he commented that דרשו, although it occurs only in the Carmoly and Oxford manuscripts, comes after שר או כשב, and not after בחדש השלישי, where Buber placed it.<sup>26</sup>

The actual dimensions of the problem became apparent only through Mandelbaum's efforts. He was the first scholar to publish an account of the actual contents of all the known manuscripts of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, based on a personal examination of these documents.<sup>27</sup> It became clear that Albeck's descriptions of the manuscripts' contents were actually reconstructions, i.e., he set down what he thought the manuscripts would have contained had they been complete.

Friedmann did the same thing with his Oxford manuscript, but he misrepresented to an even greater degree the manuscript which he called Hacoheh, and which Mandelbaum called Casanatense (P). The latter contains a table of contents which Friedmann reported, but Mandelbaum made it clear that the last eight or nine chapters are missing.<sup>28</sup>

Mandelbaum himself introduced a third Oxford manuscript ( $1N$ ), the only one which begins with Rosh ha-Shanah.<sup>29</sup> The contents of the seven known manuscripts of the midrash are shown in Table II. The arrangement of each is compared against the order of the chapters in Mandelbaum's edition. The numbers within each column indicate the arrangement of homilies within each manuscript. The Hebrew-letter symbols for the manuscripts are those used by Mandelbaum in his critical edition of the midrash.

Even though Mandelbaum included **עשר העשר** and **שורר אר כשב** among the homilies for Pesah, he says that they "reflect a less authentic Palestinian origin" as they appear in manuscripts N and Z. Manuscripts  $1N$ ,  $2N$  and C are more correct in having **ריהי** **בהצוי הלילה**, **מצרון העומר**, **והזוי בשלה** and **בחדש השלישי** as an uninterrupted unit.<sup>30</sup>

Table IIa. Order of Manuscript Contents Compared Against Order of Mandelbaum's Edition.

ג	1 <sup>א</sup>	2 <sup>א</sup>	ק	כ	פ	צ	א	
--	(1) 5	17	1	8	--	1	frag	ויהי ביום כלות משגו
b	(2) 6	18	2	9	--	2	1	כי חשא (שקלים)
b	(3) 7	19	3	10	--	3	2	זכור
--	(4) 8	--	4	11	--	--	3	פרה
--	(5) 9	20	5	7	--	--	4	החזש
--	(6) 10	25	6	12	--	--	5	את קרבני לחמי
c	(7) 11	21	7	13	--	--	--	ויהי בחצי הלילה
c	(8) 12	22	8	14	--	--	6	מצות העומר
--	--	--	9	18	--	--	7	שור או כשב
g	26	26	10	19	--	5	--	עשר העשר
f, e	(10) 13	23	11	15	--	4	8	ויהי בשלח
a	(12) 14	24	--	16	--	6	9	בחזש השלישי
--	(13) 15	1	--	--	1	7	10	דברי ירמיהו
d	(14) 16	--	--	--	2	8	11	שמעו
d	(15) 17	--	--	--	3	9	12	איכה
e	(16) 18	2	--	--	4	10	13	נחמו
--	(17) 19	3	--	--	5	11	14	והאמר ציון
--	(18) 20	4	--	--	6	12	15	ענייה סוערה
--	(19) 21	5	--	1	7	13	16	אנכי אנכי
--	(20) 22	6	--	2	8	14	17	רני עקרה
--	(21) 23	7	--	3	9	15	18	קומי אורי
--	(22) 24	8	--	4	10	16	19	שרש אשיש
--	1	11	17	--	--	17	20	ראש השנה
--	2	10	--	6	11	18	21	שרבה
--	3	--	--	--	--	19	22	סליחות
--	--	13	--	17	--	20	23	אחרי מרה
g	--	14	--	20	--	21	24	ולקחתם לכם
f	4	15	--	21	--	25	26	ביום השמיני עצרת

Table IIb. Non-Authentic Portions of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana in Various Manuscripts.

1 <sup>N</sup>	2 <sup>N</sup>	ק	כ	פ	צ	א
(32) 25  added to 26	16  added to 5, 6 middle of 8 9		23  middle of 7  added to 3 middle of 4 5		24 22	וְזאת הברכה פרשה אחרת (דסוכה) [לקוטי מדרש]  עשר תעשר  מה נארו שרש אשיש דרשו
	12	12 13 14 15 16 19 18	24 25  22		23	25  מתן תורה תנינא תליתיהא רביעתא הרנינו וה' פקד את שרה ויהי אחרי הדברים חקעו שופר פרשה סוכה הלכות נסוך המים פרשה אחרת דרש ר' חייננא

## Key to Table IIa and Table IIb.

N = Oxford 151 (Mandelbaum's Grundtext)

צ = Safed (Luzzatto)

פ = Parma

כ = Carmoly

ק = Casanatense

2<sup>N</sup> = Oxford 1521<sup>N</sup> = Oxford (Neubauer 2334)

ג = Genizah

Mandelbaum's reconstruction of the order of Pesikta differs from Buber's in the following ways: a) it begins, like Zunz's reconstruction, with Rosh ha-Shanah; b) Mandelbaum removed דרשו and וזאת הברכה; and c) he placed עשר תעשר before ויהי בשלה. However, Mandelbaum retained Buber's arrangement of שרבה before מצות העומר שור או כשב and of סליהרה.

What were Mandelbaum's reasons for placing Rosh ha-Shanah at the beginning of the midrash? He first alluded to Zunz's deduction that Rosh ha-Shanah begins the cycle on the evidence of the Aruch, which twice refers to Rosh ha-Shanah as the "beginning of the chapters."<sup>31</sup> Mandelbaum also cited three items of "additional evidence." The first of these is a twelfth-century genizah fragment from Babylonia, copied by Solomon Schechter. It contains a list of books in the possession of a scholar or book dealer. Each book is referred to by a quotation from the opening line of its text. One of these quotations corresponds to the opening words of the chapter on Rosh ha-Shanah: כתאב אבתדאה לעולם ה' דכרך נצב בש' חני בשם רבי "A book that begins as follows: 'Forever, O Lord, Thy word standeth fast in heaven.' It was taught in the name of Rabbi Eliezer, the world was created on the twenty-fifth day of Elul." In this quotation, found as it is among other "first lines," Mandelbaum found support for the thesis that Pesikta d'Rav Kahana begins with Rosh ha-Shanah, as Zunz had predicted.<sup>32</sup>

The second additional piece of evidence is the citation of R. Kahana at the beginning of the chapters for Rosh ha-Shanah in the

manuscripts N and  $2^N$ .<sup>33</sup> It is interesting to note that N, which served as Mandelbaum's basic text, begins with the chapter for Ḥanukkah; while in manuscript  $1^N$ , the only manuscript which actually begins with Rosh ha-Shanah, R. Kahana is not mentioned in the first lines.

Finally, Mandelbaum mentioned פסיקתא קדומה, a collection of homilies on the festivals which went through a similar change in the order of chapters. Although its chapters are known in the order Pesah, Shavuot, Sukkot, Ḥanukkah, Purim, Rosh ha-Shanah and Yom Kippur, Saul Lieberman proved that the original order began with Rosh ha-Shanah.<sup>34</sup>

Mandelbaum believed that manuscript  $1^N$  best reflected the original order of the Pesikta, and not only because it begins with Rosh ha-Shanah. Zunz assigned עשר תעשר to the second day of Shavuot and וזאת הברכה to Simhat Torah. Mandelbaum pointed out that these days were not observed in Palestine. While these two chapters appear in  $1^N$ , they appear at its end, out of any logical sequence. Mandelbaum concluded that the scribe copied from a manuscript which ended properly with שרש אשיש, but that he found the two non-Palestinian chapters, "didn't know what to do with them, and tacked them on the end." Other manuscripts of Pesikta and other sources indicate that this practice was not unusual.<sup>35</sup>

Starting from the assumption that Pesikta d'Rav Kahana reflects the Palestinian minhag with regard to the cycle of Scriptural readings, Goldberg believed that manuscript N, Mandelbaum's basic text, preserves the original Palestinian order of readings to a

greater degree than any other manuscript. Its first pages are missing, but a small portion at the end of **ויהי ביום כלות מצותה** (for **Ḥanukkah**) remains, followed immediately by **שקלים**. Goldberg thought that the very authenticity of this manuscript argues against Mandelbaum's determination of the original order of chapters as that which Zunz theorized, viz., beginning with **Rosh ha-Shanah**.<sup>36</sup>

**Pesikta** should rather be viewed as beginning with **Shabbat Ḥanukkah**. At the time of its composition, the Jews of Palestine read the Torah according to a triennial cycle, with an annual cycle of readings for holidays and special Sabbaths. **Shabbat Ḥanukkah** was the first Sabbath of the year which had a special reading associated with it, and it is therefore the most likely chapter to begin **Pesikta d'Rav Kahana**.<sup>37</sup>

Furthermore, Goldberg weakened Mandelbaum's argument from the quotation in the genizah booklist. Besides the "first lines of **Pesikta d'Rav Kahana**," the list also includes Chapter 10 of **Pesahim** and Chapter 3 of **Yoma** as independent units. If manuscripts of disembodied chapters from the Talmud were available, it is altogether likely that separate chapters of **Pesikta** were available as well.<sup>38</sup>

Additional evidence for the reliability of the sequence of manuscript § comes from **עשר העשר**. While Mandelbaum assigned it to the second day of **Pesah**, E. Fleischer proved that that passage was read twice during the year in Palestine: on **Shabbat Ḥol ha-Moed Pesah** and on **Shabbat Ḥol ha-Moed Sukkot**.<sup>39</sup> In § and ק it is in its proper position between **שורר אר כשב** (first day of **Pesah**) and **ויהי בשלוק** (seventh day of **Pesah**), the first time it occurs in an annual cycle of special Sabbaths beginning with **Ḥanukkah**. If the cycle began

with Rosh ha-Shanah, עשר תעשר would surely appear among the homilies for Sukkot.<sup>40</sup>

The only argument for Rosh ha-Shanah as the first chapter of Pesikta which Goldberg could not refute is Rabbi Nathan's reference in the Aruch to Rosh ha-Shanah as "the first of the piskas" (ערך מסקיד and ערך מסאסא).<sup>41</sup> The Aruch was completed ca. 1100, almost 200 years before manuscript א, the oldest known complete copy of Pesikta.

While Goldberg did not discuss Mandelbaum's point about the פסיקתא קדומה, one could say that the proof of its true beginning is not conclusive for Pesikta d'Rav Kahana. Another pesikta-cycle, Pesikta Rabbati, begins with Rosh Hodesh, and then turns to Hanukkah and the rest of the liturgical year in unbroken sequence.

Two manuscripts, א<sub>2</sub> and פ, begin with דברי ירמיהו and its sequence of homilies for the Sabbaths between 17 Tammuz and Sukkot; the latter manuscript only includes that group of homilies. A third manuscript, ג, although missing its first 17 folios,<sup>42</sup> probably began also with דברי ירמיהו. However, this cannot be the authentic beginning of the midrash for two reasons: a) these chapters are based on prophetic passages and not on the Torah; and b) this group does not come at the beginning of a Jewish calendar year, neither that beginning in Nisan nor in Tishri.<sup>43</sup>

Goldberg maintained that the redactor of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana viewed the final portion of ביום השמיני עצרת, a homily on Num. 29:39, "as a kind of conclusion for the book of the Pesikta as a whole."<sup>44</sup> Therefore, because the redactor wanted to end with Sh'mini Atzeret, he had no choice but to begin with Hanukkah.<sup>45</sup>

In a final note on the order of Pesikta, Goldberg questioned



the position of מצות העומר for the second day of Pesah in Mandelbaum's edition. Goldberg favored שורר או כשב over ויהי בחצי הלילה as the authentic Palestinian reading for the first day of Pesah.<sup>46</sup> מצות העומר should therefore follow שורר או כשב. However, if ויהי בחצי הלילה is actually an integral part of the midrash, then מצות העומר appears in its proper place.<sup>47</sup>

Braude noted that the first and last chapters of Pesikta (for Hanukkah and Sh'mini Atzeret) both conclude with perorations based on Deut. 4:4, emphasizing Israel's survival. "The people of Israel are thus possessed of strength, kl ( $20 + 8 = 28$ ) a word whose letters represent the numerical value of the 28 Piskas in Pesikta d'Rav Kahana. The disguised cipher for the number 28 may also be taken as the signature for the final Piska in the work."<sup>48</sup> While this interesting theory attempts to lend some literary coherence to the midrash as a whole, it is not supported by the texts, in which the word kl does not appear.

Mandelbaum appended to his edition of Pesikta seven selections from various manuscripts which are not, in his opinion, authentic portions of the midrash. They appear more for the sake of satisfying scholarly interest in the contents of the manuscripts, as well as presenting critical texts of דרשר and וזאת הברכה, which were thought by Buber and Zunz to be integral parts of the collection. Braude, however, said that these supplements were added because of their "general connections with the themes of the body of the work. . . . The seven supplements . . . despite their loose connection with the main body of the Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, form a fitting finale to the Midrash."<sup>49</sup>

We turn now to the occasions for which the homilies of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana were composed, discussing them in the order of their appearance in Mandelbaum's edition. Sources will be given only where there is extended discussion or a difference of opinion.

1) ויהי ביום כלות משה is generally acknowledged to be for the Sabbath during Ḥarukkah. 2) כִּי תֵשָׂא is for Shabbat Sh'kalim, the first of four special Sabbaths before and after Purim (ארבע פרשיות). Zunz said that this is the last Sabbath in Sh'vat.<sup>50</sup> 3) זָכוֹר is for Ehabbat Zachor, the Sabbath before Purim and the second of the four special Sabbaths. 4) פֶּרַח אֲדוֹמָה is for Shabbat Parah, the third of the ארבע פרשיות. 5) הַחֹדֶשׁ הַזֶּה is for Shabbat ha-Ḥodesh, the fourth of these Sabbaths. Zunz said that this was the last Sabbath in Adar,<sup>51</sup> and Braude added that it could also fall on Rosh Ḥodesh Nisan.<sup>52</sup> 6) אַתְּ קָרַבְנִי לַחֲמִי is for Rosh Ḥodesh. Goldberg said that its brevity may indicate a reading for a weekday. Further support for this theory may be inferred from Pesikta Rabbati, which contains a chapter for Rosh Ḥodesh when it falls on Shabbat.<sup>53</sup>

7) ויהי בחצי הלילה is generally thought to be for the first day of Pesah. However, Braude noted, "According to Professor Joseph Heinemann, Ezra Fleischer found evidence that in some localities in the Land of Israel, Exod. 12:21-51 was read on Shabbat ha-Gadol."<sup>54</sup> Goldberg suspected the authenticity of this chapter because it does not appear in manuscript N, Mandelbaum's basic text. Besides this, there are already four other chapters for Pesah in Pesikta.<sup>55</sup> Also, this chapter shows many structural irregularities--a matter which we shall deal with later--that indicate a later author. In addition

to these factors, because ריהי בחצי הלילה is found almost word for word in Pesikta Rabbati, it was apparent to Goldberg that it was transferred from that midrash to Pesikta d'Rav Kahana.<sup>56</sup>

8) מצות העומר is for the second day of Pesah, on which the counting of the Omer begins. As with את קרבני לחמי, its brevity may indicate a weekday reading.<sup>57</sup> 9) As mentioned above, Zunz associated שרר או כשב primarily with the first day of Sukkot, but he also thought that it was read on the second day of Pesah. Buber and Draude simply assigned this chapter to Pesah, as did Mandelbaum, although he felt that it reflects "a less authentic Palestinian origin."<sup>58</sup> Goldberg disagreed, saying that it is indeed authentic, and reflects the Torah reading for the first day of Pesah.<sup>59</sup>

According to Zunz, עשר חמש is for the second day of Shavuot,<sup>60</sup> although "sometimes it is also for the eighth day of Pesah or Sh'mini Atzeret."<sup>61</sup> Buber was more specific, saying that this chapter is for the second day of Shavuot when it falls on a Sabbath.<sup>62</sup> Mandelbaum questioned these statements, because only one day of Shavuot would have been celebrated in the Palestinian tradition. As with שרר או כשב, he doubted whether it was authentically Palestinian.<sup>63</sup> Goldberg was certain of the authenticity of עשר חמש, simply because it appears in all the manuscripts.<sup>64</sup> Furthermore, it conforms strictly to the pattern of a Pesikta homily set forth by Goldberg. As mentioned above, he cited Fleischer's proof that Deut. 14:22 ff. was read on both Shabbat Hol ha-Moed Pesah and Shabbat Hcl ha-Moed Sukkot. Braude added that this was the custom in Palestine, but that in other places the passage "is read on the eighth day of Passover as well as on the second day of Shavuot when the day falls on the Sabbath."<sup>65</sup>

This explanation covers most of the traditions associated with עשר העשר.

11) ריהי בשלח is associated with the seventh day of Pesah. Zunz saw a manuscript of this chapter, and described its history and ownership.<sup>66</sup> Goldberg pointed to a body of material in the middle of this chapter (paragraphs 14-24 in Mandelbaum's edition, pp. 189, 1.6 - 200, 1.11) which, after an introduction dealing with martyrdom, relates stories of R. Shim'on b. Yoḥai and his son, R. Elazar. Goldberg agreed with Theodor that these stories are a later addition to the chapter. Possibly, they were placed here because of the connection between Lag ba-Omer (the "festival" between Pesah and Shavuot) and k. Shim'on.<sup>67</sup> 12) בהדש השלישי is universally agreed to be for Shavuot.

13) דברי ירמיהו is the first of a block of 10-12 homilies based on haftarot read after 17 Tammuz. The number of chapters included in this series varies according to the individual scholar's evaluation. Zunz believed there were twelve, because he found many medieval sources which used the mnemonic דש"ה נר"ע אר"ק שד"ש to refer to them. This mnemonic consists of the first letters of the names of the twelve homilies. Some of these medieval scholars broke down the list, for example, Moses of Coucy in Sefer Mitzvot ha-Gadol, who wrote: "We read three haftarot of retribution before Tisha b'Av . . . and after Tisha b'Av seven haftarot of consolation and two of repentance, and thus it is in the Pesikta."<sup>68</sup> The theory that the name of the midrash was derived from the citation of R. Abba b. Kahana in its opening lines was supported by the appearance of these homilies at the beginning of several manuscripts,

as noted above. Indeed, the Parma manuscript only contains eleven of these chapters, and was catalogued by de Rossi as *מדרש הפטורה*.<sup>69</sup> Mandelbaum leaned toward the view that the original unit had only the first ten chapters, ending with *שרש אשיש*, leaving out *דרשר*, and placing *שרכה* among the homilies for the *ימים נוראים*. These were his reasons: a) Despite his quotations from medieval sources, Zunz's reconstruction of the unit--and the entire midrash--ends with *שרש אשיש*, and this is confirmed by "the best manuscripts," א<sub>1</sub>, א<sub>2</sub>, and צ. b) Putting the final *דייש* with this block makes it overlap Rosh ha-Shanah, as in MSS א<sub>2</sub> and כ. c) The *פירוטי ייני* (sic), which are based on the Torah readings and haftarot as found in Palestine, refer to the "three of retribution" and the "seven of consolation," but not to *דייש*.<sup>70</sup> Although Mandelbaum did not use it as support, it is interesting that MS פ excludes *דרשר* from the series. Taking *שרכה* away from the sequence has the disadvantage of making it the only chapter outside of the cycle of haftarah-homilies which is not based on the Torah. Goldberg merely said that there are eleven chapters based on haftarot, of which *דברי ירמיהו* is the first.<sup>71</sup>

14) *שמער* is for the second haftarah of retribution. 15) Although the mnemonic letter for the third haftarah of retribution is ט, after *חזון ישעיהו* (Isa. 1:1-27), the haftarah for *דברים*, the operative phrase in the homily based upon it is *איכה היתה לזונה* (Isa. 1:21). Thus, the homily is more properly referred to as *איכה*.<sup>72</sup> Goldberg noted that the use of proof-texts of this chapter is somewhat strange in that five out of its six proems are based on the word *איכה* as it is used in Lamentations 1:1 *איכה ישבה בדד*. The

sixth paragraph concludes with both Isa. 1:21 and Lam. 1:1, and the homilies that follow expound Isa. 1:21-26. Of Isa. 1:21, Goldberg said that "it is not impossible . . . that the haftarah began at one time with this verse."<sup>73</sup> While it is not mentioned in the sources, the chronological proximity of reading *חזון ישעיהו* on the Sabbath before Tisha b'Av and reading Lamentations within a week after may account for their juxtaposition in the chapter.

16) *נחמו*, for the first Sabbath after Tisha b'Av, also corresponds to the first haftarah of consolation. 17) *רחמי ציון* is for the second haftarah of consolation; 18) *ענייה סועיה* is for the third; 19) *אנכי אנכי* is for the fourth; 20) *רני עקרה* for the fifth; 21) *קומי אורי* for the sixth; and 22) *שרש אשיש* is for the seventh.

23) The text for Rosh ha-Shanah is *בחדש השביעי* (Lev. 23:24).

24) While all agree that *שוכה* is the haftarah for the Sabbath between Rosh ha-Shanah and Yom Kippur, there is disagreement about its place in the structure of the Pesikta, as outlined above. Zunz<sup>74</sup> and Buber<sup>75</sup> agreed that it is the last of the cycle of twelve homilies based on haftarot. Mandelbaum excluded it from that block of material on the basis of manuscript traditions and calendation.<sup>76</sup> Goldberg, without committing himself to a formal grouping of homilies, said that *שוכה* is the last of the eleven chapters which are connected with the haftarah.<sup>77</sup>

25) Although *סליחות* appears in all lists of the authentic content of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana,<sup>78</sup> there is some hesitancy about assigning this homily to any particular date. Zunz said that it is appropriate to the days of repentance which begin on the Sunday before

Rosh ha-Shanah and continue until Yom Kippur. A secondary name, פרשת יחול, indicates a connection with the Torah reading for fast days (Ex. 32:11 ff.), and especially for the Fast of Gedaliah. "Together with this it is suitable for the eleventh Sabbath out of the cycle . . . of twelve haftarot, whose haftarah (דרשו) is also the haftarah for the fast day. This Sabbath usually falls just before the Sunday of the week in which the days of S'lihot begin."<sup>79</sup> Buber believed that סליחות was not an independent unit, but that it was actually a part of דרשו, for the Fast of Gedaliah.<sup>80</sup> Mandelbaum pointed out that סליחות appears only in MSS N, א<sub>1</sub> and צ, the three manuscripts which he believed reflect the Palestinian tradition most faithfully.<sup>81</sup> Goldberg noted that in some manuscripts, סליחות appears as a part of or as an appendix to שרבה. However, Mandelbaum was correct in presenting it as an independent chapter, as it appears in MS א; שרבה is based on a prophetic reading and סליחות on a reading from the Torah (Num. 14:18-20), and the two should not be juxtaposed. This chapter seems to have been meant for the Fast of Gedaliah, or perhaps for another fast, or even for the days when the Torah is read between Rosh ha-Shanah and Yom Kippur.<sup>82</sup> Once again, Goldberg said that the brevity of the homily may indicate a weekday reading.<sup>83</sup>

ולקחתם לכם (27) corresponds to Yom Kippur; אחרי מות (26) to Sukkot; and ביום השמיני עצרת (28) to Sh'mini Atzeret.

We turn now to an examination of material which is comprised in various manuscripts, but which was not included in the main body of Mandelbaum's edition. In pursuit of this topic, we will follow the order of chapters and fragments in Table IIb.

All agree that *וְזֹאת הַבְּרִכָּה* is a homily for Simhat Torah. However, because Zunz and Buber did not distinguish between the customs of Palestine and those of other places, they included this chapter as an authentic part of this midrash on annual Scriptural readings. It has since been established that a complete reading of the Torah was completed in Palestine every three or three-and-a-half years. At any rate, because Simhat Torah was not observed annually, *וְזֹאת הַבְּרִכָּה* cannot be an authentic part of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana.<sup>84</sup> In addition, the structure of *וְזֹאת הַבְּרִכָּה* is so dissimilar to Goldberg's archetypal pattern for a Pesikta homily, that he rejected out of hand its claim to authenticity.<sup>85</sup>

Of *פְּרֻשָּׁה אַחֲרָה (דְּסוּכָה)*, Mandelbaum said that it is likely that it was composed for the second day of Sukkot,<sup>86</sup> which was not observed as a festival in Palestine. *לְקוּטֵי מִדְרָשׁ*, appearing only in MS D, was collected from various midrashim and inserted into *הַחֹדֶשׁ*.<sup>87</sup> The fragment of *עֶשֶׂר תַּעֲשֶׂה* was a later addition to that chapter in MS 1א.<sup>88</sup> *מִהּ נִאֲרָה*, appearing as indicated in Table IIb, was added from a later midrash whose chapters usually began with the phrase *זֶהוּ שְׂאֵמֶר הַכְּתוּב בְּרַחֵם הַקֹּדֶשׁ*.<sup>89</sup> The additional sections of *שְׁשֵׁשׁ אֲשֵׁר* occur in the manuscripts indicated.

*דְּרִשׁוֹ* was regarded by Buber as the authentic homily for the Fast of Gedaliah, even though "it is missing from the Luzzatto *לְצַ*, Oxford *לְא* and Parma *לְפ* manuscripts. Also, it is not quoted in the Aruch nor in the Yalkut. But I found it in the Carmoly MS and I copied it from there; I also found it complete in Tanquma Ha'azinu, in the section *הַצֹּרֵר תָּמִיד פִּעְלוֹ*."<sup>90</sup> It appears also in MS 2א.



Chapters 12-15 of MS P are the same as those of the same names in Pesikta Rabbati,<sup>91</sup> substituted for בחדש השלישי. Also, הרנינו in the same manuscript is as it appears in Pesikta Rabbati.<sup>92</sup>

The same applies to וקעו שופר and ויהי אחריו הדברים.<sup>93</sup> The latter reflects a non-Palestinian tradition in which Gen. 21 is read on the first day of Rosh ha-Shanah, and Gen. 22 is read on the second day.<sup>94</sup> Buber said that the homily on Gen. 22 was taken from Firke d'Rabbi Eliezer.<sup>95</sup>

The alternative chapter for Sukkot in MS N is also a later addition, according to Buber, who suggested that it derives from the Babylonian Talmud. It may have been taken from Midrash Harninu.<sup>96</sup> Unique to MS K, הלכות נסוך המים begins with legal material on the water-drawing ceremony during Sukkot, and continues with sections on unrelated subjects. Buber felt that this chapter is a compilation from the Babylonian Talmud and Avot d'Rabbi Nathan.<sup>97</sup> The section of MS Z which Mandelbaum identified as No. 23, פרשה אחרת דרש, seems to be identical, according to Buber's description, with No. 22 in MS Y. Buber found its source in B. Avodah Zarah 2a ff., with portions of it quoted in the Yalkut and in other medieval works.<sup>98</sup>

Finally, Mandelbaum included in his edition (pp. 213-224) a section of בחדש השלישי which derives from Tanhuma Yitro.<sup>99</sup> Although these pages are found in Mandelbaum's basic text, MS N, and in MS Y, it is so obvious that they are a later addition that one wonders why he did not place them among the appendices. Goldberg rejected Theodor's theory that this block of material was like a chapter on the Ten Commandments, and that it serves as an alternate

homily for Shavuot.<sup>100</sup>

Date of Composition

Zunz's estimate of the date of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana's composition was ca. 700. Several factors entered into this theory: the choice of chapters from the Rabbot to the Torah; the use of a halachic proem for a haggadic chapter, a pattern found only in later midrashim; the establishment of haftarot contrary to the Babylonian Talmud; and the attention given to Simhat Torah.<sup>101</sup>

Without going into any detail, Buber assumed that the redaction of Pesikta was contemporaneous with the editing of the Palestinian Talmud, which he placed in the second half of the fourth century.<sup>102</sup> The only evidence adduced for this conclusion arises from parallel passages in Pesikta and the Babylonian Talmud. In the Bavli, these are quoted with the formula *במעריבא אמר לי*. By the same token, the Pesikta contains no homilies of the Babylonian sages. Therefore, Pesikta was apparently edited before the Bavli.<sup>103</sup>

In establishing the date of Pesikta, Albeck stressed its dependence on Vayikra Rabbah. Having estimated the date of the latter at the end of the fifth century or the beginning of the sixth,<sup>104</sup> Albeck said that Pesikta d'Rav Kahana cannot predate the seventh century.<sup>105</sup>

Margulies spoke of Vayikra Rabbah and Pesikta d'Rav Kahana as "twin brothers who came out of the very same bet-midrash,"<sup>106</sup> and which are therefore contemporaneous. Because he dated Vayikra Rabbah to the beginning of the fifth century,<sup>107</sup> the same date applies to Pesikta.

Goldberg objected that Margulies only succeeded in confusing the issue,<sup>108</sup> and that Albeck was correct in positing Pesikta's dependence on Vayikra Rabbah. Pesikta is based on an annual cycle of readings, which must be a later development than Vayikra Rabbah's foundation on a triennial cycle.<sup>109</sup> In addition, Goldberg proposed the determination of the relative dates of the early midrashim by the degree of their adherence to the typical structural pattern of Pesikta homilies. This pattern is dependent upon the proportion of proems to homilies.<sup>110</sup>

Braude agreed with Margulies in assigning Pesikta d'Rav Kahana to the fifth century on the strength of the absence of citations of rabbis who lived after that time. Recently discovered liturgical compositions by Yannai (probably sixth century) which are unmistakably based on Pesikta add weight to this theory.<sup>111</sup>

### Place of Composition

Palestine is acknowledged by all to have been the place where Pesikta d'Rav Kahana was composed, and most scholars have given similar reasons. Even Zunz, without having seen a copy of the midrash, said that the language, style, tone and content of Pesikta mark it as Palestinian.<sup>112</sup> Buber pointed to R. Kahana's emigration from Babylonia to Palestine, and to the parallels to Pesikta in the Babylonian Talmud with the formula ברשׁבא אמרי.<sup>113</sup> Mandelbaum emphasized the names of the rabbis cited and their cities of residence, as well as the large amount of Palestinian Aramaic in the text.<sup>114</sup> Goldberg mentioned the absence of an authentic homily for Simhat Torah, which was not an annual event in Palestine.<sup>115</sup>

### Transmission, Disappearance and Rediscovery

We shall now trace the story of the transmission, "disappearance" and rediscovery of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana. For several centuries, Pesikta d'Rav Kahana seemed to have no physical existence. Although references to it abounded, no one knew where to find a manuscript. No edition had been printed.

The primary means of transmission of any literary material is, of course, through manuscripts and printed editions, and we shall deal with those below. However, because by the 19th century the Pesikta was "unknown or forgotten," and its existence attested only by scholars before the 16th century,<sup>116</sup> these scholarly references constituted the only means by which the Pesikta was transmitted for several centuries. Zunz found signs that the mid-

rash was known to the authors of the She'eltot, Halachot G'dolot, Midrash Shir ha-Shirim, and Pesikta Rabbati, as well as to Kalir and rabbis of the 11th century. However, Rabbi Nathan of Rome was the first authority to mention Pesikta d'Rav Kahana by name, quoting from it 274 times in the Aruch in order to explain unfamiliar words.<sup>117</sup> The Yalkut cited Pesikta as its source over 200 times.<sup>118</sup> Thus the Aruch and the Yalkut were for a long time the chief sources of knowledge about Pesikta.

Buber provided an exhaustive list of scholars who quoted Pesikta, with the locations of their quotations.<sup>119</sup> These are arranged in chronological order; the first authority mentioned is Saadia Gaon. Of Rabbi Nathan, Buber said that he was most diligent in explaining strange words which appear in Pesikta, and he quoted many passages from it even when he could have quoted parallel passages from other midrashim or from the Palestinian Talmud. Buber found all the passages quoted by Rabbi Nathan, except for two, "present without defect" in the manuscripts of Pesikta which he used,<sup>120</sup> and he included a chart listing all the entries in the Aruch, in alphabetical order, in which reference is made to Pesikta. Next to each entry is the name of the chapter in which the quotation appears.<sup>121</sup> A similar chart is included with references to Pesikta in the Yalkut.<sup>122</sup> Buber also listed sources--most of them from the rabbinic period, although some are medieval--which quote portions of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana without citing it by name.<sup>123</sup>

The "disappearance" of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana seems to have occurred largely because it was confused with two other midrashim.

Buber said that in later times<sup>124</sup> the name of Rav Kahana was also linked with Pesikta Rabbati, with the idea that the word "Pesikta" actually referred to that midrash. Although this ascription did not appear in the first printed edition of Pesikta Rabbati (1653), it appeared in later ones, whose title was given as Pesikta Rabbati d'Rav Kahana.<sup>125</sup>

Our Pesikta was also confused with Midrash Lekah Tov, ascribed to R. Tuvya b. Eliezer and edited between 1096 and 1240. It contains commentary on the Torah drawn from the Babylonian Talmud, Sifra, Sifre, Tanhuma et al. R. Tuvya put his name to every chapter, in that each begins with a Biblical verse including the word טרב. In order to identify these verses, there appears before each the abbreviation פט, which stands for פטרק. Buber conjectured that when the midrash was printed in Venice in 1546, the printer understood the abbreviation to mean פסיקתא. Because he already knew of another Pesikta, the "Rabbati," and this midrash was smaller, he gave it the name Pesikta Zutrata, "the small Pesikta."<sup>126</sup> The error was compounded by other scholars, among whom Buber gave special prominence to Rabbi M. Kunitz. Generally, the name Lekah Tov was forgotten by scholars after 1500, the name Pesikta Zutrata was substituted, and that midrash was then ascribed to Rav Kahana, resulting in the title Pesikta (Zutrata) d'Rav Kahana. Buber gave examples of works which cited Pesikta d'Rav Kahana as a source, but which actually quote from Pesikta Zutrata.<sup>127</sup>

Further confusion resulted from scribal or printers' errors in works such as the Yalkut, in which citations of Pesikta d'Rav

Kahana actually appear in Pesikta Rabbati, and vice versa. Buber said that the absence from Pesikta Rabbati of some of the quotations ascribed to it is due to the loss of chapters from Pesikta Rabbati which were still available to the compiler of the Yalkut.<sup>128</sup> Albeck, on the other hand, thought it was reasonable that some chapters of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana vanished, but only after having been quoted by other writers.<sup>129</sup>

The overall result of this inexactitude was described by Braude: "During the latter half of the sixteenth century, . . . despite the existence of manuscripts dating from about this time, the [Pesikta] seems to have been lost sight of, and except for quotations from it embedded in earlier writings, it remained unknown until 1832."<sup>130</sup>

In that year Zunz published Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden historisch entwickelt, the eleventh chapter of which contained the remarkable fruit of his painstaking labor to establish the very existence of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana. A diligent consideration of the evidence led Zunz to conclude that the Pesikta is neither "Rabbati" nor "Zutrata:" a) the various designations for Pesikta in R. Nathan's numerous citations (e.g., דפּרה, דפּרוב, etc.) apparently indicate different parts of the same midrash; b) many of R. Nathan's quotations from Pesikta appear also in sections of the Yalkut ascribed to Pesikta, indicating that the two authors drew from the same source; c) although some of the Yalkut's quotations from Pesikta appear in Pesikta Rabbati, many do not, and thus the two works cannot be identical; d) even the editor of the Yalkut cited both Pesikta and Pesikta Rabbati; e) it is even less probable

that Pesikta is Pesikta Zutrata, which draws mainly from Sifra and Sifre, and contains almost none of the passages ascribed to Pesikta by R. Nathan; f) R. Tuvya, who compiled Pesikta Zutrata, was a contemporary of Rashi and R. Nathan; and g) R. Nathan always distinguished between Pesikta and all other midrashim, and repeatedly designated Pesikta as the source of passages in common with other midrashim.<sup>131</sup>

Zunz still had to establish that there is one unified midrash called "Pesikta," and not many smaller but independent pesiktot as cited by R. Nathan. He reached this conclusion for the following reasons: a) even though the Yalkut quotes many of the same passages as the Aruch, it uses only the name "Pesikta" with no qualification; b) most writers after Rashi and R. Nathan used only the name "Pesikta" when referring to this midrash; c) the designations of various pesiktot in the Aruch parallel the beginnings or the basic Scriptural verses of passages in the Yalkut, to the point that we see them as chapter titles; and d) many chapters of Pesikta Rabbati are equivalent in their names and contents to those of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana which are named and excerpted in other works.<sup>132</sup>

Having thus established Pesikta d'Rav Kahana as an actual, independent midrash, Zunz then attempted to reconstruct its contents. He was guided in this task by R. Nathan's citations and those of other rabbis, by comparisons with Pesikta Rabbati, and by the content and placement of quoted material within the Yalkut. With each chapter, Zunz included a list of references in other rabbinic and medieval works. These references were broken down into nine categories, the first four of which are connected with actual Pesikta



passages, while the rest cover parallel passages. These categories are as follows: 1) citations which mention Pesikta by name; 2) passages from Pesikta in the Yalkut; 3) other quotations from Pesikta; 4) chapters and passages identical with portions of Pesikta Rabbati; 5) supplements and parallels in the Targum, in early midrashic works, and in halachah, in addition to the Babylonian Gemara; 6) the Palestinian Talmud; 7) early haggadah; 8) later aggadic literature; and 9) rabbinic, i.e., medieval, works.<sup>133</sup>

#### Manuscripts and Fragments

This compelling reconstruction of a midrash which apparently had not been seen for centuries spurred an intensive search for manuscripts. Seven have been found to date, as well as an equal number of genizah fragments, all of which are described below. A complete list of the contents of each manuscript and their order within the manuscripts appears in Tables IIa and IIb.

Of three manuscripts of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana in the possession of Oxford University, one was used by Buber as an auxiliary text in the preparation of his edition. Mandelbaum used the same manuscript as the basic text for his own critical edition. Its designation in the Bodleian Library is Neubauer 151(1), but Mandelbaum in his edition referred to it as N.<sup>134</sup> A colophon at the end of the manuscript identifies Yehotzadak b. Elhanan as the copyist, who completed his work on Friday, 29 Adar 5051 (1291 C.E.).<sup>135</sup> Moses Lutski said that the handwriting reflects a German influence.<sup>136</sup> This is the oldest extant complete manuscript of Pesikta. There are two homilies for Sukkot; Mandelbaum listed them as "24. ׀לקחתם"

and "25. פרשה דסוכה."<sup>137</sup> Buber combined them into one chapter, as in MS כ and Leviticus Rabba, and Mandelbaum did the same. The second part of the chapter begins with the words ד"א ולקחתם לכם <sup>138</sup> Buber also believed that two versions of פסקא ביום השמיני עזרה<sup>139</sup> and he reproduced the version unique to MS א as a נוסחא אחרת.<sup>140</sup> Mandelbaum, however, left out this section.

With the marvelous clarity of hindsight, we now know that Zunz was tantalizingly close to seeing for himself a manuscript of Fesikta d'Ray Kahana. In his comments on בשלה he wrote, "This piska, as far as we know, is the only one which has been preserved--but only in manuscript."<sup>141</sup> He went into greater detail in a note on this sentence:

The copy of Pesikta B'shalah which is in my hands, was made by order of Solomon Judah Löb Rapoport from a copy which R. Isaac Samuel Reggio of Göritz now Gorizia sent him. Dr. Samuel Vita della Volta prepared this latter copy in Mantua in 1820 from a manuscript collection in his library which was written i.e., completed on Tuesday, 19 Av, 5325 1565 C.E. by Moses Animon sic in Egypt for R. Isaac Sarog, and after this it came into the possession of R. Israel Sarog, and finally in 1706 it belonged to R. Samson Cohen Modon. Among the different compositions which are included in this collection there is however this piska from the Pesikta; whether the whole Pesikta is there is not known to me. The aforesaid Animon says

at the end of the collection: "Concluded are the Pesiktot [sic] of Rav Kahana which were found in Safed the holy city, may it be rebuilt and re-established speedily in our days." It is possible that this note was copied from an older and more complete copy [of Pesikta]. Perhaps [Hayyim Joseph David] Azulai had a page from this source. In order to clarify satisfactorily the matter of the "Pesikta d'Rav Kahana" it would be necessary to examine the actual manuscripts in Safed.<sup>142</sup>

The "manuscript collection" owned by della Volta and described by Zunz turned out to be a fairly complete copy of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana. Zunz's description corresponds in almost every particular to the manuscript described by Buber<sup>143</sup> and Mandelbaum.<sup>144</sup> It was sent to Buber by Samuel David Luzzatto, into whose possession it had passed, and it became Buber's basic text for his edition of the midrash. Buber published its first chapter with notes and corrections in 1860.<sup>144a</sup> Both Buber and Mandelbaum gave the name of the scribe as Agiman and not Animon. Furthermore, Mandelbaum gave the date of della Volta's copy of בשלח as 7 Elul, 1830, not 1820, as stated by Zunz. This copy, a single folio, is Oxford MS 2222(2).<sup>145</sup> The manuscript itself, which Mandelbaum designated as  $\aleph$ , now belongs to the Bibliothèque de l'Alliance in Paris.<sup>146</sup>

A third manuscript was found in the collection of Giovanni Bernardo de Rossi, who lived in Parma.<sup>147</sup> Mandelbaum designated it with the letter  $\phi$ .<sup>148</sup> It includes eleven homilies based on haftarot, and carried the name מדרש האפטרות in de Rossi's library.

The manuscript is part of a volume which also contains Midrash Tanḥuma and Echah Rabbati. The א in האפטרות indicates that the scribe's original copy was of Oriental origin, although the writing is German or North Italian of the 13th or 14th century. The scribe's name is unknown.

Part of the Tanḥuma, in the same script, takes up the entire first column of the first folio on which מדרש האפטרות appears. Here the scribe stated that he was writing for one R. Isaac, who also owned the Pesikta MS. However, at the end of the last folio appear several lines of Echah Rabbati in a different hand. Of the two colophons at the end of Pesikta, the first was probably copied from the scribe's original, while the second is of German origin. A later owner also signed his name at this point: שלי אברהם חיים מלארדה . The headings of the first five chapters were originally left blank, but the first four were filled in by a later Spanish hand. In the Catalogue De-Rossi, MS פ is No. 261.<sup>149</sup>

Buber obtained a fourth manuscript from Eliakim Carmoly, which was written in Fez. Buber inferred that it began with the chapters based on haftarot, because the first 17 folios were apparently torn out and are missing, and the first of the remaining folios, numbered י"ח, begins in the middle of the seventh chapter of the series, אנכי אנכי.<sup>150</sup> The writing is a North African rabbinic script, with headings in the top margin, marginal comments, corrections and omissions by a later North African hand. Some of these corrections have been set into the text itself, after the erasure of the original writing. Such confidence indicates that the corrector(s) drew on either a better manuscript of the midrash, on original sources such

as the Palestinian Talmud, or on parallels in the Yalkut. An index to the chapters was added on the first folio, probably by Carmoly. The identity of the original scribe is unknown.<sup>151</sup>

The script is characteristic of North Africa in the late 15th or early 16th century. However there is some question as to the date given in the colophon: **שנת למר"ב לפ"ק**, which Buber interpreted as 5047 (1287 C.E.). Therefore he believed this manuscript to be the oldest.<sup>152</sup> Mandelbaum, however, thought that the colophon was inserted by a later writer, probably in 5447 (1687 C.E.), because dates are sometimes written in North Africa with neither the **ה** of the hundreds nor the **ת** of the thousands. Furthermore:

The missing part of the last page might have contained a colophon with a date, but some owner purposely tore it off to give the impression that the year **למר"ב** is 5047. . . . The line of the tear does not look natural; it does not form a straight line and the person who tore it off tried not to touch the inscription with the date.<sup>153</sup>

Mandelbaum's designation for the Carmoly manuscript is **ב**. It is now owned by the University of Cambridge, Manuscript Add. #1497.

Two more manuscripts were described by Friedmann. One of them is now called "Casanatense,"<sup>154</sup> after the library in which it reposes. This is the adjectival form of the word "Casanata," by which name Mandelbaum originally called this manuscript, designating it by the letter **פ**.<sup>155</sup> Solomon Schechter procured the manuscript for Friedmann from Dr. Abraham Hacoen of London.

Friedmann noted that there are corrections in the margins, and that some of the words have been pointed where they are uncommon or even slightly illegible. Also, where a word could have been in either a חסר or a מלא form and it appears חסר in the text, it has been pointed to simplify reading.<sup>156</sup>

This manuscript includes a table of contents of 138 רמזים, which Friedmann said occurs "at the end of the book,"<sup>157</sup> but which, according to Mandelbaum, is the second page.<sup>158</sup> A later hand paginated the manuscript and added the page numbers to the table of contents. By this time, many pages were missing from the end of the manuscript, and "the foliator drew a line in the table of contents after רמו ק"ו and added יד הזה בכתיב יש בכתב יד הזה."<sup>159</sup> An inscription on the cover page identifies the scribe as one Abraham, writing in Narbonne in 1387. Lutski suggested that this entire page was added later, and backdated in order to raise the value of the manuscript. The script is in Spanish rabbinic characters of the early 17th century with Italian influence. The scribe's name was actually Moses, for there are "numerous places in the manuscript where the name משה is decorated on the margin."<sup>160</sup> The Biblioteca Casanatense is located in Rome, and MS ק is listed therein as MS No. 3324.<sup>161</sup> Friedmann began the publication of this manuscript in Bet Talmud, which suspended publication before the entire work was presented.<sup>162</sup> MS ק also contains some chapters of Pesikta Rabbati.

Friedmann also described a second Oxford manuscript, in which most of the chapters are much shorter than those in Buber's edition, and remarked that it is, in general, most like MS כ, although the two MSS differ in the order of their chapters.<sup>163</sup> Mandelbaum agreed

with this evaluation, to the point of saying that this manuscript is actually an abridgement of MS  $\beth$ .<sup>164</sup>

Mandelbaum originally designated this manuscript  $3^N$ ,<sup>165</sup> but changed this to read  $2^N$  in his critical edition.<sup>166</sup> The scribe was Nissim ibn Rosh, who wrote in a Spanish rabbinic hand and completed his work on the 37th day of the Omer, 5234 (1474 C.E.). The manuscript is listed as Neubauer 152 in the Oxford library.<sup>167</sup>

A third Oxford manuscript was described for the first time by Mandelbaum, who was at first inclined to use it as the basic text for his critical edition, designating it MS  $1^N$ .<sup>168</sup> It has two unique features: a) Like Zunz's reconstruction, it begins with Rosh ha-Shanah and ends with *שרש אשיש*, not counting the two chapters "tacked on" at the end;<sup>169</sup> and b) A previous owner of MS  $1^N$  correlated the order of its chapters with another manuscript resembling MS  $\aleph$  or MS  $\beth$  by making marginal notations. Hence, in the margin of *ויהי ביום כלות משה*, fifth in MS  $1^N$ , appears the number  $\aleph$ . These marginal notations appear in parentheses in Tables IIa and IIb. The numbers  $\beth$  and  $\aleph$  are missing as are the chapters *שרר או בשב* and *עשר חעשר*, to which, given the combined evidence of MSS  $\aleph$  and  $\beth$ , they would probably correspond, respectively.<sup>170</sup> Nos. *כ"ג - ל"א* are also missing. *עשר חעשר* is presented at the end of the manuscript only in part. MS  $1^N$  is written in a 16th century Spanish rabbinic script, and is deposited in the Oxford library as Neubauer 2334(11).<sup>171</sup>

Mandelbaum also described and used seven sets of genizah fragments, dating from the 9th century through the 14th, in his edition of *Pesikta d'Rav Kahana*.<sup>172</sup> The only subsequent comments

about them came from Goldberg, who differed with Mandelbaum over details of provenance, library numbering, and inclusion of passages in the critical apparatus.<sup>173</sup>

From all the variants of content and arrangement among the manuscripts of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, there arises a need to explain these differences. Friedmann concluded that small compilations of homilies were made by different editors, some for the four special Sabbaths on either side of Purim or for the twelve Sabbaths of retribution, comfort and repentance, some for Pesah and Shavuot or for the festivals of Tishri. In order that these compilations not be lost, various copyists collected and arranged them, each man ordering his manuscript in whatever way seemed appropriate to him.<sup>174</sup>

More recent scholarship, however, explains the variety in terms of a more or less accurate reflection of Palestinian tradition. Mandelbaum divided the midrash into five sections,<sup>175</sup> and graded the manuscripts on their conformity to Palestinian observance, taking into account the possibility that some chapters may have been lost from any given manuscript in the course of transmission. He summarized the results in a chart,<sup>176</sup> in the top half of which appear the manuscripts which are "closer to early Palestinian tradition" in any given section of Pesikta, and in the bottom half of which appear manuscripts which show the "influence of later Palestine or diaspora." Most importantly, in every section MS 18 appears in the top half of the chart. For this reason, Mandelbaum declared that MS 18 has "greater authenticity" than any manuscript of Pesikta,<sup>177</sup> at least with regard to structure, showing signs of an independent and early tradition.<sup>178</sup>



Goldberg, on the other hand, argued that MS N preserves the original Palestinian order of readings better than any other manuscript. He presented three reasons for this belief: a) The single chapter for Rosa ha-Shanah is based on the Torah passage decreed by the Mishnah, and not on the diaspora readings; b) There is no homily for Simhat Torah, which was not observed annually; and c) *עשר העשר* is in its proper position, after *שורר אר כשב*.<sup>179</sup>

Mandelbaum distinguished between two "families" of Pesikta manuscripts. The first, which includes MSS N, <sub>1</sub>N and צ, is closer to the early Palestinian tradition. They seem to have their roots in Italy and France, a conclusion supported by the Aruch and the Yalkut, which quote passages found only in these MSS. The other family, consisting of MSS <sub>2</sub>N, כ, פ and ק, reflects a later diaspora tradition. The "family resemblance" includes the arrangement of material within individual chapters and versions of the text, except for MS ק which is closer to Family I in these aspects.<sup>180</sup>

The wide variety of extraneous material in the manuscripts indicates the practice of taking midrashim from many sources and copying them with other chapters which are related in content. As a result, MS כ contains *הלכות נסוך המים*, MS צ has sections from Sefer Romi and Sefer Lombardia, and MS ק includes chapters from Pesikta Rabbati, particularly the *מחן חררה* homilies.<sup>181</sup>

#### Editions

Three editions of Pesikta d'Rav Kanana have been printed: Buber's in 1868, Mandelbaum's in 1962, and Braude and Kapstein's translation in 1975.<sup>182</sup>

Buber outlined the scope of his work at the outset. Besides gathering the manuscripts and writing copious notes to the midrash, he also provided references to both Talmuds and other midrashim; made corrections in his basic text based on these books and on the other three manuscripts at his disposal ("Three witnesses establish a fact."); explained difficult passages and uncommon words; corrected passages and words in the Palestinian Talmud and various midrashim; and introduced chapter headings.<sup>183</sup> As mentioned above, Buber used MS  $\aleph$  as his basic text, listing variants from the other three manuscripts in his notes. When there were gaps in the text or missing chapters, he filled them in from MS  $\beth$ .<sup>184</sup> That is how, for example, Piska  $\text{דרשן}$  came into his edition, although none of the other known manuscripts included it.<sup>185</sup>

Mandelbaum credited Buber with "an important contribution toward making the Pesikta available as a book," but objected to Buber's editorial methodology as not conducive to the understanding of the midrash, whether as a whole or in many of its difficult passages. Specifically, Mandelbaum claimed that Buber chose MS  $\aleph$  as his basic text simply because it was the first manuscript to reach him. Furthermore, Buber was "rather irregular and unsystematic" in supplying missing passages and in his treatment of variant readings. Buber did not always note when he inserted these directly into the body of the text, nor was he consistent in making such insertions. Sometimes variants and supplemental material were merely quoted in the notes.<sup>186</sup> Although Goldberg agreed with Mandelbaum in these particulars, he added his opinion that it would be difficult to improve on Buber's commentary.<sup>187</sup>

In editing his own critical edition of Pesikta, Mandelbaum himself faced the choice of a basic text. He favored MS  $\text{I}^{\text{N}}$  for its authentically Palestinian structure and its excellent readings which shed light on the meaning of many passages. However, these factors were not enough to "justify its use as the basic text for this new edition," for it is relatively recent (16th century) and was apparently copied quickly and carelessly, as it contains many errors and omissions. Mandelbaum turned instead to MS  $\text{N}$ , which is not only the oldest known manuscript of Pesikta, but which is the most complete in its chapters and has the best readings for individual words, reflecting the older Palestinian Aramaic.<sup>188</sup>

Despite Mandelbaum's belief that Pesikta d'Rav Kahana originally began with Rosh ha-Shanah, he began his edition with Hanukkah in order to follow MS  $\text{N}$  as closely as possible. The second volume of the edition begins with Rosh ha-Shanah, making it easier for the reader to study it first and thus approximate the original form of the midrash.<sup>189</sup>

Mandelbaum corrected errors in MS  $\text{N}$  on the basis of the other manuscripts only when he was certain of the actuality of the error. He also filled out abbreviations and acronyms, and assigned numbers to the poems and homilies within chapters.<sup>190</sup>

Goldberg's overall appraisal of Mandelbaum's edition is favorable. He praised Mandelbaum for his good judgement in not repeating the work that Buber had already done so well in quoting parallel versions from other sources and in giving extended commentary. His translations of Aramaic are good, but his rendering of Greek is even better, owing to the guidance of Saul Lieberman.<sup>191</sup>

Textual emendations are few and simple.<sup>192</sup>

As mentioned above, Goldberg favored MS N as the most authentic, and he therefore approved of Mandelbaum's use of it as the basic text, although Mandelbaum may not have turned to it with enough confidence or enthusiasm. Where Mandelbaum added his own commentary, it was good but often too brief, necessitating the use of Buber's *Pesikta* or Friedmann's *Pesikta Rabbati* for comparison and fuller explanation.<sup>193</sup>

Mandelbaum's numbering of proems and homilies made it easier to study the relative amounts of each within the chapters,<sup>194</sup> a study which Goldberg pursued.<sup>195</sup> However, Goldberg indicated passages which should have been differentiated further, or which belong to different units from those in which Mandelbaum placed them.<sup>196</sup>

Some problems remain, as well, in regard to editing, arrangement, and the relationship of *Pesikta* to other midrashim.<sup>197</sup>

Braude based his translation on MS N, "except where variants in other manuscripts or in parallel sources have supplied more precise or ampler meaning."<sup>198</sup> There are extensive comments on the problems of midrashic translation.<sup>199</sup> Comments on this work appear in Chapter Six.

### Structure and Methods

On the basis of his research in secondary sources, Zunz identified three proem-openings used in Pesikta d'Rav Kahana: a) פלוני פתח in at least four, and possibly seven, chapters; b) זה שאמר הכתוב in at least seven, and possibly nine, chapters; and c) ילמדנו רבינו in ביום השמיני עצרה. Zunz was not certain of the openings of the other chapters which he had identified.<sup>200</sup> Albeck commented that Zunz's assignment of chapter openings did not match those in Buber's edition in every case.<sup>201</sup> Albeck's own categorization of openings included proems which identify a particular rabbi, those which speak in the name of the Amoraim generally, and those which do not transmit the name of any authority. The halachic opening which Zunz identified is not an authentic part of the original Pesikta.<sup>202</sup>

Buber's observations on the nature of Pesikta homilies may be inferred from his comparisons with Pesikta Rabbati, particularly the absence of halachic proems and the wide use of Aramaic.<sup>203</sup>

Mandelbaum's edition reflects a more advanced scholarship, in which it is recognized that there are usually more than one proem in each chapter, and that it may be misleading to characterize the whole chapter by commenting only on the first of them. Goldberg traced the development of the proem from its origins in the halachic midrashim, where it is very short and simple, through its increasing complexity and prevalence in the exegetical midrashim, to its full complexity and near-predominance in the homiletical midrashim, e.g., Pesikta d'Rav Kahana.<sup>204</sup> According to Goldberg, two types of proems exist. The better-known of them begins with a Scriptural verse which is not from that day's established reading,

nor is it connected with a concept from the reading, yet the proem concludes with the first verse of the reading. The other type, which also begins with an extraneous verse, focuses on the concept of the first verse of the established reading, or on the central idea of the entire reading. This second type seems to be a kind of homily.<sup>205</sup>

Goldberg also distinguished between two types of homilies. One revolves around the principal subject of the beginning of the Scriptural reading, and one might almost understand it as another kind of proem. The other type of homily is exegetical, expounding the first verse(s) of the reading. Within any given chapter, there are usually far more verse-homilies than subject-homilies.<sup>206</sup> We shall reserve judgement as to whether the verse-homilies are more distant from the subject of the chapter than the subject-homilies. The main differences between subject-homilies, on the one hand, and verse-homilies and proems, on the other, seem to be structural. Unlike a proem, when a subject-homily begins with an extraneous verse, it does not conclude with a verse from the established reading, and often does not include such a verse at all. Unlike a verse-homily, a subject-homily does not begin with a verse from the reading.

Braude saw the proem and the homily in terms of their different but complementary functions within the chapter. ". . .The [proems] stress general ideas, themes, or concepts as guides to the understanding of the Piska as a whole; the exegetical commentary that follows the [proems] clears up the particulars that, if left

unexamined, would weaken the force of the proems and the significance of the Piska as a whole."<sup>207</sup> Perhaps Braude has overstated his case in relegating the homilies to such a subordinate role. They are, after all, a large and significant part of "the Piska as a whole," and upon close examination will be seen to advance the theme(s) of the chapter, and not merely "clear up particulars."

According to Goldberg, a typical chapter begins with its proems, which are followed by the subject-homilies (if any), and then the verse-homilies.<sup>208</sup> However, he cited one chapter, העומר, in which the verse-homily follows the subject-homily, in order to end the chapter more pleasantly.<sup>209</sup> Sometimes there is a literary transition from the proems to the verse-homilies. This is sometimes accomplished by omitting the first words of the verse to be expounded by the homily. These words have just been used to conclude the proem, and thus they serve the added function of beginning the homily.<sup>210</sup> The formula מן העניין למעלה מה כחייב is only used at the beginning of a series of homilies, and serves as a transition from the proems. Leading from the preceding verse(s) of Torah to the first verse of the reading, it sometimes introduces a subject-homily.<sup>211</sup> Related to this is the formula בחריה which, when it appears, always comes at the end of the proems, and leads from the verses preceding the reading into the reading itself.<sup>212</sup>

The structure of a chapter can be used as a criterion in evaluating its authenticity as part of the original Pesikta. In this way, ויהי בהצי הלילה,<sup>213</sup> because

of its structural irregularities. The chapter begins with four proems, but the last of them has no connection with the first verse of the Torah reading. Two subject-homilies follow, preceding four verse-homilies. However, the chapter concludes with three more subject-homilies, the last of them ending on a pleasant note. These factors point to a later authorship than the rest of the midrash, and strengthen the assumption that the chapter was taken from Pesikta Rabbati.<sup>214</sup>

Goldberg proposed the use of the numerical relation between proems and homilies as a test of a chapter's authenticity. For this purpose, he compiled a table showing the numbers of proems and homilies in each chapter of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana.<sup>215</sup> Unfortunately, Mandelbaum's numbering of sections within the chapters does not always match the actual division of the material. Where Mandelbaum included several short homilies in one section, Goldberg usually counted the whole as one homily. But where there were several long homilies within one section, or where there were homilies based on different parts of one verse, Goldberg counted them separately. According to the table, the number of proems in most chapters is greater than or equal to the number of homilies. Even where there are more homilies than proems, especially in the chapters based on haftarot, the actual relationship is not reflected by the numbers, because the proems are usually long and the homilies short. We may expect, therefore, that a preponderance of proemial over exegetical material indicates a chapter which was a part of the original Pesikta. By this criterion **עשר העשר**, with eight proems and two homilies, is certainly authentic, and **ויהי בחצי הלילה**,



with four proems and nine homilies, is not. *רזאת הברכה*, with only three proems and 17 homilies, has no claim to authenticity, nor is it in MS S. If one counts subject-homilies as proems, as Goldberg suggested, then *ולקחתם לכם* almost conforms to the pattern, as do all other chapters connected with festivals.<sup>216</sup>

The numerical relationship under discussion might also aid in estimating the age of a given chapter, for we have already noted that there were few proems in the earliest midrashim, and more verse-by-verse commentary. Therefore, the fewer the proems and the more the consecutive exegesis, the greater the age of the chapter.<sup>217</sup> This is, of course, only a rough guide to the age of a midrashic text, and must be applied with great care and in combination with other criteria.

#### Basic Themes

Little work has been done on this facet of *Pesikta d'Rav Kahana*. Zunz commented that the ends of chapters usually deal with redemption,<sup>218</sup> but the same applies to most of the homiletical midrashim.

Braude argued that *Pesikta* possesses a "basic narrative . . . --the theme of man's, particularly Israel's, spiritual journey from the creation to the coming of the Messiah."<sup>219</sup> This is a generalization so broad as to be useless, for the same can be said of all midrashic literature. The welter of examples of Judaism's religious and ethical doctrines, although drawn from *Pesikta*, reflect nothing peculiar to this midrash.<sup>220</sup> Braude's only contribution in this area is the opinion that expectation of the Messiah is voiced "with

greater yearning" than in Vayikra Rabbah, though not as strongly as in Pesikta Rabbati. Also, he asserted that Pesikta d'Rav Kahana and Vayikra Rabbah "seem more philosophical" in tone than Pesikta Rabbati, "more aware of the complexity and irony of the human condition," with less use of "parables, homely folk materials, and other simple rhetorical means of appeal."<sup>221</sup>

## CHAPTER III

## PESIKTA RABBATI

Name

Having discussed the meaning of the word פסיקתא in his chapter on Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, Zunz did not dwell on the subject when discussing Pesikta Rabbati. He did, however, list the various names assigned to the midrash by medieval writers. These include Pesikta Rabbati, Pesikta, Yelammedenu, and Midrash.<sup>1</sup> (The third of these is quite reasonable in the light of the large amount of material which Pesikta Rabbati shares with, and probably borrowed from, the Yelammedenu-Tanhuma midrashim. Furthermore, over half of the chapters in Pesikta Rabbati begin with the phrase ילמדנו רבינו.) This multiplicity of names caused confusion among later writers, particularly because separate chapters were also known as Pesikta, Midrash, or Parashah.

Friedmann went into some detail on the words פסיקתא רבתי. It was not clear to those who first printed the midrash just how its title should be written or read, as evidenced by variant spellings in the first edition. Friedmann pointed out that the word רבתי is feminine singular, and should be pointed in this manner: רַבְתִּי, meaning "the large."

Ostensibly, there is no grammatical difficulty in the title, for the word פסיקתא is also feminine singular. However, in the

titles of other works, the word רבתי is used with היכלות (feminine plural), and with אבל (masculine singular). Friedmann decided that another word was to be inferred in all three titles: משנה. The title of our midrash would now be פסיקתא רבתי.

Now we turn to the word פסיקתא. Coming from the root פסק, "to cut" or "decide," and pointed as it is usually pronounced, פסיקתא, the word with its definite infix (ת) refers to a particular act of cutting or decision. But what we have in our midrash is not a פסיקא, a cutting, but a פיסקא, that which has been cut, a section of a piece; developed from this is the signification "a part of a book." In gaonic usage, its plural is פסיקתא, and it is this plural which, according to Friedmann, was in the original title: משנה פסיקתא רבתי. Misspelled in early manuscripts with the hireq and sheva transposed, the title has now taken on its incorrect pronunciation beyond recall.<sup>2</sup>

Theodor said that the word "Rabbati" means "the larger" "to distinguish it from the earlier Pesikta," namely, Pesikta d'Rav Kahana.<sup>3</sup>

Braude claimed that the word "פיסקא" originally referred to any Biblical passage which served as the lesson for a festival or special Sabbath. Eventually, the word came to mean "Rabbinic discourse on the Biblical lesson." Braude argued that the correct plural is פסיקתא, and that the name given to the whole annual cycle of such discourses was either that or פסיקתא.<sup>4</sup>

Citing Rashi's comment on Isaiah 51:12 and on Genesis 10:9 as the first occurrences of the name Pesikta Rabbati, Braude gave other names used by medieval commentators, and by Rashi himself: Pesikta

Rabb'ta, Pesikta G'dolah, Pesikta ha-G'dolah, Pesikta, Midrash, and Haggadat Amora'im. Sources are cited for each of these names.<sup>5</sup>

Against the theories of both Friedmann and Braude as to the word פסיקתא is the work of William B. Stevenson. Braude proposed the singular form פסיקתא--the 'י is not necessary according to Stevenson--but Braude stated the plural incorrectly, giving it as פסיקתא. The plural form of פסיקתא would be פסיקתא; פסיקתא is a plural, but its singular form is פסיקתא.

Friedmann was obviously working from a better knowledge of Palestinian Aramaic. His declensions of פסיקתא and פסיקתא are correct, but his theory of the transposed vowels is unnecessary. The definite form--Stevenson called it the emphatic form--of פסיקתא is פסיקתא, and the definite form of פסיקתא is פסיקתא.<sup>6</sup> These two definite forms differ only by a 'י, and the difference in pronunciation is so slight as to cause uncertainty as to whether it was originally there. The instances of error and editorial license on the part of copyists are so numerous as to make the exact original spelling impossible to determine. But though we may fault Braude on his knowledge of Aramaic grammar, we may agree with him on one of his points: that פסיקתא refers to the whole annual cycle of sermons for festivals and special Sabbaths. Theodor's comment makes even better sense now: Pesikta Rabbati in its totality is a larger cycle than Pesikta d'Rav Kahana.

#### Contents

All writers agree that Pesikta Rabbati contains homilies for the annual cycle of holy days and special Sabbaths, and there is gen-

eral agreement on the chapters' Biblical bases and their arrangement within the midrash. However, there is some uncertainty about the occasions they serve, and also about the number, and numbering, of the chapters.

We will first examine the number of chapters. Before Zunz's work of 1832, there had been three printed editions: Prague, 1654 or 1656 (see below); Shklov, 1806; and Breslau, 1831. Each of these had 47 chapters. Zunz, however, said that there are 48 chapters,<sup>7</sup> and he listed them by name and page according to the Prague edition.<sup>8</sup> The discrepancy in numbers is accounted for by Zunz's division of Chapter 23 into two chapters, the first (Breslau 23.1-9) dealing with the fourth of the Ten Commandments, and the second (Breslau 23.10-11), Zunz's Chapter 24, dealing with the fifth Commandment.

Friedmann, in his edition, followed the numbering of the Breslau edition, which was the first to assign numbers to the chapters and to sections within the chapters. Although the chapters in the body of his edition are numbered up to 47, Friedmann followed Zunz's lead in breaking up chapters and assigning them different numbers when he felt that the themes of sections of the chapters were "different and distinct."<sup>9</sup>

In this manner, Friedmann added four chapters to the original 47: a) Breslau 23.10-11, which was also differentiated by Zunz, is Friedmann's Chapter 23-24; b) Breslau 27.5-6, is Friedmann's Chapter 27-28 (וימלך מלך צדקיהו); c) Breslau 29.4-5, is Friedmann's Chapter 29-30 (איכה); and d) Breslau 29.6-9, is Friedmann's Chapter 29-30-30 (נחמו).

To these 51 chapters, Friedmann added yet another four which

were sent to him by Solomon Buber.<sup>10</sup> Buber obtained this group from a transcription of the manuscript Parma 1240, owned by S. D. Luzzatto.<sup>11</sup> Friedmann considered these additional chapters to be authentic, and placed them in the first appendix of his edition, numbering them 1-4. The second of these previously unpublished homilies has the same Scriptural basis as Chapter 17 (Exodus 12:29, *אֵת קִרְבְּנֵי לַחֲמִי*), and the third shares its text with Chapter 44 (Hosea 14:2, *שׁוֹבָה*). These chapters apparently have not been widely accepted, as Theodor, Strack and Sperber fail to mention them.

Friedmann's second appendix contains a fragment from Genesis Rabbati, sent to him by Adolph Jellinek. This brief passage has much in common with a passage in Chapter 20, *מִתְּחַן תּוֹרָה*, and was included only for that reason. Had Friedmann considered it to be an authentic part of Pesikta Rabbati, he would have said that the total number of chapters is 56. Instead, he put the total at 55.<sup>12</sup>

Friedmann, as he described each chapter separately, tried to state how many homilies were comprised in each. Usually, he determined this figure by the number of proems in each chapter. In most cases, he gave an exact determination, like "one" or "two." Sometimes he was not so sure, as with Chapter 5, "many;" or Chapter 10, "at least five."<sup>13</sup>

Theodor seems to have been uncertain as to how to handle this accumulation of data. He wrote, "In Friedmann's edition . . .  Pesikta Rabbati  contains, in forty-seven numbers, about fifty-one homilies, part of which are combinations of smaller ones. . . ."<sup>14</sup> Although he mentioned Friedmann's appendices he did not accord them authentic status.<sup>15</sup>

Braude's table of contents includes 58 items.<sup>16</sup> Among these are the 56 sections of Friedmann's edition (body and two appendices), some of which are renumbered. Thus: while Friedmann's Chapter 29-30 remains Braude's Piska 29/30, Friedmann's Chapter 29-30-30 has become 29/30B. The chapters in the appendices have also received new numbers: Appendix I:1 is now  $\overline{48}$ ; I:2 is  $\overline{49}$ ; I:3 is  $\overline{50}$ ; I:4 is  $\overline{52}$ ; and Appendix II is  $\overline{53}$ .

Two previously unpublished chapters are also included, both derived from Ms. Parma 1240. Piska 29/30A precedes Piska 29/30B in the manuscript,<sup>17</sup> and both are based, along with Piska 30, on Isaiah 40:1, נחמר.  $\overline{Piska 51}$  precedes  $\overline{Piska 52}$  in the manuscript.<sup>18</sup>

It is difficult to understand what status Braude accorded to his  $\overline{Piska 53}$ . While he concurred in Friedmann's statement that Genesis Rabbati was its source,<sup>19</sup> he nevertheless described it as the "finale,"<sup>20</sup> and thus an integral part, of the whole collection.

Sperber described Friedmann's edition as having 47 sections but a greater number of homilies, "as some sections consist of (parts of) several homilies (e.g., section 10)."<sup>21</sup> Theodor's and Sperber's stress on the compound construction of the chapters points beyond Friedmann's and Braude's work to a degree of complexity in the editing of Pesikta Rabbati which has not yet received sufficient scholarly attention.

The names of the sections of the midrash and the Scriptural texts which support them are not a matter of dispute, and may be found without trouble in any edition. The same sequence of chapters is followed in all editions, with the exception of Braude's inser-



tions, and even they are correct according to the Parma manuscript. This sequence generally follows the course of the Jewish year, beginning after Sh'mini Atzeret and, if one includes פרשת, ending with it. Some anomalies exist in the opinions of various scholars as to the specific occasions for which certain chapters were composed. We will rely mainly on Zunz, Friedmann, Strack and Braude; Theodor and Sperber pay little attention to this problem. It will be easiest to consider the chapters as they occur in blocks, each block corresponding to one holiday or one group of special Sabbaths.

The first chapter, פרשת, is definitely linked to Shabbat Rosh Ḥodesh. Zunz tried to deduce which Rosh Ḥodesh was involved, from the position of this chapter in the midrash "between" Yom Kippur and Ḥanukkah. He settled on the first Sabbath in Ḥeshvan, Shabbat Bereshit, when the cycle of Torah reading begins anew,<sup>22</sup> an event which would certainly distinguish this Sabbath. Strack agreed with this opinion.<sup>23</sup>

Albeck, however, objected on the grounds that Zunz based himself on the annual cycle of Torah readings which we use today, and not on the triennial cycle used in Palestine at the time when Pesikta Rabbati was composed.<sup>24</sup> Furthermore, there is no evidence to link the Blessing of the New Month to the Sabbath before Rosh Ḥodesh at the time when Pesikta Rabbati was composed. Albeck concluded that the chapter in question was meant for Rosh Ḥodesh when it falls on a Sabbath.<sup>25</sup> Braude concurred in this second theory.<sup>26</sup>

Friedmann alone maintained that the first chapter is for Shabbat Rosh Ḥodesh, without qualifying his statement.<sup>27</sup>

Chapters 2-8 are universally agreed to apply to Ḥanukkah. Friedmann and Braude included Chapter 9 as well. Theodor and Sperber were not certain of this, perhaps because Zunz was not sure whether Chapter 9 applies to Ḥanukkah or to the Fast of 10 Tevet.<sup>28</sup> Braude provided a detailed schedule of homilies: for the first day of Ḥanukkah, Chapter 7; for the Sabbath in Ḥanukkah, Chapters 4, 5 and 8; for the second Sabbath, Chapter 6; for the last day, Chapters 3 and 9; and for any day of the holiday, Chapter 2.<sup>29</sup> These specifics were derived from Friedmann's notes within his text, from David Luria, and from contemporary sources.

Chapters 10-15 are assigned to the four special Torah readings on either side of Purim: Chapters 10-11 for **שקלים/כי תשא**; Chapters 12-13 for **זכור**; Chapter 14 for **פרה**; and Chapter 15 for **חודש**.

No consensus of opinion exists on Chapter 16, **את קרבני לחמי**. Zunz assigned it to Rosh Ḥodesh;<sup>30</sup> Friedmann called it "a fifth special Sabbath;"<sup>31</sup> Strack applied it to Pesah;<sup>32</sup> Braude to the Sabbath in the first week of Nisan, saying that he follows Friedmann;<sup>33</sup> and Sperber vaguely agreed, saying that it belongs to the Sabbaths before Pesah.<sup>34</sup>

Again, all agree that Chapters 17-19 belong to Pesah.<sup>35</sup> Zunz<sup>36</sup> and Braude<sup>37</sup> go farther, assigning Chapter 17 to the first day, Chapter 18 to the second, and Chapter 19 to the seventh.

In the next group of seven chapters, our numbering begins to go awry, as explained above. The first six chapters of this block comprise a midrash on the Ten Commandments, which is connected with Shavuot. Zunz gave the number 26 to the last chapter, **עשר העשר**, saying that it is for the second day of Shavuot.<sup>38</sup> We know that this

is unlikely in a Palestinian context. Friedmann<sup>39</sup> and Braude,<sup>40</sup> who call it Chapter 25, say that the Torah-verse was read when Shavuot fell on a Sabbath. Theodor seemed to include it in the Shavuot homilies,<sup>41</sup> while Strack and Sperber did not mention it.

The next block includes homilies for the Sabbaths of mourning and consolation surrounding Tisha b'Av. Zunz assigned his Chapters 27-28 to the Sabbaths of mourning, and Chapters 29-30 to Tisha b'Av. Among Chapters 31-38, 35-36 (גילי סאד and רני ושעזי) are designated for the fifth Sabbath of consolation.<sup>42</sup> Strack agrees with this view, without giving details.<sup>43</sup>

Friedmann's Chapters 26-37 cover the same material, but he divided two of these chapters into smaller parts: Chapter 27 has two parts, numbered 27 and 27-28; and Chapter 29 has three, numbered 29, 29-30, and 29-30-30 (sic). Chapters 29 and 29-30 are for mourning, and Chapter 29-30-30 is for consolation. Thus this section (Chapters 26-37) includes a total of 15 chapters. In his introduction, Friedmann implied that Chapter 37, שרש אשיש, is one of the consoling homilies,<sup>44</sup> but in his first note to the chapter he said that this homily is for Shabbat Vayelech when Rosh ha-Shanah falls on a Monday or Tuesday.<sup>45</sup> Braude followed Friedmann in this also,<sup>46</sup> but as mentioned above, he added yet another chapter to this section from the Parma manuscript. Sperber followed Friedmann's numbering here, without distinguishing among the specific occasions for the homilies.<sup>47</sup>

The last ten chapters of Pesikta Rabbati, as generally accepted, focus on the Yamim Nora'im. The first six of these homilies are for Rosh ha-Shanah, the seventh for Shabbat Shuvah.

Some difference of opinion exists over the last three chapters. Zunz said that the first of these (אשרי נשרי פשע) is either for Yom Kippur or for the Ten Days of Repentance; the second ("חרספחא") is either for those Ten Days or for the Fast of Gedaliah; and the last (אחרי מרת) is for Yom Kippur.<sup>48</sup> (Noticing the absence of homilies for Sukkot, which appear in Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, Zunz theorized that either Pesikta Rabbati was never completed, or that the final chapters were lost.<sup>49</sup> Similarly, Theodor claimed that Pesikta Rabbati is "doubtless defective" in its current version.<sup>50</sup>) Friedmann said that the first and third are for Yom Kippur, but the second is a later addition on various subjects.<sup>51</sup> Strack said only that these chapters "lead up to" Yom Kippur.<sup>52</sup> Braude leaned toward the theory that the next-to-last chapter is for Rosh ha-Shanah.<sup>53</sup> Sperber merely said that Chapters 38-48 are for the Yamim Nora'im, but his numbering is impossible:<sup>54</sup> Zunz numbered this section 39-48, and Friedmann, 38-47.

Friedmann did not discuss the probable occasions for the homilies in his first appendix, but he could hardly have missed the association of the second with the first day of Pesah; the third with Shabbat Shuvah; and the fourth with Sh'mini Atzeret. Braude understood for which occasions these homilies were designated, and went on to ascribe the first appended homily, שורר אל כשב, to the first day of Pesah.<sup>55</sup> More than this, he designated Friedmann's second appendix for Shabbat Bereshit.<sup>56</sup> As we noted above, Braude was aware of the origin of this passage; his reasons for seeking to integrate it into Pesikta Rabbati are obscure.

Braude detailed the arrangement of the contents in Parma Ms. 1240 as follows: Chapters 1-18 (הערמר, for the second day of Pesah); Shir ha-Shirim Rabbah (reasonable in light of the role of the Song of Songs in Pesah observance); 48-49 (שורר אר כשב and ויהי בחצי הלילה, both ascribed by Braude to the first day of Pesah); 25 (עשר תעשר, for Shavuot), 19 (ויהי בשלח, for the seventh day of Pesah); 20-24 (Shavuot); 29/30A-43 (consolation and Rosh ha-Shanah); 50 and 44 (שרבה); 45 and 47 (Yom Kippur); 51-52 (Sukkot and Sh'mini Atzeret); nine other midrashim; 27 (second Sabbath of mourning); 26 (first Sabbath of mourning); 28 (9 Av); and Lamentations Rabbah.<sup>57</sup> This order indicates some problems within the accepted arrangement of the midrash. If 48-49 are for the first day of Pesah, why do they appear after the homily for the second day? Why does Chapter 25 appear among the Pesah homilies; for what occasion did the editor or copyist intend it? Why do the homilies of mourning and Lamentations Rabbah appear at the end of the manuscript and in slight disorder, rather than in their usual place?

In an interesting sidelight, Zunz commented on passages missing from our version of Pesikta Rabbati, which were quoted in various medieval works, and stated that some chapters of Midrash Shir ha-Shirim used to be in Pesikta Rabbati.<sup>58</sup> Albeck cited A. Epstein and Solomon Euber to the effect that 1) there may have been two midrashim on the Song of Songs, one of which was a Pesikta; or 2) a midrash on the Song of Songs may have been joined in some way to Pesikta Rabbati, as in the Parma manuscript. Also, several chapters now joined to Midrash Zuta may once have been part of Pesikta Rabbati. Albeck checked the medieval citations, but was

unwilling to go along with either of the theories outlined above. Instead, he said only that at the time of the Yalkut there may have been homilies in Pesikta Rabbati which are no longer there, and that perhaps Midrash Shir ha-Shirim was also in a different form from that which we now possess.<sup>59</sup> More recent scholars have not elaborated on these theories.

#### Date of Composition

This is perhaps the most complicated problem in Pesikta Rabbati scholarship. Braude offered a generally accurate summation of several points of view, along with a critique; we will follow this, for the sake of the convenience of having so much material in one place.

Much controversy revolves around a passage in the first chapter (Friedmann 1b-2a), which Braude translated as follows:

Behold how long a time since the House of our life was destroyed! It is already a week of years, already a cycle of seven weeks of years, already seven hundred and seventy-seven years. (And at this writing it is one thousand one hundred and fifty-one years.) Oh, when again shall I come and see the face of God?<sup>60</sup>

Zunz accepted the reference to 777 years since the destruction of the Temple as authentic, but regarded the reference to 1151 elapsed years as a later gloss. He therefore concluded that Pesikta Rabbati was composed after 845 C.E. Zunz also found influences of other works in Pesikta Rabbati: Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, which he dated c. 700 C.E.; She'eltot, c. 750 C.E.; and Soferim, c. 800 C.E.; as well as parallels of content and usage with other post-Talmudic and gaonic works.<sup>61</sup>

V. Aptowitz agreed with Zunz on the date of Pesikta Rabbati, and found further confirmation in passages from Hilchot G'dolot (c. 760 C.E.), and a "specific reference" to Yehudai Gaon of Sura (760-764 C.E.).<sup>62</sup>

Braude objected that the post-Talmudic and gaonic passages cited by Zunz and Aptowitz may be later interpolations into Pesikta Rabbati, or these passages may have originated earlier than these scholars supposed. If one accepts, for example, the theories of Mandelbaum and Margulies that Pesikta d'Rav Kahana is a fifth century work, then Pesikta Rabbati need not have been composed so late. If anything, the She'iltot copied from Pesikta Rabbati, and not vice versa.<sup>63</sup>

Friedmann found several indications of the antiquity of Pesikta Rabbati: in its use of the Rabbot to Leviticus, Numbers (!), and Ecclesiastes; in its Biblical quotation according to the Targum; in the cycle of Torah pericopes and haftarot which is different from our own. On the other hand, there is material in Pesikta Rabbati which was not composed before the gaonic period, e.g., Chapters 20 (מזן חררה) and 46 (חוספתא).<sup>64</sup>

But Friedmann's main focus is the passage in Chapter 1, quoted above. He contends that the reference is to the number of years elapsed since the destruction of the first Temple, not the second. He thus concludes that Pesikta Rabbati was composed c. 355 C.E., with the second number referring to c. 730 C.E.<sup>65</sup> As support for this theory, Friedmann points to Chapters 34-37, which he says are of Tannaitic origin, and the oldest in the midrash.<sup>66</sup> One could therefore say that the two Pesiktas influenced each other or had

a common origin.<sup>67</sup>

Braude said that Friedmann's date is supported by internal evidence, in that the cited Amoraim lived in Palestine in the third and fourth centuries. This dating is further supported by "the bold polemics in the *Pesikta Rabbati* against Christianity," for at that time Christianity could still be challenged openly. However, Chapters 34-37 are more likely of post-Amoraic origin, perhaps from the seventh century.<sup>68</sup>

Jacob Mann, on the basis of a reference to the *Avele Zion* in Chapter 34 (Friedmann 1<sup>58a</sup>), also accepted the date of 845 C.E., and suggested that the redactor was an Italian haggadist who settled in Jerusalem in the first half of the ninth century, and joined the *Avele Zion*.<sup>69</sup>

Chapters 34-37, singled out by Friedmann and mentioned by Mann, became the focus of attention for Bamberger in a significant article.<sup>70</sup> Calling these four chapters "a distinct and distinctive document,"<sup>71</sup> he tried to establish the date of their composition. Theories of their extreme earliness, e.g., Friedmann's, or lateness are rejected. Furthermore, even if the date of 845 C.E. is accepted for the redaction of *Pesikta Rabbati*, it has no necessary connection with the dates at which its various components originated.<sup>72</sup>

Bamberger concentrated on a passage on page 162a of Friedmann's edition, in which Persia, Arabia and Edom (Rome or Byzantium) are mentioned as world powers. This passage must have been written between 632, when the Islamic armies emerged as a major force, and 637, when Persia was eclipsed by Islam as a result of the Battle of Kadisiya. In its details, it is not a statement of fact,



only a prediction of the future in a time of upheaval.<sup>73</sup> Stylistic, thematic and historical considerations led Bamberger to set the seventh century as "the only possible date that fits the language of the text."<sup>74</sup>

While Braude found some evidence in support of this theory, he rejected it because the events described on page 162a did not coincide with historical reality. He interpreted the passage to conform with events of the fifth and sixth centuries, shifting the date of its composition backward, accordingly. However, since there is no available evidence placing the Avele Zion (mentioned in Chapter 34, at the beginning of this document) in Jerusalem at that time, Braude again found himself in difficulty. If we were to date these chapters to the eighth or ninth centuries, when we do find references to the Avele Zion in Jerusalem, we would expect some reference to Arab rule, which began in the seventh century; but there is no such reference in these chapters.<sup>75</sup>

The argument between Bamberger and Braude turns on the following words: מלך פרס מחוגרה במלך ערביא. Bamberger translated this as "The King of Persia will war with the King of Arabia. . . ." Braude, however, favored "The King of Persia will make war against a king of Arabia. . .."<sup>76</sup> Bamberger interpreted the passage as an observation on the current international situation, and a prediction of its future course and ultimate result. Braude felt that the text had to conform to the historical facts, and according to these facts, "Arabia" was the aggressor, not Persia. Nevertheless, Braude's contention is not on the same plane as Bamberger's, and cannot be regarded as a valid refutation. If one interprets the passage as a

prediction and not as a chronicle, the aggressor's identity does not matter; the only pertinent facts are the actual occurrence and date of the battle. If we have evidence of the Avelle Zion in Jerusalem in the eighth century, it is certainly possible that they were there in the seventh. Bamberger's reasoning is sound, and his theory, plausible.

Braude himself, based on the citation of third and fourth century Amoraim, and the weight of the evidence against compilation of Pesikta Rabbati in the eighth or ninth centuries, favored the seventh century as the most likely date of redaction.<sup>77</sup>

Theodor commented that "there are no grounds for regarding the date [845 C.E.] as a gloss."<sup>78</sup> Strack mentioned the work of Levi, Bacher and Friedmann, but agreed with Zunz.<sup>79</sup> Albeck reasoned that the date 845 C.E. is evidence only for the redaction of the Yelammedenu-Tanpums stratum, since Pesikta Rabbati may have had several periods of editing.<sup>80</sup> According to Sperber, the other date, 1219, is clearly a later gloss, perhaps by Eleazar of Worms, who made much use of the midrash. Modern scholarly opinion views Pesikta Rabbati "as a Palestinian work of the sixth or seventh century."<sup>81</sup>

We shall presently refer to the Yelammedenu-Tanpums midrashim, with which large parts of Pesikta Rabbati have an affinity. Moshe David Herr acknowledged this relationship, and commented that "even the earliest of the extant texts was not edited before 800 C.E."<sup>82</sup>

Finally, we shall see that scholars have distinguished five types of homilies in Pesikta Rabbati. Although these have not been associated with particular dates, it is possible that they are the

key to understanding the progressive compilation of the midrash.

#### Place of Composition

Zunz assumed that the Jewish community in Palestine in the eighth and ninth centuries did not possess enough intellectual vitality to produce a work such as Pesikta Rabbati. For this reason, he placed the compiler of the midrash in Europe. However, because of its absence from the Aruch of Rabbi Nathan of Rome (1035-1106), Zunz also assumed that it could not have been compiled in Italy. Therefore, he said that Pesikta Rabbati was compiled in Greece.<sup>83</sup>

Strack mentioned a theory of Israel Levi and Wilhelm Bacher, that Pesikta Rabbati was composed in Italy, specifically in Bari. This is on the basis of the word באר on page 135b of Friedmann's edition.<sup>84</sup>

Braude believed that the midrash originated in Palestine for the following reasons: the spelling and language follow Palestinian usage; there is only one sermon for Shavuot, and none for Simhat Torah; and the teachers cited are Palestinian, without exception. Against Zunz, Braude argued that the Palestinian Jewish community was indeed intellectually active during the eighth and ninth centuries. Furthermore, the lack of citations of Pesikta Rabbati in the Aruch may have no significance at all. If the midrash was composed in Palestine, it may simply not have reached Rome by the time R. Nathan compiled his lexicon.<sup>85</sup>

### Manuscripts

The only manuscript of Pesikta Rabbati known to Zunz was described by de Rossi as No. 1240 in his catalogue. Without actually having seen the manuscript, Zunz repeated the former description.<sup>86</sup>

Braude, however, both saw and used this manuscript, also known as Parma 1240. He went to some lengths to verify its authenticity and date, concluding that it was transcribed by Menahem b. Jacob, somewhere in the Rhineland, about 1268.<sup>87</sup> While the order of its contents has been mentioned above, it is interesting to note that Parma 1240 does not contain Chapter 1.2 (including the passage about the number of years elapsed since the destruction of the Temple), Chapter 10.15, or Chapters 29, 29/30, and 46. On the other hand, aside from the material added by Friedmann and Braude to the standard contents of the midrash, and already mentioned above, the manuscript also contains the "preamble" to Chapter 15 and a few paragraphs at the beginning of Chapter 18, none of which appeared in the editio princeps of 1654 (?).<sup>88</sup>

There is a second manuscript, Casanata 3324, which contains chapters from both Pesiktas. It was transcribed by Isaac Abraham Abigedor in the 17th century, whose script was Spanish, with Italian influence.<sup>89</sup> Furthermore, the Jewish Theological Seminary owns a copy of the Prague edition, with two sets of marginal notes, one of which has readings drawn from Parma 1240, and the other consisting of a "very brief commentary." Isaiah Sonne identified the two scripts as northern Italian, and from the second half of the 18th century.<sup>90</sup>

Unfortunately, the portions of Casanata 3324 which contain material from Pesikta Rabbati have not been treated sufficiently, in English or Hebrew, to allow of a comparison with Parma 1240. All evaluations of authenticity must be deferred until this work has been done. It is regrettable, also, that only one manuscript of Pesikta Rabbati exists from before the age of printing.

#### Editions

Seven editions of Pesikta Rabbati have been printed, and a critical edition of one chapter. The first edition was printed without indication of date or place. Zunz deduced, however, that it appeared in Prague, 1656.<sup>91</sup> Moshe Sanders, however, on the basis of an inscription in his copy of the Prague edition, established its date as "no later than 5414  $\overline{1653}$ ."<sup>92</sup>

The second edition, printed at Shklov, 1806, contained a short list of difficult words at the end of the book.<sup>93</sup> The third edition came out in Breslau in 1831; the name of its editor is variously reported: by Zunz, as Wolf b. Israel Isser;<sup>94</sup> by Friedmann, as Rabbi Ze'ev Wolf Meir of Vilna;<sup>95</sup> and by Braude, as Ze'ev Wolf Einhorn.<sup>96</sup> Zunz said that Rabbi Wolf corrected the text from a manuscript belonging to Rabbi Abraham, son of the Gaon Elijah of Vilna. Friedmann did not mention that, saying only that Rabbi Wolf added to his edition several features, the most important of which was a commentary. On these first three editions, Zunz commented that one may find mistakes in them through use of readings in the Yalkut.<sup>97</sup> A fourth edition, published in Lemberg in 1853, contained two commentaries by Rabbi Ephraim Zalman Margaliot.<sup>98</sup>

Friedmann's was the first attempt at a critical edition (Vienna, 1880), although it does not have all the apparatus usually associated with such a work, and Friedmann had no reference to manuscripts. He used the Breslau edition as his basic text.<sup>99</sup> However, besides adding his own commentary to those found in previous editions and expanding the references to parallel passages in rabbinic literature,<sup>100</sup> Friedmann also tried to correct the text, often duplicating readings in the Parma and Casanata manuscripts.<sup>101</sup> He included indices to the Biblical verses on which the chapters are based; Biblical verses referred to in *Pesikta Rabbati* and the pages on which they occur; all Tannaitic and Amoraic preachers who appear in the midrash; and all sages who "open" discourses. Such indexing for *Pesikta Rabbati* was original with Friedmann. This edition closes with notes on foreign words (mostly Greek and Latin), by Moritz Gudemann.

The sixth edition (Warsaw, 1893) was published with an added commentary by David Luria.<sup>102</sup> Almost 70 years later, Braude published a critical text, with variant readings and notes, of Chapter 26 (וְיִהְיֶה בַשָּׁעָה שֶׁסִּרְחָה הַצֶּמֶן).<sup>103</sup>

Braude's translation and notes are based on an eclectic text made up of the Parma and Casanata manuscripts and the Prague edition, with emendations suggested by the commentators. Braude tended to rely mainly on Friedmann, sometimes using his readings even when they were not supported by the manuscripts.<sup>104</sup> This edition also includes four indices: a) Biblical and rabbinic passages, b) authorities, c) subjects and names, and d) plays on words.<sup>105</sup>

At this writing, a critical edition of some chapters of Pesikta Rabbati is being prepared by Rabbi Norman Cohen, of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, New York City. It is to be hoped that the application of modern methods to the extant manuscripts will shed new light on the many puzzling problems connected with this midrash.

#### Structure and Methods

There is some consistency, but no uniformity, among the chapters of Pesikta Rabbati, in their structures and standard exegetical devices. Most of the homilies have the same format common to many homiletical midrashim, i.e., one or more proems followed by commentary on the first verse(s) of the day's Scriptural reading, and closing in all but eleven cases (by Braude's count<sup>106</sup>) with a promise of Israel's restoration. As mentioned above, the chapters can be classified into several groups, which may indicate different dates of composition and/or redaction. We shall discuss the progressive development of the classification up to the work of Albeck and Braude, when we shall turn to a consideration of each group, in turn.

Zunz identified 28 chapters that drew from the Yelammedenu-Tanpuma family of midrashim.<sup>107</sup> Their outstanding characteristic, for Zunz, was the phrase ילמדנו רבינו and a proem based on a halachic question at the beginning of the chapter. The transition to the aggadic material is made by means of the words כן פתח רבי אם היתה קטטה, in all but one of these chapters (No. 39, in Friedmann, No. 38, מדרש הרנינו). All other chapters lack this

type of opening.<sup>108</sup> Zunz also pointed to two chapters which have no opening at all, Chapter 27 (ויהי בעת שסרחה הצאן) and Chapter 47 (מנה אחת אפירים); in Friedmann, No. 46, (תוספתא); without giving a reason, he believed that the latter was of the Yelammedenu type.<sup>109</sup> Some of the opening portions of these chapters appear in the She'eltot and in Midrash Tanhuma; the rest Zunz ascribed to "the ancient Yelammedenu."<sup>110</sup>

Friedmann was in essential agreement with Zunz that the "Yelammedenu chapters" comprised a distinct grouping, to which he added Appendix I:1 (שור או כשב) and I:2 (ויהי בחצי הלילה), and excepted Chapter 45 (אשרי נשרי פשע). He also noted that the ascription of the proem to Rabbi Tanhuma is sometimes joined with the phrase זה שאמר ברוח הקדש or זה שאמר הכתוב, after which is set the proem-verse.<sup>111</sup> Friedmann noted that other chapters begin immediately with a Biblical verse, with זש"ה, with זה שאמר ברוח"ק, or with other phrases, each unique to its chapter.<sup>112</sup>

The introduction of a new homily within a chapter may be indicated by the following phrases: דבר אחר, פתח ר' פלוני, דבר אחר, דבר אחר, et al. At times, a new homily will begin with only its Scriptural text, and no introduction. Although Friedmann found the introductory כתיב only twice, he inserted it in several places.<sup>113</sup>

More than this, Friedmann recognized that not all of Pesikta Rabbati was composed at one time, or in the same style. Many of the preachers mentioned in the midrash appear also in other midrashim and in the Palestinian Talmud, but the chapters which were composed latest of all include names from the Babylonian Talmud.



"The very oldest are anonymous, according to the nature of all early passages which are in the baraitot, e.g., Sifra, Sifre, and others like them."<sup>114</sup> Friedmann pointed to Chapters 21-24 as an independent midrash on the Ten Commandments, and to Chapters 26-28 and 34-37 as possessing different styles. As for Chapter 46, it is not even a legitimate part of Pesikta Rabbati.<sup>115</sup>

Albeck proposed five groupings of the chapters of Pesikta Rabbati by structural form, with a view towards isolating their sources. The first group is the same as that identified by Zunz and Friedmann: the chapters which begin with the phrase *יְלַמְדֵנוּ רַבֵּינוּ*, and whose principal source is the Tanhuma-Yelammedenu midrashim. Opening with "a problem of religious principle or practice,"<sup>116</sup> the chapter continues with its solution, followed by a "discourse" bearing on the problem, introduced by the formula *ר' פלוני פתח*. According to Braude, the authors of these discourses were Amoraim of the third and fourth centuries. The most prolific author among them was Rabbi Tanhuma, whom Braude, following Friedmann, called "one of the greatest of all men of Midrash."<sup>117</sup> Albeck expressed the more accepted opinion, that as a general rule, Amoraim are not named as the authors of the proems. The expression *כך פתח ר' תנחומא* only indicates the proems' source in the Tanhuma midrashim, and not the name of the actual author. The same proems may appear anonymously in other midrashim. There are even places in Pesikta Rabbati where a passage ascribed to Rabbi Tanhuma is not a proem at all, or where a proem is inserted in a structurally inappropriate place.<sup>118</sup>

The second group includes Chapters 15-18, 32 (ענייה סוערה) and the appended ביום השמיני עזרה, to which Braude added his [Piska 51] (ולקחתם לכם), newly drawn from Parma 1240. In these chapters, the opening Biblical quotation is set alongside another Biblical quotation which is related in wording or thought, and is subsequently used to deepen the reader's understanding of the original quotation. The commentary following the citation is introduced by the phrase, "Rabbi X taught," "said," etc. The commentary in these chapters is a "fairly unified" exposition of a single theme.<sup>119</sup> Albeck said that the names of Amoraim are given in these chapters without the further qualification of father's name or place of residence. He also called attention to the placement of these chapters in Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, saying that they came into Pesikta Rabbati from the latter (see Chapter 4).<sup>120</sup> Braude did not make this connection at this point in his work. (It is interesting that neither Albeck nor Braude added Chapter 14 to this group, the major portion of which is also in Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, although in Pesikta Rabbati it begins with two halachic Yelammedenu-proems and a proem ascribed to Rabbi Tanhuma.)

Of the third group, Chapters 20-24, Albeck said that it is a midrash on the Ten Commandments. Chapter 20 is different in style and may have come from another collection.<sup>121</sup> Braude referred to Mordecai Margulies' opinion that these chapters date back to the period of the Yerushalmi. In addition, Braude included Chapter 25 (לשר חמשה) within this group.<sup>122</sup>

A different type of formulaic opening distinguishes the fourth group, which includes Chapters 28, 30, 34-37, and the appended

version of שרבה. The formula is as follows: **זו היא שנאמרה ברוח הקדוש** . . . **על ידי . . . כנגד מי אמר . . . למקרא זה לא אמרו אלא כנגד** . . . which Braude translated in this way: "These words are to be considered in the light of what \_\_\_\_\_ was inspired by the holy spirit to say: [proem-verse]. What did \_\_\_\_\_ have in mind when he uttered this verse? He had in mind . . ." <sup>123</sup> This style is found in Tanhuma. <sup>124</sup>

The last group is a miscellany, in which Albeck included Chapters 26, 27, 29 and 30, saying that they are fragmentary; and Chapter 46, a (later) addition. <sup>125</sup> Leaving out Chapter 29, Braude added Chapters 27/28, 29/30, 29/30A and 29/30B to this group, saying that they show unified exposition, but different structure from chapters in the other four groups. <sup>126</sup>

Braude added a note on style, saying that the phrases **פתח** , **שנו רבותינו** and **דבר אחר** are to be understood as rhetorical signals of units within a homily. Within any given unit, the statement of a rabbi introduced by **אמר** is not to be translated merely by "Rabbi X said," but "As Rabbi X said," in illustration of the point being made. In his own time and place, the author of the midrash could expect his contemporaries to be familiar with this material, and therefore he omitted directive and transitional words and phrases. <sup>127</sup>

Because *Pesikta Rabbati* is seen to derive from many different sources, there can be no question of any basic, underlying point of view or theology throughout the whole collection. Indeed, except for Barberger's treatment of Chapters 34-37, no such investigation has been carried out with reference to any of the parts.

## CHAPTER IV

## PARALLEL PASSAGES

The study of passages common to any two, or even all three, of the midrashim discussed in this paper presents the most complex of problems, and not in this paper alone; parallelism in midrashic literature is a vast puzzle whose pieces are so numerous, so similar in their differences and so different in their similarities, that the dedicated student might easily despair of fitting them all together in the course of a lifetime. Indeed, there seems to be too little information, caused by the lack of ancient notes, the falling of traditions into undeserved oblivion, and the loss of manuscripts, all of which might have provided clues to the large and small alterations in aggadot from one midrash to another.

With regard to the three midrashim discussed in this paper, several scholars have advanced theories which claim to answer the question: Why is there identical or similar material in these midrashim? How did such duplications arise? The answer is usually given in the form: Midrash A was edited before Midrash B, and Midrash B incorporated material from Midrash A. Let us turn to an examination of these theories in general outline.

Braude gave a concise summary of scholarly opinion regarding the parallel passages in Vayikra Rabbah and Pesikta d'Kav Kahana.<sup>1</sup> Zunz, Weiss, Albeck and Goldberg all believed that Vayikra Rabbah

was prior to Pesikta, and that all parallel passages were copied by the editor of Pesikta from Vayikra Rabbah.<sup>2</sup> Goldberg stated that the annual cycle on which Pesikta is based was a later development than the triennial cycle on which Vayikra Rabbah is based. Therefore it is only natural that the editing of Pesikta began when there was already a midrashic collection based on the triennial cycle.<sup>3</sup> The opposite view, that Vayikra Rabbah followed and copied from Pesikta, was held by Buber, Theodore, Strack, Abraham Epstein, and Freidmann.<sup>4</sup> A third opinion was rendered by Margulies, who believed that the two midrashim shared an early and identical provenance, and might even have been edited by the same person, who knowingly used materials common to each.<sup>5</sup> Heinemann stopped short of complete agreement with Margulies, saying that the editor of Pesikta may have been the "younger contemporary" of the editor of Vayikra Rabbah,<sup>6</sup> and that, soon after their compilation, other editors transposed parts of each to each.<sup>7</sup> Clearly, then, the weight of scholarly opinion, particularly in recent times, favors the precedence of Vayikra Rabbah over Pesikta d'Rav Kahana.

Albeck was the only scholar to comment at length on the parallel passages in Vayikra Rabbah and Pesikta Rabbati. He found no evidence at all which indicated that the editor of Vayikra Rabbah used Pesikta Rabbati, but there is much evidence to suggest the opposite conclusion.<sup>8</sup> Where Pesikta Rabbati includes a passage common to Vayikra Rabbah and Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, Pesikta Rabbati may have used either as a source.<sup>9</sup>

Finally, it is unanimously agreed that Pesikta d'Rav Kahana was edited before Pesikta Rabbati, and that Pesikta Rabbati derived

much of its material from the older midrash. Zunz said that the editor of Pesikta Rabbati drew whole chapters and other large sections from Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, to the point that Pesikta Rabbati might almost be considered a reworking of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana.<sup>10</sup> Buber was certain that the editor of Pesikta Rabbati used Pesikta d'Rav Kahana and altered its style, sometimes basing a new sermon on a Torah reading common to both of them, but different in style and broader in scope, with the name of R. Tanhuma placed at the beginning. Buber noted instances in which a proem in Pesikta d'Rav Kahana begins with the words ר' פלוני פתח פתח, and a similar proem in Pesikta Rabbati begins with the words ר' חנניה בשם ר' פלוני פתח פתח. When entire chapters of the two midrashim correspond word for word, it is because a copyist discerned a gap in the order of the text, which he filled from Pesikta d'Rav Kahana.<sup>11</sup> Sperber agreed that Pesikta d'Rav Kahana was one of two major sources for Pesikta Rabbati, the other being the Yelammedenu-Tanhuma literature.<sup>12</sup>

Let us now turn to some specific examples of parallel passages. One of the largest blocks of material which appears in two of our midrashim is composed of Chapters 20 and 27-30 in Vayikra Rabbah, which correspond to Chapters 26, 9, 8, 23 and 27<sup>13</sup> in Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, respectively. Buber claimed that these chapters "were copied word for word" from Pesikta d'Rav Kahana into Vayikra Rabbah.<sup>14</sup> Albeck disagreed, and asked, "How is it possible that the editor of Vayikra Rabbah, with all his many sources, did not have for just these chapters any other homilies but those which are in Pesikta d'Rav Kahana?" On the contrary, the editor of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana needed complete sermons based on certain festival Torah readings, and he

drew these five sermons from Vayikra Rabbah where these pericopes were already expounded, and included them in his own collection. The only changes made by the editor of Pesikta were the abridgement of Vayikra Rabbah 20:3, and the omission of a part of 28:2.<sup>15</sup> Margulies objected to Albeck's argument on the grounds that it could just as easily be reversed in favor of Pesikta. Instead, Margulies postulated the identical provenance of the two midrashim, as mentioned above.

Heinemann suggested that neither midrash originally contained this block of material in its totality, for both editors possessed creativity to a degree that would have made a resort to such "borrowing" unthinkable. It is more likely that some of these chapters originated in Vayikra Rabbah, and some in Pesikta, and that later copyists transferred whole chapters from one midrash to the other. Such transfers were possible because of the similarities in composition and scope of these two midrashim.

Specifically, Chapters 20, 29 and 30 of Vayikra Rabbah came originally from Pesikta. Instead of Chapter 20 there is already another, Chapter 21, based on the same pericope. Neither Chapter 29 nor Chapter 30 corresponds to any pericope in any ancient list of synagogue readings from Leviticus; therefore, these chapters are superfluous in Vayikra Rabbah. Furthermore, only 14 verses in Leviticus separate the beginning of the pericope on which Chapter 28 is based and that of Chapter 29, although one would expect a minimum of 21 verses. There is an equal distance between the pericopes of Chapters 29 and 30. Chapters 27 and 28 were both original sections

of Vayikra Rabbah, based on well-established pericopes, neither of which was read on a Palestinian festival day. Therefore, these two chapters are superfluous in Pesikta d'Rav Kahana.<sup>16</sup> Heinemann later retracted his appraisal of Chapter 27 (שׁוֹר אֹר כֶּשֶׁב) on the basis of a genizah fragment found at Oxford University by Ezra Fleischer. This document indicates that וַיְהִי בַחֲצֵי הַלַּיְלָה was the Torah pericope for Shabbat ha-Gadol, and not for the first day of Pesah. This may also have been the custom observed by the author of Pesikta, who would then have based a homily for the first day of Pesah on שׁוֹר אֹר כֶּשֶׁב.<sup>17</sup>

The last four sections of Chapter 30 of Vayikra Rabbah (ולקחתם לכם) consist of two proems and two homilies. Only the last of these sections appears in Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, although they all appear, rearranged, in MS כ of Pesikta. Albeck noted this, and referred to gaps in the text of Pesikta Chapter 27 where Vayikra Rabbah 30:5-6 should have been. However, two manuscripts of Pesikta include the missing equivalent of 30:5 in the midst of a proem. Albeck concluded that the sections of this chapter of Pesikta were in a state of flux, and that this chapter cannot be an original part of Pesikta.<sup>8</sup>

Vayikra Rabbah 10:1-3 is paralleled by Pesikta 16:4 and by Pesikta Rabbati 33 (Friedmann pp. 150a-151a), all of which are based on Psaim 45:8. In Vayikra Rabbah, the verse is applied to Abraham, Isaiah, and Aaron, in turn. In Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, the portion about Aaron is omitted. In Albeck's opinion, the editor wanted to end this homily with Isaiah, but he also refused to distort his source by rearranging it, and thus he preserved its integrity. The



editor of Pesikta Rabbati also wanted to end with Isaiah, but he rearranged the Biblical examples in the order Abraham, Aaron and Isaac. Albeck suggested that the editor of Pesikta Rabbati was not so much indebted to any written source here, but that the applications of Psalm 45:8 to these three personalities were well known and widely used by contemporary preachers. Therefore, the editor of Pesikta Rabbati was bound to no order.<sup>19</sup> If this is true, it is hard to understand why Pesikta Rabbati includes Abraham and Aaron at all. It would have been simpler to exclude the irrelevant homilies. Rather, the contents of this parallel reveal a knowledge and concern with the preservation of the written tradition on the part of Pesikta Rabbati's editor, but his editorial principles were probably less stringent than those used in Pesikta d'Rav Kahana.

However, Albeck also recorded at least one parallel in which the editor of Pesikta was not scrupulously faithful to tradition. Vayikra Rabbah 8:1 is in the name of R. Levi; its parallel in Pesikta 2:4 is in the name of R. Jonah. Albeck believed that the name was changed in Pesikta to match the name ascribed to another aggadah which immediately follows it and relates to the Torah-verse, thus attributing the entire proem to one rabbi and not two.<sup>20</sup>

Vayikra Rabbah 21:6, 9 and 11 are paralleled by Pesikta Rabbati 47 (Friedmann 191a-b), which shortened the material from Vayikra Rabbah, and supplemented it with a passage from Pesikta d'Rav Kahana 24 (שרובה).<sup>21</sup> Similarly, Albeck noted Vayikra Rabbah 34:16, paralleled by Pesikta Rabbati 25 (Friedmann 126b). The latter passage is a Hebrew abridgement of the Aramaic original in Vayikra Rabbah.<sup>22</sup> In the same way, Vayikra Rabbah 29:3, 7, 6 and 8 have been altered

and the amoraic names omitted in Pesikta Rabbati (Friedmann 168b, 169a, 171b and 172a).<sup>23</sup>

Friedmann argued that Pesikta Rabbati was the source of a number of passages common to it and to Vayikra Rabbah; Albeck refuted these claims. For example, an anonymous passage in Vayikra Rabbah 17:4 bears the name of R. Ḥama bar Ḥanina in Pesikta Rabbati 17 (Friedmann 88b), an outward indication of the latter midrash's greater proximity to the sources. However, R. Ḥama's name appears at this point in all manuscripts of Vayikra Rabbah, although it was omitted in the editions which had been printed prior to Albeck's article.<sup>24</sup> A printer's error was also responsible for the "confusion" which Friedmann noted in Vayikra Rabbah 6:3,<sup>25</sup> which parallels Pesikta Rabbati 22 (Friedmann 113b-114a). Albeck explained that a passage from the same chapter of Pesikta Rabbati (Friedmann 113a) was added to the printed editions of Vayikra Rabbah, but this passage does not appear in the manuscripts. There is thus no "confusion," and Vayikra Rabbah is the original source of the parallel.<sup>26</sup>

Without listing all the parallel passages in Vayikra Rabbah, Pesikta d'Rav Kahana and Pesikta Rabbati, we have nevertheless accounted for the basic theories which seek to explain their existence. We have also discussed all the types of reasoning used to explain specific occurrences of parallelism. All other explanations are merely variations on these.<sup>27</sup>

## CHAPTER V

A Textual Comparison

We turn now to a textual comparison of Chapter 3 in Pesikta d'Rav Kahana and Chapter 12 in Pesikta Rabbati. Both of these chapters are based on Deut. 25:17-19, hereafter referred to as "Zachor," which is the first word of the passage. They will be compared against each other, and they will also be compared individually against models drawn from the work of Margulies, Goldberg and Heinemann.

Zachor is the maftir for the second Sabbath in the month of Adar, which is the Sabbath before Purim. In its three verses, Jews are commanded to remember (zachor) the cowardly attack by the tribe of Amalek on the Israelite stragglers at Refidim, which is recounted in this passage and in Exodus 17. Jews are also commanded to "blot out the memory of Amalek from under heaven." The two midrashic chapters under consideration expand the passages in Deuteronomy and Exodus, as well as other passages in which Amalek's ancestors and descendants are mentioned. One of these is I Samuel 15:32-33, a part of the haftarah for Shabbat Zachor which describes the execution of Agag, the Amalekite king. These passages are read in anticipation of Purim because of the villainous role played in the Book of Esther by Haman "the Agagite."

Before turning to a comparison of the midrashim on Zachor, let us note the sources of parallel passages in other midrashic collections.

Those listed most often by Mandelbaum include Bereshit Rabbah, Mechilta d'Rabbi Ishmael, Sh'mot Rabbah, Echah Rabbati, Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer, Ya'alkut Shimoni, Tanhuma, Midrash ha-Gadol, the Babylonian Talmud and of course, Pesikta Rabbati. Out of this list, only Bereshit Rabbah, Mechilta, and Echah Rabbati are generally considered prior to or roughly contemporary with Pesikta d'Rav Kahana. Friedmann referred in his notes to the same midrashim except for Midrash ha-Gadol, which had only recently become known in the West, and with the obvious substitution of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana for Pesikta Rabbati. Another interesting aspect of this list is the absence of parallels in Vayikra Rabbah, a circumstance which, if repeated in many other chapters of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, would support Margulies' theory about the authorship of the two midrashim.

In comparing our two chapters against each other and against the scholarly models, we will ignore the five paragraphs printed on pp. 35-36 of Mandelbaum's edition of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana. These appear only in MS  $\mathfrak{V}$ , and are not to be considered an authentic part of the midrash. The paragraphing introduced by Mandelbaum is retained for the convenience of citation, as is the paragraphing introduced into the Breslau edition of Pesikta Rabbati (1831) and preserved in Braude's translation.<sup>1</sup>

As noted above,<sup>2</sup> it is widely assumed that Pesikta Rabbati derived much of its material from Pesikta d'Rav Kahana. A close examination of the texts reveals that they rarely correspond word-for-word, and that they often differ on significant details. The following examples are not exhaustive; they are only meant to show the various types of differences which exist.

Pesikta d'Rav Kahana 3:1 and Pesikta Rabbati<sup>3</sup> 12:4 are mostly taken up with the enumeration of Esau's sins. (Esau enters the discussion for two reasons: a) He was the grandfather of Amalek according to Gen. 36:4, 12; b) He was equated with Edom in Gen. 36:1, 8. "Edom" was commonly used by the Rabbis to denote any nation which attacked, oppressed or otherwise victimized the Jews; the term is usually understood as referring to Rome. Thus, preachers and writers had a deceptively innocent way of airing political grievances and protests against Roman rule and devout wishes for the overthrow of the Empire--statements which would have been punished by torture and even death, had their meaning been understood by the authorities.) Both of these passages are proems based on Ps. 109:14, whose first word, זָכַר, comes from the same root as the chapter title, Zachor. However, the pivotal words for this proem are עֲוֹן אֲבוֹתָיו (the iniquity of his fathers) and הַטְּמֵאת אִמּוֹ (the sin of his mother). In Kahana, the first of these phrases is quickly reinterpreted as "the sin he committed against his fathers," namely, Isaac and Abraham. Actually, four sins are involved. The first was the rape of a woman betrothed to another man; the second was murder. These led to a third, the "theft" of five years from Abraham's life, for God, in order to keep His promise to Abraham of a good old age, had to prevent Abraham from knowing of his grandson's evil ways. Therefore, Abraham lived only 175 years, and not the 180 that Isaac enjoyed. Esau's fourth sin was in causing Isaac's blindness, the effect of an evil student on his righteous teacher.

What about the sin of--i.e., against--his mother? Tradition here records a difference of opinion. R. Judah claimed that in his

animosity toward Jacob, Esau tore Rebecca's womb as he was born. R. Nehemiah said that Esau thereby prevented Rebecca from bearing the twelve tribal ancestors, an honor of which she was worthy. And the rabbis stated that Esau's wickedness prevented a public burial for Rebecca, lest the mourners curse her for having borne him. Her death is not even recorded in the Bible. This interpretation coincides with the grammatical structure of the proem-verse: **עַן** is singular and **אֲבֹתָיו** is plural; therefore tradition records one sin by Esau directly against each of his forebears: Abraham's premature death and Isaac's blindness. However, both **חַמָּאֵחַ** and **אָמַר** are singular, and for this reason only one sin may be ascribed to Esau here, although opinions vary as to the nature of that sin.

Rabbati 12:4 (Friedmann p. 47b, line 9--p. 48b, line 13) concurs with Kahana in the interpretation of **חַמָּאֵחַ אָמַר**, but its interpretation of **עַן אֲבֹתָיו אֵל-יְהוָה** can be rendered, "Let Esau's sin(s) be remembered, from those against his fathers to those against the Lord." This opens the way for inclusive recitation of Esau's sins against God, Israel, Jacob, Isaac and Abraham. These include burning the Torah and the Temple, burning, killing and exiling Jews, plotting to kill Jacob, denying the resurrection of the dead and spurning his birthright, in addition to the sins mentioned in Kahana. Isaac's blindness is attributed to the smoke of Esau's idolatrous sacrifices.

In a digression, Kahana expounds the phrase **אֵלֶיךָ בָּכוֹת** (Gen. 35:8), an aggadic unit which is absent from Rabbati. Kahana also quotes the continuation of the proem-verse, Ps. 109:15, before concluding with Deut. 25:17, the Torah-verse. Rabbati does not conclude with the psalm, but adds Deut. 25:19 to the original Torah-verse. Both endings

are equally appropriate, and illustrative of the variety of treatments possible for a single homiletical tradition.

Kahana 3:5 parallels the first part of Rabbati 12:5 (Friedmann p. 48b, line 14--p. 49a, line 3), both of which are proems based on Ps. 9:6. However, there are striking differences in the application of the first part of the proem-verse, focusing on the words גוים (nations) and רשע (wicked). In Kahana, גוים is equated with Amalek, and Numbers 24:20b is adduced as support: ראשית גוים עמלק (First of all the nations was Amalek, but his end shall be utter destruction). The word רשע is applied to Esau/Edom, as in Malachi 1:4b: וקראו להם גבול רשעה (They shall be called a realm of wickedness, a people whom the Lord has cursed forever).

According to Rabbati, however, the גוים are the אויבות, the nations who conspire against Israel, and whose plans God confounds. Not Esau but Haman is the רשע. Despite these differences, both proems end in exactly the same way, by quoting the second part of Ps. 9:6, "You have blotted out (מחית) their name for ever and ever," immediately followed by Deut. 25:19, "You shall blot out (חמדה) the memory of Amalek from under heaven."

Both Kahana 3:6 and Rabbati 12:13 quote a tradition ascribed to R. Isaac and based on I Samuel 15:33, that Agag's execution was by castration, the same method used by Romans against Jews. However, each involves a different conclusion. Kahana (Mandelbaum p. 45, lines 7-10) says that Moses had already hinted at this incident in the Torah, by speaking of a wife who aids her husband in a fight (Deut. 25:11-12). "What is written after this? 'Remember what Amalek did to you'" (Deut. 25:17). Thus, the merest reference to the rough handling of

the genitals is made to assume a causal relationship to the commandment to remember. Rabbati (Friedmann p. 52b, lines 3-4) however, gives an imaginary continuation of Samuel's statement to Agag, "Just as you did to Israel in Egypt, so I have done to you--castrating them and placing their wives in a state of dubious marriage."

Both Kahana 3:9 and Rabbati 12:12 (Friedmann p. 52a, lines 7-14) conclude that the Amalekite attack at Refidim was a punishment for Israel's doubt and ungratefulness toward God (Exodus 17:7). Both illustrate this point with a parable about a dog who guards the king's property and bites an intruder, but there is a curious divergence in details. In Kahana the property is a fenced vineyard, the thief is the king's own son, and the king later reminds his son of the latter's transgression. But in Rabbati the property is a garden, the prowler is a son of the king's friend, and the king later instructs his own son in the words to use when reminding his friend's son of his crime.

Parts of Kahana 3:13 correspond to sections of Rabbati 12:5 in comparing the characters and activities of Joseph and Esau. The tradition concludes that they each bequeathed a certain moral heritage to their descendants, which rendered Joshua, Joseph's scion, able to defeat Esau's grandson Amalek. However, each midrash expresses this conclusion in a different way. For example, both midrashim agree that Esau grew up among righteous people, Isaac and Rebecca, and that Joseph grew up among wicked people, Potifar and Pharaoh, yet neither was affected by his environment. The expression of this idea proves again that Rabbati is not a direct copy of Kahana, for Kahana (Mandelbaum p. 51, lines 4-5) says *ולא עשה כמעשיהם* (he did not act according to their



deeds). Rabbati (Friedmann p. 49b, lines 4-6) states *ולא למד ממעשיהם* (he did not learn from their deeds). Further, Kahana adds the refrain *יבוא זה ויפול ביד זה* (let this one come and fall by the hand of that one), while Rabbati ascribes the statement to God: "Let Joseph come . . . and exact punishment from Esau."

Kahana 3:15 and Rabbati 12:9 are both concerned with reconciling contradictory verses. In both passages, one of the verses is Deut. 25:19, in which Israel is commanded to "blot out the memory of Amalek." The other verse, in Kahana, is Exodus 17:14b in which God says that He Himself will blot out (*מחה אמהם*) the memory of Amalek. But in Rabbati (Friedmann p. 51a, lines 8-13) the other verse is Exodus 17:16, in which God swears to make war on Amalek (*מלחמה ליהרהר בעמלק*). Both midrashim resolve the conflict in the same way, by saying that God was moved to action only after Amalek attacked His throne. In Kahana, Jer. 3:17 is then used to prove that God's throne is Jerusalem: *יקראו ירושה כסא יהרהר* (they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the Lord). Rabbati equates Jerusalem with the throne before reconciling the contradictory verses.

These examples are typical of the variants in the content of tradition between Pesikta d'Rav Kahana and Pesikta Rabbati. A large amount of the material in our two chapters is identical, but it is important to prove that one is not a mere copy of the other.

Other differences between our chapters arise when one has more material on a given subject than the other. For example, Kahana 3:5 is not content with merely identifying Esau as the wicked one. It continues (Mandelbaum p. 43, lines 11-12) by countering the charge that the wickedness of Jacob's descendants is also proven by Malachi 1:4,

since the Bible uses the singular רשע, not the plural רשעים. Rabbati does not record this contention.

Both Kahana 3:12 and Rabbati 12:13 (Friedmann p. 52b, line 10--p. 53a, line 2) expound the word נחשלים in Deut. 25:18. Each gives the same four interpretations, the last of which is "whispering" or "complaining." Rabbati stops there, but Kahana goes on to speculate about the content of the "whispers," and supports its speculation by quoting from the Psalms.

Kahana 3:14 and Rabbati 12:13 (Friedmann p. 53a, lines 11-18) agree on the three things which Israel was commanded to do upon entering the Land, the last of which was to blot out the memory of Amalek. Kahana stops here, but Rabbati goes on to Israel's argument with God that they are temporal and He is eternal; therefore God should take this responsibility. However, in an answer which is most appropriate to Shabbat Zachor, God enjoins Israel to read the Chapter of Amalek every year, for which God will credit them with wiping out Amalek's memory. In contrast, Kahana implies the physical, forceful destruction of Amalek by Israel.

It has been said that the homilies of Pesikta Rabbati tend to be more elaborated than those of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, but evidence for this conclusion does not exist in Zachor. In these two chapters, more details and exposition are provided sometimes in one work, and sometimes in the other.

Many of the numbered sections in Kahana 3 and Rabbati 12 are composed of smaller units, the arrangement of which differs in the parallel texts. For example, Kahana 3:6 may be divided into two sub-sections, each containing three units. The first sub-section (Mandelbaum p. 44,

lines 1-8) speaks of "the nations'" crimes against Israel in this order: a) mockery of circumcision, b) destruction of the Torah, and c) destruction of the Temple. The parallel in Rabbati 12:10 (Friedmann p. 51a, line 20--p. 51b, line 10) reverses the order: a) destruction of the Temple, b) burning of the Torah, and c) mockery of circumcision.

The second sub-section of Kahana 3:6 (Mandelbaum p. 44, line 8--p. 45) speculates on the way in which Samuel executed Agag: a) cutting small pieces of flesh from his body, b) spread-eagling, or c) castration. The parallel in Rabbati 12:13 (Friedmann, p. 52b, lines 2-8) uses the following arrangement: a) castration, b) cutting pieces of flesh, and c) spread-eagling.

This phenomenon, common within parallel sections of the chapters, looms as a major contrast between the chapters as a whole. Table III shows each pair of parallel passages opposite each other. All page and line numbers are according to Mandelbaum's edition of *Pesikta d'Rav Kahana* and Friedmann's edition of *Pesikta Rabbati*. A dash indicates that there is no parallel within the chapter to the passage on the same line. The sections of Kahana 3 are given in consecutive order, and the sections of Rabbati 12 are given as consecutively as possible. There has been no attempt to break the chapters down completely into all their aggadic units, nor to show all permutations of the type discussed with reference to Kahana 3:6.

Even a quick glance at Table III will show that the editors of *Pesikta d'Rav Kahana* and *Pesikta Rabbati* did not follow the same homiletical path in their treatments of *Zachor*. Rabbati 12:13 is particularly conspicuous in that it contains parallels to portions of seven

sections of Kahana 3, as well as material which does not occur in Kahana 3. The comparative arrangements of these chapters may be understood in all their complexity by means of the study of page and line numbers.

TABLE III. Parallelism in Kahana 3 and Rabbati 12.

<u>PESIKTA D'RAV KAHANA</u>	<u>PESIKTA RABBATI</u>
---	1. p. 46b, line 13-p. 47a, line 12
1. p. 37, line 1-p. 41, line 4	4. p. 47b, line 9-p. 48b, line 13
---	2. p. 47a, lines 13-19
2. p. 41, lines 5-11	p. 47a, lines 19-25
3. p. 42, lines 1-3	---
p. 42, lines 3-8	3. p. 47a, line 26-p. 47b, line 8
4. p. 42, line 9-p. 43, line 3	---
5. p. 43, lines 9-14	5. p. 48b, line 14-p. 49a, line 3
---	p. 49a, lines 3-16
---	p. 49a, line 21-p. 49b, line 4
---	p. 49b, lines 7-25
---	6. p. 49b, line 27-p. 50a, line 4
---	7. p. 50a, line 4-p. 50b, line 8
---	8. p. 50b, line 8-p. 51a, line 2
---	10. p. 51a, lines 18-20
6. p. 44, lines 1-8	p. 51a, line 20-p. 51b, line 10
---	11. p. 51b, line 11-p. 52a, line 6
p. 44, line 8-p. 45	13. p. 52b, lines 2-8
7. p. 46, lines 1-2	p. 53a, lines 14-18
p. 46, lines 2-8	---

(TABLE III, Continued)

<u>PESIKTA D'RAV KAHANA</u>	<u>PESIKTA RABBATI</u>
8. p. 46, line 9-p. 47, line 3	---
9. p. 47, lines 4-10	12. p. 52a, lines 7-14
10. p. 48	13. p. 52a, lines 14-24
11. p. 49, lines 1-3	p. 52a, line 24-p. 52b, line 1
p. 49, lines 4-6	---
12. p. 49, line 7-p. 50, line 2	13. p. 52b, line 10-p. 53a, line 2
p. 50, lines 2-9	---
13. p. 50, line 10	---
p. 50, line 11-p. 51, line 2	5. p. 49a, lines 16-18
p. 51, lines 2-3	13. ---
p. 51, lines 4-5	5. p. 49a, lines 19-21
p. 51, lines 5-6	13. p. 53a, lines 2-6
p. 51, lines 6-7	5. p. 49b, lines 4-6
14. p. 51, lines 8-11	13. p. 53a, lines 6-7
15. p. 52, lines 1-6	---
16. p. 52, lines 7-11	---
p. 52, line 11-p. 53, line 5	5. p. 49b, lines 25-26
p. 53, lines 5-7	13. p. 53a, lines 10-11
p. 53, lines 7-11	13. p. 53a, lines 11-14
---	9. p. 51a, lines 8-13
---	p. 51a, lines 2-5
---	---
	p. 51a, lines 5-8
	p. 51a, lines 13-17
	13. p. 52b, lines 8-10
	p. 53a, lines 8-9
	p. 53a, lines 18-22

Kahana 3 and Rabbati 12 are also distinguished from one another linguistically. The former often uses Aramaic, but the latter rarely employs it. This is particularly evident in technical terminology. However, parallel passages occur in which, although the content is the same, Rabbati's text resembles a Hebrew "translation" of Kahana's Aramaic "original."

Kahana 3:1 (Mandelbaum p. 41, lines 1-3) says that all those whom Esau wronged should requite him evil for evil. This passage is in Aramaic: אבוי שלים ליה ביש, אימיה . . . אהרי . . . סביה . . . אחרן שלגורן. The same thought in Rabbati 12:4 (Friedmann p. 48b, lines 10-12) is expressed in Hebrew: אביר שילם לו . . . כל רע, אמר . . . זקינר . . . אהיר . . . אני משלם לו כל רע.

Another example is found in Kahana 3:10 (Mandelbaum p. 48, lines 3-6) which describes how Amalek took advantage of the Israelites by calling their names from beyond the clouds of glory. Amalek's preparations are narrated in Hebrew, but his actual speech to the Israelites is given in Aramaic: אהובכון אנא פוקו דאנא בעי מעבד פרנמטיא עימכון (I am your brother; come out, for I want to transact business with you). In Rabbati 12:13 (Friedmann p. 52a, lines 15-18), the entire incident is rendered in Hebrew, including Amalek's speech: פלוגני בן (John Doe, come out, for I want to trade with you).

It is impossible to reach valid conclusions about the comparative usage of technical terminology in Pesikta d'Rav Kahana and Pesikta Rabbati on the basis of only one chapter from each midrash. However, some significant facts do emerge from a study of the technical vocabulary in Kahana 3 and Rabbati 12.

Although some terms are identical in both chapters, and others are unique to one chapter or the other, several Aramaic expressions used in Kahana appear in Hebrew translation in Rabbati. Thus, דכתיב in Kahana corresponds to שכתב בה in Rabbati; and Kahana's ביה in Kahana corresponds to מה כתב אהרין in Rabbati as מה כתב אהרין in Rabbati.

The frequency with which some expressions are used is also worthy of attention. The most commonly used terms are אמר, אומר, and אמרין (אמר in Rabbati), which appear 36 times in Kahana 3 and 38 times in Rabbati 12 when rabbinical authorities are cited. In Rabbati 12, a rabbi's name stands without a verb indicating speech only once. In Kahana 3, rabbis' names appear without such verbs in nine instances. This would seem to indicate the oral nature of the tradition by associating forms of אמר as well as דרש, למד, and פתח with the names of rabbinical authorities.

Large discrepancies exist in these chapters' use of other terms. Rabbati 12 uses the phrase דבר אדר to introduce new aggadic units no less than 27 times; Kahana 3 uses it only twice. Rabbati 12 indicates the citation of a Scriptural verse 14 times with שנאמר; Kahana 3 uses this expression also only twice. On the other hand, Kahana 3 employs the phrase הוה הוא דכתיב five times to indicate a Biblical passage, but Rabbati 12 uses it only once. Such differences, if found to be consistent throughout large portions of these midrashim, might be of help in determining the approximate time of their redaction.

There is surprisingly little homogeneity in the exegetical terminology of either chapter. A full 62½% of the technical formulae used in Kahana 3 are unique to the sections in which they occur. For example, מהדין קרייה appears twice in Kahana 3:1, but it does not occur

again in Kahana 3. In Rabbati 12, the figure is 59%. This may indicate that both editors were scrupulous in preserving, just as they received them, the traditions which they incorporated into their midrashim.<sup>4</sup> Also, the lack of correspondence of technical terms in parallel passages, as well as the other variants discussed above, may indicate that the editor of Pesikta Rabbati was more independent of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana than has previously been believed. Future studies in Pesikta Rabbati's terminology should include the Yelammedenu-Tanḥuma midrashim, with which the former may have more in common.

No consistency is found in the citation of rabbinical authorities when Kahana 3 and Rabbati 12 are compared. The results of such a comparison range from total correspondence to complete inconsistency, as shown in the following examples.

Kahana 3:14, a brief passage, and its parallel in Rabbati 12:13, although not identical, are exceptionally close. They both cite the same three rabbis in the same order, the only differences being in spelling (Rabbati has יְהוֹדָה for Kahana's יוֹדָה, and אֶלְעִי for אֶלְעִי) and Rabbati's addition of a conjunctive -וְ. The list in Kahana's version is as follows: R. Azariah, R. Judah bar R. Simon in the name of R. Judah bar R. Ilai. Kahana 3:11 (Mandelbaum p. 49, lines 1-3) and its parallel in Rabbati 12:13 correspond in their anonymity.

The names recorded in Kahana 3:16 and Rabbati 12:9 are in only partial correspondence. Where Kahana has R. Eliezer, Rabbati is more complete, with R. Eliezer b. Jacob. This situation is later reversed when Kahana quotes R. Berechia in the name of R. Abba b. Kahana, and Rabbati cites only the latter. Other citations in these parallels correspond with only minor variants in spelling.



In comparison with Kahana 3:1, Rabbati 12:4 omits many names and changes others. Rabbati also here follows a pattern which is repeated throughout the midrash; the opening of Kahana 3:1 is anonymous, but its parallel in Rabbati 12:4 begins, "Thus R. Tanḥuma Berabbi opened his discourse. . ." This addition of R. Tanḥuma occurs also in the parallel to Kahana 3:2, in which R. Tanḥum b. Ḥanilai is cited. Rabbati 12:2 cites R. Tanḥuma b. Abba in the name of R. Tanḥum b. Ḥanilai.<sup>5</sup>

Kahana 3:6 may be divided into two parts according to their contents, the first of which--to be designated Kahana 3:6a--has its parallel in Rabbati 12:10, while Kahana 3:6b is paralleled in Rabbati 12:13. It is remarkable that these two sets of parallels exhibit different degrees of consistency in rabbinical citation. The differences between Kahana 3:6b and Rabbati 12:13 are only partial; Rabbati substitutes R. Levi for Kahana's "the Rabbis." (R. Levi does appear at the very end of Kahana 3:6b, in a passage without a parallel in Rabbati 12.) However, the inconsistency between Kahana 3:6a and Rabbati 12:10 is almost total. Where Kahana cites "the Rabbis," Rabbati cites R. Judah; and instead of R. Joshua b. Levi, Rabbati quotes R. Nehemiah. In Kahana, the remaining aggadah in this set is divided into two parts, the first of which is ascribed to R. Judah b. Gurya, and the second to R. Ḥanana (sic) b. Shalka, R. Joshua of Sichnin and R. Levi in the name of R. Johanan. Rabbati ascribes this aggadah to the following series of rabbis, which bears some similarity to the list in Kahana: R. Ḥanina b. Shallum and R. Joshua of Sichnin in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi.

The differences in rabbinical citations in Kahana 3:6 and its

parallels, as well as their differences in arrangement mentioned above, lead to two conclusions. The first is that the editor of *Pesikta d'Rav Kahana* received the two sections of *Kahana* 3:6 as independent *aggadot*, which he placed side by side. The other is that the editor of *Pesikta Rabbati* did not take these two *aggadot* from *Pesikta d'Rav Kahana*; rather, he also received them as independent traditions and used them in a different way from the former editor.

The independence of these editors' sources is reflected also by the rabbinical citations in *Kahana* 3:9 and *Rabbati* 12:12, whose textual variants have already been discussed. In *Kahana* the parable is ascribed to R. Levi, and in *Rabbati* to R. Berechiah.

*Kahana* 3:10 and its parallel in *Rabbati* 12:13 differ in an unusual way. In these passages, the rabbis and the order in which they are cited are identical: R. Judah, R. Nehemiah, "our Rabbis," and R. Huna. However, what is said in *Kahana* by R. Judah is ascribed in *Rabbati* to R. Nehemiah, and vice versa. Again, this phenomenon demonstrates *Rabbati's* independence of *Kahana*, and its (*Rabbati's*) use of a different source.

The differences in the contents of *Kahana* 3:5 and *Rabbati* 12:5 were described above. In *Kahana* this poem is ascribed to R. Levi, but in *Rabbati* it is anonymous. However, the structure of both poems in their use of the poem-verse is precisely the same.

Certain rabbis are often cited together in these two chapters. For example, the sequence of R. Judah, R. Nehemiah and "our Rabbis" is common. R. Berechiah often appears in conjunction with R. Levi; at other times R. Berechiah transmits R. Levi's teachings. As noted above, this pair is split in *Kahana* 3:9, given in the name of R. Levi,

and Rabbati 12:12, in the name of R. Berechiah Berebi. R. Abba b. Kahana is often cited in the same sections in which R. Levi and R. Berechiah appear.

It is important to note that some passages in Kahana 3, although they are unparalleled in Rabbati 12, do have parallels elsewhere in Pesikta Rabbati. Similarly, parallels to Rabbati 12 occur in parts of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana other than Kahana 3.

We turn now to the comparison of Kahana 3 and Rabbati 12 with three models for midrashic chapters. It must be borne in mind that Margulies and Heinemann studied Vayikra Rabbah, and that Goldberg studied Pesikta d'Rav Kahana. Therefore, except for Kahana 3 as compared with Goldberg's model, the conclusions reached below are based only on inference and extrapolation. Because most scholars agree that the homilies of Vayikra Rabbah and Pesikta d'Rav Kahana have a common structure and style, and that these two midrashim are roughly contemporaneous, it is to be expected that our three models will correspond more closely to Kahana 3 than to Rabbati 12.

Margulies' model is basically structural in nature. Although it was explained above,<sup>6</sup> it bears repetition here. Each chapter begins with one or more proems, continues with homilies based on the first verse(s) of the pericope, and closes with a *hatimah*--words of blessing, comfort and hope. The thematic component of this model arises from Margulies' observation that each chapter's dominant theme is drawn in some way from the pericope upon which it is based.

Kahana 3 follows this pattern with great consistency, opening with six proems. Four of them conclude with the first verse of Zachor, Deut. 25:17, and the other two (the second and fifth proems) conclude

with its third and last verse, Deut. 25:19. Although strict regularity would dictate that all proems be based on the first verse of the pericope, it is not so unusual for the second or third verse to serve this function as well.

Usually, only the first few verses of a pericope are expounded in a chapter. The brevity of Zachor, which includes only three verses, does not signal a change in this procedure. All three verses are therefore expounded, the first in Kahana 3:7-9, the second in Kahana 3:10-13, and the last in Kahana 3:14-15. Mandelbaum made a separate division at the end of the chapter, Kahana 3:16, for a homily based on Ex. 17:16, which is the last verse of the original account of the battle with Amalek. This section ends with the customary *ḥatimah*, which is based on Ps. 9:7-8.

Goldberg believed that Kahana 3:16 should have been presented in two separate sections, each expounding its half of Ex. 17:16.<sup>7</sup> He also tried to explain the presence in Kahana 3 of a homily based on a pericope other than Zachor, adducing three reasons:<sup>8</sup>

. . .the first is that also by the reading in Exodus [17] one may fulfill his obligation; the second: because in the preceding section, together with the pericope from Deuteronomy, the reading from Exodus is expounded; and the third is that the preacher wanted, by mentioning Mordechai and Esther, the generation of the Messiah and the completed Throne (mentioned in the last homily based on "Zachor" in Exodus), to conclude on a positive note.

From a different perspective, the designation of a 16th section is unnecessary, creating more problems that it settles; it is more practical to view it as a part of Kahana 3:15. There are at least two arguments for this theory: a) Kahana 3:15 involves the reconciliation of Deut. 25:19 with Ex. 17:14. It appears that, in accordance with

common practice, the editor merely continued with the exposition of the Exodus passage. b) Almost every aggadah in Kahana 3:15-16, with the exception of the play on words between מדר דר (Deut. 25:19) and מדרדר, is paralleled in Rabbati 12:9, although these aggadot are rearranged in the latter midrash. Thus we know of another source in which these aggadot appear as a single unit. They occur side-by-side in Kahana; why should they be separated?

The thematic requirement of Margulies' model is surely satisfied by Kahana 3, in that each of its sections explores the meanings and ramifications of the verses which constitute Zachor.

One would expect that, for a large number of chapters of Pesikta Rabbati, Margulies' model could be adapted merely by adding a halachic Yelammedenu-proem at its beginning. However, this expectation will have to be tested on chapters other than Rabbati 12, which is quite irregular in structure, and whose division into sections should be done in a more precise manner.

Rabbati 12 does indeed begin with a Yelammedenu-proem, and continues with four more proems; Rabbati 12:2-3 conclude with Deut. 25:17, section 4 with both Deut. 25:17 and Deut. 25:19, and section 5 with Deut. 25:19. This last proem is followed, in the same section, by two homilies. The first is a phrase-by-phrase exposition of Ex. 17:9, and the second is based on Deut. 25:18b. Therefore, Rabbati 12:5 would more properly be designated Rabbati 12:[5-7].<sup>9</sup> Rabbati 12:6 is not based on either the Deuteronomy or the Exodus reading; rather, it continues the theme of the second homily in Rabbati 12:5, and should be assimilated to it. Thus, in our theoretical restructuring of the chapter, it would become part of Rabbati 12:[7].

Rabbati 12:7 expounds a phrase in Ex. 17:15, and would become Rabbati 12:[8]. Rabbati 12:8 offers a phrase-by-phrase exposition of Ex. 17:12, and concludes with a brief remark based on Ex. 17:13. Although this last remark is not based on the same text as the rest of the aggadot in its section, according to customary practice it is too short to merit designation as a separate section. The whole section would thus become Rabbati 12:[9]. Rabbati 12:9 is based on Ex. 17:16, but it refers back to Deut. 25:19 before closing, like Kahana 3, with a ḥatimah based on Ps. 9:7-8. It would become Rabbati 12:[10].

The order of the Scriptural verses on which the homilies are based, only one of which is from Zachor, is worthy of note: Ex. 17:9, Deut. 25:18, Ex. 17:15, Ex. 17:12-13, and Ex. 17:16. It is more common to find Scriptural verses expounded in the order in which they occur in the Bible. These homilies are also unusual in that most of them are not based on Zachor, which is the chapter's reason for existence.

The ḥatimah in Rabbati 12:9 is unusual in that it is not the end of the chapter, which continues with two more proems, Rabbati 12:10-11. In our reconstruction, these would become Rabbati 12:[11-12]. Both of these proems conclude with Deut. 25:17. Rabbati 12:12, a homily also based on Deut. 25:17, would become Rabbati 12:[13]. Rabbati 12:13 continues with two series of homilies, the first of which is based on Deut. 25:18, and the second on Deut. 25:19. These would become Rabbati 12:[14-15]. Rabbati 12:13 concludes with a ḥatimah which is unusual in that it carries no overt expression of hope for future redemption. Citing Judges 5:14, it refers to an event which had already occurred: Saul's conflict with Agag. More than this, Judges 5:14

is the verse upon which Rabbati 13 is based. Therefore, the second ḥatimah of Rabbati 12 actually functions as a transition to the next chapter.

With the exception of the irregular use of the ḥatimah, the four or [five] sections of Rabbati 12:10-13 (Friedmann p. 51a, line 18--p. 53a) comprise a short but orderly and regular chapter based on Zachor. Rabbati 12, therefore, seems to be composed of two separate chapters; the first ends regularly, and the second is joined to it with no transition. Its function as a bridge to Rabbati 13 seems almost to justify its appearance in the midrash. (Rabbati 13 is also a discourse related to Purim.)

The only direct parallels between the two parts of Rabbati 12 occur in Rabbati 12:5 and 12:13, which contrast Esau's evil with Joseph's goodness.<sup>10</sup> Even in these three brief passages, there are two differences: a) When one passage mentions Esau first and Joseph second, its parallel uses the opposite arrangement; and b) The proof-texts which demonstrate that Joseph was  $\gamma\delta\zeta$  are different--Gen. 37:3 in Rabbati 12:5, and Gen. 37:2 in Rabbati 12:13. One might think that the editor of Pesikta Rabbati would have harmonized these differences, or even deleted the repetitions. However, the endurance of the variants and the structure of Rabbati 12 as a whole lead to the conclusion that both Rabbati 12:1-9 and 12:10-13 were once complete and self-sufficient units.

Goldberg's primary contribution to the study of midrashic structure is statistical in nature. According to him the model Pesikta chapter contains at least as many proems as homilies, if not more proems.<sup>11</sup> By Goldberg's count, Kahana 3 has six proems and eleven

homilies, and therefore it is irregular.<sup>12</sup> Although Goldberg used the ratio of proems to homilies as a criterion of a chapter's authenticity, he was not willing to assert that Kahana 3 is inauthentic.

The number of proems and homilies may not be an accurate reflection of the actual amount of material in the proemial and homiletical sections of a chapter. In order to solve this problem, Goldberg proposed counting the number of lines devoted to each type of material, in the expectation that the proems will take up more space than the homilies.<sup>13</sup> Such is indeed the case with Kahana 3, which has 87 lines of proems and only 84 lines of homilies. Thus Kahana 3 is a regular chapter.

Goldberg's model also contains a structural component, which enlarges on Margulies' model by differentiating among types of proems and homilies.<sup>14</sup> However, these distinctions cannot be applied to the sections of Kahana 3, which are homogeneous by Goldberg's definitions.

As a guide to distinguishing the proems from the homilies, Goldberg pointed to the phrase *מה כתיב למעלה מן העניין* which occurs at the beginning of a series of homilies, and the complementary *מה כתיב* *בתיבה* at the conclusion of the proems.<sup>15</sup> The latter phrase is used four times in Kahana 3. In its first and last occurrences, in Kahana 3:4 and 3:16 (Mandelbaum p. 43, line 1 and p. 53, line 10), it is used to move from one extraneous verse to the next. In its second and third occurrences, in Kahana 3:4 and 3:6 (Mandelbaum p. 43, line 7 and p. 45, line 9), it is indeed used to move from the theme of the proem to the Torah-verse by way of the preceding pericope. Goldberg himself mentioned the third occurrence.<sup>16</sup> However, only one of these sections, i.e., Kahana 3:6, can mark the end of the proems. Therefore, either



Goldberg erred as to the function of *מה כתיב בחרייה*, or the presence of Kahana 3:5-6 indicates that at least two editorial strata are to be found in this chapter.

The results of applying Goldberg's statistical model to Rabbati 12 are problematic, especially in view of the structural analysis of the chapter offered above. Taken as a whole and with its current division into sections, Rabbati 12 has seven proems and six homilies, which cover 162 and 102 lines, respectively. This is quite regular according to Goldberg, and would indicate the applicability of his model to the chapters of Pesikta Rabbati. However, when the contents of Rabbati 12 are analyzed as [seven] proems and [eight] homilies, the numbers of lines become [115] and [149], reversing the ratio.

The same conclusion is reached when Rabbati 12 is broken down into two portions. If we say that Rabbati 12:1-9 has five proems and four homilies, then we would count 137 and 50 lines, respectively, thus confirming the model. However, analyzing the contents of this section as [five] proems and [five] homilies yields 90 and 97 lines. This is not so far from the norm as to be unacceptable.

Whether Rabbati 12:10-13 is interpreted as having two homilies or three, its two proems cover only 25 lines, while the homilies take up 52 lines. This is totally irregular and cannot be reconciled with Goldberg's model. However, because the structural arguments already advanced will be bolstered by compositional evidence,<sup>17</sup> it seems preferable to question the applicability of the model to Rabbati 12, rather than the legitimacy of my suggested divisions.

The homilies based on Ex. 17 in Rabbati 12:5-9 are also perplexing. According to Goldberg's typology, these are subject-homilies, and

should be arranged between the proems and the verse-homilies. However, only one verse-homily is found in Rabbati 12:1-9, the second homily in Rabbati 12:5, which is based on Deut. 25:18. All the other homilies are based on Ex. 17. Surely this situation was not anticipated by Goldberg, and it lessens the viability of his model in relation to Pesikta Rabbati.

Heinemann's model encompasses the compositional aspects of a mid-rashic chapter; the chapter which conforms to this model is described as "integrated." Although the aspects of Heinemann's analysis of Vayikra Rabbah have already been described,<sup>18</sup> it will be worthwhile to review them briefly here. Integration is achieved when the following three criteria are met: a) thematic unity throughout the chapter, or the consistent illumination of the primary theme by a secondary theme; b) a logical or associative progression from point to point; and c) the purposeful and effective arrangement of material. Heinemann assumed the basic structure as elucidated by Margulies; he also assumed the editor's unwillingness to alter the tradition as he received it. Therefore, the editor's success in integration lay in the judicious choice and artistic arrangement of his materials. Heinemann identified various literary devices and techniques used in the proems, the homilies and the chapter as a whole. The stylistic hallmark of Vayikra Rabbah is the dialectical approach, a searching examination of conflicting points of view about the theme of the chapter.

In analyzing Kahana 3 and Rabbati 12 according to Heinemann's criteria, it will be necessary to discuss all sections of the chapter separately, in order to discover how they contribute to the unity of the whole. At those points where the structural analysis offered above

differs from the published division of the chapters into sections, an effort will be made to decide the issue on the basis of literary criteria.

Kahana 3:1 is a proem based on Ps. 109:14, "Let the iniquity of his fathers (עון אבותיו) be brought to remembrance (יזכר) unto the Lord; and let not the sin of his mother (חוטאת אמו) be blotted out (מחוק)."<sup>1</sup> The preacher intends to speak about Esau, to whom he refers without introduction. Surely neither Esau's fathers, Isaac and Abraham, nor his mother, Rebecca, are guilty of sin! Therefore, the verse must refer to Esau's sins against his fathers and his mother, which the preacher lists, adducing proof-texts for each.

There are two digressions. The first establishes that an evil student can cause his teacher to become blind, an affliction which Jeroboam brought upon Ahijah, just as the evil Esau caused Isaac's blindness. The other digression elaborates on Rebecca's death and the manner in which Jacob received news of it.

The section closes with God's statement that all those against whom Esau sinned are to requite him, including "you" (the Jewish people) and "I" (God). The Jews will mention his name on earth, and God will blot out his name in heaven. Ps. 109:15, which follows the proem-verse, is adduced as an affirmation: "Let his sins be before the Lord continually, that He may cut off the memory of them (זכרם) from the earth." The proem ends with Deut. 25:17, the first verse of the pericope: "Remember (זכור) what Amalek did to you. . ."

As mentioned above, the names of Esau and his descendants function as euphemisms for "Rome" and all the oppression, destruction and death

it brought upon the Jewish people. The import of this proem, therefore, is to identify Rome with all the oppressors of the Jewish people throughout their history. The proem also assures the Jews that a continuing sense of outrage, symbolized by the reading of Zachor, will result in divine retribution against Rome.

Kahana 3:2 is a proem based on Job 13:12, "Your memorials (זכרניכם) are like ashes (אפר), your eminences like eminences of clay (חמר)," which opens this section. God enjoins Israel to be punctilious in remembering two verses of Torah: a) Deut. 25:19, "You will blot out (תמחה) the memory of (זכר) Amalek," and b) Ex. 17:14, ". . .for I will utterly blot out (מחה אמחה) the memory of Amalek." These two verses seem to contradict each other in identifying those responsible for blotting out Amalek's memory. A reconciliation of these verses is achieved in Kahana 3:15,<sup>19</sup> but their treatment in this proem is of a different nature, and it is not fully developed. God encourages Israel to be worthy like Abraham, who compared himself to "dust and ashes (ואפר)" (Gen. 18:27); but if they are not worthy, they will be returned to slavery in Egypt, where they did hard labor with clay (בחמר; Ex. 1:14). Ashes are also a symbol of mourning and repentance. Therefore, Israel is reminded in this proem to utilize the remembrance of what Amalek/Rome did to them as a path to repentance for the sins which were punished by such dreadful chastisements. Repentance purifies the people; thus Israel will again become strong enough to blot out Amalek. The proem ends without the citation of a Torah-verse, and is identifiable as a proem only by the early use of the word פתח and the explication of a verse from the Writings.

The point of this proem seems to be that both the Jews and God are to do their parts in blotting out Amalek's memory, but that the Jews are to remain humble and penitent, and are not to exalt themselves overmuch. The final disposition of Amalek's fate is in God's hands, and Jewish arrogance will have drastic consequences.

The third proem is based on Ps. 32:9, "Do not be like the horse or mule which have no understanding, whose mouth must be held in (לבלום) with bit and bridle, lest he come near you." After listing a number of the horse's unsavory traits, the proem offers details of the way in which the horse repays good with evil, kicking (ברלם) its master. Jews, however, are enjoined to repay good with good, and evil with evil. Thus, on the basis of Deut. 23:8, Jews should not abhor their brother Edomites nor the Egyptians in whose land the Jews lived for so many years. However, returning to the Torah-verse (Deut. 25:17), they should remember what Amalek did to them and blot out his memory.

Although the lesson of just requital is clear, the differentiation of Edom and Amalek is problematical. Up to this point, they have been equated as symbols for Rome. Mandelbaum tried to solve this problem by saying that only the second part of Deut. 23:8 is applicable, i.e., ". . .do not abhor an Egyptian, because you were a stranger in his land." However, this explanation alone is not satisfactory, because the distinction between Edom and Amalek is elaborated in the parallel proem, Rabbati 12:3. This question must be set aside for the present.

Kahana 3:4 contains two verses which deal with the sin of using false weights and measures, Prov. 11:1 and Micah 6:11. Although Prov. 11:1 is the proem-verse, either verse could serve in this capacity. Both verses use some of the same vocabulary which appears in

Deut. 25:13-16, four verses which comprise laws of fair trade. Because this Deuteronomic passage immediately precedes Zachor, the preacher implies that the destruction caused by Amalek is the same punishment which is meted out to those who break the laws of fair weights and measures. One may conclude that the sufferings of Israel are not entirely unmerited, that they are God's response to the collective sins of the people. However, the agent of God's chastisements, Amalek, is irredeemably evil and destined for destruction.

We have already witnessed several times the use of "verbal tally," a technique in which a word in the proem-verse or its sequel is the same as a word in the Torah-verse. Kahana 3:5, a proem, depends entirely upon "verbal tally." Its proem-verse is Ps. 9:6, "You have rebuked the nations (גוים), You have destroyed the wicked (רשע), You have blotted out (מחיה) their name for ever and ever." The preacher finds verses which identify "the nations" and "the wicked." "The nations" refers to Amalek: ". . . Amalek was the first of the nations (גוים), but its fate is to perish forever" (Num. 24:20). "The wicked" refers to Esau: ". . . /Edom/ shall be called 'the border of wickedness' (רשעה), and 'the people whom the Lord execrates forever'" (Mal. 1:4). Jacob (i.e., Israel, Esau's brother) is immune to the charge that "the wicked" applies to them, because רשע is singular and not plural. ". . . You have blotted out" tallies with Deut. 25:19, ". . . you shall blot out (תמחה) the remembrance of Amalek. . ." The simple message of this proem is that Amalek and Esau (i.e., Rome) are evil and will be destroyed, but the Jewish people will survive them.

The last proem, Kahana 3:6, is based on Ps. 79:12, "Render unto our neighbors sevenfold (שבעתים) into their bosom (חיקם) their

reproach, with which they have reproached You, O Lord." Three types of "reproach" are named. The first is the amputation and further shameful maltreatment of the circumcised organ, which is set into a man's middle (בְּחִיקוֹ; lit. bosom). No Scriptural verse is associated with this act. The second is an unspecified act against the Torah,<sup>20</sup> of which it is written, "The words of the Lord are . . . seven times (שִׁבְעָתַיִם) refined" (Ps. 12:7). The third is the destruction of the Temple, of whose altar it is written, "And from the bottom (רִמְחִיק) on the ground to the lower ledge--two cubits" (Ezek. 43:14).

Samuel is said to have requited these "reproaches" by cutting Agag into pieces at Gilgal (I Sam. 15:33). Three methods of execution are suggested: a) cutting out small pieces of Agag's flesh, b) spread-eagling, and c) castration. The latter is associated with Deut. 25:11-12, with the implication that Roman functionaries did to Jewish males what the wife in Deut. 25:11 did to help her husband. For this reason, the Jews are commanded several verses later to "remember what Amalek did to you" (Deut. 25:17). Two minor digressions add little to the poem.

This poem suggests that the punishment be made to fit the crime. Certainly Jews of this period derived some vicarious triumph over their oppressors in expanding upon Samuel's execution of the Amalekite king.

Having completed the poems, let us summarize the flow of the chapter up to this point. The Jewish people have a role to play in requiting Amalek (Kahana 3:1), but they should remain humble and repentant (3:2) and should not allow their vengefulness to extend unfairly to other peoples (3:3). Indeed, because of their sins the Jewish people have brought God's chastisements upon themselves, but His agent

is destined for total destruction (3:4). Returning to the opening statement, we note that the Jews will survive oppression and participate in Amalek's extinction (3:5), which will be carried out in an appropriately gruesome and reproachful manner (3:6).

With Kahana 3:7 begin the homilies which expound various words and phrases in Zachor. In this section, the commandment to remember (זכור; Deut. 25:17) is turned back upon God. Mere mortals are forgetful, but God does not forget, and--what is more important--Israel's enemies offended Him, too. "Remember (זכר), O Lord, against the children of Edom the day of Jerusalem--they who said 'Raze it, raze it (ערי ערי) even to its foundation'" (Ps. 137:7). This much is sufficient for the theme of the chapter. However, the section continues with two explanations of the word ערי, each with its proof-text.

Thus the chapter has taken on a new dimension. God not only dispenses justice; He is also--if it were possible--an "injured" party.

In Kahana 3:8, Amalek (עמלק; Deut. 25:17) is first described as a swiftly moving "locust people" (עם ילק), and then as a "licking people" (עם לק), eager to lap up Israel's blood like a dog or a fly. Finally, Amalek is said to have traveled 400 parasangs (over 1500 miles) to make war upon Israel at Refidim. The function of this section, therefore, is to add bloodthirstiness to the list of Amalek's evil traits.

Kahana 3:9 is brief, but it has three distinct parts. Expounding the words "on the road when you came out of Egypt" (Deut. 25:17), the preacher first compares the Amalekites with bandits. A parable follows, in which a king protects his vineyard with a fence and a watchdog.



When the king's own son breaks through the fence, he is bitten by the dog. Later, the king reminds the son of his transgression by saying, "Remember (זכור) how the dog bit you." In this parable God is the king, Israel is His son, and Amalek is the dog and the agent of God's chastisement. Israel has become, in effect, the bandit. The symbolic value of the vineyard, however, is unclear in the context of the pericope, thus rendering the exact nature of Israel's sin unclear, as well.

In the final part of Kahana 3:9, Israel's sins are shown to be doubt and ingratitude. "'Is the Lord among us, or not?' Then came Amalek" (Ex. 17:7-8). This, however, is not banditry. Except for the first line of this section, which seems to continue the approach of Kahana 3:8, the concept expressed is Israel's chastisement at Refidim. God punishes Israel by sending Amalek against them, and thereby proves that He is indeed present with His people, even though He temporarily declines to protect them. This dramatic intervention in Israel's journey expresses the paradoxical, bittersweet nature of a rabbinic concept, chastisements out of love (איסורין של אהבה). Thus we return to an idea expressed in Kahana 3:4, that Israel brought their suffering upon themselves.

A parable of Israel's ingratitude is rendered more aptly at the beginning of Kahana 3 as given in MS ז (Mandelbaum p. 35, lines 6-14) and in Rabbati 13:6 (Friedmann p. 55a, line 15--p. 55b, line 6). A man carried his son on his shoulders through the marketplace, and bought for the boy whatever he wanted. The son asked a passer-by, "Have you seen my father?"; whereupon the father chided his son for his

ingratitude and threw him to the ground, where a dog bit him. In the same way, when Israel left Egypt, they were enfolded in clouds of glory and all their needs and wants were provided, yet they questioned God's presence among them (Ex. 17:7). God then caused a "dog" to "bite" them: "Then came Amalck. . ." "Therefore it is said: 'Remember (זכור)' (Deut. 25:17).

This parable explains only the last portion of Kahana 3:9. How, then, did the parable of the vineyard come to be included? The answer is provided by a parallel passage in Rabbati 13:7 (Friedmann p. 55b, lines 6-13). It is not so significant that the details of the parable are different here. The important aspect of the passage is the reason given for the parable. "God did not have to say Remember what Amalek did to you. Rather, He could have said, 'Remember what you did at Refidim.' . . . Why, then, did He say 'Remember what Amalek did?' He made them aware of their misbehavior indirectly." It is apparent, therefore, that the precise details of the parable in Kahana 3:9 are not as important as the indirectness with which God reproved His people. We may now summarize Kahana 3:9 as follows: By their ingratitude, Israel brought God's chastisement upon themselves, but His tenderness and consideration for His people are revealed in the indirect way in which He reminds them of their misconduct.

Kahana 3:10 offers three interpretations of the word קרך ("he met you;" Deut. 25:13). The basic interpretation of this word would associate it with the root קרה, "to encounter," which carries a connotation of mere chance that the rabbis could not accept. Certainly, everything that happened to Israel was divinely ordained! Therefore,

קרן is associated in this section with three different words. The first of these, קר'י, is derived from קרה: Amalek "made you unclean" by forcing you to commit pederasty. The second is קרא: Amalek "read" your names from genealogical lists and "called" you out from within the clouds of glory, and then he killed you. The last is קר: Amalek "cooled your fearsome reputation" by entering into battle with you, even though he was "scalded" in the process. In this section, therefore, the theme of Amalek's sins against Israel is further elaborated.

In interpreting the words ריזנב בכ ("he struck at your rear;" Deut. 25:18) in Kahana 3:11, the preacher again mentions the mockery of circumcision by the Amalekites. He goes on to say that Amalek taught Israel some sort of grossly sacrilegious act which he had learned from Esau. The nature of this act is not clear, and various commentators differ about its specifics. Alternately, the preacher suggests that Esau coughed up phlegm and exhibited his member as signs of contempt for God. This is yet another instance of Amalek's wickedness. It is surprising that Israel is not castigated for learning from Amalek.

Kahana 3:12 expounds the phrase "all who were enfeebled (הנחשלים) at your rear" (Deut. 25:18). In this section, it is interesting to note the names of those to whom the aggadot are ascribed. R. Judah divides the word נחשלים into נה and של, saying that everyone who נינרה was cast out (נישרל) from the clouds of glory, and thus exposed to Amalek's attack. Various commentators differ about the meaning of נינרה. Mandelbaum said that נינרה means that they deliberately disrupted or caused errors in divinely ordained observance of rest.

Braude claimed that נִינְרַח means "hung back feebly from obeying God's commands." However, R. Judah may only have meant "everyone whom the cloud caused to remain in his place," with no reason given for the coming punishment. This last suggestion is parallel in form with the interpretation of R. Neḥemiah, who explained נְחָשָׁלִים as if it were spelled נְחָשָׁרִים: "Everyone whom the cloud expelled was cast out."<sup>20a</sup> The rabbis added that the cloud expelled the tribe of Dan because they worshipped idols.

A different interpretation of נְחָשָׁלִים was offered by R. Isaac, who transposed the letters of the root חָשַׁל, and explained the word as "whisperers" (מְלַחְשִׁים). Again we encounter R. Judah, R. Neḥemiah and the rabbis, each with a different account of the content of the whispering. It is somewhat confusing that, within a single midrashic unit, R. Judah and R. Neḥemiah are cited as the authors of contradictory interpretations of the very same word. Thus, Kahana 3:12 expands the theme of Israel's sins, which exposed them to God's chastisement through Amalek.

Kahana 3:13 begins with a brief comment on the phrase, "when you were faint (עִיֵּף) and weary (וַיִּגַע)" (Deut. 25:18). The occurrence of two synonyms must be explained, because they seem to be needlessly redundant. Yet the Rabbis assume absolute economy of Scriptural language, which means that all seeming redundancies are advised and convey additional meaning. Therefore the explanation is given, "faint because of thirst and weary because of the hardships of travel."

The section continues by expounding the phrase, "and he (Amalek) did not fear God (וְלֹא יָרָא אֱלֹהִים)" (Deut. 25:18). The preacher begins by saying that Esau's descendants will only fall at the hands of

Rachel's descendants, basing himself on Jer. 49:20, "Surely the youngest (צעירי) of the flock shall drag Edom away." Rachel's sons were the youngest of Jacob's children. This comment leads into a series of four comparisons between Esau and Joseph, Rachel's elder son--comparisons which are always favorable to Joseph. The last of these returns to the Torah-verse by demonstrating that Esau/Amalek "did not fear God" (Deut. 25:18), but Joseph said, "I fear God (את-האלהים אני ירא)" (Gen. 42:18). The last three comparisons end with the refrain, "Let this one (Amalek) fall at the hand of that one (Joseph)."

The first brief aggadah, based on the words "faint" and "weary," does not contribute to the thematic development of the chapter. However, the second part of the section expands on the theme of Israel's ultimate triumph over their oppressors, despite Israel's weakness and its persecutors'--especially Rome's--strength. There is no evidence to suggest that the virtue of Joseph as demonstrated in the comparisons conceals a reference to the eschatological Messiah ben Joseph. Rather, the figure of Joseph points to Joshua, his descendant, who repulsed the Amalekite attack.

Kahana 3:14 is a comment on Deut. 25:19 in its entirety, "Therefore, when the Lord your God grants you safety from all your enemies around you, in the land that the Lord your God is giving you as a hereditary portion, you shall blot out the memory of Amalek from under heaven. Do not forget!" The preacher lists three commandments which Israel were to fulfill upon their entry into Canaan, the last of which is Deut. 25:19, the physical destruction of Amalek. The other two are the appointment of a king, and the building of a Temple. To a Palestinian

Jewish audience living under Roman oppression, this would have been a tremendously moving statement. Suffering under Roman rule, they would indeed wish to appoint their own king.<sup>21</sup> Still mourning the destroyed Temple, and discouraged by broken Roman promises of its reconstruction, they would wish to see it reestablished. And most of all, they would wish to banish all remembrance of their persecution by the Caesars. Indeed, they did not and would not forget. This section carries unspoken messianic implications; although it is the shortest in the chapter (less than four lines), it is one of the most powerful.

Kahana 3:15 deals with the reconciliation of two seemingly contradictory verses. The first of these is Deut. 25:19, "You shall blot out (מחיתה) the memory of Amalek." The other is Ex. 17:14, ". . .for I will utterly blot out (סחה אמהה) the memory of Amalek." The resolution of this contradiction is quite different from that in Kahana 3:2. Before Amalek moved against God's throne, the Jews were commanded to blot out his memory; afterwards, God himself took on the responsibility. How, then, can a mere mortal present any danger to God's throne? Because "they shall call Jerusalem 'the throne of the Lord (כסא יהוה)'" (Jer. 3:17), and Jerusalem has been attacked by many "Amaleks." Chief among them, of course, is Rome. Therefore, "I will utterly blot out the name of Amalek." God appears again as the "injured" party, and His prerogative to dispose of Amalek's fate is reaffirmed.

Mandelbaum indicated a sectional division at this point, but reasons have already been offered for believing that such a division is not appropriate.<sup>22</sup> Another consideration may now be added. Kahana 3:15 focused on the motif of God's throne; the same motif begins and

ends Mandelbaum's 16th section. Thus, Kahana 3:15-16 are related thematically, and should not have been separated in the critical edition. However, because Mandelbaum's work has set a standard for discourse, we will continue to refer to the remaining portion of the chapter as Kahana 3:16.

This final passage begins by quoting Ex. 17:16, "[Moses] said, 'Hand upon the throne of the Lord (יָד עַל כִּסֵּי יְהוָה): The Lord will have war with Amalek. . . .'" Moses' utterance is commonly understood as an oath, and the preacher depicts God as swearing not to accept Amalekite proselytes. God's vow is an elaboration of Moses' statement, "By My right hand and again by My right hand,<sup>23</sup> by My throne and again by My throne (יְמִינֵי יְמִינֵי כִסְּאֵי כִסְּאֵי). . . ." An example is given of David's execution of this policy of non-acceptance (II Sam. 1:13-16), with a short digression on the incident.

The section continues with an exposition of the concluding words of Ex. 17:16, "from generation to generation (מִדּוֹר דּוֹר)." The incomplete spelling of דּוֹר allows the preacher to treat the two words as one--מִדּוֹרֹד--with the meaning, "I will roll after (track down) [Amalek] from generation to generation." Three rabbis define the "generations" which are referred to, each of which begins and ends with victors over Amalek: a) from Moses to Samuel, b) from Samuel to Mordecai and Esther, and c) from Mordecai and Esther to the messianic king. Another digression seeks to establish that only three generations are involved.

Now that the messianic implications of the end of the chapter have been rendered explicit, the preacher concludes with a kind of double "coda," whose parts share the same formula: "As long as Amalek's descendants exist in the world. . .when Amalek's descendants are

expunged (אבד) from the world. . .," a messianic expectation. The first example says that--if it were possible--it is as if God's countenance were hidden by a wing (כנף) as long as Amalek exists. This concept is based on Isa. 30:20, "Your Teacher shall not conceal Himself (יכנף) any more, but" when Amalek has perished, "your eyes shall see your Teacher."

The conclusion of the chapter returns to the theme of God's throne and to the oath in Ex. 17:16, "Hand upon the throne (כס) of the Lord (יה): The Lord will have war with Amalek . . ." Two words are abbreviated in this verse--כס instead of כסא, and יה instead of יהוה--leading the preacher to say that God's name and throne will not be complete until Amalek's descendants are destroyed. This remarkable statement is buttressed by the citation of Ps. 9:7-8, "O enemy! The waste places have come to an end forever; and the cities which you uprooted--their very memory has perished (אבד זכרם). But the Lord (יהוה) is enthroned forever; He has established His throne (כסא) for judgment."

Much needs to be said about this conclusion. 1) In Ps. 9:8, the words for "throne" and "Lord" appear in their complete form, which fulfills the preacher's homiletical intent. 2) The use of Ps. 9:7-8 at the end of the chapter represents an artistic choice on the part of the editor. Ps. 9:6 is the basis of the proem in Kahana 3:5, and the use of the two succeeding verses as a *ḥatimah* helps to unify the entire chapter. 3) The *ḥatimah* heightens the themes already discussed. The fight against Amalek is not just another instance of God redeeming Israel. God is so committed to the well-being of His people and to the advent of the Messiah that He places His very name and throne in



the balance against the attainment of these goals. God fought for Israel against Amalek and Haman; He will fight against Rome, as well.

Let us now summarize the progression of the entire chapter. Although the proems stated God's decisive role in requiting Amalek, the focus was on Israel's attitudes and actions, with an emphasis on humility, repentance and justice. Even in Kahana 3:6, in which Israel calls on God to punish "our neighbors" for having offended Him, the actual punishment is meted out by Samuel to Agag, with no hint of divine assistance. However, God is quickly called upon again to punish Edom's descendants for their destruction of Jerusalem (3:7), and the editor returns to the task of building the case against Amalek (3:8, 10-11). An important part of this case is the humble realization that Israel strays from the right path and is deserving of chastisement (3:9, 12); despite this, God shows tenderness and compassion for His people even in the act of punishing them (3:9).

The remaining sections of the chapter have an increasingly militant and messianic tone. Despite his strength, Amalek--i.e., Rome--will fall at the hands of Israel (3:13), who will then reestablish national autonomy, rebuild the Temple and wipe out all traces of Roman dominance (3:14). God will aid Israel in accomplishing these goals, which are also His goals; for He remembers "the day of Jerusalem" (Ps. 137:7), which is His throne (3:15). God swears upon His throne--i.e., upon Jerusalem--to fight Amalek. The successful conclusion of this battle will not only restore the fortunes of Israel, it will complete the still--if one may say it--imperfect Throne and Name (3:"16").

Kahana 3 admirably meets all of Heinemann's criteria for an

integrated chapter. The themes of the chapter are homogeneous and unified in a way which is appropriate to the occasion, Shabbat Zachor. Every section deals in some way with the theme of Amalek's (Rome's) evil and the fight against him. Thus there is always at least an associative progression from point to point. This is combined with a prayerful attitude, as if to say that Israel is not intent on pleading its own merits but on ridding the world of Amalek's evil, a goal which God will pursue not only for Israel's sake, but for His own. However, the speed with which Amalek will be uprooted is conditioned by Israel's return to righteousness. Amalek will remain in the world as long as God needs a rod to chastise His errant people. Finally, Kahana 3 exhibits a purposeful and effective arrangement of material in what Heinemann would call a "rising order." The opening sections of the chapter focus on the earthly conflict of Israel and Amalek; the case against Amalek is fully developed; and the chapter ends with a series of continually heightening messianic climaxes.

In his juxtapositions of Israel's misconduct a) with Amalek's evil, and b) with Israel's ultimate triumph and redemption (N.B.: The battle with Amalek occurred shortly after Israel was redeemed from Egyptian slavery), the editor employed the dialectical approach which Heinemann saw as the stylistic hallmark of Vayikra Rabbah. This is not surprising in the light of those theories which place the editing of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana near in time and place to that of Vayikra Rabbah. We may also note that the *ḥatimah* not only refers back to a verse used in a poem, but it also develops organically out of the motifs of remembrance and God's throne. All things considered, this chapter is a fine example of the editor's art.

We turn now to the compositional analysis of Rabbati 12, bearing in mind that neither Margulies' nor Goldberg's model applies adequately to this chapter. It is impossible to know, without detailed study of Pesikta Rabbati as a whole, whether these discrepancies are limited to Rabbati 12. Inevitably, some of the points made in the analysis of Kahana 3 will be repeated here. However, because of variants in style and arrangement, and possibly also in intent, Rabbati 12 must be as painstakingly analyzed as its cousin in Pesikta d'Rav Kahana.

Rabbati 12:1 begins with a Yelammedenu-proem on the question of the proper blessing to be said when walking through a cemetery. This blessing is given as, "Blessed is He who keeps track of each of you." Thus, the theme of remembrance is indirectly introduced. The blessing's unusual direct address to the supposedly uncomprehending dead is supported by the statement that the power of speech is the only difference between the righteous dead and the living.

A second halachic question follows: When a man walks through a cemetery knowing that a righteous man is buried there--if he mentions the man, is he also required to mention his deeds? The implied answer is positive, because Scripture is adduced to prove that when God mentions a righteous man, like Abraham or Moses, He also immediately mentions his good deeds. By the same token, when God mentions a wicked man, He also mentions his wicked deeds. One of these was Amalek, whose attack God commanded Moses to record. When Moses remonstrated with God for remembering the deeds of the wicked, God explained that the righteous and their deeds are remembered so as to give them their future reward; but the wicked and their deeds are remembered so as to

punish them and to blot out their name. The preacher concludes this proem by referring to Zachor, "Remember (זכור) what Amalek did to you" (Deut. 25:17); . . . "You shall blot out (תמחה) the remembrance of Amalek" (Deut. 25:19). The halachic proem in this chapter functions in the same way as a regular proem, by teasing the congregation or reader into attentive waiting to see how such an extraneous issue will be brought to bear upon the day's Scriptural lesson. The connection is easily made in this proem. From speaking to the righteous dead and remembering their deeds it is only a short step to speaking of the wicked dead, and thence to Amalek (Rome). The message of this proem is that God will remember Amalek in order to blot out his memory, and that the Jews are to do the same.

Rabbati 12:2 is a proem based on Job 13:12, "Your memorials (זכרונות) are like ashes (אפר), your eminences like eminences of clay (חמר)." The first part of this section, in which the proem-verse is explained as Job's rebuke to his friends for their hypocrisy, has no thematic connection with the chapter. In the other part of the proem, the verse is applied to Israel, to whom God said, "I command that you make mention of two remembrances (זכרונות), i.e., two verses containing words derived from the root זכר): 'Remember (זכור) what Amalek did to you'" (Deut. 25:17), and "'You shall blot out the remembrance (זכר) of Amalek'" (Deut. 25:19). Furthermore, if Israel does not remember and read these commandments every year, God will cause them to return to working with clay (חמר) in Egypt. In other words, Israel's failure to remember what Amalek did, or their acquiescence in what Rome does, will nullify God's redemptive acts.

Unlike Kahana 3:2, no mention is made here of Israel's worthiness, nor is there any allusion to mourning or repentance. Only the commandment remains, to read annually the verses of Zachor. The absence of the analogy with Abraham and the implied admonition to repent may stem from the faulty transmission of this aggadah, part of it having been lost. One might also find a cause for the alteration in the resignation of a community, battered for centuries, which has found repentance to be of no avail against the oppressor. The rabbis, in their wisdom, decreed that Zachor shall be read, but one senses the community's hopelessness coupled with the fear of the consequences of disobedience to the tradition.

The third proem, Rabbati 12:3, is based on Ps. 32:9, "Do not be like the horse or mule which have no understanding, whose mouth must be held in with bit and bridle, lest he come near you." As in Kahana 3:3, the Israelites are enjoined, when they enter their land, to requite good with good and evil with evil. Therefore, in accordance with Deut. 23:8, they are not to abhor their brother Edomites nor the Egyptians in whose land they lived for so many years. However, "Remember what Amalek did to you. . ." This proem makes the same unusual distinction between Edom and Amalek as does its parallel. The reason for this distinction is simply not apparent from its context in the proem or the chapter. However, the lesson of just requital is the same as in the parallel.

Rabbati 12:4 is a proem based on Ps. 109:14, "Let the iniquity of his fathers (עַן אֲבוֹתָיו) be brought to remembrance (יִזְכֵּר) unto the Lord; and let not the sin of his mother (וְהַטָּאת אִמּוֹ) be blotted out (תִּמְחָה)." As in Kahana 3:1, the phrases עַן אֲבוֹתָיו and הַטָּאת אִמּוֹ are

taken to mean "the iniquity against his fathers" and "the sin against his mother," respectively. However, in Rabbati 12:4 the preacher extends the connotation of the word "fathers" to include not only Abraham and Isaac, but God, the Jewish people, and Jacob, as well. The sins against Abraham, Isaac, and Rebecca are essentially the same as those listed in Kahana 3:1; but the sins against the others have a marked religio-political tone: a) against God--burning the Torah and the Temple; b) against Israel--burning, killing, and exile; and c) against Jacob--murderous threats which forced him into exile. All those against whom Esau sinned are to requite him, including "you" (the Jewish people) and "I" (God). Finally, the Jews are exhorted with two verses to blot out his name from the earth: "Remember (זכור) . . ." (Deut. 25:17) and "You shall blot out (תמחה)" (Deut. 25:19). By his descent from Esau, Amalek/Rome is identified with all the Jews' oppressors throughout history. In this proem, it is Esau himself who is responsible for the excesses of the victorious Empire. Assurance is given that God will join the Jews in "repaying" Esau's evil.

Rabbati 12:5 begins as a proem based on Ps. 9:6, "You have rebuked the nations (גוים), You have destroyed the wicked (רשע), You have blotted out (מחית) their name for ever and ever." As in Kahana 3:5, the three parts of the verse are interpreted separately, but the technique of "verbal tally" is used only at the end. Thus, the גוים are the nations (האומות) which make evil plans against Israel, only to be forestalled by God. The רשע is Haman, a surviving descendant of Amalek, who sought to exterminate Israel. The only tally is ". . . You have blotted out (מחית)" with Deut. 25:19, ". . . you shall blot out

(תמוה) the remembrance of Amalek." The implications of this proem are more general than those of its parallel in Kahana 3:5. There, by reference to Amalek and Esau, a direct but veiled statement was made about the longed-for overthrow of Rome. Here, we find references only to "the nations" and to Haman, who is depicted as a survivor. Clearly, this proem reflects a political reality unlike that which may be inferred from Kahana 3. "The nations" may refer to the successive barbarian invasions which crippled the Roman Empire, and from which the Jews also suffered. Haman's status as a survivor may indicate Rome's weakened condition. Certainly, the figure of Haman never carried the terrifying connotations traditionally ascribed to Amalek.

Following the proem, Rabbati 12:5 assumes the form of a homily. As mentioned above,<sup>24</sup> there are two distinct homilies in this section. The first of these, which I have designated Rabbati 12:[6], begins with the restatement of Deut. 25:17, "Remember what Amalek did to you. . ." This is immediately followed by Ex. 17:9, "Moses said to Joshua, 'Choose men for us,' etc. . . ." Braude agreed with Friedmann that Deut. 25:17 was originally linked with Ex. 17:8, "Amalek came and fought with Israel at Refidim."<sup>25</sup> Furthermore, Friedmann thought that the editor cited Deut. 25:17 at this point "in order to return to the basic story [of the Amalekite attack] which is in פרשת בשלח, expounding all the verses there until he concludes with the verses from Psalms with which he opened his discourse."<sup>26</sup> This conclusion occurs at the end of Rabbati 12:9 with the citation of Ps. 9:7-8. One may infer that Friedmann also rejected the established division of Rabbati 12 into sections, and viewed Rabbati 12:5-9 as one long section. "Because this section begins with a proem," Friedmann might

say, "it should not be surprising that two proems follow it, Rabbati 12:10-11."

Let us return to the analysis of Rabbati 12:[6], which has been identified as a homily. Based on Ex. 17:9, it comments on almost every word of the verse. Some of this commentary is irrelevant to the theme of the chapter, e.g., the first comment, which concerns the etiquette of the master-disciple relationship.

The preacher next inquires into the type of men whom Joshua was to choose. One comment favors righteous men as exemplified by Eldad and Medad (Num. 11:26), whose modesty was legendary. The other comment merely says, "Valiant men (אנשים גבורים)." Apparently, both qualities were deemed desirable in the contemporary Jewish community, but the cursory treatment given to bravery may indicate that rebellion was not encouraged.

Ex. 17:9 continues, ". . .and go out, fight with Amalek tomorrow; I will stand on the top of the hill. . . ." Moses' stance on top of the hill recalls a parable in which a widow's son, rather than joining the local garrison to repel bandits, stands on the roof of his house to watch the battle. The preacher fails to interpret the parable. Braude claimed that the widow's son represents Moses, enfeebled by Israel's lack of faith (Ex. 17:7) and therefore unable to participate in the battle. Braude further stated that the absence of an interpretation of the parable is deliberate, because the rabbis were "aghast at the idea of spelling out in full the implications. . . ." <sup>27</sup> Friedmann quoted an older commentary, Zera Efraim, which is similar to Braude's interpretation in that it (Zera Efraim) also imputes weakness to Moses. In this case, Moses is said to be afraid. Friedmann himself



thought that "I will watch (צופה)" is an error, and that "I will cry out (צורעק)" is the correct reading. Thus, Moses stood on the hill in order to pray in Israel's behalf.<sup>28</sup>

It is difficult to understand why the editor would choose to include an aggadah to which he reacted with horror or repulsion. Friedmann's interpretation, even though it involves a textual emendation, fits into the context of the following passage; Moses pleads for Israel by invoking the merits of the Torah (particularly the Ten Commandments), the legal decisions based upon the Torah, the Patriarchs, the Matriarchs, and his own miracle-working staff. The preacher comments that the merit of the staff is decisive, for although Amalek can also claim the merit of the same Patriarchs, Abraham and Isaac, he does not possess the staff, and never has.

Another interpretation of the parable of the widow's son is suggested by the political situation. The decaying Roman Empire was involved in wars with barbarians and Persians. Although Jewish communities enlisted at various times on one side or the other, they were not always allowed to fight, and they suffered the depredations of all parties. They were powerless to do anything but--to borrow the metaphor--climb onto the roof and watch--and pray. Thus, Moses' stance on the hill becomes a poignant symbol of the sorry state of the Palestinian Jewish community.

Now that Moses' instructions to Joshua (Ex. 17:9) have been expounded, the preacher asks why Moses spoke with Joshua, and not with someone else. The answer given is that Joshua was descended from Rachel. Immediately thereafter, Deut. 25:18 is quoted in full, but only for the sake of its last three words, ". . .and he (Amalek) did

not fear God (ולא ירא אלהים)." The preacher then launches upon a series of nine comparisons of Joseph and Esau. These are always favorable to Joseph, and all but the last end either with Esau's fall at Joseph's hands or with Joseph's exaction of punishment from Esau. By means of these comparisons, Joseph and Esau become role models for Israel and Rome. They stand in opposition to each other; the first is a paradigm of righteousness and the other is irredeemably evil. The final comparison opposes Esau's irreverence--"and he did not fear God" (Deut. 25:13)--to Joseph's piety: "I fear God" (Gen. 42:18).

Even though this homily arises from Ex. 17:9, it is appropriate to assign it independent status as Rabbati 12:[7]. The question it seeks to answer grows out of the context of Ex. 17:9, not its content. It is more accurate to say that it is based on Deut. 25:18. Its subject is the merit of Joseph (handed down to Joshua), not the prayer of Moses, as in Rabbati 12:[6]. Its method and formulae set it apart from the preceding homily.

Having mentioned the fear of God, and also having mentioned (in the course of the comparisons) Joseph's brothers, the question arises: Why did Moses call upon a descendant of Rachel? Why did he not call upon a descendant of one of Joseph's older brothers? In Rabbati 12:6, the answer to this question is given by means of an imaginary debate in "heaven." None of the heavenly counterparts of the tribal fathers is worthy to prevail in debate over Esau's counterpart; to each, Esau can name his unexpiated sin. Only before Joseph's counterpart does Esau fall, having no rebuttal against an unblemished character. Joseph will destroy Esau like a fire burning stubble (Obad. 1:18).

The heavenly counterparts of Joseph and Esau, along with the original Biblical personalities, serve as symbols of the conflict between Israel and Rome. Joseph is a model to which Israel must aspire and a goal to attain, before Esau can be blotted out.

Because Rabbati 12:6 is not based on one of the verses from Exodus or Deuteronomy dealing with Amalek, it is not in keeping with established practice to set it off as an independent section. However, it does continue the theme of the merit of Joseph; therefore, it should be assimilated to Rabbati 12:[7]. This homily retains the tone of Rabbati 12:[6]. The heavenly debate is far off in the future as Joseph's life in the past. Action by contemporary Jews will not avail against Esau. It remains only to wait for the Messiah.

Rabbati 12:[8], which is Rabbati 12:7 in the Breslau edition, interprets Ex. 17:15 as the conclusion of the battle with Amalek, which is recounted in Ex. 17:9-14. The name of Moses' altar, יהרה נסי, is taken as a comment on the preceding verses. Four interpretations of this name are given: a) "My miracles (נסי) are the Lord's, "i.e., the Lord performed miracles for His own sake; b) "The Lord is my (Moses') banner, and I am Your children's banner;" c) "The Lord has made of me (Israel) a banner," raised high like a ship's flag; and d) "O Lord, perform a miracle for me!" This last interpretation is illustrated by a parable in which a king, although he is angry with his wife, goes to a goldsmith and orders a piece of jewelry for her, how much more will he do for his wife if she does his will! In the same way, God performed miracles for Israel, even though they angered Him with their doubt (Ex. 17:7). How much more will He do for Israel. . .

The implications of this parable for the contemporary Jewish community are clear. God's miraculous intervention is the only means of improving their pitiable state. By doing God's will, the Jews can improve the chances for a greater miracle to occur more quickly.

Rabbati 12:[9], formerly Rabbati 12:8, contains a phrase-by-phrase exposition of Ex. 17:12. The topics covered include the heaviness of Moses' hands, Moses' sharing of Israel's troubles, and the meaning of Aaron's and Hur's standing on either side of Moses,

The last interpretation of Ex. 17:12 is based on the words, ". . .his hands were steady (אִמְרָנָה) until the sun set (בָּא)." Amalek fell because of the merit of Moses' hands and the pain which Moses suffered. Even so, Amalek's sun did not set; some of his descendants survived the battle. Only in the future, when Esther comes, who was brought up (אִמְרָנָה) to have trust (אִמְרָנָה) in God (Esther 2:7), will Amalek be eradicated. By inference, when Moses raised his hands all that day, he was "bringing up" Israel to trust in God. Even so, and despite Joshua's overwhelming (וַיִּחַלֵּשׁ) victory, Amalek was not wiped out. They were greatly weakened, but they survived (חָרַלְשׁ וּמִשְׁתַּיִר; Ex. 17:13). The implications are clear: if Israel has faith, the weakened remnant of the Roman Empire will be uprooted from the earth.

Rabbati 12:[10] (or Rabbati 12:9) offers four interpretations of Ex. 17:16, "Moses said, 'Hand upon the throne of the Lord (יָד עַל כִּסֵּא יְהוָה)!' The Lord will have war with Amalek from generation to generation." In the first comment, God swears by His throne (נִשְׁבַּע בְּכִסְאוֹ) not to accept any proselyte from among Amalek's descendants, and David executes this policy (and the Amalekite messenger). Without the verbal tally employed in Kahana 3:16, the second comment explains the incomplete

spelling of the divine name (יה) as the result of Amalek's continued existence in the world. It is--if it were possible--as if the divine countenance were covered, but when Amalek is uprooted from the world, it will be uncovered. In a third comment, the hand (יד) upon God's throne is said to be Amalek's (Rome's) hand stretched out against Jerusalem, which is called "the throne of the Lord (כסא יהוה)" (Jer. 3:17). Before Amalek attacked Jerusalem, Israel was commanded to blot out Amalek's memory (Deut. 25:19); but after Amalek's attack, God involved Himself directly in the struggle. The last interpretation takes up the incomplete spelling of "the throne of the Lord (כס יה)," saying that until Amalek is uprooted from the world, it is--if one may say it--as if God's throne and name are incomplete. They will become complete when Amalek perishes. The section--and, according to our structural analysis, the first of the two component chapters of Rabbati 12--concludes with a proof-text from Ps. 9:7-8, "O enemy! The waste places have come to an end forever; and the cities which you uprooted--their very memory has perished. But the Lord (יהוה) is enthroned forever; He has established His throne (כסא) for judgment." In these verses, the words for "throne" and "Lord" are given in their full spellings. The four aggadot in this section all comment on Ex. 17:16, but they do not seem to reflect any purposeful arrangement. The last three aggadot all speak in eschatological terms of God's involvement in the war against Amalek. No role in this struggle is assigned to Israel.

The repeated use in these final verses of the word "forever (לעולם . . . לנצח)" establishes the messianic tone appropriate to a *ḥatimah*. As if to complete and unify the chapter, the use of Ps. 9:7-8 refers back to Ps. 9:6, the proem-verse of Rabbati 12:5. Another

argument for the conclusion that Rabbati 12:1-9 comprises a separate chapter may be derived from its use of Torah-verses. All of the proems are based on Torah-verses from Zachor, but the only one out of five homilies to be so based is Rabbati 12:[7]. All the others are based on Ex. 17:9-16, which recounts the battle with Amalek. This alteration in mid-chapter of the basic passage is most unusual. However, as if to anchor the chapter to Zachor, each of Zachor's three verses occurs in the chapter, and each is in its proper order. Deut. 25:17 is cited at the very beginning of the homilies, Rabbati 12:[6]. Deut. 25:18 is the basis for Rabbati 12:[7]. Finally, Deut. 25:19 is cited in Rabbati 12:[10]. Thus, the editor seems to have been conscious of the need to preserve order. In the remainder of Rabbati 12, the three verses of Zachor, in order, are the sole bases of two proems and three homilies. If the chapter as a whole were one unified work, it would be most unusual to start another complete cycle of citations of Zachor, instead of interweaving the sections in order to present an integrated sequence. (We have already remarked on the strangeness of finding two proems which follow upon a ḥatimah.<sup>29</sup>)

Let us summarize Rabbati 12 up to this point. God and Israel remember Amalek's wickedness (12:1). Israel's failure to remember would nullify God's redemptive acts (12:2), but Israel must obey the rule of justice, and not recall for evil any who have done them good (12:3). Esau's sins against God and Israel are described; both will join in requiting Esau (12:4). However, the preacher turns to God for redemption from Israel's oppressors, a weakened Rome and an increasingly strong group of other powers (12:5). Israel's role in its pitiable state is the raising up of righteous men like Abraham, Moses (12:[6])

and Joseph (12: [7]), who, by doing God's will and trusting Him, might hasten Israel's redemption and Rome's final downfall (12: [8-9]). But all concrete action is in God's hands; it is He Who must redress Israel's grievances and His own (12: [10]).

Although this sermon is integrated to a degree, it is not as successful as Kahana 3. Rabbati 12:1-[10] exhibits thematic unity, in that each section is related to the theme of Amalek's downfall by means of Israel's piety and God's power. However, the progression from point to point is often retarded by irrelevant and discursive material; this may indicate the editor's desire to preserve intact the rabbinic traditions about the verses which are discussed. The impact of the last section is weakened by the atmosphere of helplessness and plaintive longing for the messianic future which broods over all the homilies. Although the ḥatimah develops organically out of the theme of the sermon, there is no trace here of the dialectical approach which contributed to the vitality and appeal of Kahana 3.

We must still examine the remaining portion of Rabbati 12. Rabbati 12: [11], formerly designated Rabbati 12:10, is a proem based on Ps. 79:12, "Render unto our neighbors sevenfold (שבעתים) into their bosom (חיקם) their reproach, with which they have reproached You (חרפוך), O Lord." This verse is brought into opposition with Lam. 3:64, "Give them, O Lord, their deserts according to their deeds (כמעשה ידיהם)." The preacher must now resolve the issue of how severe the punishment is to be. Two sages agree that sins against Israel are only to be requited measure for measure (כמעשה ידיהם), but sins against God are to be punished sevenfold (שבעתים). However, the sages differ as to the nature of the sin against God. One says that it was the destruction of the

Temple, of whose altar it is written, "And from the bottom (רמחיק) on the ground to the lower ledge---two cubits" (Ezek. 43:14). The other says that it was burning the Torah, of which it is written, "The words of the Lord are. . .seven times (שבעתים) refined" (Ps. 12:7). The words "into their bosom (חיקם) their reproach" are identified with the amputation and further shameful maltreatment of the circumcised organ, which is set into a man's middle (בחיק). This outrage is associated with Deut. 25:11, several verses before Zachor, with the implication that Israel's enemies did to them what the wife in Deut. 25:11 did to help her husband. This "reproach" is what Israel should "remember" (Deut. 25:17).

Although this proem states some of "our neighbors'" sins against God and Israel, it is unusual in that the neighbors are not named. No mention is made of Esau, Edom, Amalek or Haman. Retribution is clearly for God, not Israel to carry out.

Rabbati 12:[12] (Rabbati 12:11 in the Breslau edition) is a proem based on a slightly altered version of Isa. 48:8, "Did you not know? Did you not hear, nor was your ear opened long ago? For I knew that you are most treacherous, and that you were called (קרא לך) a transgressor from birth." The preacher explains that this verse is addressed to Amalek and to Haman, his progeny. Proofs are adduced from Scripture and combined with words from the proem-verse to show that the Egyptians and all the peoples know about God, and about the miracles which he performed for Israel. Only Amalek stubbornly refuses to recognize the truth. Therefore, God will send someone (Mordecai) to teach Amalek a lesson. Playing on the words קרא לך, the preacher depicts God as promising to hang Haman from a beam (קורה) 50 cubits high; 50 is the



sum of the numerical values of the letters ל (30) and כ (20). Therefore, Deut. 25:17 is also addressed to Haman: "Remember what Amalek made---fifty---for you (לכ)." In this proem, for the first time, the hereditary wickedness of Amalek is associated directly with the Book of Esther. Although both Amalek and Haman are addressed at the beginning of the proem, at its end---given the detail of the 50-cubit gallows---only Haman remains. He is again in the role of the "survivor," as in the first part of Rabbati 12, although this is not explicitly stated. In the same way, the surviving Roman authorities stubbornly refuse to recognize the special relationship between God and Israel. God will also prepare for them an appropriate punishment.

In Rabbati 12:[13], formerly Rabbati 12:12, the preacher recounts a parable of a king, his garden, and his watchdog. When the son of the king's friend broke into the garden, the dog bit him. The king chose an indirect way of reminding the would-be thief of his crime, telling his (the king's) son to say to the thief, "Remember what that dog did to you." In the same way, when Israel sinned at Refidim by questioning God's presence among them, God sent Amalek, like a dog, to attack them. God reminds Israel of their sin in an indirect way, by saying, "Remember what Amalek did to you" (Deut. 25:17). The point of this parable is that, even though Israel sins, God shows them loving consideration even in the act of chastising them. As in Kahana 3:9, the theme of this section is God's chastisements of love. The punishment is carried out for Israel's good, not for their harm.

Rabbati 12:[14], which is the first part of Rabbati 12:13, consists of a phrase-by-phrase exposition of Deut. 25:18. The preacher first discusses the words "how he met you (אשר קרך)." To the rabbinic

mind, it was impossible that Amalek could have merely "encountered (קרה)" Israel; whatever befalls Israel is in God's hands. Therefore, the word קרך is explained as if it derived from three other roots. The first is קרא: Amalek called to the Israelites by name, and killed each one as he emerged from the clouds of glory. The second is קרי, which is derived from קרה: Amalek "made you unclean" by forcing you to commit pederasty. The last is קר: Amalek "cooled your fearsome reputation" in the eyes of the nations. Although Israel should remember these sins as a stimulus to blot out Amalek's memory, they should also remember that these events did not occur by accident.

The words "he struck at your rear (ויזנב בך)" are explained as a euphemism for castration. This is also the inferred meaning of I Sam. 15:33, "Samuel hewed (וישסף) Agag in pieces." The preacher regards Samuel's treatment of Agag, the Amalekite king, as just requital for the same crime which Amalek committed against Israel. With some digression, two other explanations of וישסף are offered. In this aggadah, another entry is made in the catalogue of Amalek's sins, and the principle of just requital is upheld. Contemporary readers and listeners must also have derived some vicarious satisfaction from this gory tale of a Jew's revenge upon an Amalekite (Roman).

In the next part of this section, the preacher expounds upon the words, "all who were enfeebled (הנחשלים) at your rear." According to one authority, the נחשלים were those whom the clouds of glory left behind (מניחור, from the root נחח) and caused to fall away (רמשילור, from the root נשל). Another rabbi said that the cloud discharged them violently. A third opinion states that the נחשלים were the Tribe of Dan, which merited this fate because they were idol-worshippers. The

last interpretation identifies the נחשלים with those who complained, "Is the Lord among us or not?" In sum, those Israelites whom Amalek attacked had, in some way, deserved to be punished.

The concluding part of Rabbati 12:[14] is based on the description of Amalek, that "he did not fear God (ולא ירא אלהים)." Five reasons are given for the appropriateness of Joshua, a descendant of Joseph, doing battle with Amalek, a descendant of Esau. These reasons arise out of comparisons between Joseph's life and attitudes, and Esau's; their lives could have been parallel, but instead they were diametrically opposite. Joseph was righteous, and Esau was wicked. Here again, as in Rabbati 12:[7], we find the archetypal representatives of Israel and Rome. In the last example, Joseph declares with reverence, "I fear God (את-האלהים אני ירא)" (Gen. 42:18), but of Amalek it is said, "he did not fear God (ולא ירא אלהים)" (Deut. 25:18). Apparently, Joshua inherited Joseph's merit, and thus was able to defeat Amalek. Contemporary Jews should be encouraged, believing that the merit of their fathers will help them to defeat Rome.

Rabbati 12:[15], the second part of Rabbati 12:13, is a commentary on Deut. 25:19, "Therefore, when the Lord your God grants you safety from all your enemies around you, in the land that the Lord your God is giving you as a hereditary portion, you shall blot out the memory of Amalek. . . ." The preacher named three commandments which were incumbent upon the Israelites when they entered the Land: establishing the monarchy, building the Temple, and blotting out Amalek's memory. To contemporary Jews, fulfillment of these commandments would signify the restoration of Jewish life as it was before the Caesars. Then the Jews were autonomous; they worshipped in the Temple and had

no memories of Roman oppression. Thus, this aggadah calls for the dissolution of Roman domination of Palestine.

As for the commandment to "blot out the memory of Amalek," the Jews in the aggadah turn it back to God, "You remember, Yourself! We are mortal flesh and blood, but You are eternal." In other words, blotting out Amalek is something which God may realistically be called upon to accomplish. God replies that the annual reading of פְּרִשְׁתָּהּ עֲמֹלֵק (Ex. 17:8-16) will be enough to fulfill the commandment. Thus, Jews have a share in the destruction of Amalek/Rome, albeit a share which is currently of humble human proportions, and realistically achievable in their historical context.

In the ḥatimah of Rabbati 12, the preacher states that Joshua tried to blot out Amalek's memory, but with only partial success. Some remnants of Amalek remain even until now (עַד עַכְשִׁיר), and King Saul will, in the future (עַתִּיד), arise from the tribe of Benjamin (Rachel's other son) and uproot the last traces of Amalek. The Scriptural proof comes from Judg. 5:14, "Out of Ephraim came Joshua who would have uprooted them of Amalek; after you, Joshua, came Saul of Benjamin, with your multitudes."

This aggadah is identifiable as a ḥatimah largely on the basis of the explicit opposition of "now (עַכְשִׁיר)" and "in the future (עַתִּיד)." However, two details are unusual. Saul is not commonly referred to as a messianic figure; and the concluding verse, more likely by design than by accident, is the basis of the next chapter of the midrash, Rabbati 13. Each of these anomalies, in its own way, renders the ḥatimah somewhat unsatisfactory. a) The reference to Saul is mysterious and, therefore, unsettling. Saul is an unlikely choice for the ultimate

victor over Amalek, in view of his refusal to heed the divine commandment of utter ruthlessness in battle with Agag. b) The deliberate structural forging of continuity between Rabbati 12 and Rabbati 13 makes the former chapter dependent on the latter. The implication of the *ḥatimah*, however, is clear: A time will come when the Jews, with God's help, will regain military power and throw off the Roman yoke.

In summarizing the second part of Rabbati 12, we note that it begins with the idea that retribution, in whatever measure, is for God to undertake (12:[11]). When God punishes Amalek/Rome, He will punish them in an appropriate manner, such that they will recognize the nature of the special relationship between God and Israel. God performs miracles for Israel (12:[12]), and even when Israel sins and God punishes them, yet He punishes them out of love. This love is evident both in the indirectness of the reminder, and in the form of the reminder as a commandment. By giving Israel a path to follow, a commandment to obey, God opens to Israel an opportunity to return His love. The case against Amalek is built up, even though his victims were deserving of punishment. A difference emerges, here, in the identity of Israel's avenger against Amalek. Retribution comes not from God directly but, with God's help, from Samuel and from Joshua, Joseph's descendant, even though both are merely mortal. Thus, hope arises that the merit of their ancestors will aid Israel in their fight against Rome (12:[14]), a hope which is buoyed by the memory of a Jewish-controlled Palestine before the Caesars. Now the Jews lack the strength to challenge Rome, but in the time to come they will drive the oppressor from their Land (12:[15]).

The tone of Rabbati 12:[11-15] is one of sublimated hostility, of

anticipation of the imminent resurgence of Israel. This is far different from the atmosphere of pitiful resignation which characterizes Rabbati 12:1-[10]. This difference in outlook is a further reason for separating Rabbati 12 into two parts. One can only speculate as to the reason for which they were placed together. Perhaps one was meant to balance the other.

Although Rabbati 12:[11-15] is brief, it is successfully integrated. This chapter shows thematic unity, in that it focuses on the punishment of Amalek. There is at least an associative progression from point to point. The material is arranged effectively and with purpose, but the flow of concepts heads in an unusual direction: from God to man, and not the reverse. Traces of the dialectical approach are found, particularly in the concept of Israel's punishment with consideration, as against the ruthless treatment of Amalek.

Both parts of Rabbati 12 share a similar point of view, that physical action against the oppressor is not currently appropriate. Amalek will be crushed in a time which is unforeseeable and messianic. The editor of Kahana, however, believed that Israel's return to righteousness and power could be imminent. It was still possible for him to envision Israel's resurgence as an autonomous nation, living in holiness and free of the tyrant's yoke.

It is clear that Heinemann's model may be successfully applied to these excerpts from Pesikta d'Rav Kahana and Pesikta Rabbati. Further study may reveal that the model can be modified by the addition of other characteristic midrashic techniques, but as it stands, it is a most useful tool in the study of the homiletical midrashim.

## CHAPTER VI

Conclusions

Having reviewed the secondary literature about Vayikra Rabbah, Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, and Pesikta Rabbati, and having applied some of the scholars' opinions to actual texts, we are now ready to evaluate their work. These appraisals will be brief, and we shall try to avoid presumption. Our task is rendered easier in that we have cited passages in which these scholars have sometimes supported and sometimes disagreed with each other. We will exclude from this discussion all authors who were consulted only in passing, as well as those who entered the bibliography only as authors of encyclopedia articles. We will also exclude Strack, who mainly quoted the conclusions of other researchers, and Eamberger, whose contribution to the understanding of Pesikta Rabbati was evaluated above.<sup>1</sup>

The importance of Zunz's work in the field of midrash is hard to overestimate. In 1832, when he published Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden historisch entwickelt,<sup>2</sup> he was practically alone in applying modern principles of literary criticism and research to the study of rabbinic literature. Such an undertaking required, in those days, independence of spirit, as well as a considerable breadth of knowledge. To these qualities Zunz added, especially in his work on Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, imagination and profound diligence. This work was, of course, conditioned by the lack of manuscripts and editions,

and today we may find fault with Zunz's conclusions throughout his book. Easy as it is to criticize, we must remember that Zunz's methods were not yet developed to the degree to which we have become accustomed. Therefore, we cannot expect of him opinions which follow from more sophisticated analysis.

The most important question to ask about a scholar's work is not whether he was right or wrong, but whether and how much he contributed to the advance of knowledge and understanding in his field. By these criteria, Zunz merited the greatest respect. He pointed the way for generations of scholars who lived after him, and his influence continues even today. One can find only a few issues discussed in this paper which Zunz did not discuss or suggest. All modern midrashists inevitably look back to him, and their methods and concerns are usually improvements or elaborations upon his.

Following Zunz's hypothetical reconstruction of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, Buber was the first to make an edition of this midrash available. Using four manuscripts, he proceeded according to the most modern principles of his day. The goal was not, as it is now, the transmission of the oldest or most authentic manuscript, with textual variants noted below. Instead, Buber, like his contemporaries, tried to choose the best and most complete readings from among the various manuscripts and parallels, although one manuscript served as the basic text against which all the others were checked. In this way, scholars believed that they could reproduce the original and authentic text of the midrash which no single manuscript preserved in its entirety.

The defects of this method, and of Buber's way of applying it, have already been noted.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, Buber's attention to detail and the



breadth of his reading are revealed in his introduction and commentary; the latter is still very useful, even though we now possess a more sophisticated critical edition. Ironically, the Oxford manuscript of Pesikta which Buber used came to him only when his work was in a very advanced stage, and he did not use it as well as he might have. This manuscript, almost 100 years later, became the basis of Mandelbaum's edition of Pesikta.

Friedmann's scholarship is of the same era as Buber's. In describing two additional manuscripts of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana which he had examined, he was not content to state their contents as he found them. Rather, he attempted to fill in the lacunae and present them as he thought they must have been. His edition of Pesikta Rabbati is not based on any manuscript, but on the Breslau edition (1831). Friedmann frequently suggested emendations in this text, many of which proved to be correct when checked against the manuscripts. Although his extensive commentaries are sound, detailed and clearly written, he occasionally made large errors, e.g., his opinion on the date of Pesikta Rabbati.<sup>4</sup> He introduced the practice of indexing all references to Biblical verses and rabbinic authorities, apparatus which has become standard in the editing of rabbinic texts. In sum, despite its deficiencies, Friedmann's work advanced both understanding of those midrashim which we have discussed, and the methodology of midrashic studies, in general.

Albeck's work shows signs of progress as compared with the methods of previous scholars. He improved on Zunz's work, diligently examining details which Zunz had glossed over. He explored the problems of technical language in great detail. However, in some ways his scholarship was a product of the preceding generations. Like others before him,

Albeck tried to reconstruct the original order of incomplete Pesikta manuscripts, without stating that his conclusions represented hypothetical re-creations. In his comparisons of parallel texts in our three midrashim, Albeck had insufficient reference to manuscripts; his reliance on printed editions with corrupt texts occasionally marred his conclusions. Nevertheless, because of Albeck's habitual carefulness and his great familiarity with the sources, his opinions are not to be regarded lightly.

In his introduction to Vayikra Rabbah, Margulies' sifting of evidence is generally quite sound, particularly in regard to homiletical methods, terminology and midrashic structures. His conclusions about the latter gave rise, as we have seen, to a model which is of great value in the analysis of midrashic chapters. His descriptions of genizah fragments which are found in widely separated libraries bear witness to the painstaking labor required in their classification. His comparative midrashic studies, based on manuscripts and fragments, are generally careful, competent and discerning.

One would have thought that Margulies would pay more attention to paleography. He assigned dates to only a few of the manuscripts and fragments, and some of these dates seem to be excessively early.<sup>5</sup> In addition, a study of the variant readings on random pages of Margulies' edition of Vayikra Rabbah will reveal that textual emendations, indicated by asterisks, are frequent. Margulies must have been well aware of the fine line between responsibility and recklessness in the task of editing the midrash, but he remained confident that he had emended the text only in places where errors or omissions in MS 7 were obvious.<sup>6</sup>

The most striking conclusion reached by Margulies regards the

provenance of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana.<sup>7</sup> Aside from Goldberg's objections, which are not fully elaborated,<sup>8</sup> Margulies' theory is open to further challenge. If Vayikra Rabbah and Pesikta came from the same school, or even from the same editor, how is it that Vayikra Rabbah is unique among midrashim in its use of the term **גורפא**? If Margulies was correct, one would expect Pesikta to use **גורפא** in an identical manner. Furthermore, Margulies did not account for textual variance between the two midrashim. Would not the same editor have written the same aggadah identically in both midrashim? Certainly, the ancient rabbis' reverence for tradition would dictate the practice of textual conservatism. Although Margulies' work as a whole is excellent, his opinion about the authorship of Pesikta is certainly open to question.

The first clear account of the actual contents of the Pesikta manuscripts was given by Mandelbaum, and his conclusions regarding their relationships are useful. However, we have noted occasional inconsistencies in his descriptive writing about the midrash. Furthermore, his arguments for Rosh ha-Shanah as the first chapter of the midrash, except for the citation of this chapter in the Aruch, have proven to be less than compelling.<sup>9</sup>

Mandelbaum did very well in his editing of Pesikta. The variant readings and lists of parallels are complete, detailed and easy to use. This is also the first edition of this midrash in which the chapters are divided into numbered sections, rendering the study of Pesikta more convenient. However, Mandelbaum's sectioning is not always optimal, as noted above.<sup>10</sup> The major deficiency of Mandelbaum's work is the brevity of his commentary. Granted that Buber's commentary is excellent, further elaboration based on more recent scholarship would have been welcome.

Goldberg's classification of proems and homilies and his statistical model for a chapter of homiletical midrash are the products of an analytical mind. If Vayikra kabbah and Pesikta d'Rav Kahana are contemporaneous (or nearly so), then Margulies' contention that the homiletical proems are fundamental in this literature offers indirect support for Goldberg's ratio between proems and homilies. Even so, the statistical model must be refined. The definitions of the different types of proems and homilies are too ambiguous, and the length of a homily, sufficient to warrant consideration of it as an independent unit, has yet to be established. Because it is tied to numbers, Goldberg's model is inflexible; in the course of his article, Goldberg had time and again to explain away phenomena which did not coincide with his theory. The statistical model is ultimately dependent on the total amounts of proemial and homiletical material, which may be easily differentiated from one another.

Braude's introductions to his translations must be approached with caution. His descriptions of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana and Pesikta Rabbati are largely dependent upon Mandelbaum and Friedmann, respectively. All too often, however, when Braude made an independent decision or evaluation, little or no support could be found for it. Likewise, the translations themselves are based on eclectic texts, following no single manuscript or edition; nor did Braude always indicate which text he was translating at any given time. In a way, Braude's goal was the same as Buber's and Friedmann's: to produce the fullest and most precise text, regardless of the primacy of any one source.

Two things must be said in Braude's defense. a) His works are not critical editions for scholars, but translations for laymen. Never-

theless, a stricter adherence to the norms of sound scholarship would result in the interested layman's initiation into the problems of understanding and working with rabbinic texts. b) Braude is not a professional scholar; until recently, he was a full-time pulpit rabbi. It is very much to his credit that he has devoted the time and effort to the preparation of these and other translations, and to other scholarly pursuits. However, Braude's introductions and notes lead one to the conclusion that his readers would fare better if he entrusted the scholarly underpinnings to more competent hands.

Heinemann was the first scholar to consider the midrash in purely literary terms, and his reasons for doing so make sense. His work is full of good, original thinking and insights which might almost be described as revelatory. Occasionally, in his enthusiasm, he seemed too ready to fit various chapters of *Vayikra Rabbah* into "successful" categories, or to alter his conclusions on the basis of single genizah fragments, such as those found by Ezra Fleischer.

The criteria for integration advanced by Heinemann could well apply to literary creations of many kinds, but with reference to the homiletical midrashim, the compositional model and the theories which support it are most useful in understanding this genre--for one is almost compelled to acknowledge these creations as a distinct literary type. Application of the model to individual chapters of midrash necessitates deep study, and results in increased comprehension and appreciation. Although one may find fault with some of Heinemann's conclusions, the broad sweep of his research into midrash deserves serious attention and respect.

We have already discussed the riddle of parallel passages in

Chapter Four. This puzzle would be easily solved if only all parallels were exact copies of one another. Of course, this is not the case. A way must be found to explain not only the phenomenon of parallelism, but also the existence of variants among parallels. Certainly, many variants arose from the inadvertent errors of scribes. Letters, words, lines and even entire pages may have been transposed or skipped. We know that different spelling traditions prevailed in various times and places. Some copyists were more careful with and faithful to their texts than other copyists; some had more legible handwriting. A careless and inferior scribe introduces corruptions into a text; a meticulous scribe with a legible hand preserves them. At the same time, we must keep in mind the reverence for tradition which militated against the alteration of any part of it.

Albeck was typical of scholars who based their explanations on the written word. For him, tracing the original source of an aggadah became a matter of establishing the dates of composition of the midrashim relative to one another. Once these dates are known, we will also know which editor copied from which midrash. Such a solution is acceptable only in cases of exact correspondence between parallels. Certainly, many instances of direct copying are known, but significant textual variants may be found even in those chapters which Vayikra Rabbah and Pesikta d'Rav Kahana are said to share.<sup>11</sup> Even Buber, who also tried to establish dates for the midrashim, admitted that the editor of Pesikta Rabbati altered and expanded the material which he borrowed from Pesikta d'Rav Kahana.<sup>12</sup>

Finkelstein suggested that aggadot, baraitot et al. were transmitted orally by means of catchwords, "certain phrases in each tradition,

which served as pegs on which the unformulated portion depended."<sup>13</sup> Later, these catchwords were written down as shorthand notes, in which form they preserved the tannaitic tradition until it was completely edited and written down. The variant forms which exist--and Finkelstein provided several sets of examples--indicate that the catchwords were strictly adhered to, but the remainder of the tradition was reconstructed from memory, producing a certain "fluidity" in the tradition. Elaborations and differences in detail are, therefore, common. Failure of memory on the part of a transmitter could (and often did) result in the loss of a tradition. Finkelstein's concept refers mainly to oral tradition; the shorthand notes were never intended for public use. This theory also applies only to the tannaitic literature and the two Talmuds, although Finkelstein included a few examples from amoraic midrashic strata.

Neither Finkelstein's theory nor Albeck's offers, by itself, an adequate solution to our problem: How can we account for parallels with variance after the time when it became common practice to commit the oral tradition to writing? We must remember that the process of oral transmission did not cease when written transmission became acceptable. The oral tradition is still alive even today, and will remain alive as long as rabbis teach and preach. Every rabbi recounts traditions which have been passed down for centuries; often these traditions are preserved in much the same way that Finkelstein described. Certain catchwords, in both content and style, are essential to the tradition, and the rest is supplied by the transmitter in his own style. In this respect, nothing has changed since before the midrashim were compiled.

The homiletical midrashim, especially, bear the rhetorical stamp

of oral transmission as it was practiced in the synagogue. Despite the collection and composition of midrashim, the oral tradition lost none of its authority. It remained the established medium for the preservation of rabbinic concepts and lore. In the period of time under discussion, the midrashic editor gleaned his material from the rabbis' sermons, and he seems to have had recourse to earlier compilations only when relevant and contemporary sermons were either lacking or unsatisfactory. Because the same tradition will be expressed in different ways as the time and place vary, it should not be surprising that parallel texts exhibit variance. Thus, the midrashic literature may be understood as a record of the progress of the oral tradition, a record which is mediated by the sensitivities and concerns of the editor and his community. No aggadah, just because it appears in writing, may be said to have achieved its unchanging form for all time. Rather, each aggadah is a potential part of a living homiletical and pedagogical vocabulary, whose usage and style are modified according to the preferences of the transmitter. Although every aggadah is adaptable to occasion and mood, it retains a central core which justifies and enables its preservation.

Much respect and admiration is due the scholars whose studies and opinions I have reported. Nevertheless, I feel the responsibility, imposed by the insights I have gained through the description and evaluation of previous research, to suggest my own tentative explanation of parallelism with variance.

The acceptability of written records of the tradition caused an increased complexity in the process of transmission. Previously, there had been only two parties to the act of transmission: the transmitter and the listener/re-transmitter. Finkelstein's theory, founded on the



spoken word, and Heinemann's, founded on the precise transcription of the pulpit discourse to the written word, are aids in understanding this relationship. Both men emphasized the reverence for tradition, which was apparent in the effort to retain every word (or at least the core) of every aggadah without alteration. Both of these theories are to be modified by the concept of a living, growing and changing aggadic vocabulary--a concept which is developed just above.

The sanction of written transmission introduced a third party to the process: the editor. Finkelstein's conception becomes insufficient at this juncture. Albeck's theory, even when it is conditioned by scribal errors and traditions, depicts the editor as a mere copyist. Nor does Heinemann's editorial scenario give the editor full credit for his personality, which is inevitably--albeit unintentionally--imposed upon his work. Heinemann's concept of the editor's role--selecting, arranging, forging a unified structure--no matter how artfully that role is fulfilled, overlooks the possibility that the editor, himself, is potentially a creative source of textual variance. Surely, reverence for tradition was the norm, but editors throughout the ages have wielded their blue pencils. Because the midrashic editor was engaged in a holy task, he may have carried respect for the text to the extent of making the text "respectable" according to his own views and those of his community.

Albeck, Finkelstein and Heinemann were all correct as far as they went, but I respectfully suggest that none of them went far enough. The transmission of tradition is a complicated affair, which each of these scholars treated perhaps too simply. None of these theories can

be proven, but mine has the advantage of taking into account the human factor in the editorial enterprise.

Notes. Chapter I.

1. Zunz-Albeck, p. 79.
2. Albeck, p. 42.
3. Bamidbar Rabbah was the last to be completed, perhaps as late as the 12th century.
4. Theodor, pp. 557-558.
5. Heinemann, JAAR, p. 143.
6. Heinemann, Tarbitz, p. 339.
7. Ibid., p. 340.
8. Albeck, p. 27. Although these suggestions were made only with reference to Chapters 31 and 32, the principles are applicable throughout the midrash.
9. Heinemann, Tarbitz, p. 351.
10. Ibid., p. 352.
- 10a. Heinemann, ha-Sifrut, p. 820, and note 47 thereto.
11. Heinemann, Tarbitz, p. 344. See Chapter 4 for full discussion.
12. Heinemann, ha-Sifrut, p. 820, and note 47 thereto.
13. Heinemann, Tarbitz, pp. 349-350.
14. Ibid., pp. 350-351.
15. Ibid., p. 353. See below, p. 32.
16. Albeck, p. 25.
17. Margulies, p. ix.
18. Ibid., p. x.
19. Heinemann, JAAR, pp. 142-143.
20. Zunz-Albeck, p. 80. Zunz believed that Bereshit Rabbah was edited in the sixth century.

Notes. Chapter I. (Continued)

21. Albeck, pp. 28-32.
22. Ibid., p. 42.
23. Margulies, p. xii.
24. Ibid., pp. xii-xiii.
25. Ibid., p. xiii.
26. Ibid., p. xiv.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid., p. xix.
29. Ibid., pp. xix-xxi.
30. Ibid., pp. xxii-xxvi.
31. Ibid., pp. xxxii-xxxiii.
32. Heinemann, JAAR, p. 141.
33. Ibid., p. 142
34. Albeck, p. 25.
35. Margulies believed that נפנן originally occurred in every chapter;  
see below, p. 21.
36. Albeck, pp. 27-28.
37. Margulies, pp. xxvii-xxx1.
38. Ibid., p. xxvii. Babylonia and Rome are both referred to as  
ןתן, "there."
39. Ibid., p. xxxii.
40. Because this MS is the grundtext, the study of its paleography  
should have been diligently pursued.
41. Margulies, p. xxxiv.
42. Albeck, p. 42.

Notes. Chapter I. (Continued)

43. Margulies, p. xxxv.
44. Albeck, p. 26, and note 20 thereto.
45. בארלדי .
46. Margulies, p. xxxv.
47. Ibid., p. xxxvi. The reference is probably to the 13th century exegete Bahya ben Asher ben Halawa. According to Efraim Gottlieb (Encyclopedia Judaica, 4: 104), his commentary on the Torah was written in 1291.
48. Ibid.
49. Ibid.
50. Ibid., pp. xxvi-xxvii.
51. Ibid., p. 3.
52. Ibid., p. 6.
53. Ibid., p. 3. In order not to multiply notes ad absurdum, the pages on which information regarding the fragments may be found are listed here: 2) pp. 3-4; 3)-6) p. 4; 7) pp. 4-5; 8)-11) p. 5; 12) p. 7; 13)-17) p. 8.
54. Ibid., pp. xxxix-xi.
55. Ibid., p. 5. Cf. pp. 9-86.
56. Ibid., p. 7.
57. Ibid., pp. xxxviii-xxxix.
58. Ibid., p. xxxviii.
59. Ibid., p. xxxvii-xxxviii.
60. Ibid., p. xxxix.
61. Ibid., note 18. No explanation is given for these omissions.
62. Ibid., p. xi.

Notes. Chapter I. (Continued)

63. Ibid., pp. xxxix-xl.
64. Zunz-Albeck, p. 79.
65. See above, pp. 3-4.
66. Albeck, pp. 25-26.
67. Margulies, pp. ix-x.
68. See above, pp. 10-11.
69. Margulies, pp. xi-xii.
70. Ibid., p. xxii.
71. Albeck, pp. 42-43.
72. Margulies, pp. xvi-xvii.
73. Ibid., p. ix.
74. Ibid., p. x.
75. See above, pp. 20-21.
76. Heinemann, JAAR, pp. 142-143.
77. Heinemann, ha-Sifrut, pp. 811b-812a.
78. Ibid., p. 808a.
79. Ibid., pp. 808a-809a.
80. See discussion of proems below, p. 27.
81. Heinemann, ha-Sifrut, pp. 809a-810a.
82. Ibid., p. 810b.
83. Ibid., p. 827a-b. This point is problematic if Vayikra Rabbah "borrowed" from Bereshit Rabbah and the Palestinian Talmud, for the parallel passages were surely altered "in transit" from one to the other. Nor can we say that the editor of Vayikra Rabbah felt free to alter the written tradition but not the oral.
84. Ibid., p. 810b.

Notes. Chapter I. (Continued)

85. Heinemann, JAAR, p. 144.
86. Heinemann claims that the editor undertook the writing of a mid-rash on Leviticus for the sheer challenge of bringing something "attractive, interesting and inspiring" out of the driest and most difficult texts. Cf. Heinemann, JAAR, p. 142.
87. Heinemann, ha-Sifrut, p. 811a.
88. Ibid., p. 811a-b.
89. Heinemann, Scripta, p. 101.
90. Ibid., p. 102.
91. Ibid., pp. 103-104. The rest of this article is most interesting, but it is not altogether germane to the present discussion.
92. Heinemann, JAAR, pp. 149-150.
93. Heinemann, ha-Sifrut, pp. 813a-818a, 823b.
94. Ibid., p. 823a.
95. Ibid., p. 820.
96. See above, pp. 3-4.
97. Heinemann, ha-Sifrut, p. 820a.
98. Ibid., pp. 822b-823a.
99. See above, p. 22.
100. Heinemann, ha-Sifrut, p. 813b.
101. Ibid., pp. 820a-821a.
102. Ibid., pp. 823b-824a.
103. Ibid., p. 810a.
104. Ibid., pp. 824a-825a.
105. Heinemann, JAAR, p. 146.

Notes. Chapter I. (Continued)

106. Ibid., p. 148.

107. Heinemann, ha-Sifrut, pp. 821b-822a.

108. Heinemann, JAAR, p. 149, and note 13 thereto.

109. Heinemann, ha-Sifrut, pp. 825a-827a.



Notes. Chapter II

1. Zunz-Albeck, pp. 84-85.
2. Buber, p. iii. For further comment on the word פסיקתא, see Chapter 3, pp. 80-81.
3. Ibid., pp. iii-iv.
4. Strack, p. 210.
5. Theodor, p. 559.
6. Mandelbaum, PRK, p. xviii.
7. Braude, PRK, p. xlix.
8. Zunz-Albeck, p. 84.
9. Buber, p. 156a, note 1.
10. Ibid., p. 185b, note 1.
11. Ibid., p. 148b, note 1.
12. Ibid., p. 194b, note 1.
13. Ibid., p. 185b.
14. Friedmann, Bet Talmud, p. 6.
15. Zunz-Albeck, pp. 105-106.
16. Mandelbaum, PRK, p. 37, note on line 1. Goldberg singled out for special treatment a section of גיהי בשלח which is devoted to R. Shim'on b. Yoḥai, but stopped short of assigning it independent status; pp. 76-78.
17. Goldberg, p. 71.
18. See below, on the "rediscovery" of the Pesikta, pp. 59-61.
19. Zunz-Albeck, p. 83.
20. Ibid., p. 84.
21. Ibid., p. 92, and p. 356, note 132.
22. See Table I.

Notes. Chapter II. (Continued)

23. Friedmann, Bet Talmud, pp. 1-2.
24. Ibid., pp. 2-6.
25. Zunz-Albeck, p. 106.
26. Ibid., p. 360, note 190. Unfortunately, in all his references to the Oxford manuscript used by Buber, Albeck actually used the Oxford manuscript described by Friedmann (28), which was unknown to Buber.
27. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, pp. 43-51.
28. Ibid., pp. 48-49. While Mandelbaum says that nine chapters are missing, a comparison of the lists yields only eight.  
See the discussion of the Casanatense manuscript below, pp. 65-66.
29. Ibid., pp. 50-51.
30. Ibid., p. 56.
31. Mandelbaum, PRK, p. xiv.
32. Ibid., pp. xvii-xviii.
33. These citations were mentioned in the section on the name of the midrash, p. 35.
34. Mandelbaum, PRK, pp. xviii-xix.
35. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, p. 58.
36. Goldberg, p. 72.
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid., note 5.
39. Ibid., p. 72. Cf. E. Fleischer, Tarbitz 36:116 f.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid., note 5.
42. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, p. 45.

Notes. Chapter II. (Continued)

43. Goldberg, p. 72.
44. Ibid., p. 78.
45. Ibid., p. 72.
46. See below, p. 47.
47. Goldberg, p. 75.
48. Braude, PRK, p. xlviii, note 40.
49. Ibid., p. xiv.
50. Zunz-Albeck, p. 94.
51. Ibid., p. 96.
52. Braude, PRK, p. 90.
53. Goldberg, p. 79.
54. Braude, PRK, p. 140, note 1.
55. See below, pp. 47-48. Nos. 8)-11).
56. Goldberg, p. 75.
57. Ibid., p. 79.
58. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, p. 56.
59. Goldberg, p. 75.
60. Zunz-Albeck, p. 100.
61. Ibid., p. 347, note 36.
62. Buber, p. 95a, note 1.
63. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, p. 56.
64. Goldberg, p. 72, note 4.
65. Braude, PRK, p. 186, note 1.
66. Zunz-Albeck, p. 98 and p. 358, note 160. See below, pp. 62-63.
67. Goldberg, p. 76. Cf. Theodor, MGWJ, 1879, p. 109, note 1.
68. Zunz-Albeck, p. 347, note 35. A passage from Tosafot Megillah 31b is even more explicit.

Notes. Chapter II. (Continued)

69. Buber, p. xlix.
70. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, pp. 53-54. He also attempted a proof from MS ק, saying that it lacks all the haftarot but שרבה, which appears among the נמלים נוראים. However, no homily for שרבה is indicated in his list of the contents of ק, p. 49.
71. Goldberg, p. 76.
72. Buber, p. 119a, note 1.
73. Goldberg, p. 76.
74. Zunz-Albeck, p. 89.
75. Buber, p. 157a, note 1.
76. See above, pp. 48-49.
77. Goldberg, p. 77.
78. See Table I.
79. Zunz-Albeck, pp. 88-89.
80. Buber, p. 166a. See discussion of דרשן below, p. 52.
81. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, p. 53.
82. Goldberg, p. 77 and note 12 thereto.
83. Ibid., p. 79.
84. Mandelbaum, PRK, p. 437, note on line 1.
85. Goldberg, p. 79.
86. Mandelbaum, PRK, p. 452, note on line 1.
87. Ibid., p. 460, note on line 1.
88. Ibid., p. 462, note on line 2.
89. Ibid., p. 463, note on line 2.
90. Buber, p. 156a, note 1.

Notes. Chapter II. (Continued)

91. Friedmann, Bet Talmud, p. 4.
92. Ibid.
93. Ibid.
94. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, p. 54.
95. Buber, p. xlix.
96. Ibid., p. xlv.
97. Ibid., pp. xlviiii-xlix.
98. Ibid., p. xlv.
99. Mandelbaum, PRK, p. 213, note on line 1.
100. Goldberg, p. 76.
101. Zunz-Albeck, pp. 85-86.
102. Buber, p. 1.
103. Ibid., p. iv.
104. See above, p. 6.
105. Zunz-Albeck, p. 107.
106. Margulies, p. xiii.
107. See above, pp. 9-10.
108. Goldberg, p. 73, note 7.
109. Ibid., p. 73.
110. Ibid., p. 79.
111. Braude, PRK, pp. xlv-xlvi.
112. Zunz-Albeck, n. 86.
113. See above, p. 54.
114. Mandelbaum, PRK, p. xiv.
115. Goldberg, p. 71 and note 3 thereto.
116. Zunz-Albeck, p. 81.

Notes. Chapter II. (Continued)

117. Ibid., p. 87.
118. Ibid., p. 81.
119. Buber, pp. xi-xxviii.
120. Ibid., pp. xi-xii.
121. Ibid., pp. xiii-xiv.
122. Ibid., pp. xxiv-xxvii.
123. Ibid., pp. xxxviii-xl.
124. Probably after 1500.
125. Buber, p. iv. There is only the most tenuous correlation between the ages of the seven manuscripts of Pesikta d'Ray Kahana and their inclusion of material from Pesikta Rabbati. The newest manuscript contains such material, and the two oldest do not. However, although the 15th century MSS  $\text{2N}$  and  $\text{D}$  duplicate chapters of Pesikta Rabbati, the two 16th century MSS  $\text{1N}$  and  $\text{Y}$  borrow nothing from the later midrash.
126. Ibid., pp. vii-viii.
127. Ibid., pp. ix-x.
128. Ibid., pp. xxiii-xxiv, note 22.
129. Zunz-Albeck, p. 106.
130. Braude, PRK, p. xlvi.
131. Zunz-Albeck, pp. 81-82.
132. Ibid., p. 82.
133. Ibid., p. 87.
134. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, p. 45 and note 10 thereto. Mandelbaum's designation for the manuscript in Proceedings is  $\text{2N}$ .

Notes. Chapter II. (Continued)

135. Ibid., p. 44 and Buber, p. xlv.
136. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, p. 44 and the unnumbered note thereto.  
Mr. Lutski was consulted on paleographic details in all the MSS.
137. Ibid., p. 45.
138. Buber, p. xlv; cf. also p. 181b, and note 60 thereto.
139. Ibid., p. xlv.
140. Ibid., pp. 194b-195b.
141. Zunz-Albeck, p. 98.
142. Ibid., p. 358, note 160. Azulai, the great bibliographer, described in his Va'ad la-Hachamim a sheet of parchment which seemed to be the last page of a manuscript of Pesikta, for the text proclaims it to be the conclusion of both רזאח הברכה and of Pesikta d'Rav Kahana. Cf. Isaac Benjacob, Otzar ha-S'farim, p. 489, entry No. 971. Zunz also alluded (p. 100) to the preservation of בחדש השלישי, but he did not indicate where it might be found, nor the source of his information.
143. Buber, pp. xliv-xlv.
144. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, pp. 43-44.
- 144a. Buber, p. xliv
145. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, p. 44, note 7.
146. Ibid., with note 8 thereto.
147. Buber, p. xlix.
148. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, p. 48.
149. Ibid., pp. 46-47.
150. Buber, pp. xlv-xlvi.
151. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, p. 45.

Notes. Chapter II. (Continued)

152. Buber, p. xlv.
153. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, p. 46.
154. Mandelbaum, PRK, p. xiii.
155. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, pp. 48-49.
156. Friedmann, Bet Talmud, p. 2.
157. Ibid., p. 3.
158. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, p. 48.
159. Ibid.
160. Ibid., pp. 48-49. Braude said that the scribe was Isaac Abraham Abigedor. See below, p. 96.
161. Ibid., p. 49, note 14.
162. Friedmann, Bet Talmud, pp. 46-53, 78-90, 108-114, 168-172, and 197-206.
163. Ibid., pp. 4-6.
164. Mandelbaum, PRK, p. xiii.
165. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, p. 49.
166. Mandelbaum, PRK, p. xiii.
167. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, p. 49.
168. Ibid., p. 50.
169. Ibid., pp. 57-58.
170. Ibid., p. 50. Here Mandelbaum gave the distinct impression that both these chapters occur in both MSS N and Y in the ninth and eleventh positions. Given the lists of contents presented on pp. 44-45, this is simply irresponsible.
171. Ibid., pp. 50-51.



Notes. Chapter II. (Continued)

172. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, pp. 51-52; and Mandelbaum, PRK, p. xiii. These fragments are not listed in the same order in the two sources; the two lists may be correlated as follows:

follows:	<u>Proceedings</u>	<u>PRK</u>
	1 <sup>א</sup>	d
	2 <sup>ב</sup>	e
	3 <sup>ג</sup>	a
	4 <sup>ד</sup>	b
	-	e
	-	f
	5 <sup>ה</sup>	g

173. Goldberg, p. 71, and note 1 thereto.
174. Friedmann, Bet Talmud, p. 6.
175. 1) 17 Tammuz-Shabbat Shuva, 2) Rosh ha-Shanah-Yom Kippur, 3) Hanukkah-Rosh Hodesh Nisan, 4) Pesah-Shavuot, 5) Sukkot.
176. Mandelbaum, PRK, p. xvi.
177. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, p. 58.
178. Mandelbaum, PRK, p. ט"ג.
179. Goldberg, pp. 71-72.
180. Mandelbaum, PRK, pp. ט"ב - ט"ג.
181. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, p. 58.
182. Kapstein, a professor at Brown University, was concerned mainly with matters of English style. Because it was Braude who did the scholarly spadework and, apparently, the basic translation, Kapstein is not referred to in the notes to this chapter.
183. Buber, p. 1.

Notes. Chapter II. (Continued)

184. Ibid., pp. xliv-xlv.
185. Ibid., p. xlvi.
186. Mandelbaum, Proceedings, pp. 42-43, and notes 4 and 5 thereto.
187. Goldberg, p. 69.
188. Mandelbaum, PRK, p. xix.
189. Ibid.
190. Ibid., p. ט"ט.
191. Additional notes by Lieberman appear on pp. 473-476.
192. Goldberg, pp. 69-70.
193. Ibid.
194. Ibid., p. 74.
195. See below, pp. 76-77.
196. Goldberg, p. 74, כי תשא, זכור et passim.
197. Ibid., p. 79.
198. Praude, PRK, pp. li-lil, note 55.
199. Ibid., pp. li-lvi.
200. Zunz-Albeck, p. 85, and p. 350, notes 65-67.
201. Ibid., p. 350, note 67.
202. Ibid., p. 107
203. Buber, pp. v-vi.
204. Goldberg, pp. 73-74.
205. Ibid., p. 74.
206. Ibid., p. 79. In the chart on p. 78, Goldberg indicated only four chapters of unquestioned authenticity in which subject-homilies appear. The number of verse-homilies is greater than that of the subject-homilies in two of these chapters (4-1 and 6-2), the same in one chapter (1-1), and less in the remaining

Notes. Chapter II. (Continued)

chapter (3-6). One might say that the 23 chapters with no subject-homilies bear silent witness to the predominance of the verse-homily.

207. Braude, PRK, p. xxxvii.

208. Goldberg, p. 79.

209. Ibid., p. 75.

210. Ibid., p. 76.

211. Ibid., p. 74.

212. Ibid., note 11.

213. See above, p. 46.

214. Goldberg, p. 75.

215. Ibid., p. 78.

216. Ibid., pp. 78-79.

217. Ibid., p. 79.

218. Zunz-Albeck, p. 85.

219. Braude, p. xv.

220. Ibid., pp. xviii-xxiv.

221. Ibid., p. 1-li.

Notes. Chapter III.

1. Zunz-Albeck, p. 118.
2. Friedmann, PR, pp. 25-26.
3. Theodor, p. 561.
4. Braude, PR, pp. 1-2.
5. Ibid., pp. 20-21.
6. Stevenson, pp. 34-35.
7. Zunz-Albeck, p. 117.
8. Ibid., pp. 376-377, note 2.
9. Braude, PR, p. 492, note 1 et passim.
10. Friedmann, PR, p. 3.
11. Ibid., and Braude, PR, p. 28, note 41.
12. Friedmann, PR, p. 3.
13. Ibid., pp. 3-7.
14. Theodor, p. 561. Italics added.
15. Ibid., p. 562.
16. Braude, PR, pp. vii-xi.
17. Ibid., note on p. 570.
18. Ibid., note on p. 852.
19. Ibid., p. 28, note 41.
20. Ibid., p. 16.
21. Sperber, p. 335.
22. Zunz-Albeck, p. 117.
23. Strack, p. 213.
24. Cf. Heinemann's conclusions in JJS XIX:41-48, that the triennial cycle as observed in the fifth and sixth centuries actually lasted about three and a half years; therefore the date of Shabbat

Notes. Chapter III. (Continued)

Bereshit would vary throughout the calendar, not necessarily falling between Yom Kippur and Hanukkah.

25. Zunz-Albeck, p. 378, note 6.
26. Braude, PR, p. 12 et passim.
27. Friedmann, PR, p. 3.
28. Zunz-Albeck, p. 117.
29. Braude, PR, p. 909.
30. Zunz-Albeck, pp. 117, 97.
31. Friedmann, p. 4.
32. Strack, p. 213.
33. Braude, PR, p. 343, note 1.
34. Sperber, p. 335.
35. Sperber does not mention Chapter 19.
36. Zunz-Albeck, pp. 97-98.
37. Braude, PR, p. 909.
38. Zunz-Albeck, pp. 117, 100.
39. Friedmann, PR, 126a.
40. Braude, PR, p. 512.
41. Theodor, p. 561.
42. Zunz-Albeck, pp. 117, 104.
43. Strack, p. 213.
44. Friedmann, PR, p. 6.
45. Ibid., p. 162b.
46. Braude, PR, p. 684.
47. Sperber, p. 335.

Notes. Chapter III. (Continued)

48. Zunz-Albeck, p. 117.
49. Ibid., p. 118.
50. Theodor, p. 561.
51. Friedmann, PR, p. 6.
52. Strack, p. 213.
53. Braude, PR, p. 15.
54. Sperber, p. 335.
55. Braude, PR, p. 811.
56. Ibid., p. 910.
57. Ibid., p. 31, note 43.
58. Zunz-Albeck, p. 119.
59. Ibid., pp. 384-385, note 39.
60. Braude, PR, p. 39.
61. Ibid., p. 21.
62. Ibid., pp. 21-22. Cf. V. Aptowitz, "Untersuchungen zur Gaonaeischen Literatur," HUCA, 8/9 (1931-32), pp. 383-410.
63. Ibid., p. 25.
64. Friedmann, PR, p. 24.
65. Ibid., p. 25.
66. Ibid., p. 24.
67. Ibid., p. 25.
68. Braude, PR, pp. 22-23.
69. Ibid., p. 22.
70. Bernard J. Bamberger, "A Messianic Document of the Seventh Century," HUCA 15 (1940), pp. 425-431.

Notes. Chapter III. (Continued)

71. Ibid., p. 425. Actually the passage under discussion extends only through Friedmann 163b, line 3.
72. Ibid., pp. 425-427.
73. Ibid., pp. 427-428.
74. Ibid., p. 429.
75. Braude, PR, pp. 23-25.
76. Ibid., p. 23, note 28.
77. Ibid., p. 26.
78. Theodor, p. 561.
79. Strack, p. 213.
80. Zunz-Albeck, pp. 120-121.
81. Sperber, p. 335.
82. Moshe David Herr, "Tanḥuma Yelammedenu," Encyclopedia Judaica, 15:794-796, Keter Publishing Co., Jerusalem, 1971.
83. Zunz-Albeck, p. 118.
84. Strack, p. 213.
85. Braude, PR, pp. 25-26.
86. Zunz-Albeck, pp. 382-383, note 34.
87. Braude, Proceedings, pp. 1-6.
88. Braude, PR, p. 27, note 37.
89. Ibid., p. 31.
90. Ibid., and note 46 thereto.
91. Zunz-Albeck, p. 576, note 1.
92. Moshe Sanders, "Pesikta Rabbati, First Printing," 'Areshet 3 (1971), pp. 99-101.

Notes. Chapter III. (Continued)

93. Zunz-Albeck, p. 376, note 1; and Friedmann, PR, p. 1.
94. Zunz-Albeck, p. 376, note 1.
95. Friedmann, PR, p. 1.
96. Braude, PR, p. 27, note 36.
97. Zunz-Albeck, p. 119.
98. Friedmann, PR, p. 2.
99. Ibid.
100. Ibid.
101. Braude, PR, p. 28.
102. Ibid., p. 27, note 36.
103. Braude, Proceedings, pp. 7-35.
104. Braude, PR, pp. 27-28.
105. Ibid., pp. 911-995.
106. Ibid., p. 16, note 18.
107. Nos. 1-14, 19, 26, 30, 32, 34, 39-46, 48.
108. Zunz-Albeck, p. 118.
109. Ibid., p. 378, note 8.
110. Ibid., p. 118.
111. Friedmann, PR, p. 23.
112. Ibid.
113. Ibid.
114. Ibid., p. 24.
115. Ibid., p. 7.
116. Braude, PR, p. 3.
117. Ibid., p. 4.
118. Zunz-Albeck, pp. 119-120.



Notes. Chapter III. (Continued)

119. Braude, PR, p. 4.
120. Zunz-Albeck, p. 120.
121. Ibid.
122. Braude, PR, pp. 4-5.
123. Ibid., p. 677 et passim.
124. Zunz-Albeck, p. 120.
125. Ibid.
126. Braude, PR, p. 5.
127. Ibid., pp. 28-30. Cf. William Braude, "Overlooked Meanings of Certain Editorial Terms in the Pesikta Rabbati," JQR 52 (1962), pp. 264-272.

NOTES. CHAPTER IV.

1. Braude, PRK, pp. xlix-1.
2. Cf. Albeck, p. 37.
3. Goldberg, p. 73.
4. Cf. Buber, p. xxxviii and Strack, p. 211.
5. See above, p. 7.
6. See above, p. 10.
7. Braude, PRK, p. 1.
8. Albeck, p. 40.
9. Ibid.
10. Zunz-Albeck, p. 118.
11. Buber, p. v.
12. Sperber, p. 335.
13. In Mandelbaum's edition, which will be used for all further citations from Pesikta d'Rav Kahana, unless specified otherwise.
14. Buber, p. xxxviii.
15. Albeck, p. 36.
16. Heinemann, Tarbitz, pp. 343-344.
17. Heinemann, ha-Sifrut, p. 820, note 47.
18. Albeck, p. 39.
19. Ibid., p. 38.
20. Ibid., p. 37.
21. Ibid., p. 41.
22. Ibid., p. 40.
23. Ibid., pp. 41-42.
24. Ibid., p. 40.

Notes. Chapter IV. (Continued)

25. Friedmann, PR, p. 114a, note 79.
26. Albeck, p. 41.
27. More complete information on parallels may be found in Albeck, pp. 36-42, whose account is the most complete.

Notes. Chapter V.

1. Friedmann omitted the paragraph numbers because he felt that they did not adequately reflect the style of the homilies. Friedmann, PR, p. 2.
2. Pp. 105-106.
3. Hereafter abbreviated as "Kahana" and "Rabbati."
4. In Pesikta Rabbati, pending further study, this statement applies only to those chapters which begin with ילמדנו רבינו.
5. Various complements to the name of R. Tanhuma are used in Pesikta Rabbati. "Berebi," an honorific, coexists with "bar Abba," a patronymic. It is likely that the same person is being referred to throughout.
6. Pp. 20-21.
7. Goldberg, p. 74.
8. Ibid.
9. Throughout the remainder of this chapter, section numbers of Rabbati 12 which appear in brackets indicate the author's restructuring of the chapter. These numbers do not correspond to those in any printed editions.
10. See Table III.
11. See above, p. 76.
12. Goldberg, p. 74.
13. Ibid., p. 78.
14. See above, pp. 73-74.
15. See above, p. 75.
16. Goldberg, p. 74, note 11.

Notes. Chapter V. (Continued)

17. See below, pp. 161, 168-169.
18. See above, pp. 27-28.
19. See below, p. 145.
20. Rabbati 12:10 and Ta'anit 4:6 say that the Torah was burned.
- 20a. The transposition of ך and ם is a common exegetical device.
21. Cf. Deut. 17:15.
22. See above, pp. 127-128.
23. A rabbinic dictum says that the word "hand" (יָד) always refers to the right hand. Zevahim 24a.
24. P. 128.
25. Braude, PR, p. 225, note 30, and Friedmann, PR, p. 49a, note 27.
26. Friedmann, p. 49a, note 26.
27. Braude, PR, p. 226, note 35.
28. Friedmann, PR, p. 49a, note 32.
29. See above, p. 129.

Notes. Chapter VI.

1. Pp. 93-94.
2. Included in the bibliography of this paper as Ha-D'rashot b'Yisrael etc.
3. See above, p. 70.
4. See above, p. 91.
5. Conversation with Dr. I. O. Lehman, April, 1976. Dr. Lehman is curator of rare books and manuscripts for the HUC-JIR Library, Cincinnati campus.
6. See above, pp. 18-19.
7. See above, p. 7.
8. See above, p. 55.
9. See above, pp. 41-44.
10. P. 72.
11. These variants do not seriously affect the intent of the midrashim. However, enough manuscripts of each midrash are known to establish that one is not a simple copy of the other.
12. See above, p. 106.
13. Finkelstein, p. 115.

Bibliography

- Albeck, Hanoch. "Midrash Vayikra Rabbah." Sefer ha-Yovel Lichvod Levi Ginzberg. Edited by Saul Lieberman, Solomon Zeitlin, Shalom Spiegel and Alexander Marx. New York: The American Academy for Jewish Research, 1946. (In Hebrew.)
- Bamberger, Bernard J. "A Messianic Document of the Seventh Century." Hebrew Union College Annual, XV (1940), 425-431.
- Braude, William G., and Kapstein, Israel J., trans. and ed. Pesikta dē-Rav Kahana. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1975.
- Braude, William G., trans. and ed. Pesikta Rabbati. Yale Judaica Series, Vol. XVIII. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.
- Braude, William G. "The Piska Concerning the Sheep Which Rebelled." Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research, XXX (1962), 1-35.
- Buber, Solomon, ed. Pesikta d'Rav Kahana. Jerusalem: 1963. (In Hebrew.)
- Finkelstein, Louis. "The Transmission of the Early Rabbinic Traditions." Hebrew Union College Annual, XVI (1941), 115-135.
- Friedmann, Meir. "Ma'amar al Ha'takot v'Chitvey Yad me'ha-Pesiktot." ("Concerning Copies and Manuscripts of the Pesiktot.") Beyt Talmud, V (1889), 1-6, 46-53, 78-90, 108-114, 168-172, 197-206. (In Hebrew.)
- Friedmann, Meir, ed. Pesikta Rabbati. Tel Aviv: 1963. (In Hebrew.)
- Goldberg, Abraham. "Pesikta d'Rav Kahana." Kirjath Sepher, XLIII (1967-68), 68-79. (In Hebrew.)
- Gratz, Heinrich. History of the Jews. Vols. 2-3. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1956.
- Heinemann, Joseph. "Omanut ha-Kompositzia b'Midrash Vayikra Rabbah." ("The Art of Composition in Leviticus Rabbah.") Hasifrut, II (1969-71), 808-834. (In Hebrew.)
- Heinemann, Joseph. "Parashot b'Vayikra Rabbah she-M'koriutan M'pukpekot." ("Chapters of Doubtful Authenticity in Leviticus Rabbah.") Tarbiz, XXXVII (1967-68), 339-354. (In Hebrew.)

(Bibliography, Continued)

- Heinemann, Joseph. "The Proem in the Aggadic Midrashim: A Form-Critical Study." Scripta Hierosolymitana, XXII (1971), 100-122.
- Heinemann, Joseph. "Profile of a Midrash: The Art of Composition in Leviticus Rabba." Journal of the American Academy of Religion, XXXIX (1971), 141-150.
- The Holy Scriptures. Hebrew-English ed. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955.
- Jastrow, Marcus. A Dictionary. New York: Pardes, 1950.
- Mandelbaum, Bernard, ed. Pesikta de Rav Kahana. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962. (In English and Hebrew.)
- Mandelbaum, Bernard. "Prolegomenon to the Pesikta." Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research, XXIII (1954), 41-58.
- Margulies, Mordecai. Midrash Wayyikra Rabbah. Part 5. Jerusalem: The Louis M. and Minnie Epstein Fund of the American Academy for Jewish Research, 1960. (In Hebrew.)
- The New English Bible: The Old Testament. Library ed. Oxford and Cambridge: Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Sarason, Richard. "Parashat Sh'kalim ('Ki Tisa') b'Pesikta d'Rav Kahana uv'Pesikta Rabbati." ("The Chapter Sh'kalim /'Ki Tisa'/ in Pesikta d'Rav Kahana and in Pesikta Rabbati: A Comparative Analysis in the Light of 'The Art of Composition in Leviticus Rabbah.'") Seminar paper, Hebrew University, 1972. (In Hebrew.)
- Sperber, David. "Pesikta Rabbati." Encyclopedia Judaica. Vol. XIII.
- Stevenson, William B. Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic. 2nd ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Strack, Hermann L. Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash. Temple Books. New York: Atheneum, 1969.
- Theodor, Julius. "Midrash Haggadah." The Jewish Encyclopedia. Vol. VIII.
- The Torah. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1962.



(Bibliography, Continued)

Wacholder, Ben Zion. "The Date of the Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael."  
Hebrew Union College Annual, XXXIX (1968), 117-144.

Zunz, Leopold. Ha-D'rashot b'Yisrael v'Hishtalsh'lutan ha-Historit.  
("Sermons in Israel and Their Historical Development.") Edited  
and completed by Hanoch Albeck. Translated from the German by  
M. A. Szyk. 2nd ed. Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1954. (In  
Hebrew.)