

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
NEW YORK SCHOOL

INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES

AUTHOR Jeffrey Joseph Weisblatt

TITLE The Extent of Editing and Shaping in The
Homiletic Midrashim: A Comparison of Parallel
Sections in The Pesikta De-Rav Kahana, Pesikta Rabboti,
and Midrash Tanhuma

TYPE OF THESIS: D.H.L. () Rabbinic (✓)

Master's ()

1. May circulate ()

2. Is restricted (✓) for 10 years. (may be used by
H.U.C. students only)

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on
theses for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of
my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis.

yes ☒ no

April 1, 1985
Date

Jeffrey J. Weisblatt
Signature of Author

Library
Record

Microfilmed _____
Date

Signature of Library Staff Member

THE EXTENT OF EDITING AND SHAPING IN THE
HOMILETIC MIDRASHIM: A COMPARISON OF PARALLEL
SECTIONS IN THE PESIKTA DE RAV KAHANA,
PESIKTA RABBATI, AND MIDRASH TANHUMA

JEFFREY JOSEPH WEISBLATT

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
Requirements for Ordination

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

March 29, 1985

Referee: Professor Norman J. Cohen

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	i
CHAPTER ONE:INTRODUCTION:SCHOLARLY MATERIAL.....	I
ON THE HOMILETIC MIDRASHIM	
Dating And Provenance Of The Homiletic Midrashim	
The Function Of The Homiletic Midrashim	
The Extent Of Editing In The Homiletic Midrashim	
Structure In The Homiletic Midrashim	
Pesikta De Rav Kahana	
Pesikta Rabbati	
Tanhuma	
CHAPTER TWO:HOMILIES ON NUMBERS 7:I.....	27
Introduction	
-Pesikta De Rav Kahana,Pisqa One	
Section Analysis	
Thematic Overview	
Pesikta Rabbati,Pisqa Five	
Section Analysis	
Thematic Overview	
Tanhuma, Parashah Naso,Sections 19-29	
Section Analysis	
Thematic Overview	
Comparison and Contrast Amongst The Three Homilies	
CHAPTER THREE:HOMILIES ON LEVITICUS 16:I.....	65
Introduction	
Pesikta De Rav Kahana,Pisqa Twenty-Six	
Section Analysis	
Thematic Overview	
Pesikta Rabbati,Pisqa Forty-Seven	
Section Analysis	
Thematic Overview	
Tanhuma, Parashah Aharei Mot,Sections 1-13	
Section Analysis	
Thematic Overview	
Comparison and Contrast Amongst The Three Homilies	
CHAPTER FOUR:CONCLUSION.....	124
APPENDICES.....	138
Appendix A.....	140
Appendix B.....	143
NOTES.....	149
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	154

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have helped me during the work on my thesis, without whose help this thesis would not have been completed. I am indebted to my advisor, Norman Cohen, who has guided me and inspired me throughout the process of writing my thesis. He helped me organize my research, was critical and helpful in his editorial comments, gave me encouragement and support throughout the process, and was always there to offer kind words of support.

The staff of the Klau library helped me in finding references which I needed to prepare my thesis.

My parents and in-laws offered me encouragement as I proceeded with my work and were understanding when I could not see them as often as we would have liked.

Most importantly and significantly has been my wife, Jeanne. She put up with the pressures I had while working on my thesis. She is a wonderful human being who helped me put things in perspective when she suggested we start our family. In short, she was a source of love and strength during this harried time. With undending love and gratitude I dedicate this thesis to my companion in the journey of life, and to our unborn child.

With God's help and guidance I have gained much knowledge and love of Midrash doing this thesis. "Praised are you God who gives strength and hope to the weary."

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION: SCHOLARLY MATERIAL ON THE
HOMILETIC MIDRASHIM

During my years of study at the Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute Of Religion, the field of Midrash has intrigued me the most. I find Midrash fascinating because it represents the creative imagination of the rabbis in their living dialogue with the Torah. Midrash has come to represent for me our people's ingenious way of making the Torah a living, breathing, viable text for all time. By studying Midrash, we also gain a better sense of the social and historical contexts of the people who composed it. In this way, Midrash can give us insight into how our people responded to challenges in the past so that we can respond in a positive manner to challenges that confront us today. Looking to the messages within the Midrash, we also see a continuum of Jewish love for and dedication to survival in harmony with the Torah, the Jews' guide to moral, spiritual, and holy living. For these reasons I decided to do my thesis in the field of Midrash.

Within Midrashic literature there are two basic forms, the Exegetical and Homiletical Midrashim. The Exegetical Midrashim are generally earlier and comment on each verse of the Torah. In this sub-genre, there generally does not appear to be a real flow of themes or ideas from the comments on one verse to the next. The opposite seems to be true of the Homiletic Midrashim. It fascinated me to see how the editors of the Homiletic Midrashim could weave a homily based on

one Torah verse with an identifiable unifying ~~theme~~. Consequently this peaked my interest in the Homiletic Midrashim, and I decided to investigate a selection of them to see how themes are developed and to what extent different literary techniques are used by the editors to fashion homilies culled from various sources into a single artistic unit. Also I was curious about the development of the Homiletic Midrashim over time; if later compilations are more highly edited and the extent to which later sources borrowed material from earlier ones.

In order to test my hypothesis that the Homiletic Midrashim are made up of homilies that are single units possessing a unifying theme, and shaped and edited with various techniques, I have decided to examine two sets of parallel homilies from the Pesikta De Rav Kahana, Pesikta Rabati, and Midrash Tanhuma. Before we analyze these specific homilies, however, we must understand the nature of the Homiletic Midrashim in general.

A. Dating and Provenance Of The Homiletic Midrashim

The first question that confronts us in our study of the Homiletic Midrashim is: Where and when, and why did the particular form of the Homiletic Midrash arise? Midrash was born because of the economy of language of the Torah which looks askance at tautology and the redundant word or letter.^I The Torah was in need of new expansion and elucidation and therefore there was a propensity to create

Midrash, the creative rabbinic mind's ability to shed new light on the Torah text. As a result of the historical situation in the early centuries of the common era, "the sages searched for harmony between the detailed text and the contemporary view of metaphysics and man."² Thus, according to Jacob Neusner, "Midrash represents...creative philology and historiography."³

The process of Midrash evolved in the style of the Homiletic Midrash with the advent of Leviticus Rabbah. Leviticus Rabbah was the first Homiletic Midrash, and was compiled in the latter part of the Fifth, early Sixth Century C.E.; it comprised a new literary genre.⁴ This new genre was a concentration on the first verse (or verses) of the pericope text as the focus of the homily.

Amongst scholars there is disagreement as to when the form of the Homiletic Midrash arose in Palestine. According to Hanoch Albeck Midrash begins in the Second Century with the advent of the petihta (proem) form. Mandelbaum posits that Homiletic Midrash began in the Third or Fourth Century when in his estimation, Leviticus Rabbah was composed. Though J. Heinemann agrees with Mandelbaum, he dates the composition of Leviticus Rabbah to the Fifth Century. Finally, Leopold Zunz places the beginning of Homiletic Midrash rather late, feeling that it began in the Sixth Century, when according to him, Leviticus Rabbah was composed. Although there is disagreement as

when the Homiletic Midrash began, there is no disagreement as to its place of origin. AS Ben-Zion Wacholder writes," As far as the Aggadic Midrashim are concerned, such as Genesis Rabbah and Leviticus Rabbah the investigations of Thedor, Albeck, and Lerner have shown that the economy of the midrashic chapters presupposes the Palestinian reading of the Torah."⁵

B. The Function Of The Homiletic Midrashim

Recognizing that Homiletic Midrash arose in Palestine sometime between the Second and Sixth Centuries of the common era, it is important for us to comprehend the function of this Midrashic form. The fact that the study of Midrash was on the curriculum of all the academies is an indication of the important place it occupied even among scholars.⁶ While Midrash with its cornucopia of parable and proverb, simile, and saw, analogy, and anecdote represents a vast playground of Rabbinic fancy, the main role of the Homiletic Midrash was to "shed light on obscure passages, to harmonize seeming paradoxes and to reconcile apparent contradictions."⁷ For Zunz, the main purpose of specifically the Homiletic Midrash was an "investigation in the spirit of the tradition ... to attach a new lesson to things said and to derive from old traditions comfort and new hope."⁸ According to Lehrman, it "supplied the inner light which heartened the soul of the Jew when despair was gnawing at his very existence."⁹

It seems from these comments on the function of the Homiletic Midrashim that they were intended for popular consumption. However, scholars have two views regarding for whom specifically the Homiletic Midrash was intended. Samuel Mirski contends that, "the Yelamedenu was not written as (if it were) said to the community, rather it was a dialogue between the scholar and the meturgaman (translator) who sat near him (and whose role it was) to make it heard to the people."¹⁰ Yet, Mirski also posits that the Yelamedenu has a quality that makes it seem that it was intended for study solely by disciple circles.¹¹ For Mirski, the only homilies that were intended for public use were those that began with a verse from the Hagiographa. Richard Sarason supports Mirski's conclusion that the Homiletic Midrashim were intended solely for Rabbinic disciple circles, or at the very least for people familiar with inner Rabbinic concerns:

We must conclude that the early Homiletic Midrashim (Leviticus Rabbah, Pesikta De Rav Kahana and their constituent materials in their present form) are addressed to a Rabbinic, not a 'popular' audience, or at least one thoroughly familiar with what would seem to be inner Rabbinic concerns.¹²

However, I tend to disagree with both Mirski and Sarason, because I see the function of the Homiletic Midrashim, as Zunz and Lehrman point out, as invigorating the text with new meaning for the folk and giving hope and consolation to a depressed people. Indeed why can't Rabbinic concerns be shared

by the people?

C. The Extent Of Editing In The Homiletic Midrashim

Since the editors of the Classical Homiletic Midrashim, such as the Pesikta De Rav Kahana, Pesikta Rabbati, and Midrash Tanhuma drew upon earlier material to compose their homilies, we need to understand scholarly views concerning the editing and redacting process in the formation of these texts. Joseph Heinemann emphasizes the process of redaction in the formation of the Homiletic Midrashim by writing that "the compilers of (these) Midrashim used for each of their homilies a variety of actual sermons, fully or in part, and combined them into a new entity, which we may perhaps call the 'literary homily.'" ¹³ Thus, the Homiletic Midrashim in their final form are a combination of disparate texts, which were shaped by a later editor or editors.

Consequently, the question that we need to explore is whether these editors in compiling their homilies attempt to weave together unified entities, and if so how was this accomplished. Note in this regard, that Norman Cohen writes that, "as early as the time of Leopold Zunz, the derashah, the classic Rabbinic homily was seen as a unified entity in a highly artistic form." ¹⁴ Joseph Heinemann,

believed that the parashiyyot and pisqa'ot of Leviticus Rabbah and the Pesikta De Rav Kahana are not simply haphazard collections of traditional material, but are highly

edited homilies which have a unified theme. Heinemann concluded that the editors of the pieces selected material from traditions already shaped into units and they in turn, welded these units into derashot. The material utilized was ordered and integrated, and this ensured thematic development.¹⁵

On the other hand, A. Goldberg rejects Heinemann's conclusion that these are edited sermons with a unifying theme. He sees them as anthological compilations with no sense of editing and thematic unity. This would lead him as Sarason points out, "to overlook evidence of recasting or re-stating to fit the literary context in a particular document."¹⁶

However, many scholars agree with Heinemann, including Zunz, Alter, Cohen, Sarason, and Solomon (Shlomo) Buber, arguing that the Homiletic Midrashim, and specifically Leviticus Rabbah was the product of conscious literary activity which led to editing and unification of material culled from different sources. As Ira Chernus writes, "large numbers of traditions were assembled with great skill to form independent and complete pericopes marked by harmonious unity of both form and content."¹⁷ The scholars listed above as well as Heinemann enumerate the skills the editors utilized to compose the Homiletic Midrashim into unified units. Heinemann describes the method of integrating material by the juxtaposition of contradictory material as a "dialectical approach in which the editor cited different views of the same issue."¹⁸ For Sarason, the unity of the homilies can be seen in "the process of

ordering, shaping, and transmitting the inherited mass of Rabbinic traditions."¹⁹ Robert Alter augments our awareness of the shaping and editing that took place in the Homiletic Midrashim, by applying the editing and shaping techniques of Biblical Narrative to Midrash:

Through our awareness of convention we can recognize significant or simply pleasing patterns of repetition, symmetry, and contrast; we can discriminate between the verisimilar and the fabulous, pick up directional clues in a narrative work, see what is innovative and what is deliberately traditional of each nexus of the artistic creation.²⁰

Following this observation, he further demonstrates the unification of the Homiletic Midrashim by recognizing that, "with their assumption of interconnectedness, the makers of the Midrash were often as exquisitely attuned to small verbal clues of continuity and to significant lexical nuances."²¹ Word ties are used by the editors of the Homiletic Midrashim, as Alter suggests, to make connections between seemingly unconnected episodes.²²

In addition, because of the pattern of narrative present in the Homiletic Midrashim, repetitions are utilized to tie homilies together. In fact, we shall see that word, idea, and phrase repetitions are major techniques used by the editors to achieve thematic unity. Solomon Buber's description of this technique is vital and aids us in seeing how it was used in the Homiletic Midrashim for the thematic unification of

the homily. He observed:

A leitwort is a word or word-root that occurs significantly in a text, in a continuum of texts, or in a configuration of texts. By following these repetitions, one is able to decipher or grasp the meaning of the text or at any rate the meaning will be revealed more strikingly. The repetition, as we have said, need not be merely the word itself, but also can be the word root; in fact the very difference in words can often intensify the dramatic action of repetition. I call this 'dramatic' because between the combinations of sounds related to one another in this manner a kind of movement takes place.²³

Not only does the repetition of words, ideas, or phrases indicate the degree of editing and shaping in the Homiletic Midrashim, but selectivity and integration are also the keys to the compiler's creativity.²⁴ The editor's ability is seen in the choices of traditions made, and in the way he combines them and gives them new contexts in order to communicate his own message with the apparent support of earlier authorities.²⁵ As we examine the homilies, we shall see how this type of editing affects theme development and unifies derashot compiled from a variety of sources.

D. Structure In The Homiletic Midrashim

Since most scholars feel there is evidence of shaping and editing in the Homiletic Midrashim we also need to investigate

their views regarding the structure of the Homiletic Midrashim and the extent to which the formal structure persists among the different compilations. Heinemann contended that the compiler or redactor of Leviticus Rabbah originated the 'literary homily' which had a tripartite form: proems (petihtot), a body (exegesis on the first verse(s) of the pericope text), and a messianic peroration.²⁶ Goldberg, following in Heinemann's footsteps, went even further in underscoring the highly structured nature of the pisqa'ot of the early Homiletic Midrashim. He seems to feel that over and above this tripartite form the body of the Rabbinic homily had a predictable structure: thematic interpretations are always followed by exegetic comments.²⁷

It is clear that Leviticus Rabbah and Pesikta De Rav Kahana have this fixed tripartite structure: petihtot, thematic and exegetic comments, and peroration. They lack the flexibility of structure we see in the later compilations, Pesikta Rabbati and Tanhuma.

As the creative editing process continued in these Homiletic Midrashim, there is not as much ordering of the formal elements. As the structure breaks down, thematic and exegetic comments are mixed with petihtot. According to Heinemann, this breakdown of structure was unconscious and caused by the exigencies of time. His opinion is that the structural breakdown had deleterious effects on the Homiletic Midrashim. However,

Cohen disagrees with Heinemann and takes the opposite view. He states that, "contrary to Heinemann's view, the compilers of these homilies consciously chose to deviate from the previously fixed structure in an effort to enhance the quality of their work."²⁸ He further states:

It is very plausible that the breakdown in the fixed structure of the Rabbinic derashah was due to a conscious decision on the part of the editors to enhance the artful editing of their homilies. Deviation from the previous accepted tripartite structure and the resultant flexibility led to a maximizing of the editor's creative ability and to the production of more homogeneous derashot.²⁹

An important part of the structure of all the Homiletic Midrashim is the petihta. The petihta is a section in a homily that consists of: a) the introduction of a verse from the Prophets or Writings; b) a weaving around this verse; and c) a return to the pericope text. It is to this form that we now turn our attention, since it is ubiquitous in the Homiletic Midrashim, from Leviticus Rabbah to Midrash Tanhuma.

The petihta, according to Zunz, originated in the oral exegesis of Scripture in the Tannaitic period. However, during this period it had not yet attained the polish and form we see in its later development. In the Tannaitic period, the petihta went through its formative stages. In fact one might say that at this stage they were really pseudo-petihtot, only to reach their full blown form by the Amoraic period, in which it acquires strict conventional rules of structure, formal perfection, and

polish. 300

The petihita by this time was basically a rhetorical device that, according to Heinemann, was intended for an actual audience and presupposed auditory impact.³¹ As an oratorical device, the petihita captured and held the congregants' interest. The congregation knew that its structure was based on the tension between two seemingly unrelated verses, which the preacher succeeded in linking together gradually.

There are three types of petihita: halachic, regular, and composite. The halachic petihita poses an halachic question which is discussed and leads to the pericope text. In the regular petihita, a verse from the Hagiographa is quoted and then there is a weaving from this verse to the pericope text, which is stated at the end. Finally, in the composite petihita, the biblical verse that is introduced is applied to different biblical characters and then returns to the pericope text.

The major question about the petihita is whether it originally was a sermon in itself or rather an editorial composition used as an introduction to the homily? Heinemann rejects the notion that the petihita were just introductions to the homily, writing that, "there can be little doubt that the poems were originally sermons in themselves."³² Butressing his position, he continues this way:

The poems were originally delivered before the Scriptural lesson itself... the poem and the reading following it were conceived of as one organic entity, the latter beginning where

the former left off.³³

However, the majority of scholars feel that the petihtot were editorial constructions used as introductions to the homily. The petihtot seem to be composite literary creations of the editor who used material originally meant for other purposes. Sarason, for example, stresses that the petihtot are content specific, "having been formulated to begin with as petihtot only in the process of the redaction of the document in which they appear, and having been reshaped by the editor as they moved from context to context."³⁴ He concluded that the bulk of the petihtot preserved in the Midrashic compilations as we have them are editorial compilations.³⁵

Since there is an abundance of shared material amongst the homilies from the different compilations, a major question remains about the borrowing amongst the various Homiletic Midrashim. We must ask whether it is possible to determine whether specific compilations drew upon earlier ones and to what extent?

This issue as well as the other key questions that have been raised, which include the development of the Homiletic Midrashim, the extent of their editing and shaping, the nature of theme development in these compilations, and the structure of the Homiletic Midrashim must be investigated in the light of selected parallel pisqa'ot. With this in mind let us turn to three Midrashic compilations, Pesikta De Rav Kahana, Pesikta Rabbati, and Tanhuma.

E. Pesikta De Rav Kahana

Pesikta De Rav Kahana is one of the oldest Homiletic Midrashim and is based on the festivals and important Sabbaths of the Jewish liturgical year. It includes 28 homilies and is divided into the following five units: Rosh Ha-Shanah to Yom Kippur, Sukkot and its related holidays, Hanukkah through Purim, Pesach through Shavuot, and the Sabbath after the seventeenth of Tammuz until the Sabbath before Rosh Ha-Shanah.

It was not until 1832 with the publication of Ha-Derashot be-Yisrael that the overall structure and content of the Kahana became known. In his magnum opus, Leopold Zunz described and outlined its pisqa'ot. Prior to that it had been known for a long time by secondary citations, particularly in the Sefer He-Arukh and the Yalkut Shimoni.³⁶ The structure and content of the Kahana was described by Leopold Zunz without the benefit of any manuscripts. He demonstrated that it is very ancient and is totally separate from the Pesikta Rabbati which was already extant.³⁷ Zunz proposed that the Kahana contained 29 homilies on the festivals and the important Sabbaths, beginning with a homily on Rosh Ha-Shanah and concluding with a homily on the Sabbath prior to Rosh Ha-Shanah.

Zunz description of the Kahana was confirmed by Solomon Buber in 1868 who had in his possession four manuscripts of the work. The manuscripts represented remarkable confirmation of Zunz's basic notions about the compilation.³⁸

Since the Kahana's existence and content have been demonstrated by Zunz and Buber, we now need to find out where and when it was composed. With the research of Marguiles in Leviticus Rabbah and parallel texts, it is not difficult to prove that the Pesikta De Rav Kahana is a product of Eretz Yisrael. The tradants and places cited, its language, and the different sources used all prove clearly that its place of composition is the Land Of Israel.³⁹

As far as dating the Kahana is concerned, scholars differ greatly. William Braude dates the Kahana to the Fifth Century because no tradants are cited who lived after the Fifth Century. Importantly, the tradants are mostly Palestinian and recently discovered (Palestinian) liturgical compilations of Yannai are based on a redacted Pesikta De Rav Kahana text.⁴⁰ In addition, the language, contents, and style distinguish it as a product of the Land Of Israel composed sometime in the Fifth Century. However, other scholars date the Kahana to different periods based on its relationship with other compilations. Zunz feels that the Kahana's date of composition is in the Seventh Century because parts of it are based on Genesis Rabbah, and Lamentations Rabbah. Yet, Zunz dates the beginning of the Homiletic Midrashim in general later than most scholars. By contrast, Buber places the Kahana in the Fifth Century, while Theodor feels that Leviticus Rabbah and Lamentations Rabbah are dependent on the Kahana, thus placing the Kahana in the Fourth Century. However, the majority of scholarly opinion is that the

Kahana's date of composition is sometime towards the end of the Fifth Century in Palestine because of the tradants cited, language, style, and the issues raised in the work.

A central question pertaining to the nature and structure of the *Pesikta De Rav Kahana* is that of the order of its *pisqa'ot*.⁴¹ According to Zunz the *Kahana* begins with Rosh Ha-Shanah, continues with the holidays of Tishri and the Sabbaths in between Sabbath Hanukkah, the four special *sidrot*, Rosh Hodesh, Pesach, Shavuot, the Haftarot of rebuke and consolation, and ends with the Sabbath before Rosh Ha-Shanah. He proposed that it followed the Jewish calendar year.⁴² Buber, on the other hand, basing himself on the four manuscripts in his possession, proposed that that *Kahana* began with Hanukkah. Mandelbaum concludes that Zunz was correct in arguing that the *Kahana* was arranged according to the calendrical year, because he had in his possession a new manuscript of the *Kahana* whose table of contents was so arranged. He writes, "because the *Peskita De Rav Kahana* is a product of the Land of Israel this is a key to solving the problem of the order of the *pis-ga'ot*."⁴³ In addition, writes Mandelbaum, "the major importance of the New Oxford Manuscript is that it allows us to recognize the structure and original order of our Midrash; that it was arranged according to the Hebrew calendrical year and started with Rosh Ha-Shanah."⁴⁴ Despite this new evidence, Madelbaum in his edition based his order of the *Kahana* on the Old Oxford Manuscript copied in 1291. He did this because

it was the oldest manuscript, contains the fewest mistakes, and more importantly, because it was closer to the original version of the Kahana and its writing style than the new Oxford Manuscript. As a result, his text begins with the pisqa on Hanukkah.

Thus, the question as to what was the original order of the pisqa'ot in the Pesikta De Rav Kahana remains unsolved and requires further research.

Since it has been established that the Kahana's homilies are shaped from different sources, we now need to look at the attitude of scholars concerning its internal structure, i.e., the form of the homilies and the extent of editing and shaping that occurs in the work. Mandelbaum writes that the Kahana "gives us a clear picture of the homily of Israel, its form and production. The preacher starts with a petihta from a different place in the Bible and his creative imagination attracts the listener until he returns to the central subject."⁴⁵ The Kahana has a carefully arranged sequence of one or more petihtot that leads to exegesis on the pericope text, which is followed by a peroration derived from the theme of God's concern for Israel. Norman Cohen informs us that 93% of the pisqa'ot in the Kahana have this fixed triparite structure.

Scholars generally feel that the extent of editing in the Kahana is demonstrated by the fact that individual motifs at the start of the homily are picked up later and extended

or integrated with earlier material. For example, in discussing the edited nature of the Kahana, Zunz writes, "each pisqa is a complete work and the appropriate content of the named parashah and the subject of the holidays or Shabbat is the focus."⁴⁶ Braude extends this sense of editing in the Kahana by stating that each of the pisqa'ot has its own unifying theme, a theme appropriate to the Scriptural reading that pisqa accompanies.⁴⁷

Finally, the last issue we need to deal with is the extent of material in the Kahana that is shared with other Homiletic Midrashim. In this regard Zunz believes, "it is possible to prove that parts of the Pesikta De Rav Kahana are taken from Lamentations Rabbah."⁴⁸ In addition, five homilies in Leviticus Rabbah are found in the Kahana⁴⁹ and the Kahana also shares material with the Rabbati and Tanhuma. The question remaining is whether the Kahana borrowed directly from these works or vice versa.

F. Pesikta Rabbati

Pesikta Rabbati is a collection of homilies on the cycle of lessons for the holidays and special Sabbaths which was produced in Palestine during the late Sixth, early Seventh Century.⁵⁰ Its chief concern, indeed its unifying concern is discourse on the biblical lessons prescribed for reading on all the Festivals, fasts, and special Sabbaths in their

successive occurrence during the Jewish year. The Rabbati contains at least 48 chapters and starts with a homily on Rosh Hodesh, continues with a homily for Hanukkah, and then continues throughout the calendrical year until it ends with homilies on Yom Kippur, and probably Sukkot, Shemini-Atzeret.⁵¹

Scholars debate the date of the compilation of the Rabbati. Zunz proposes that it was composed in Greece in the Ninth Century, because in the first pisqa there is a reference made that it was composed 777 years since the destruction of Temple. Zunz assumes that this refers to the Second Temple, thus dating the Rabbati to 845 C.E. In addition, because its style is close to the Tanhuma, which he places in the Ninth Century, according to him the Rabbati could not have been composed much before that time.⁵² Aptowitzer and Mann concur with Zunz's late dating of the Rabbati, as they also accept the reference in the opening pisqa to 777 years since the destruction of the Temple as being authentic.⁵³ Opposing these scholars is Meir Friedmann, who in his edition of the Rabbati assumes that the reference to 777 years since the destruction of the Temple refers to the destruction of the First Temple. Therefore, he dates the Rabbati's composition as 355 C.E. He supports this by noting the tradants cited and the anti-Christian polemic found in the Rabbati.⁵⁴ However, Eppenstein disagrees with Friedmann, and uses the Christian influence to demonstrate that the Rabbati is of Italian origin in the seventh Century

when there were cordial relations between the Jewish and Christian communities.⁵⁵ In contrast, Bamberger dates the Pesikta Rabbati to 632-637 C.E. because in pisqa'ot 34-37 there are references to specific Persian kings who waged war at that time. This conclusion is also based on stylistic considerations.⁵⁶ William Braude, in his dating of the Rabbati, asserts that scholars are mistaken when they take the reference in the first pisqa concerning 777 years since the destruction of the Temple as being original. He sees this as a late insertion in the pisqa and considers the Rabbati as a Sixth-Seventh Century Palestinian compilation. He bases himself on its language, style, and the tradants mentioned. We have already seen that Norman Cohen also dates the Rabbati as a late Sixth-Seventh Century compilation of Palestine. It therefore seems that the current opinion is that the Rabbati was composed in Palestine during the late Sixth or early Seventh Centuries, a conclusion based on its contents, tradants, structure, style, and language.

We now turn to the internal structure of the Rabbati and the extent of editing and shaping that took place in the Rabbati. It is clear that the Pesikta Rabbati is not one unified work, rather sections from different sources were composed and gathered together.⁵⁷ The Rabbati is a composite work of different literary units woven together by its editors.⁵⁸

Yet, many scholars feel that its individual homilies for the most part are closely knit discourses based on themes

suggested by specific holidays. For instance, William Braude in discussing this writes that, "the anonymous editor intends them to be integrated units expressing a single theme; and the several authorities cited in the davar achar are quoted to illustrate or enliven the principal theme (the editor) has in mind."⁵⁹ Braude demonstrates this by showing how the usage of a variety of formulae used in the Rabbati by its editors were utilized to unify and integrate the homilies.

The extent to which the homilies of the Rabbati are edited and shaped could further be seen in their structure. The Rabbati evinces a flexibility of structure and does not seem to be constricted by the same conventions of structure as is the Kahana. This breakdown of structure in the Rabbati will force us to ask whether this is beneficial or detrimental to theme development in its homilies.

The last significant concern for us now is the amount of material the Rabbati shares with other Homiletic Midrashim. It is clear that the Rabbati used and borrowed material from the Kahana and shares material with the Tanhuma. For example 28 of its homilies begin with a halachic petihta in the style of the Yelamedenu-Tanhuma. Also it has five pisqa'ot in common with the Kahana.⁶⁰ However, the Rabbati is selective in its usage of material from the Kahana and so we will need to examine how this impacts upon theme development in the Rabbati's homilies.

G. Midrash Tanhuma

Focusing on the Tanhuma, we see that it is a group of homilies which have the following features in common: frequent mentioning of Rabbi Tanhuma, usually introducing a regular petihta as the second element in the homily, and halachic petihtot which serve as introductions. The Tanhuma is a compilation of complete homilies (not commentaries) on the major topics of the Torah and is arranged according to the triennial cycle of parashiyyot of the Torah. Therefore, it is seen to be a product of Palestine. Ben-Zion Wacholder informs us that the Tanhuma texts weave their homilies about a set of sedarim that to a large extent are identical with the standard list of the triennial cycle.⁶¹

Yet, scholars have a difficult time determining the date and place of the Tanhuma's composition because though the editor used primarily the Jerusalem Talmud and the haggadot of Palestine it also contains Greek and Latin terms. Therefore, Zunz dates the Tanhuma to the Ninth Century and places its composition in either Syria or in Eretz Yisrael, though he also thinks it might be a European composition because in Greece and Southern Italy Jews were familiar with the literature of Palestine.⁶² L. Ginsburg, on the other hand, places its composition in the Sixth Century, because it does not include any traditions who lived after the Fifth Century.⁶³ Mirski, however, sees the Tanhuma as an Eighth Century Babylonian work.⁶⁴

Nevertheless, the majority of scholars date the Tanhuma to the late Seventh-early Eighth Century in Palestine, and it is seen as a late work because of its mixed halachic-aggadic style.

The function of the Tanhuma was to create new contexts for older traditions by using the pedagogic devices of the regular and halachic petihtot.

It is now necessary for us to outline scholarly views regarding the extent of editing and shaping in the Tanhuma, and its internal structure. Epstein noticing that the Tanhuma initiated a new form in Homlietic Midrash, i.e., the halachic petihita, indicates that the derashot of the Tanhuma are anthological compilations from various sources, according to him, the editor of the Tanhuma took different traditions and molded them "into a straightforward unity."⁶⁵ Ginsburg, agrees with Epstein, and in addition sees the derashot as highly edited and shaped homilies. He writes that, "the style of the Tanhuma is beautiful, exalted, poetic, and aggadic. It is difficult to state that it was edited by one individual."⁶⁶

Consequently, we need to inquire about the editorial quality of the Tanhuma. Mirski sees each homily as being built on a single idea that emanates from a verse in the appropriate Torah portion.⁶⁷ Similarly, Chernus points out that the editor used bridge passages in the transformation and development of Midrash in the Tanhuma.⁶⁸

Focusing our attention on the structure of the Tanhuma

homilies, Norman Cohen points out that the Tanhuma homilies do not follow a fixed ordering of elements. He emphasizes that, "not only do the thematic and exegetic comments generally not follow any set order, but proems are interwoven with expository elements throughout the homilies."⁶⁹ This having been raised, we will look to see how this strengthens or weakens the unity and theme development in the Tanhuma homilies which we will examine.

The last area of our investigation of the Tanhuma must concern the material which the Tanhuma has in common with the other Homiletic Midrashim, 30 of the homilies in the Tanhuma are found in the Rabbati and the Tanhuma has quite a large amount of shared material with the Kahana as well. Consequently, we will have to see what the interrelationships of these compilations are relative to their parallel material.

H. The Focus Of This Study

Several major questions have been raised here regarding the nature and relationship of the homilies in the Pesikta De Rav Kahana, Pesikta Rabbati, and Midrash Tanhuma. These include concern about: a) the extent of theme development within the Homiletic Midrashim; b) the extent of editing and shaping in the individual homilies; c) the affect of structure and structural breakdown on theme development; d) the affect of the selective usage of shared material and its placement on theme development; and e) because of the extent of shared

material amongst the Homiletic Midrashim, which works borrowed from the other works.

To answer these poignant questions, I have chosen to analyze two sets of parallel pisqa'ot in the Pesikta De Rav Kahana, Pesikta Rabbati, and Midrash Tanhuma. The first set of parallel pisqa'ot is based on Nu. 7:1: "After Moses completed erecting the Tabernacle." These homilies are pisqa. One of the Pesikta De Rav Kahana, pisqa Five of the Pesikta Rabbati, and Midrash Tanhuma, Parashah Naso, sections 19-29. The second set of parallel pisqa'ot is based on Lev. 16:1: "After the deaths of the two sons of Aaron," and includes pisqa 26 of the Pesikta De Rav Kahana, pisqa 47 of the Pesikta Rabbati, and Midrash Tanhuma, Parashah Aharei Mot, Sections I-13.

I. INTRODUCTION

The three homilies that I am comparing on the pericope text from Nu. 7:1: "וַיִּכְלֹם מֹשֶׁה אֶת-הַמִּשְׁכָּן" (It was on the day that Moses completed erecting the Tabernacle) are found in the Pesikta De Rav Kahana, Pisqa One, Pesikta Rabbati, Pisqa Five, and Midrash Tanhuma (Buber Edition) Parashah Naso, sections 19-29.

The overriding theme present in all three homilies is the place of the mishkan in the relationship between God and Israel. As we shall see, this is developed in each of the homilies in a different way by their respective editors.

II. PESIKTA DE RAV KAHANA, PISQA ONE

A. Section Analysis

Section One- The opening petihta of the homily on Nu. 7:1 begins to develop the theme of the love relationship between God and Israel. It is seen to be parallel to the relationship between a king and queen, and is set up well with the verse from S.S. 5:1: "בָּאֵלֶי אֶחָדָה אֶחָדָה", "I have entered my garden, my sister bride." Israel is like a spoiled queen whom God, the king banished. A love spat had taken place between God and Israel and prior to any reconciliation, they both need guarantees of continued faithfulness. God's guarantee to Israel is that if she should build the mishkan, He will dwell with her. As a result, Israel promises to build the

mishkan and offer sacrifices there for God to smell. Thus, He will re-enter His garden,"smell the pleasing odor"(Gen. 8:21),and accept Israel as before:"I have come into my garden my sister bride"(S.S. 5:1). Here the symbolism of gan as the mishkan is brought out;the mishkan becomes the bridal chamber for God and Israel. The mishkan is the pristine place of God,and Israel asks God to resume their relationship via the mishkan,the bridal chamber.

Now we are introduced to the theme that the day the mishkan was built was the wedding day between God and Israel. Israel,the bride,gave God permission to enter the bridal chamber," יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יֵרָד וְנִשְׁכָּב ". "Let my beloved enter His garden." Rav Tanhuma makes this clear by saying that gan should be read as genuni(bridal chamber). The point is also made that this teaches the groom manners. He should not enter the hupah until the bride gives him permission.

The concept that the original place of the shechinah is earth is further developed in this section. The original place of the Divine Presence was earth,but seven generations of wicked people removed it to the seventh firmament of heaven, and then seven generations of righteous people brought it back to earth;the last being Moses. Moses's erection of the mishkan brings the shechinah back to her pristine place,earth.

The theme being developed throughout the section is that God and Israel were united, then estranged,and reunited finally with the building of the mishkan(the gan,bridal

chamber). They are in an eternal nuptial relationship and covenant, and the mishkan ensures that the shechinah will remain on earth.

Section Two- This section is a lengthy petihta. The first theme developed is a continuation of the love relationship between God and Israel. As Israel matures in her special relationship with God, God recognizes the need for a special place where the two can carry on this mature relationship. This place is the mishkan, the pavillon where God and Israel can experience an intimate relationship. There appears to be here the idea of kabalat'ol malchut shamayim (the acceptance of the yoke of God's kingdom) as the last stage in the process of the development of a mature relationship between God and Israel. This ties us back to Section One where the mishkan is presented as the nuptial chamber. After this, one expects a return to Nu. 7:1. However, there follows a description of the materials that make up the mishkan. I believe that this is gererah material. Gererah is the process of dragging, 'including' a block of material that the editor has taken from another source and used verbatim in his homily. The editor does not remove anything from this block of material, even if it is tangential to the theme development or breaks up the flow of the homily. Gererah breaks up ~~the~~ the theme being developed, that the mishkan is God's

place of glory, the appropriate place for God and Israel to establish their relationship.

The idea that concludes this section is that the mishkan is like a cave of water at the edge of the sea. When the cave is full of water, there is not less water in the sea; so when the mishkan is full of God's glory, God's glory is not diminished anywhere else. God's glory is pervasive.

Section Three - At the beginning of this section there is a petihta on S.S. 3:11: "Go forth daughters of Zion and look at King Solomon on his wedding day." In this long and meandering petihta, one notices a continuation of the theme of the special relationship between God and Israel. In Section Two we raised the idea of the acceptance of the yoke of God's kingdom as the final stage in Israel's maturation process in her relationship with God. This theme is further developed and given greater detail at the ~~S~~start of this section on S.S. 3:11: "Go forth daughters of Zion and see." The comment is, "Go forth and see those who are consecrated to me by virtue of circumcision, the wearing of beards, and the wearing of fringes." This strengthens the theme of the love bond between God and Israel. The mitzvot are derived from the mishkan, the designated place for their mature relationship. As Israel reaches the level of a mature relationship via the mishkan, the people are able to carry out more of God's commandments as a sign that they have

accepted the responsibilities inherent in this relationship.

After this, one expects a continuation of the theme that God and Israel enjoy a special relationship as a result of the mishkan. However, there is a lengthy discussion of how God reconciles opposites, causing peace to reign among them. One can see this as a product of the process of gererah because after this, the section returns to the theme of the love relationship between God and Israel, i.e., S.S. 3:11. The adornment that the king, God, wore on the wedding day was the mishkan. This is what Israel bestowed upon God on their wedding day. Here again, we are reminded of the theme developed in Sections One and Two.

The next theme that is developed in this section is the relationship between God and Moses which is a microcosm of the relationship between God and Israel. God instructs Moses on the construction of the mishkan by showing him a picture of the heavenly mishkan. He tells Moses that this will ensure that the shechinah will reside with Israel.

The petihta then concludes by returning to the wedding day between God and Israel. This was the day the mishkan was built. The mishkan is God's eternal habitation and it represents the consecration of the mature relationship between the Divine and Israel.

Section Four- This section is a composite petihta based

on Prov. 30:4 and it is applied to God, Elijah, and Moses seriatim. The importance of Moses is brought out by the same verse being applied to him and God. Thus, continuing the development of the theme of the centrality of Moses in the building of the mishkan.

The theme developed at the end is that not until the mishkan was built was the world set on a firm foundation. An implicit sub-theme here is that not until the mishkan was constructed was there a secure and firm relationship between both God and Israel, and God and the world. The mishkan was the sign of that firm relationship. This also ties us back into the previously mentioned theme that the day the mishkan was erected was the wedding day between God and Israel. I would suggest that the mishkan is their mutual wedding band, a symbol of the eternality of their love for each other.

Section Five- This section begins the body of the sermon with different interpretations of the pericope verse word kelot (completed). The first interpretation is that kelot means kallah, bride, and the day Moses erected the mishkan was Israel and God's wedding day. The play is on the root of kelot, klh, which is turned into kallah. The second interpretation is that each day Moses himself erected the mishkan and took it apart. He did this for seven days. The third interpretation is again a word play on kelot, it means conclusion. The conclusion here is that all the demons

left the world the day the mishkan was built. The fourth interpretation takes kelot to mean 'end,' and the day the mishkan was erected enmity, competition, jealousy, and dissension left the world. The last interpretation is that the erection of the mishkan brought stability to the world. It is interesting to note that Section Five concludes with the exact same words as does Section Four.

Section Six- In this section of the body of the homily reasons are given as to why Moses annointed and sanctified each part of the mishkan. The theme brought out in this section, which was mentioned earlier, is that they collectively and seperately hold the world together, and they connect this world and the world to come. This second theme is the only eschatological reference to the mishkan in the entire homily.

Section Seven- As the homily's exegesis on the pericope text continues, we read about the tribal chiefs offering sacrifices. These sacrifices were brought in six wagons and were pulled by twelve oxen. The theme brought out by the interpretations on what the six wagons represent is that they are what the rabbis consider to be vital to life and set Israel's relationship to God on a firm basis. What is vital to life and set Israel's relationship to God on a firm basis as represented by the six wagons include the six days of creation

(note a parallelism between creation and the erection of the mishkan), the six Orders of the Mishnah, the six patriarchs, and the six commandments a ruler has to follow.

Section Eight-This last section begins with different descriptions of the wagons and twelve oxen. These twelve oxen represent the twelve tribes and plays back to the idea that all Israel was present for the wedding day between God and Israel. A sub-theme derived is that each Jew has equal access to God.

Although every Jew had equal access to God because of the mishkan, it was the tribe of Issachar who was learned in Torah and instructed the people about the sacrificial process in the Tabernacle to insure that the Divine Presence would be among them. Moses is also assured that God's presence has not left them.

The homily concludes with the peroration that since the oxen who were designated for the work of the mishkan lived for many years, then Israel would be eternal because she cleaves to the work of God. The covenant between God and Israel is eternal as a result of the mishkan. This is a classic peroration of analogy, ending with the theophoric verse: "you who cleaved unto the Lord, your God, are alive this day " (Dt. 4:4).

B. THEMATIC OVERVIEW

The first homily in the Pesikta De Rav Kahana has

as its overriding theme the role the mishkan plays in the relationship between God and Israel. The mishkan is the vortex of that relationship.

The extent of editing and shaping in the homily is reflected by the fact that the overriding theme is carried throughout with sub-themes integrated and interwoven within the homily. Note for example, how the theme of the nuptial relationship between God and Israel is reflected through most of the homily. In Section One the mishkan represents the bridal chamber which God enters because Israel built it and offered sacrifices in it. In Section One the mishkan reunites the shechinah with her beloved Israel. This is carried further in Section Two as the mishkan becomes the place for the mature relationship between God and Israel. God had Israel build the mishkan as their bridal chamber so that she may accept the yoke of the kingdom of heaven properly. Israel accepts the demands of her groom and invites Him into the hupah. As we move into Section Three, Israel carried out the demands of her groom via circumcision, wearing beards and fringes. By the end of Section Four it is clear that the day the mishkan was erected is the wedding day between God and Israel. The marriage theme is picked up again in Section Five, where kelot explicitly signifies the wedding day between God and Israel. I would also suggest that the seven days Moses spent erecting and taking apart the mishkan was symbolic of the betrothal period between God and Israel prior to their wedding day.

This theme is again picked up in the peroration in Section Eight, when Israel is described as being in an eternal covenant with God.

Another theme that holds the homily together and appears in various sections is how the erection of the mishkan causes the shechinah to dwell on earth with Israel, bringing stability, harmony, and peace. This is begun in Section One as Moses, the last righteous person, erects the mishkan and brings the Divine Presence back to her pristine place. The petihta in Section Two continues developing this theme by stating how the mishkan returned God's glory to its proper place. As the mishkan returns God's glory to its appropriate place, it also enables God to reconcile opposites (Section Three), bringing harmony to the world. Sections Four and Five answer the question of how the mishkan can affect the peace of the world. The mishkan put the world on a sound base, demons left the world, hate, jealousy, and dissension departed and blessing came to the world. An implicit continuation of the vitality of the mishkan to the stability of the world also is brought out in Section Seven. The six wagons of sacrifices are like the six days of creation and the six Orders of the Mishnah; thus, the erection of the mishkan is like the renewal of ma'aseh bereshit (creation of the world) and order in the world.

One final tie is the centrality of Moses in the building of the mishkan. Moses appears in Section One as the

righteous person responsible for returning the shechinah to earth, her pristine place. His role is even more spelled out in the subsequent sections. In Section Three where God instructs him on the building of the mishkan, Section Four where Prov. 30:4 is applied to him, in Section Five he erects and takes apart the mishkan for seven days, in Section Six he anoints and sanctifies each part of the mishkan, and in Section Eight God assures him that the Divine Presence has not left him and will never leave Israel.

Finally, the hand of the editor is evident in the flow of material from section to section. For example we saw how the motif of the marital relationship introduced in Section One is spelled out in greater detail in Section Two (the pavillon), and in Section Three (the mitzvot).

Despite the evidence that this homily has a good deal of shaping and editing, there are times when the editor allowed superfluous material to enter. Incidental material that breaks the flow of the homily is found in Section Two, with a description of the materials that make up the mishkan. This interrupts the development of the theme of the special relationship between God and Israel, and the mishkan as the place of God's glory. Section Three is a very meandering section which, though it sets us up for the further development of the marriage between God and Israel, loses us with a lengthy discussion of how God reconciles opposites. The

composite petihta of Section Four does not need Elijah because it obscures the point that God and Moses are in a close relationship. Section Six could have been left out altogether because it introduces an eschatological theme to which we never return. It breaks the flow from Section Five to Section Seven which develops the sense of how the mishkan and sacrifices bring stability to the world. Finally, in Section Eight, with the lengthy discussion of the tribe of Issachar being learned in Torah does not lead well into the peroration that the offering of sacrifices by Israel and her involvement with the mishkan merit for her an eternal covenant with God and eternal life.

In conclusion, this homily is fairly well-shaped and edited. Its two major themes, the erection of the mishkan signifying the wedding day between God and Israel, and their love relationship, and the mishkan returning the shechinah to the world and thus insuring peace and stability, are integrated and well-developed. This homily comes to a dramatic finish by restating the overriding theme that Israel's involvement with the mishkan merits her an eternal covenant with God, i.e., marriage.

III. PESIKTA RABBATI, PISQA FIVE

A. Section Analysis

Section One- The opening halachic petihta asks the question: Can the person translating the Torah into Aramaic look at a written text? The answer is that it must be done by heart without the aid of a text. The question/answer leads directly to a statement of the theme of the special relationship between God and Israel. Israel enjoys a special relationship with God by possessing the Torah and Oral law, and this distinguishes her from other nations. This theme is carried further as Moses's request that the Oral law be written is denied by God because if it were, then in the future all the nations will claim that they are the true Israel. God does not want the quality of the special relationship between Him and Israel to be diminished.

Section Two- This section is a continuation of the halachic petihta and discusses how Moses himself erected and took apart the mishkan for seven days prior to its final erection. This section further develops the theme of the special relationship between God and Israel, specifying that the erection of the mishkan is the pinnacle of the relationship. God, Moses, and Israel are now integrally bound together.

Section Three- This begins as a composite petihta on Prov. 30:4 and is applied to God, Elijah, and Moses. At the end of the application to God, we have the question: What is the name of God's son? The answer is Israel, thus tying us back to Section One in which it was emphasized that only Israel is

God's people.

After the tripartite application of Prov. 30:4, there is a sudden introduction of the notion of the three things upon which the world stands: Torah, worship, and deeds of lovingkindness. In this section ma'aserot (tithes) are also included which allude to the Temple, the future mishkan. The theme that is developed from the exegesis on "al shlo-sha" (on three things) is that the establishment of the mishkan is equal to the act of creation itself. The mishkan gave the world its third leg, thus putting the world on a firm base. Also the relationship between God and Israel is now seen to be on a firm base, perhaps even enjoying a new beginning or further development. At the end of this section, the text from Is. 40:22: "He spread it out as a Tabernacle for habitation" hints that the mishkan is God's abode with Israel on earth.

Section Four- This regular petihta starts with S.S. 4:16: "Arise North wind, come South Wind, spread out my garden, ... let my beloved enter his garden and its fruits." In it there is a further development of the theme of the unique relationship between God and Israel as a result of the mishkan, by designating the day the mishkan was built as the wedding day of God and Israel. A parallelism between gan and mishkan is developed which is then interrupted by a lengthy discussion of the sacrifices that were offered,

However, maybe this is not an interruption, but makes clear that Israel, the bride, invites God, the groom into the bridal chamber. The sacrifices and the bridal chamber fit together since Israel offers the sacrifices to God as a gift, in the mishkan, the bridal chamber, enticing God to enter the bridal chamber. This is Israel's invitation to God, the groom, to enter the bridal chamber. The section then concludes with a return to the theme of the bridal day and the nuptial relationship between God and Israel. The Rabbinic comment on this scene is that it teaches the groom marital etiquette, in that he may not enter the bridal chamber until the bride invites him in.

Section Five- This is a continuation and more explicit description of the mishkan as the hupah and Israel's inviting God into the bridal chamber. The exegesis on S.S. 5:1 is that Israel says, "May my beloved enter His garden." Gan is genuni, the bridal chamber, i.e., the mishkan. As God enters the bridal chamber with Israel's permission, the mishkan becomes the appropriate place for the mature relationship between them.

Section Six- Here there is a composite petihta on Eccl. 2:21: "The man who works with wisdom, knowledge, and talent gets his share." This is applied to Bezalel and Moses, and it appears to break up the flow of the homily because it discusses the reward given these two for building the mishkan. However, an implicit tie to our theme of the love relationship between God and

Israel is that Israel is rewarded with this type of relationship because she built the mishkan.

Section Seven- This section is made up of different interpretations of the word "Vayehi" (It was on the day) (Nu.7:1). R. Joshua ben Levi claims that it means that God conditioned Israel in Egypt to build the mishkan; therefore, the mishkan is developed as a vehicle for redemption (a sub-theme Of Israel's special relationship with God). Rav claims that it refers to something not yet created. According to him, the mishkan will cause the shechinah to dwell on earth. Finally, according to Rabbi Shimon ben Yohai, Vayehi, refers to something that was, ceased, and then returned to its original status. Here we find the idea that seven wicked generations of people caused the shechinah to flee from earth, to the seventh firmament of heaven, and then seven righteous people gradually returned it to earth. This culminated with Moses, the last of the righteous people, who built the mishkan, thereby returning the shechinah to her pristine place, earth. The mishkan returns the glory of God to earth.

A final idea on Vayehi is provided by Rabbi Joshua of Siknin who said that the mishkan is like a cave at the edge of the sea; when it is filled with water, the sea does not diminish. Therefore, when the mishkan is filled with God's glory, God's glory is not diminished outside the mishkan. Even though God's glory is concentrated in the mishkan, it does not dissipate in the rest of the world.

This section develops a number of themes regarding the mishkan: its redemptive powers, the fact that it brings the shechinah back to earth, and God's glory is concentrated in it. There is a universal impact to the mishkan.

Section Eight- In this exegetic section we encounter the idea that "Vayehi Bayom" (and it came to pass on that day) means that there was no greater joy for Israel than the day the mishkan was erected. This ties us back to the wedding day theme, because that is the day of greatest joy for the bride and groom.

Section Nine- Here we are reacquainted with themes that were developed earlier by an exegesis on who it was that was crying 'woe' the day the mishkan was built. The first repetition is of the theme of the marital relationship between God and Israel. God hopes that with the mishkan, Israel's nature as a complaining spouse will end. The hope is that the mishkan will cement their relationship and Israel will be more mature. In addition, the priesthood is established as a result of the mishkan, which is a vehicle for redemption. The angels cry 'woe' because now God's primary place will be earth. Finally, the nations cry 'woe' because they now know that God will protect Israel because of the mishkan. The mishkan symbolizes the very special relationship between God and Israel. It distinguishes her from the other nations, a repeat of that theme

found in Section One.

The repetition of themes here is important for the flow of the homily, because otherwise we would lose sight of them. The end of the section, with its emphasis on the special relationship between God and Israel, is a segue to Section Ten which starts with the erection of the mishkan seen as the wedding day between God and Israel.

Section Ten- This section opens with a discussion as to why the Priestly Benediction (Nu. 6:24 ff) is prior to the description of the building of the mishkan. The day the Torah was given was the day of betrothal between God and Israel. Kiddushin, betrothal prior to marriage took place with God saying to Israel: "You are sanctified this day" (Ex. 19:10). However, since the evil eye was present because Israel built the golden calf, the mishkan now reconciles God to Israel with the priestly blessings being an amulet to ward off the evil eye on the wedding day, i. e., the day the mishkan was built. God lets Israel know that because she built the mishkan, God will protect her and bless her. A final theme introduced here is that when the mishkan was built, all the demons left the world and Israel was blessed by God. The overall theme in this section is that the mishkan affirms the relationship between God and Israel and atones for the sin of the golden calf.

Section Eleven- This concluding section of the homily starts as a petihta on S.S. 3:11: "Go out daughters of Zion and gaze upon King Solomon on his wedding day," and expounds the theme that the day the mishkan was erected was the wedding day of God and Israel. But, then a second petihta formula zeh she'amar ha-katuv is included, introducing the verse, "I will listen to what God will say, if He will speak peacefully about His people and His faithful ones" (Ps. 85:9-10). The theme expounded is that God has forgiven Israel for the sin of the golden calf, because she built the mishkan. The mishkan is the vehicle of reconciliation and atonement for the grievous sin of the golden calf. God promises Moses that He will again be merciful towards His people as He was prior to the golden calf. The mishkan turns the enmity, hatred, and strife between God and Israel to brotherhood, friendship, and love.

The theme that the mishkan turns the negative into the positive is continued, for once the mishkan was erected, peace reigned in the world and God blessed Israel with peace.

The homily ends with a peroration which stresses that once an earthly mishkan was established, a heavenly one was set up, and in the future God will also bless Israel with His glory because they built the mishkan.

B. Thematic Overview

Pesikta Rabbati, Pisqa Five, is a well-edited homily and the themes of the relationship between God and Israel and the

significance of the mishkan in this relationship are interwoven and intermeshed as the homily develops to its climax. Though this homily does have superfluous material, it does not interfere that drastically with the flow of the homily.

The theme of the relationship between God and Israel is first stated in general terms in Section One-the unique love relationship is based on the Torah and Oral law. As the homily develops, this theme is described in more detail. In Section Two, Israel is called God's favorite son and by Section Four there is the idea that the establishment of the mishkan is the wedding day of God and Israel. As the homily moves to Section Five, the mishkan becomes the hupah and Israel invites God into the bridal chamber. The love relationship between God and Israel, i.e., their marriage, is returned to in Section Eight, which states that the time of Israel's greatest joy was the day the mishkan was built, in Section Nine, as God hopes the mishkan will stop Israel's complaining, and at the end of Section Nine and the beginning of Section Ten where it is once again stated that the day the mishkan was erected was the wedding day of God and Israel. As the homily moves to Section Ten, we have a more detailed description of the marital relationship between God and Israel because Israel broke the betrothal with the building of the golden calf. However, God forgives Israel because she built the mishkan, which reconciles the couple. Finally, in Section Eleven, we return to the wedding theme and God forgives Israel and blesses her.

The wedding theme is interwoven with the importance and

significance of the mishkan to the relationship between God and Israel, and also with the different things the mishkan represents. In Section Two, because Moses erects the mishkan for seven days, a strong relationship develops between God and Israel, so that in Section Three Israel is called God's favorite son. In addition, the mishkan becomes not only the equivalent of the creation of the world, but also puts the world on a firm base for the first time. As the world is set firm by the mishkan, so is Israel's relationship with God made firm through its erection. This is clear in Sections Four and Five where the mishkan and the sacrifices associated with it become the vehicle for the wedding day between God and Israel. The mishkan is the hupah, the place in which God and Israel consummate their marriage, which would have been impossible without it.

As the homily moves to Section Seven, the mishkan takes a more significant place in the relationship between God and Israel because it becomes the vehicle for redemption from Egypt (bringing God and Israel closer) and it causes the shechinah to dwell with Israel. In Section Eight, the mishkan represents the day of the greatest joy for Israel, the day she brings her relationship to God to a higher plane, i.e., marriage.

The mishkan plays an even more central role in the relationship between God and Israel in Section Ten, for here it assures atonement for the sin of the golden calf. Only by virtue of Israel's involvement with the mishkan could God forgive her for the sin of building the calf. It seems that editor flashes

back to the betrothal period between God and Israel and underscores the importance of the mishkan because it was the only vehicle of reconciliation for the lovers who had been estranged from each other because of the golden calf. The mishkan causes the evil spirits that had been an impediment to the resumption and solidification of the relationship between God and Israel to leave the world. Section Eleven, which concludes the homily, ties up the two major themes: the love relationship between God and Israel, and the significance and importance the mishkan has in this relationship, by re-emphasizing a) that the erection of the mishkan was the wedding day between God and Israel; and b) that the mishkan was thought to have brought about love, brotherhood, and peace between God and Israel, since it brought about the expiation for sin; and finally c) that God will bless Israel because she built the mishkan.

Though quite integrated thematically, the homily does possess some superfluous material. For example, in Section Three the exegetical comments on "al shloshe devarim" (on three things) breaks the flow from the theme that Israel is God's favorite son to that of the mishkan setting the world on a firm basis. In Section Four, the long discussion on the various sacrifices offered interferes with the theme that the day the mishkan was built was the wedding day between God and Israel. In my opinion Section Six is totally extraneous because it breaks the flow from Section Five to Section Seven, which is developing ideas about the nature of the mishkan.

Even though there is some extraneous material in the homily, the homily is well-structured, ordered, and edited. In addition, we have seen that the themes are woven together fairly well, and the homily has good thematic development, reaching its climactic point at the conclusion of the homily.

IV. MIDRASH TANHUMA (BUBER EDITION) PARASHAH NASO, SECTIONS 19-29

A. Section Analysis

Section Nineteen - This is an halachic petihta which poses the question: What things (events) existed in potential prior to creation? One of these things is the mishkan, thus viewing it as vital to the creation of the world. The petihta continues with God's command to Moses to build the mishkan out of God's love for Israel (mipnei hibatam) and as a result God says: "I will go down and dwell with them (when) they shall make me a mishkan" (Ex. 25:8). The theme being developed is the special relationship between God and Israel as exemplified by the mishkan. Thus, the reciprocal relationship is based on the fact that God demands of Israel according to her strength. The phrase, "I do not demand according to my strength, but according to theirs" is repeated a few times. Each Israelite willingly gives a half shekel to build the mishkan. "When Israel heard this they willingly volunteered (nitnadvu) and built the mishkan. As Israel responds to God's command to build the mishkan, the mishkan

becomes the vehicle enhancing our relationship with God. It has been there from the beginning of the world, and has had the potential of causing God to dwell in our midst.

Section Twenty- As we move to this section of the homily we encounter the idea that God rewards people for their efforts on His behalf. It is a composite petihta on Prov. 27:18: "One who has planted his fig tree will eat its fruit." This verse is applied to David and Moses. David's name is attached to the Temple and Moses's name is attached to the mishkan. Israel and Bezalel are then rewarded for their work on the mishkan. The same phrase that we found in Section Nineteen is repeated here: "All Israel willingly volunteered (nitnadvu) their beings to make the mishkan." When the mishkan is built, Moses blesses the people, "May God dwell with you as a result of the work of your hands (ma'aseh yedaychem). " Thus, here the theme that we cause God to dwell among us because of the work of our hands with the mishkan is reinforced.

Section Twenty-One- The mishkan now becomes an insurance policy, for even if Israel sins, God dwells among them because they have made the mishkan. The mishkan reconciles God with Israel in the event that she should sin. This is the case after Israel builds the golden calf. The mishkan is a vehicle of atonement for every person.

Section Twenty-Two- The idea developed at the start of this section is that when we sacrifice with joy, the shechinah dwells with us. However, the tribal chiefs do not know the proper sacrificial procedure, so the men of the tribe of Issachar who are learned in Torah must instruct them. The way the sacrifices fit thematically is that they were offered in the mishkan and so the sacrifices also guarantee that God will dwell with Israel. Without the mishkan and its accompanying sacrifices, there would not be a vehicle for bringing the shechinah into our midst. Because Israel knows how to maintain the mishkan and offer the sacrifices correctly, God dwells with Israel.

Section Twenty-Three- The theme developed in this section ties us back to Sections Nineteen and Twenty, because it is stated here that we give to God according to our abilities. In the desert we offered the sacrifices of the mishkan and in the future in Jerusalem Israel will offer more appropriate sacrifices for the Temple. This further develops the special relationship between God and Israel as manifested by the mishkan and its sacrifices.

Section Twenty-Four- This section entails an exegetical treatment of the word "Vayehi" (Nu. 7:1). The comment is that it refers to something that once was, ceased, and then returned to its original status. This is based on S.S. 5:1: "I have come into my garden, my sister bride." The pristine place of the shechinah

was earth. However, seven generations of wicked people gradually removed it to the seventh firmament. The shechinah was gradually returned to earth, her primary place, by the actions of seven righteous people. The last one was Moses, who, by constructing the mishkan, brought the shechinah back to earth.

Section Twenty-Five-A5 we move into this section, Moses enters the mishkan to speak to God. He wants assurance from God that He has reconciled himself to His people, Israel. God gives Moses the guarantee by telling him: "I shall speak peace about my children" (Ps. 85:9). Prior to the building of the mishkan there was competition between God and Israel, but once the mishkan is established, peaceful relations resumed, "He will speak peace to His people and His faithful ones" (Ps. 85:9-10). As it is stated right before Nu. 7:1: "God will lift up His countenance and grant you peace" (Nu. 6:27). This happens the day the mishkan is built. Here the particular nature of how the mishkan causes peace to reign between God and Israel is brought out. The end of the section sets us up for what follows.

Section Twenty-Six- This section develops the idea that on the day the mishkan was built God came laden with blessings. This was foreshadowed at Sinai: "You will make me an altar and I will come and bless you" (Ex. 20:24). Since the blessing is actualized with the erection of the mishkan, the theme of the mishkan drawing God and Israel closer together is further developed

here.

Section Twenty-Seven- This section continues the flow started in Sections Twenty-Four through Twenty-Six, because it is an exegetical comment on the word 'kelot'. On this day all the evil spirits left the world. Rabbi Shimon ben Levi's comment underscores the flow by stressing that on the day the mishkan was erected God blessed Israel. How did God bless Israel? "God will bless you and keep you from evil spirits."

Section Twenty-Eight- All of a sudden we have the idea that the day the mishkan was erected was the wedding day between God and Israel. However, it is not really developed because this section is limited to one line: Kelot means the day the bride entered her bridal chamber. Israel and God are now in a permanent relationship because of the mishkan, which is the hupah. This continues the theme developed in the previous sections that God blessed Israel the day the mishkan was built. I surmise that it is a one line section because it is the perfect climax to the developing theme that the day the mishkan was built God and Israel were married.

Section Twenty-Nine- Now we come to the peroration of the homily based on Nu. 7:1. Here it is made clear that God blesses Israel because of her work on the mishkan; consequently, the shechinah resides with Israel: "May the shechinah dwell with

you because of the work of your hands (ma'aseh yedaychem)."

This returns us to Section Twenty which has this same idea. The homily then concludes that in this world Moses blesses Israel, but in the world to come God blesses Israel because of their involvement with the mishkan: "God will bless you from Zion, may you see the goodness of Jerusalem all the days of your life, and may all generations see the peace of Israel (Ps. 128: 5-6). This is a messianic peroration. In the future God will bless Israel when the Bet Mikdash is restored.

B. Thematic Overview

At first glance this homily on Nu. 7:1 appears to be disjointed, with little carry over of ideas from section to section. However, upon closer examination, one notices that ideas alluded to in the opening petihta are picked up later and developed to the end of the homily. This also assures thematic flow until the end of the homily.

One example of this notion of a carry over from section to section is that God demanded of Israel according to her ability and each Israelite willingly volunteered one half shekel to build the mishkan. This idea of Israel's voluntary participation is found in Sections Nineteen and Twenty. In addition, God's demanding of Israel according to her ability is returned to in Section Twenty-Three. Similarly, the overall idea that the mishkan causes the shechinah to dwell with Israel is developed in Sections Nineteen, Twenty, Twenty-One, and Twenty-Four.

Another example of an idea put forth in an early section and picked up later is that the mishkan reconciles God and Israel, and even though she sins, God will forgive her because she has built the mishkan. This theme of the mishkan as bringing forgiveness is initiated in Section Twenty-One, slightly developed in Section Twenty-Two, and then further developed in Section Twenty-Five.

An interesting flow of material can be seen from Sections Twenty-Four through Twenty-Eight. In Section Twenty-Four we see the general idea of how the mishkan returns the shechinah to earth, her pristine place, so that God will dwell with Israel is introduced. The theme is spelled out in Section Twenty-Five in which the building of the mishkan ends the competition between God and Israel, causing peace to reign. Then God blesses Israel in Section Twenty-Six. The flow continues as the blessings are actualized in Section Twenty-Seven, and in Section Twenty-Eight the wedding day of God and Israel is symbolized by the day the mishkan was built. This is an excellent case of thematic development in the homily.

Yet, the disjointedness in the homily is apparent when an idea is presented in one section, but is never picked up again or when the introduction of material breaks the ongoing thematic flow. In this regard, note how in Section Twenty-Three there is the idea of reward not picked up later, except perhaps implicitly with the blessings in Section Twenty-Six.

In Section Twenty-Two we have the notion that when Israel sacrifices with joy the shechinah is with her, which is not picked up later, and in Section Twenty-Two, Issachar instructs Israel about the sacrificial procedure and this, too, is never alluded to again.

While we have seen that one theme is carried out in depth, i.e., the strong relationship between God and Israel as exemplified by the mishkan, other themes are not developed to any great extent, and this may indicate that this homily is more of a compilation of comments on Nu.7:1. For example, the theme of reward is touched on only briefly in Section Twenty, the mishkan causing the shechinah to return to earth is only mentioned in Section Twenty-Four, and the day the mishkan was built was the wedding day between God and Israel gets only one line in Section Twenty-Eight. Though these are vital themes to the overall theme of God's relationship with Israel as exemplified by the mishkan and could help in the progression of the homily to its climax in Section Twenty-Nine, they are not developed as fully as possible.

In conclusion, this homily has a certain degree of thematic flow from section to section, though there are some breaks and the introduction of ideas that are not carried out. All this leads me to believe that the editor while trying to shape a main theme in the homily was also interested in presenting different ideas on the mishkan and the pericope text, Nu.7:1.

V. COMPARISON AND CONTRAST AMONGST THE THREE PARALLELS

For each homily the theme of the mishkan as the essential ingredient in the relationship between God and Israel is crucial, though each one develops the theme and sub-themes differently. The each share the notion that the mishkan is the bridal chamber of God and Israel, that God and Israel are in a close loving relationship, i.e., marriage, and that the mishkan returns the shechinah to her pristine place, earth, and removes evil spirits from the world. However, in the Kahana the nuptial relationship plays a more significant role than in both the Rabbati and Tanhuma. In addition, the Rabbati and Tanhuma share the idea that there is a reward for constructing the mishkan, which is not present in the Kahana.

There is a good amount of shared material amongst these three homilies. It appears that the Tanhuma borrowed from both the Kahana and Rabbati; however, in so doing the editor removed a good deal of extraneous material.¹ The Tannuma, for example, uses only one interpretation of "Vayehi" from the Rabbati and two interpretation of "kelot" rather than the several found in the Rabbati. Additionally, when Moses goes to talk to God to get a guarantee that God has forgiven His people and is reconciled to them, the Tanhuma removes a good deal of the discussion found in the Rabbati. Similarly, the Tanhuma in its description of Issachar being the tribe that is knowledgeable about the Torah and instructs

the chiefs about the sacrificial process does not use as much of the material from the Kahana that is available. Regarding the theme that the day the mishkan was built was the wedding day between God and Israel, the Tanhuma has only one line as opposed to the large amount of material in both the Kahana and Rabbati. Likewise, the Tanhuma in its usage of the birkat cohanim as protection for Israel only uses Nu. 6:27 and has a brief comment at that, as opposed to the Rabbati which has a large section on why the Priestly Benediction preceded the erection of the mishkan. Also in its usage of how the mishkan reconciles God and Israel, the Tanhuma edits out a large amount of material that is available to it from the Rabbati.

Regarding the parallels between the Kahana and Rabbati, one notices that the Rabbati in using the Kahana edits out material found in the Kahana and changes the placement of some of the traditions. This movement of parallel material aids in the development of the Rabbati and gives it better thematic flow than the Kahana. For example, Section One of the Kahana is used in Section Four of the Rabbati and all the material on the sacrifices is left out in the Rabbati. This change improved the thematic flow in the Rabbati as the general idea of God's special relationship to Israel mentioned in Section One is now spelled out as a marriage relationship. In contrast, in the Kahana the concept of the

marriage relationship is stated at the outset and in great detail and then the theme moves to a more general statement, leaving the reader with the question of how the marriage relationship came about. Section Five of the Kahana appears in Section Two of the Rabbati. However, the Rabbati leaves out the comment that Moses also spent three days with the work of the mishkan, and only includes the more thematically relevant material that Moses spent seven days and nights erecting and taking apart the mishkan. Here the change aids the flow because in Section One in the Rabbati, God discusses with Moses the special relationship between God and Israel and then in Section Two Moses becomes the catalyst for expanding the relationship as he erects the mishkan. In the Kahana in Section Two God instructs Moses about building the mishkan, but it is not until Section Five in the Kahana that we read how Moses erected and took apart the mishkan. Section Four of the Kahana and Section Three of the Rabbati are identical, yet even here the Rabbati leaves out some of the prooftexts. The changes in the Rabbati aids the thematic flow as Section One introduced us to the special relationship between God and Moses (a microcosm of the special relationship between God and Israel), Section Two has Moses as the catalyst for deepening this relationship by erecting the mishkan, and then in Section Three the same prooftexts are applied to Moses and God. This strengthens the relationship between God and Moses which progresses to the notion that the mishkan strengthened God's relationship to Israel and the

world. However, in this case the placement of this identical material in Section Four of the Kahana aids the thematic flow in the Kahana. Section Three introduced us to the close relationship between God and Moses and how God instructed Moses to build the earthly mishkan. The close relationship between God and Moses is further developed in Section Four as the same proof texts are applied to both of them. On the parallel material concerning a heavenly and earthly mishkan the Kahana in Section Two has a lengthy section on how God showed Moses the materials that make up the heavenly mishkan so that the earthly mishkan would be equivalent and appropriate for God. In the Rabbati there is just the mention of an earthly and heavenly mishkan, which appears in Section Eleven and acts as a peroration. This closes the homily thematically as it ties together the importance of the mishkan with the relationship between God and Israel. Since God dwells in the heavenly Tabernacle, God will also reside in the earthly Tabernacle. In the Kahana the discussion of the materials that are used to make the mishkan breaks up the flow and loses the reader, because the point that God resides in the heavenly mishkan and thus resides in the earthly mishkan is lost in the detailed description of the mishkan.

The Rabbati's change of placement of material is due to the fact that its editor(s) is not constricted by the same structural obligations as the editor(s) of the Kahana, who faces

classical homiletic midrashic structural demands. For him, the homily must have at the outset a series of petihtot, the body, and then the peroration. This is clear when looking at Pisqa One of the Kahana, which has a series of four petihtot, a body which consists of three sections, and then the peroration. On the other hand, the Rabbati starts with a series of three petihtot, then has exegetic comments on the pericope text, a composite petihta, more exegetic comments, and concludes with a petihta that acts as the peroration. Similarly, in the Tanhuma, one also sees structural breakdown. It does open with a petihta, but then exegetic comments and petihtot are interspersed, and finally there is a petihta that acts as a peroration. This demonstrates a greater structural flexibility by the editors of the Rabbati and the Tanhuma than the editors of the Kahana. This greater flexibility enables the Rabbati to move from the more general to the more specific within the development of its theme and then to a conclusion that ties things together. For example, by moving Section Five of the Kahana to Section Two in the Rabbati, Section Four of the Kahana to Section Three of the Rabbati, and part of Section One of the Kahana to Section Four of the Rabbati, the editor of the Rabbati traces the theme's growth from Moses's involvement with the mishkan, to how the mishkan established the world on a firm base, and then to how the mishkan functions within the relationship between God and Israel. By having the sections in this order, we move from generalities about the mishkan and Israel's

relationship with God to the specifics about this relationship and the role of the mishkan within it, which is spelled out in the final sections. In addition, by moving the petihta in Section Three of the Kahana to Section Eleven of the Rabbati, its concluding section, the editor of the Rabbati can tie up the entire theme of the marital relationship between God and Israel. The structural looseness of the Tanhuma also aids the theme development by allowing new ideas to augment the theme of the importance of the mishkan viz. the relationship between God and Israel. For example in Section Nineteen the idea that the mishkan causes the shechinah to dwell on earth was raised. At that time the reader has a question in his mind: How does the mishkan cause the Divine Presence to reside on earth? Then Section Twenty-Four, a petihta, which follows exegetic comments develops this theme further. By the editor putting off this petihta which follows exegetic comments the drama of the mishkan causing the shechinah to dwell on earth is extended and finally answers the question implicit in Section Nineteen: How does the mishkan accomplish this? In addition, by concluding the homily with a petihta, the Tanhuma ties the theme of the significance of the mishkan to the relationship between God and Israel. The homily ends by demonstrating that as Israel builds the future mishkan, the Bet Mikdash, once again Israel and God will be in a close relationship and God will bless Israel.

Another important contrast amongst the three homilies

is the usage of prooftexts and their selectivity of material. The Kahana offers the most interpretations on each word or phrase, whereas the Rabbati is content to include fewer opinions. By the time we reach the Tanhuma, there is even greater selectivity. The same is true for the number of prooftexts included in each homily. This seems to demonstrate more selective usage of material the later you go in the Homiletic Midrashim and the greater concern for thematic development.

CHAPTER THREE: HOMILIES ON LEVITICUS 16:1

I. INTRODUCTION

The three homilies which I will compare on the pericope text Lev. 16:1: אֵלֶּם מִשֶּׁה אֶחָד מֵאֲחֵי אֹהֶן שֶׁנִּכְנָס בְּיָמֵינוּ " (After the deaths of the two sons of Aaron) are Pesikta De Rav Kahana, Pisqa 26, Pesikta Rabbati, Pisqa 47, and Tanhuma (Buber edition), Parashah Aharei Mot, Sections I-13. The homilies from the Kahana and Rabbati were associated with Yom Kippur, while the homily in the Tanhuma was tied into the regular lectionary cycle.

These three homilies all share the same overall theme of God being the judge who makes decrees that we have to accept, and this theme is applied to the deaths of Aaron's sons. This theme is especially appropriate for the Kahana and Rabbati homilies because Yom Kippur is the day that God makes His final decree for the coming year. This also leads me to suggest that the homily in the Tanhuma probably was associated with Yom Kippur as well as the regular cycle. As we shall see, each of these homilies flows well and develops the overall theme, and in so doing uses the sub-themes that tie into it.

II. PESIKTA DE RAV KAHANA, PISQA 26

A. Section Analysis

Section One - This opening section of the homily on Lev.

I6:I is a composite petihta based on the verse, "All things come alike to all, like befalls the righteous, the wicked, the good, the pure, the impure, the sinner, the one who sacrifices, the one who doesn't sacrifice, the one who swears an oath, and the one who fears an oath (Eccl 1.9:2). The petihta text is applied to: Noah who was righteous and Necho who was wicked, and both of them were attacked by lions and died lame; the good one is Moses, the pure one is Aaron and the impure ones are the spies, none of whom entered the land of Israel; the one who sacrificed was Josiah, while Ahab stopped the sacrifices, and both of these kings were killed by archers; David was good and Nebuchadnezzar was a sinner, but both of them ruled for forty years; in addition Zedekiah swore an oath and Samson feared an oath, and both of them had their eyes plucked out by their enemies. The petihta then closes with a return to the idea that like befalls the righteous and wicked. The final application is to Aaron as the righteous one and the congregation of Korach as the wicked ones. Korach and his congregation came to sacrifice and were consumed by fire and Aaron's sons came to sacrifice and also were consumed by fire. The petihta then concludes with the pericope text, "After the deaths of the two sons of Aaron" (Lev. I6:1).

This first section introduces us to the theme that everyone receives a decree from God that is carried out no matter what characteristics that person possesses. The section has superfluous material since the crucial applications are

to Noah as the righteous man and Necho as the wicked one, and to Aaron as the righteous man and to Korach and his congregation as the wicked ones. These applications are crucial because of the juxtaposition of the righteous and wicked which will reappear, making the point that God judges all people, and bringing us to the deaths of Nadab and Abihu, Aaron's sons who become the focus as the homily develops. It is clear that the other applications could have been omitted, since the theme that God decrees for all people would have been made just as strongly without them.

Section Two- As the homily continues here with a composite petihta on Eccl. 2:2: "About laughter I said that it is mingled with grief and what of joy " the theme that God ordains decrees and we must accept them is further developed.

The application to King Solomon and how he abrogated the three commandments concerning a king, i.e., not to increase wives, horses, or gold, for which he was removed from the throne and then mocked by people, alludes to an idea we will see later in Section Nine of how Nadab and Abihu were punished because they also were arrogant, and how their parents' joy was turned to mourning. This then leads us to the incident of a father whose day of greatest joy was the day that he made a bridal feast for his son who was about to be married. The future groom went up to the attic to get a barrel of wine and was bitten by a snake and died. The father's joy was turned to grief. He,

like Solomon, had to accept God's decree.

The verse from Eccl. 2:2 is now interpreted as "how joy is mingled with grief that the measure of justice came upon it." The word m'hulal of Eccl. 2:2 is understood as meaning m'urbav, which means mixed or mingled. This introduces us to the idea of middat ha-din, God's measure of justice and it makes more specific how God decrees via the measure of justice. The degree of specificity of middat ha-din is seen in the applications of: "How joy is mingled with grief that the measure of justice came upon it." In addition, this develops our theme of God making decrees by giving God, our judge a method of judging. It makes God's measure of justice more acceptable and humane. The first application is to the generation of the flood, which ties us back to Section One with Noah, and the second application is to the people of Sodom and Gemorrah. These two applications break up the flow of how a parent's joy over his/her children turns to grief, which is seen in the last application to Elisheva, the daughter of Aminadav. Elisheva saw four great joys in one day: her husband became the High Priest, her brother-in-law king, her brother a prince, and her two sons adjutants of the priesthood. However, it all turned to mourning because when her two sons entered to sacrifice they were consumed by fire. This happened because of God's measure of justice, his middat ha-din.

I feel that this last application is the most appropriate as it returns us to the pericope text of Lev. 16:1, "after the

deaths of the two sons of Aaron. Again, this section develops the theme that we must reconcile ourselves to God's decrees. Just as Solomon, the father, the people of Sodom and Gemorrah, and the generation of the flood, and Elisheva and Aaron accepted God's measure of justice that turned their joy to grief, we too, have to accept God's measure of justice that sometimes turns our joy into grief.

Section Three- This petihta begins with the verse: "I say to the arrogant don't deal arrogantly and to the wicked don't raise your horn" (Ps. 75:5). The rabbis interpret the word holalim (arrogant) as murbavim, those whose joy is mingled with grief. The usage of this word play ties us back to Section Two where we found the identical derash on the root 'halal.' The further comment on this which develops the theme of accepting God's decrees is that it refers to people whose joy is so mixed with grief that they bring grief to others. Implicit in this comment is that these people should accept God's measure of justice that their joy was turned to mourning and not let it overwhelm them.

This leads to the juxtaposition of the righteous and the wicked which we saw earlier in Section One. The phrase that ties this part of the section together is: "God says to the wicked, 'The righteous do not rejoice in my world and you want to rejoice in my world.' There are several applications to righteous people who could not rejoice in

God's world. The first one is to Adam who was reminded that "you are dust and will return to dust"(Gen.3:19). The second application is to Abraham who finally, after having Issac at the age of one hundred was commanded to offer him up on the mountain. Here there is an excellent example of gererah. This seems to be the case because there is a long description of how Abraham took Issac to the mountain, the conversation that took place between them, and between Issac and his mother, and finally Sarah's death and Abraham's mourning. The main point is that Sarah and Abraham accepted God's decree and grief overcame the joy they had because of Issac.

An allusion to God and Israel rejoicing in the future is then introduced. The wicked want to rejoice in this world when neither God nor Israel can. Concerning God and Israel, the homily states, "God will rejoice in His works"(Ps.104:3) and "Israel will rejoice in His works"(Ps.149:2). The final rejoinder to the wicked is a repetition of the conclusion of Section Two. The wording is identical concerning Elisheva: Her joy was turned to mourning: "After the deaths of the two sons of Aaron"(Lev.16:1).

The sub-theme introduced here, that the righteous may not rejoice in God's world strengthens the main theme that God is the one who judges and we must accept His judgment. Another sub-theme introduced is: even God must accept His decree that He cannot rejoice in this world. Perhaps an allusion to Aaron is implicit here, in that he as a righteous person was not

allowed to rejoice in this world.

Section Four- This petihta on Job 39:27 "Does the eagle rise up at your command or hover over her nest," gives us first a linguistic tie back to Section Three. The tie is the usage of the phrase yarim keren (raise a horn). In Section Three it referred to the wicked who were told not to raise their horn, lo tarimu keren, and here it refers to an eagle, does she mount her nest, yarim al kano. However, now this phrase also comes to describe the glory that God accorded to Aaron, the High Priest. It was by Aaron's command that the Divine Presence descended on the ark and withdrew from the ark. Aaron as a righteous man had great power, but at the same time had to accept God's decree of death for his two sons. After this, there is an allusion to how God abided in the First and Second Temples. This ties us back into the theme that God is a judge who acts and whose actions we must accept and submit to: God decreed how He would abide in both Temples and how long each Temple would be in existence.

Following this, the rabbis give the lengthy prayer that the High Priest offered on Yom Kippur. The prayer was: May it be Thy will Lord Our God and God of Our ancestors that this be a year of rain, sunshine, dew, a year when the cost of living will be low, a year of plenty, a year of favor, a year of blessing, a year of good business, a year that one Jew will not be dependent on another, and a year that the household of Israel will

laud it over each other." After this the High Priest looked out at the land to see what the agricultural prospects for the year would be. At the start of the year, he knew what its fate would be. This ties us to the theme of Yom Kippur as the day God judged the world and the day on which our fate was sealed for the coming year, a fate we had to accept.

After all this glory that God gave Aaron, Aaron saw his sons die. Aaron had to face the death of his sons after beseeching God for a good year. If he could accept this decree, how much more the rest of Israel had to accept God's decree. Perhaps a sub-theme on how prayer affects God's decree is also introduced here.

Section Five-This petihta on Job 37:1, "Even at this my heart trembles and leaves its place," leads us to the climactic point of the homily which deals directly with the deaths of Nadab and Abihu, and Aaron's acceptance of God's measure of justice.

In this section there appears to be an uneasiness amongst the rabbis with the deaths of Nadab and Abihu. They say that they didn't even receive the same treatment as Aaron's rod which entered dry, left wet, and blossomed. Although the rabbis accept the deaths of Nadab and Abihu they are uncomfortable, and therefore, posit several reasons for it.

Here again as earlier (Sections One and Three) there is a startling contrast between the righteous and the wicked. The wicked Titus entered the holy of holies, slashed the curtains, and left peacefully. However, Aaron's sons entered to sacrifice

and were consumed by fire. This section now leads us to the central part of the homily which deals with the details and reasons for the deaths of Nadab and Abihu and Aaron's acceptance of their deaths.

This section with the juxtaposition of wicked and righteous, reinforces the earlier theme that God judges the righteous and wicked alike (like befalls the righteous and wicked) and all have to accept God's judgement.

Section Six- This short section is the last petihta. It is based on the text, "To punish the righteous beyond measure is not good" (Prov. 17:26). Though He has punished Aaron by taking his two sons, God realizes He may have been overly harsh. However, God had to teach the arrogant a lesson: "One has to strike the princes because right requires it" (Prov. 17:26).

This section not only ties us back to earlier sections (One, Two, Three, and Five) because it speaks about God judging the righteous, but also moves us forward by implying that the reason for the deaths of Nadab and Abihu was that they were arrogant. This reason will be spelled out in the succeeding sections. This petihta is a good watershed section within the thematic development.

Section Seven- Although the rabbis accepted God's decree that Nadab and Abihu should die, they were troubled by this and had to come up with the capital offenses they committed

that warranted death. This is presented in Section Seven as well as in the two subsequent sections. Here, in the beginning of the body of the sermon, R. Eliezar claims that Nadab and Abihu died because they taught the law in the presence of Moses. He points out that this was a capital offense which is buttressed by a story about one of his students who died because he taught the law in the presence of R. Eliezar. Again, a tie to our theme could be that the individual has to accept the status that God has decreed for him in the community.

Section Eight- Prior to mentioning the sins that Nadab and Abihu committed that warranted their deaths, in this section we are tied back to the idea that the deaths of Nadab and Abihu were difficult for God (Sections Five and Six). R. Eliezar, the Modiite, proves this by saying, "Go and see how hard the deaths of Nadab and Abihu were for God, because in each place Scripture mentions their deaths, their sin is also recorded." Because the deaths of Nadab and Abihu were difficult for God He has to spell out the sin they committed that caused their deaths. Scripture assures us that their deaths were not a capricious act by God, but an act of God's measure of justice.

As the homily now continues, more reasons are given for the deaths of Nadab and Abihu. Bar Kappara states they died for four things: they came too close to God's presence, they offered an extra sacrifice, they brought a strange fire, and they did not take counsel from one another.

Section Nine- Continuing the line of thought of the capital offenses which Nadab and Abihu committed R. Mini states that they committed four acts which warranted their deaths: they entered the sanctuary drunk, they did not wash their hands and feet, they lacked the prescribed garments, and they had no children.

R. Levi derives from the fact that they had no children that they were arrogant and this was another reason why they died. They felt that no women were suited to be their wives. As a result, "Fire devoured their young men...and they caused their virgins no wedding song" (Ps. 78:63). The arrogance of Nadab and Abihu is further developed by the rabbis when they stress that as Nadab and Abihu followed Moses and Aaron they would say, "How much longer will it be until these two old men die and we shall take over authority of the community." R. Berchaya, commenting on this said, "God said to them: 'Don't pray for tomorrow because you do not know what the day will bring' (Prov. 27:1), he further stated that, "Many brazen young donkeys have been made into saddle covers for their mothers' backs," and in so doing develops the theme that a person should accept the communal status that God has decreed for him. This is derived from the overall theme that God decrees things for us that we must accept, and thus returns us to the idea that was raised in Section Three. The section then returns us to the theme of joy being mingled with grief, because it was at Mt. Sinai

when Nadab and Abihu feasted their eyes on the Divine Presence that God decreed they would die when the Tabernacle was built.

Following this, we return to the notion that the deaths of Nadab and Abihu were difficult for God. R. Yohanan teaches, "When the children of a righteous man die during his lifetime, it is difficult for God." It was twice as difficult for God as it was for Aaron since the text emphasizes that they died before God twice.

The main concern of these last three sections has been the reasons for the deaths of Nadab and Abihu. There may be an attempt here to justify God's judgements and actions, so that people could more easily submit to them. This is vital to the theme development of God being the judge who doles out decrees that people must accept.

Section Ten The outset of this section returns us to the idea set forth earlier that Nadab and Abihu had no children (Section Eight). The comment is that if they would have had children, their children would have preceeded Elazar and Ithamar as High Priests. After this there is a discussion on the succession of the High Priesthood from Aaron to Elazar to Ithamar. This could be superfluous material, but I think it is appended to soften the blow of Nadab and Abihu's deaths, to emphasize the continuity of the High Priesthood, and to tie into the theme that Aaron had to submit to and accept God's judgement that Elazar and Ithamar, his two younger sons would take over for

him as High Priest.

Section Eleven- This concluding section of the homily is the peroration which concerns itself with how the deaths of righteous people atone for Israel as does Yom Kippur. The association of the deaths of Miriam, Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, 'these righteous people' (a linguistic tie back to earlier sections) with Yom Kippur makes it clear that they both make atonement for Israel. The people needed to know that atonement could be made for them on Yom Kippur, the day God makes the final decree for the coming year. Also in this peroration a positive tone is used in reference to Nadab and Abihu, which we also noted in Section Five. This might be comforting to those who felt God wrongly judged Nadab and Abihu. It perhaps comforts those who have suffered the pain of exile, destruction, and the deaths of their children while they were alive. Finally, it ties us back to the theme that whatever God decrees for us, we must submit to and accept.

B. Thematic Overview

This homily is well-developed and the thematic flow is good from beginning to end. This is accomplished as we shall see by the interweaving of the overall theme throughout the homily with key sub-themes, by a repetition of ideas, words, and phrases, and by the development of the theme to a climactic conclusion at the end of the homily.

The overall theme that God is the judge of all people who must accept what God ordains for them is stated at the outset and carried throughout the homily with various sub-themes that derive from this main theme. In Section One, with the pet-ihta on Eccl. 9:2, it is made clear that God judges all people no matter what their characteristics are and that these people must accept whatever God ordains. As we move to Section Two, this is made more specific by applications to people upon whom God's measure of justice came and they had to accept God's decree upon them. In Section Three, the theme is carried further by the idea that since the righteous have to accept God's decree that they cannot rejoice in His world; therefore, the wicked have to also accept God's decree that they cannot rejoice in God's world. The theme that God is the judge of all people whose judgements people have to accept is thus developed further in this section. Sections Two and Three are tied together linguistically and thematically by the usage of m'hulal in Section Two and holalim in Section Three. In Section Two, it refers to those whose joy is mingled with grief, a decree they have to accept, and in Section Three it refers to: a) the arrogant, and b) those whose joy is mingled with grief that grief has overcome them. These people, too, must accept what God has decreed for them. In addition, there is a thematic tie in that the righteous referred to in both sections have to accept what God has decreed for them. The righteous accepting God's decrees is made even clearer in Section Four. Aaron, the High Priest, had attained

much glory and had to beseech God for a good year. After this prayer was said, it is implicit that He and Israel would have to accept what God ordained for the coming year. Even more significantly, Aaron had to live with the fact that after he asked God for a good year, God ordained the death of his two sons.

By Section Five, the rabbis evince their uneasiness with God's decree of death for Nadab and Abihu, but accept it and point out that God judges the righteous and wicked, a tie to Sections One, Two, and Three.

Section Six, a petihta, on the verse, "to punish the righteous beyond measure is not good" (Prov. 17:16), is a watershed as the homily moves into the reasons for the deaths of Nadab and Abihu in Sections Seven, Eight, and Nine. In these sections, it is emphasized that Nadab and Abihu did not accept what God decreed for them in terms of the priesthood, nor their position in the community, and therefore, they died.

Section Ten forces us to reconcile ourselves to how God determines the succession of the High Priesthood, a sub-theme on God, the judge and ordainer. The theme of God who issues decrees and carries them out continues through the end of the homily, in which even after we learn that the righteous make atonement for us on Yom Kippur, we are still under the aegis of God, the judge, whose judgements we have to accept.

Not only is the main theme shaped in each section of the homily, but there is some good internal flow from section to

section which aids in the thematic development throughout the sermon. A good example is that Sections Seven through Nine all deal with the rabbis' reasons for the deaths of Nadab and Abihu. Various opinions are given and this binds these sections together. Another example of this is the sub-theme that God had to accept his decree of death for Nadab and Abihu and that this was difficult for God. This notion is initiated in Section Six, brought up again in Sections Seven and Eight, and finally dealt with again in Section Nine.

Realizing that sub-themes can aid in holding the homily together thematically, one notices that the idea of the need for the leader to accept his position in the community ties well with our main theme. This notion is seen in Section Three, in which Solomon's arrogance leads to his removal from the throne, in Section Seven where Nadab and Abihu died because they taught the law in the presence of Moses and again in Section Nine where Nadab and Abihu were not satisfied with their secondary status in the community behind Moses and Aaron and hoped they would die so that they could take over. The rejoinder to them is, "Don't pray for tomorrow because you do not know what the day will bring" (Prov. 27:1). They died because they did not accept their communal position.

Another important theme that the editor uses to help tie parts of the homily together is the contrast of the righteous person with the wicked in several sections. This occurs in Section One where Noah is juxtaposed to Necho, and Aaron to

the people of Korach. It appears again in Section Three where God, Abraham, Adam, and Elisheva are juxtaposed to the wicked of the world. In addition, we find this type of contrast again in Section Five where Nadab and Abihu are placed in opposition to Titus.

A final theme which helps tie the homily together is the idea that laughter is mingled with grief. This occurs in Section Two with the applications to Solomon, the father, the people of the generation of the flood, the people of Sodom and Gemorrah, and Elisheva, the daughter of Aminadav. The concept reappears in Section Nine, for at Mt. Sinai the moment of Israel's greatest joy, God decreed that Nadab and Abihu would die.

Another technique the editor uses to hold certain sections together is the repetition of a phrase in these sections. In Section Two the phrase: "How joy is mingled with grief that the measure of justice came upon it" binds the several examples together, and in Section Three, the phrase: "God says to the wicked: 'The righteous cannot rejoice in my world and you want to'" ties these examples and the entire section together.

Another device the editor uses to unify the homily, is the use of word ties in the first few petihtot, such as: m'hulal and holalim in Sections Two and Three, yarim keren in Sections Three and Four, and tzadikim and reshaim in Sections One, Three, and Five.

Yet, there are occasional breaks in the thematic flow of

of the homily which are due to the inclusion of superfluous material. In Section One the numerous applications get in the way of the point that God judges all people. The applications to Noah and Necho, and Aaron and Korach and his congregation would have been sufficient to make the thematic point that God judges all people. The same is true in Section Two, where the application to Elisheva would have been sufficient because it emphasizes the point that God can decree that joy be turned to mourning. In addition, this focuses attention on the deaths of Nadab and Abihu, the focal point of the entire homily. In Section Four the entire prayer of the High Priest did not need to be included to demonstrate that we beseech God for a good decree for the coming year. The editor only needed to include the opening phrase: "May it be Thy will O Lord that this be a good year." A final disruption of the flow occurs in Section Ten where there is a lengthy discussion on the succession of the High Priesthood. It would have been sufficient to state that Elazar and Ithamar succeeded their father.

Despite this extraneous material, the editor has done a good job of shaping his material, developing the theme, and tying the material together by word or idea association.

A final question that needs to be asked is: Does the theme that is laid out develop intelligently and build to a climax? Examining this homily, one has to state that the theme is developed intelligently and brought to climax at the conclusion. The theme starts out with the general notion

that all people good and bad are judged by God and they must accept these judgements. As the homily develops, the editor makes more specific the notion of God as the judge of all people. God judges us by His measure of justice and specific examples in the homily demonstrate this to us. The example that is most vital to the theme development is how God's measure of justice came upon Nadab and Abihu. This is introduced in Section Three with their deaths and then, as the homily continues to unfold, specific reasons are given for their deaths. This reinforces the theme that God judges us by the measure of justice (middat ha-din) and not in some whimsical manner. As this comes out, the tension is heightened as we start to understand how God judges people according to their actions and that no one, not even those associated with the priesthood, are immune to God's measure of justice.

The climax builds as Nadab and Abihu are seen as sinners who have no positive qualities. The question raised in the reader's mind is: Did their deaths accomplish anything; can any good come out of God's measure of justice that decreed death for them? These questions are answered as the homily reaches its climax and denouement by turning the deaths of Nadab and Abihu into a source of atonement. This is a climactic moment, since the focus of the homily had been on the deaths of Nadab and Abihu as determined by God's measure of justice.

A. Section Analysis

Section One- The opening halachic petihta introduces us to the theme of the power that prayer and repentance have in affecting God's decrees. The halachic question's concern is which is greater, prayer or repentance? Two divergent opinions are given. The first one is given by R. Yudan who taught that prayer annuls the whole decree, while repentance annuls only half. On the other hand, R. Joshua of Siknin stated that prayer annuls half the decree while repentance annuls the entire decree. Proofs are given to support their positions.

The position that is given prominence is that of R. Joshua of Siknin that prayer annuls half the decree. In its application to Aaron and his sons, we find concerning Aaron that, "the Lord was angry with Aaron to have destroyed him" (Dt. 9:20). R. Joshua understood this text to mean that God meant to root out his children: "I will destroy his fruit from above and his roots from below" (Amos 2:9). However, because Moses prayed on behalf of his brother, as is stated in Dt. 9:20, "I will pray for Aaron now." God annulled half the decree and spared Elazar and Ithamar.

This halachic petihta introduces us to the theme of how prayer can affect a Divine decree. More importantly, however, it introduces us to the theme of submitting to God's decrees. In the end Aaron was silent and accepted the decree of death on his two sons.

Section Two- This regular petihta in the name of R. Tanhuma starts with the verse, "You are my God at dawn, my soul thirsts for you... I saw you in your holy place... your loving-kindness is better than life, my lips shall praise you" (Ps. 63: 2-4). The section then has exegetical comments on these phrases and within each one the theme of how God decrees and the people must accept God's judgement is developed.

For instance, when Israel was in Egypt, the Egyptians decreed on Israel that, "every male would be thrown into the Nile" (Ex. I:22). Here the word decree (gezerah) ties us back to the halachic petihta, i.e., that prayer annuls half the decree (gezerah). The Jewish women accepted this decree of God via the Egyptians. However, when they gave birth, they went to the dung heap and gave birth there. God came down and washed, cleansed, and dressed the infants. Next, there is a jump to the Red Sea when Israel accepted God's decree and exclaimed, "This is my God and I will glorify Him" (Ex. 15:2). Here the imagery of water ties us back to the Psalm verse chapter 63, verse 3, "My soul thirsts for you." In addition, there is an implicit tie to the theme of praying to God concerning a decree and Israel accepting God's judgement on the Egyptians as they previously accepted God's judgement on them.

As we move to the exegetical comment on "My soul thirsts for you" (Ps. 63:3) we find out that Israel thirsted for God

in the desert. Once again Israel's submission to God's will is demonstrated no matter what the circumstances: the children being thrown into the Nile, redemption at the Red Sea, or being in the wilderness, a dry and desolate place.

The next exegetical comment on, "To see your glory and strength" (Ps. 63:3) bridges from how Israel saw God's glory at the Red Sea and to Aaron in Lev. 16:1, and ties in with the end of Section One where Aaron was a major figure.

One might get the feeling that the material concerning Israel in Egypt was extraneous. However, when we continue reading this section and see how Israel and Aaron are juxtaposed, we realize that the idea that Israel submitted to God's will at the Red Sea is necessary for the development of the general theme of submission to God's will and power. An additional reason for the inclusion of this material is to show that since Israel accepts God's will, consequently Aaron, a leader of the people, also must submit to God's decree.

Aaron complains to God that the people of Israel, who are not permitted to enter the Tabernacle and see your glory in that place, saw your glory at Sinai and the Red Sea, but my sons (banai) whom you permitted to enter the Tabernacle and see your glory did just that and died. Here the word banai (my sons) ties us back to the opening halachic petihta, in which we read that Aaron's sons (banav) died. We also have a tie to our theme that Nadab and Abihu died because they did not accept God's decree that they could only

enter the sanctuary at specific times. They died because they did not submit themselves to God's will (as Uzziah did not).

Now that Nadab and Abihu have died for overstepping the bounds placed on the priesthood, we discover that God instructs Moses to tell Aaron that He did a great act of chesed (love) when he decreed that Nadab and Abihu should die. This ties us back to the petihta text, because there we read, "God's love (chesed) is greater than life itself" (Ps. 63:4). When Aaron finds out that if God had not killed his sons they would have been lepers and ostracized from the camp of Israel, he accepts God's decree and even praises God: "I thank you for what you did to me, for the chesed (love) through which they died rather than living as lepers; thus, I am obligated to thank and praise you." This exemplifies Aaron's submission to God's will and ties the section together as the word 'lovingkindness' brings us back to the Psalm text at the start of the petihta. Aaron truly accepts God's judgement, for rather than cursing God he praises Him.

This section then concludes by introducing us to the concept of middat ha-din, God's measure of justice. Since this appears in the next section as well, this last point is a bridge. We read that God said to Moses, "Since Aaron has been stricken with the measure of justice (middat ha-din) and more than that, since he praised me for the love I showed him, go and comfort him." This reinforces our theme that we have to accept God's measure of justice. Perhaps there is also the concomitant idea that

we should comfort those upon whom God's measure of justice has come, thereby, also demonstrating that we accept God's decree.

Section Three- This section begins the body of the homily in the following way: God said to Moses, "Blessed is the man who has been smitten with chastisements, but overcomes his anger and has not raised a cry against the measure of justice" (middat ha-din).

The editor develops the theme of accepting God's decree without raising a cry first through a statement about Job and then by a dialogue between God and Job. The statement about Job is that if when the chastisements came upon him he had overcome his anger and not raised a cry against the measure of justice (middat ha-din), he would have risen to great and praiseworthy eminence. In fact, R. Hanina bar Papa said, "If he had not cried out against the measure of justice, just as we say in the Tefilla, "the God of Abraham, Issac, and Jacob, we would also say, 'the God of Job.'"

After this we read how when the chastisements fell on Job he cried out, "O that I could find Him...If only I could grab hold of Him" (Job 23:2,4). The homily then continues with a dialogue between God and Job. Here God rebukes Job who cried out against the measure of justice by citing a number of biblical characters who, when the measure of justice came upon them, accepted it and did not cry out. These include: Abraham, Issac, and Moses. God meted out the measure of justice on each of them

but each overcame his anger and did not cry out against God's decree. The repeated use of the phrase, "He did not cry out against the measure of justice," not only ties them all together, but it also reinforces our main theme that whatever God decrees, we have to submit to and accept.

The fifth and final application is to Aaron, which is lengthy, which we expect because this will return us to his acceptance of God's decree of death for his two sons while not raising a cry against the measure of justice. God says to Job that, "I gave Aaron the most glory (kavod) of all the creatures I created and that when he entered the holy of holies in his eight garments, even the ministering angels fled because of all the glory. Aaron had great honor because he caused the Divine Presence to descend on the Tabernacle and to withdraw." The text: "Does the eagle mount up at your command, (Job 39:27) is then used as proof for how Aaron caused the Divine Presence to descend because of his glory (kavod).

After this, there seems to be an interruption in the application to Aaron because there is a discussion of how God's glory (kavod) resided in the First Temple on the rock and in the Second Temple between the crag of the rock. Though this seems to detract from the discussion about Aaron, the usage of the word 'glory' (kavod) ties the two parts together and also ties us back to Section Two in which the glory of God and its relation to Aaron was discussed. Furthermore, we are tied to our general theme, since it is because of God's glory that

Aaron and those cited above accepted God's measure of justice and did not raise a cry against it.

Now we return directly to a discussion of Aaron because at the start of the year, from within the Tabernacle, the High Priest looked out and could see the agricultural prospects for the coming year and he prayed, "May it be thy will that this year..." This reinforces our theme that we accept what God has decreed for the coming year. Although the entire text of the prayer is not cited, it makes the point that whatever God decreed for the coming year, the people must accept.

God then says to Job, "Even after all this glory that I apportioned to Aaron, his two sons entered to sacrifice without permission and I strangled the two young men: 'His young ones chocked on their blood' (Dt. 1:30). However, this is where the exegesis ends. The section closes with Moses telling Aaron's brethren to remove the corpses and pass them before the mourner, and with Moses comforting Aaron. The notion that Aaron did not raise a cry against the measure of justice is missing here. The reason for this I think is that the editor is building towards a climactic point at the end of the homily. He wants to keep us in suspense and it not ready to disclose the idea of Aaron submitting to God's judgement.

Section Four-This concluding section is a composite petihta on the verse: "With wise advice (tachbolot) you shall make war" (Prov. 24:6). The word tachbolot at the outset is taken to

mean a wise leader and the application at first is to Moses, Joshua, and Samuel.

The final application is to Aaron, where tachbolot is taken to mean the meritorious deeds of Israel. Here we see a play on tachbolot as havi lot, meaning bundles of meritorious deeds. The comment is that Aaron entered the holy of holies, "bezot yavo" (with this he came) (Lev. 16:3), meaning that it was with the meritorious deeds of Israel that he came into the holy of holies. The meritorious deeds of Israel through the ages include: those of the patriarchs, the matriarchs, the tribes, the merit of circumcision, the merit of Torah, and the merit of Israel.

The homily ends with the peroration that if Israel keeps the covenant, then God will be with us as we will live and have peace, as Malachi 2:5 states, "My covenant was with him, life and peace."

Though this section seems to be out of place and it is a strange way to end a homily whose main theme has been submission to God's decrees and measure of justice, it does have some relevance. The leaders mentioned and the fact that Israel had so many meritorious deeds indicates they all accepted God's decrees and judgements.

In addition, we can infer from this section that Aaron, himself, submitted to God's decree of death for his two sons because he continued to serve as High Priest after they died. In this light, the Malachi text (2:5) could mean, "my covenant was with him (Aaron) for life and peace." This would also

support the notion put forth at the end of Section Three that the editor waited till the homily's end to state that Aaron accepted God's decree.

Finally, an important sub-theme may be introduced here, namely, that by Israel's meritorious deeds and adherence to the covenant, they can help annul God's Divine decree, an important idea in the context of Yom Kippur. Since at the start of the homily we read that prayer and repentance are vehicles for annulling God's decrees, the editor augments this here by emphasizing the effect of meritorious deeds on God's decrees. The peroration thus ties Sections One and Four together and brings the derashah full cycle.

B. Thematic Overview

This homily flows well as a result of good editing and thematic shaping. We should note in this regard how the main theme of our necessary acceptance of God's decrees and judgements is developed throughout the homily, and how sub-themes are brought in to help insure the flow from one section to another.

In Section One, the theme of our acceptance of God's decrees is immediately introduced with the halachic question of which is greater, prayer or repentance? the answer that both of them affect God's decrees, which we have to accept, leads to Moses's prayer which affects God's decree that all four of Aaron's sons should die. Since Moses prayed, only Nadab and Abihu died and Aaron accepted their death. Moving into Section Two, the theme of our

acceptance of God's decrees no matter what the circumstances may be is demonstrated by Israel's acceptance of God's decree that their sons be thrown into the Nile, Israel singing God's praises at the Red Sea when they accepted the decree of redemption, and how they thirsted for God in the desert, accepting even there the decree that they be relegated to the desert. AS the section continues the theme of accepting God's decree is even more clearly presented because Aaron, upon whom God's measure of justice fell, praised God for the love He showed him by killing his sons, rather than keeping them alive as lepers. Our overall theme of accepting God's decree and His measure of justice is played out again in Section Three by the statement, "Blessed is the man upon whom chastisements fell and he has overcome his anger, and did not raise a cry against the measure of justice." The applications to Adam, Abraham, Issac, Moses, and Aaron, who when smitten by God's measure of justice, did not cry out, stress that if these righteous men could accept God's measure of justice without crying out, then who are we to cry out against God's measure of justice. Also within Section Three, the prayer the High Priest said for a good year demonstrates that the people would accept whatever God decreed for the coming year. Section Four brings the theme to a climax by stating that if Israel will accept the covenant, i.e., God's decrees and judgments, they will have peace and life. In the final section there is also a tie to the sub-theme that we can affect God's decrees which was introduced in Section One. Here we see the

notion that meritorious deeds affect the Divine decree, which is added to the concepts of prayer and repentance affecting God's decree brought up in Section One.

As we have seen, an important device the editor utilizes to tie sections of the homily together is the repetition of key words, images, and ideas. For example, in Section One the word gezerah (decree) is used and this appears in Section Two. In Section Two, the word kavod (glory) is used to describe God's presence and Aaron, and this term is used again in Section Three. Within Section Two itself, the imagery of water ties things together. At first we see God washing (rachatz) the infants, then there is the water of the Red Sea, and finally Israel's soul thirsting for God (tzamah) for God in the desert. Another way Section Two is tied together is that at the end we see the usage of the word chesed, which brings us back to the Psalm text cited at the start of the section. Aaron praised God for His chesed, and said, "Your lovingkindness (chesed) is better than life, my lips shall praise you" (Ps. 63:4). A similarly important theme word is found in both Sections One and Three. In Section One we read tefillah (prayer) annuls either half or all of God's decree, while in Section Three we have the tefillah of the High Priest. Here not only is the word tie important, but also the idea that prayer can affect God's decree. Another tie is the introduction of the notion of middat ha-din in Section Two and then it is applied in Section Three to people who have received God's measure of justice. In like manner, God tells Moses to

comfort his brother Aaron after the deaths of Nadab and Abihu in Sections One, Two, and Three. Included here is also a subtle tie to our theme of submitting to and accepting God's decree, because Moses's action of comforting Aaron means that he also accepted God's measure of justice. Though the theme flows well in this pisqa from section to section there is one apparent deficiency in this homily. Section Three brings us to a climactic point with the deaths of Aaron's sons and then Section Four seemingly has little to do with Aaron's accepting God's measure of justice or with the general theme of accepting God's decrees. However, this Section might be here to buttress the portrait of Aaron as a leader and to add to the idea that although we accept God's measure of justice, we can affect this by prayer, repentance, and meritorious deeds.

The theme of this homily is developed intelligently and reaches its climax in the last section. From the outset of the homily, the theme of God making decrees which we accept is stated. Although we accept these decrees, we can affect them by prayer and repentance. By the close of the first section it is clear that the deaths of Nadab and Abihu are the focus for the discussion of accepting God's decrees. In Section Two examples are given as to how Israel always submitted herself to God's decrees. Within this section, the specific example of Aaron accepting God's decree of the death of his two sons is mentioned, which now becomes

the focus in the intelligent development of our theme. Once we are in Section Three other examples of people accepting God's decree without raising a cry against the measure of justice are given. However, here Aaron not raising a cry against God's measure of justice is not mentioned. The reason for this I think is that the editor is building up towards an even more climactic point at the end of the pisqa. The editor wants to keep us in suspense and is not ready to end the homily with Aaron submitting to God's judgement. If this notion was made explicit here the homily would have to end because everything that followed would be anti-climactic. The editor by not mentioning that Aaron did not raise a cry against God's measure of justice brings the homily to a climax in Section Four where Aaron does continue to serve as the High Priest after the deaths of his sons, which is a sign that he has accepted God's decree of death for his two sons. In addition, the climactic point of the homily is underscored in Section Four by the idea that we affect God's decrees by meritorious deeds. This also shows intelligent theme development, for at the start we were told that prayer and repentance affect God's decrees. Thus, throughout the sermon, in our minds is the question: can anything else affect God's decrees? This question is answered for us in Section Four. In this same light, Section Four again emphasizes the theme that we do accept God's decrees even after we have tried to affect them by prayer, repentance, and meritorious deeds.

In conclusion, this homily is fairly well-developed,

shaped, and edited by a redactor who uses numerous techniques to tie together its sections.

TANHUMA (BUBER EDITION) PARASHAH AHAREI MOT
SECTIONS 1-13

A. Section Analysis

Section One- This homily opens with the same composite petihta found at the outset of the Kahana parallel based on Eccl. 9:2: "Like befalls the righteous, the wicked, the good, the sinner, the pure, the impure, the one who sacrifices, the one who doesn't sacrifice, the one who swears an oath, and the one who fears an oath." This text is applied to: Abraham who is righteous and Nimrod the wicked, both of whom died; to David who was good and Nebuchadnezzar a sinner, and both of them ruled for forty years; to King Solomon who offered sacrifices, and Jereboam who removed the sacrifices, and both of them ruled as kings; to Moses who was good and the spies who were sinners, and none of them entered the land of Israel; to Zedekiah who willingly offered to make vows, while Samson was afraid of vows, and both of their enemies plucked out their eyes; and finally to Aaron's sons and Korach and his congregation, both of whom sacrificed before God and both of them were consumed by fire.

After this, the section concludes with Aaron crying out, "What sin did my sons commit that this was done to them," and

God telling Moses to comfort his brother.

The overall theme of the homily which is introduced in this section, is that all people, no matter who they are or how righteous they may be, are subject to God's decrees. God is the judge of all people. A sub-theme which also is introduced is that God wants us to comfort those upon whom his decrees have fallen. Perhaps God's commanding Moses to comfort Aaron is a foreshadowing of a later idea that the deaths of Nadab and Abihu were difficult for God.

Section Two- This section is a composite petihta on Eccl. 2:2, "How laughter is mingled with grief," and is also parallel to Section Two of the Kahana pisqa on Lev. 16:1. However, here the phrase "that the measure of justice came upon it" is added to the biblical verse. This aids the development of our theme as it ties us back to Section One in that despite people's status God's measure of justice falls on all people. The introduction of middat ha-din, God's measure of justice, also helps give the theme greater detail.

The above phrase, "How laughter is mingled with grief that the measure of justice came upon it," is applied to four cases. King Solomon abrogated the three commandments concerning a king by increasing his wives, increasing the number of horses he possessed, and increasing the amount of gold he possessed. Consequently, we read that God turned to his joy to grief by removing him from the throne and putting an angel who resembled

him in his place. As Solomon went to the houses of assembly and study proclaiming that he was the king, the people thought he was crazy and placed a bowl of grits in front of him. Likewise, the generation of the flood was so rapturous that they rebelled against God and God brought His measure of justice down on them by killing them. In the third application, the people of Sodom and Gemorrah were destroyed by God's measure of justice. The final case that starts with the phrase, "How joy is mingled with grief that the measure of justice came upon it;" involves Elisheva, the daughter of Aminadav. On one day she saw four joys: her husband was made the High Priest, her brother-in-law was made prince, and her two sons were made adjutants to the priesthood. However, all this joy turned to mourning, for when her two sons entered to sacrifice they were consumed by fire.

Our theme is specified in greater detail here as the Rabbis emphasize that God can decree that joy be turned to mourning, and the recipients of this decree have no recourse but to accept His judgement.

Section Three- AS the homily continues in this section, there is a petihta on Ps. 75:5, "Say to the arrogant (holalim) don't deal arrogantly and to the wicked do not raise your horn." The Rabbis interpret 'holalim' as murabavim, those whose joy is mixed with grief. This word play ties us back to Section Two where it was also used and underscores the general theme by trying to comfort those who have received a Divine decree that they have

to accept.

The phrase, "and to the wicked don't raise your horn," moves the homily forward as God says to the wicked, "The righteous do not rejoice in my world and you want to rejoice in my world." First of all, this statement recalls Section One where there is also a juxtaposition of the righteous and wicked, and the stress that they all receive the same decree from God, and second, the idea is emphasized that of the righteous cannot rejoice in God's world, how can the wicked expect to rejoice in it. The same is decreed for all of them: "Like befalls the righteous and the wicked" (Eccl. 9:2).

This section is held together by the phrase, "Such and such (righteous person) did not rejoice in my world and you request to rejoice in my world," which recurs in the various applications to Adam, who had great glory, but was reminded that he was dust and will return to dust, and to Abraham (this ties us back to Section One where he was called 'righteous'), who finally at the age of one hundred had Issac and then was told to offer him up on the mountain. After this there is a long excursus on how Abraham and Issac went up the mountain, the conversation they had and then how Issac told his mother about the sacrifice, and as a result she died. The third application is to God who also could not rejoice in His world, as it is written, "God will rejoice in His works" (Ps. 104:3). Following this the application is to Israel who does not rejoice in this world, but will rejoice in the world to come

as it is written, "Israel will rejoice in His works" (Ps. 149:2).

One is surprised that there is not an application to Aaron and the death of his sons. However, the four applications make it clear that the righteous, including Aaron, have to accept God's measure of justice. As a result, the wicked must also accept God's decrees for them.

This section aids in the theme development by demonstrating that not only must human beings accept God's decree, but that even God, the judge, has to accept His decrees.

Section Four - This petihta begins with the verse, "Does the eagle mount up at your command" (Job 39:27). Following this, we read how Aaron caused the Divine Presence to rest on the ark. Then we read how God's presence resided in the First Temple on the rock and the Second Temple in the crag of the rock.

As the section introduced us to how Aaron caused the Divine Presence to descend on the ark and that God's presence resided in the two Temples, the homily continues with the prayer the High Priest offered on Yom Kippur: May it be Thy will Lord our God that this be a year of rain, sunshine, dew, a year when the cost of living will be low, a year of satisfaction, a year of good will, a year of blessing, a year of good business, a year in which one Jew will not laud it over another, and a year in which one Jew will not be dependent on another. Then the High Priest looked out and predicted the agricultural prospects for the coming year.

However, after all this glory that God gave Aaron, "His young ones drown on their own blood" (Dt. 1:30). Then Moses told Aaron's brethren to remove the dead and pass them before their father.

Here the theme that none of us is immune to God's measure of justice, i.e., middat ha-din, because of our station in life is poignant. Aaron, who was righteous and the High Priest, had to accept God's decree of death for his sons. This recalls Section One where we read, "Like befalls the righteous and the wicked" (Eccl. 9:2).

Section Five- Now as the homily develops thematically, the deaths of Nadab and Abihu gain a more prominent place. Though broached in Sections One, Two, and Four, for the next few sections it becomes the main focus.

This section is a petihta which uses the verse, "Even at this my heart trembles and leaves its place" (Job 37:1) and puts forth again the juxtaposition of the righteous and the wicked. Titus, the wicked, entered the holy of holies, ripped the curtains, and left peacefully. On the other hand, Nadab and Abihu entered to sacrifice and were consumed by fire.

It is here that we have the first indication in this homily that the deaths of Nadab and Abihu appear to be difficult for God. The proof text used is, "It is not good to punish the righteous beyond measure" (Prov. 17:16). This concept ties us back to Section Four, in which it was implicit that

the deaths of Nadab and Abihu were difficult for God because He commanded Moses to comfort Aaron. Moreover, we are tied to our general theme that all people are subject to God's decrees and must accept them. There is also a tie to the sub-theme that God has to accept His own decrees, which was raised in Section Three.

The conclusion of this section also prepares us for the coming sections, in which the reasons for the deaths of Nadab and Abihu are provided by the rabbis.

Section Six- As we now turn our attention to the body of the homily, reasons are provided by the rabbis for the deaths of Nadab and Abihu. Though we are subject to God's decrees and must accept them, we are able to search for reasons for the decrees.

Here, R. Eliezar taught that Nadab and Abihu died because they taught the law in the presence of Moses, their master. He proves that their deaths were deserved, by citing an incident of one of his students who died because he taught the law in his presence. Implicit in this is the idea that Nadab and Abihu were not satisfied with, nor could accept, the position that God had decreed for them in society.

Section Seven- This section continues with reasons for the deaths of Nadab and Abihu. At the outset, it reiterates the idea that their deaths were difficult for God, because every place in Scripture where their deaths are mentioned their sin

is also mentioned. This ties us back to Section Five, where this concept was initially raised.

Following this, there are different opinions for the decree of death issued by God for Nadab and Abihu. Bar Kappara said they died because of four things: they drew too near the altar, they offered an extra sacrifice, they offered a strange fire, and did not take counsel from one another. R. Joshua of Siknin also said they died for four things: they entered the sanctuary drunk, they did not wear the prescribed clothing, they did not wash their hands and feet, and they had no children. Each of these sins merited the death penalty. On the other hand, R. Aha derived from the fact that they had no children that Nadab and Abihu were arrogant. They both felt that because of their lofty position in the community that no women would be appropriate wives for them. Their arrogance is further attested to by the fact that when they followed Moses and Aaron, they whispered to each other, "When will these two old men die so that we can take over authority for the community." Their impudence is countered by God, who says to them, "Don't pray for tomorrow because you do not know what the day will bring" (Prov. 27:1). This ties us back into the notion that we have to accept the position that God has decreed for us in the community. It was because Nadab and Abihu did not accept their position that they died.

A final comment in this section on the reason for the deaths of Nadab and Abihu is that they did not show God the

correct reverance at Mt. Sinai. Because they gazed at the Divine Presence, God decreed that they would die.

Finally, as the section concludes, we are reacquainted with the idea that the deaths of Nadab and Abihu were difficult for God. The comment that makes this clear is, "it is grievous for God when the sons of a righteous man die during his lifetime." This again emphasizes the theme that we must accept God's decrees and the sub-theme that God has to accept His own Divine decrees.

Section Eight- At the start, the section continues with the idea that the deaths of Nadab and Abihu were difficult for God. Here it is stated that they were twice as difficult for God as they were for Aaron!

Following this, the section points out that God had decreed their deaths at Mt. Sinai, but waited until the Tabernacle was erected to carry it out. God did this because He did not want to ruin the joy of the giving of the Torah. Consequently, God mixed His joy with grief by having Nadab and Abihu die when the Tabernacle was erected. This returns us to the idea that joy is mingled with grief, which was introduced in Section Two.

Here, too there is a further development of the theme that we must accept God's decrees and the sub-theme that God has to accept His own decrees.

Section Nine- Now we are reminded of an earlier point that Nadab and Abihu had no children, with the citation of the text, "They had no children" (Nu. 3:4). After this there is an excursus on the succession of the priesthood from Aaron to Elazar to Ithamar. Included here is the point that if Nadab and Abihu would have had children, they would have taken precedence of Elazar and Ithamar.

God decreed the succession of the High Priesthood, which Aaron and the entire congregation of Israel had to accept. Once again, we are tied to our theme that God decrees all and we have to accept His judgement.

Section Ten- Section Ten ties us back to the importance of righteous people which we saw in Sections One, Two, and Four. Here, the point is made that the deaths of Miriam, Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu who were righteous make atonement for the people, as does Yom Kippur.

The tie into our theme is that God decreed their deaths to atone for Israel. Just as we accept their deaths as an act of atonement, we accept the decree that is carried out after atonement has been made. In addition, this lets us know that there is a vehicle for atonement regarding God's decrees on Yom Kippur, the day for which the homily was intended.

Section Eleven- As we move into this section, we confront a petihta that uses a verse we already encountered in Section Five and In the Kahana pisqa, 26 Section Five, "Even at this

my heart trembles"(Job 37:1). Elijah saw how Aaron's sons entered the Tabernacle to sacrifice and were consumed by fire. He was in shock and exclaimed,"Even at this my heart trembles and leaves its place"(Job 37:1).

The theme developed here is that even Elijah, the prophet, had to accept the decree of death for Nadab and Abihu.

Section Twelve-In this section we discover that the prayer of Moses annuled half of God's decree regarding Aaron's sons. The original decree made at Sinai was that all four of them would die. The prooftext used is,"God was angry with Aaron to destroy him"(Dt.9:20). However, the rabbis understand it to mean that God meant to destroy his children,"To destroy his fruit from above and his roots from below"(Amos 2:9). But, since Moses prayed,God's decree was cut in half.

An important sub-theme is thus introduced here: We can affect God's decrees through prayer. However, when the final decree is carried out, we still have to accept it. This is reminiscent of how in the previous section the deaths of the righteous were a vehicle of atonement and affected God's decree.

Section Thirteen- The initial part of this concluding section ties us back to the question discussed earlier, of where and when did Nadab and Abihu receive the decree of death from God?

Here we have repeated the notions that Nadab and Abihu received the death decree: a) when they wished Moses and Aaron would die, b) because they did not have any children, and finally c) because they gazed at the Divine Presence at Mt. Sinai.

As we reach the peroration, the Rabbis bring up the idea that God is with Israel when she is in distress. The example used is God redeeming the people at the Red Sea. The intent is clear: Just as God redeemed Israel in the past, He once again will redeem Israel and we will rejoice together. The idea harkens us back to Section Three where it was foreshadowed that God and Israel will rejoice in the future. The same texts are even used as in Section Three: "God will rejoice in His works" (Ps. 104:3) and "Israel will rejoice in His works" (Ps. 149:2).

Section Thirteen clearly brings the homily full-cycle by a) once again stressing the theme that God decrees and we accept His judgement by showing that Aaron had to accept the death of his two sons; b) by recapping the various reasons why Nadab and Abihu died; and c) by emphasizing that God will decree our redemption in the future. If we accept our times of trial decreed by God, we will also rejoice when God redeems Israel.

B. Thematic Overview

This homily appears to be well-shaped and highly edited

as the result of thematic flow and development, and the repeated usage of certain ideas, words, and phrases.

The overall theme of the homily is that God is the judge who makes decrees on human beings that they have to accept and to which they must submit. The theme is introduced directly in Section One, as we see that all people, no matter what their characteristics, are subject to God's decrees, which is emphasized by the verse, "Like befalls all" (Eccl. 9:2). Moving into Section Two this theme is presented in greater detail as it is emphasized that God can decree that joy be turned to mourning or can be mixed with grief, and the recipients of this decree have to accept it. Section Three adds a novel aspect to the theme that just as the righteous have to accept God's decree that they cannot rejoice in this world, so too, God has to reconcile Himself to His decree that He will not rejoice in this world. In Section Four, Aaron, who beseeches God with a prayer for a good year, has to accept what God has decreed for the year. He is not immune from God's measure of justice, as he must face the fact that God has decreed death for his two sons. The theme of God decreeing is further developed in Section Five, in which the Rabbis discuss God's decree of death for Nadab and Abihu. Further in Sections Six and Seven they ponder the reasons for their deaths. Here the sub-theme of accepting God's decrees and trying to explain them helps move the homily along, for in Section Nine the Rabbis emphasize that God decreed their deaths at Mt. Sinai, and in Section Ten stress that we can accept the

decrees of God because the deaths of the righteous atone for us. The theme of accepting God's decree is given greater detail in Sections Eleven and Twelve, in which both Elijah and Aaron are reconciled to God's decree concerning Nadab and Abihu. The homily carries the theme of God issuing decrees and that we must accept to its conclusion in Section Thirteen. There the Rabbis again accept the decree of death on Nadab and Abihu by explaining the sins they committed that warranted their deaths. In addition, just as we accept God's decree at times of grief, we will also accept God's proclamation of redemption in the future.

Therefore, it is clear that the overall theme is carried throughout the homily and develops from one section to the next. For example, we discover that certain ideas introduced in one section are picked up in other sections. One illustration of this is the contrast between righteous and wicked people, which occurs in Sections One, Three, and Five. A second example is the Rabbis providing explanations for the deaths of Nadab and Abihu in Sections Six, Seven, Nine, and Thirteen. Finally, Sections Eight and Thirteen state that Nadab and Abihu received God's decree at Mt. Sinai. Similarly, we discover in Sections Four, Five, twice in Section Seven, and in Section Eight that the deaths of Nadab and Abihu were difficult for God. Finally in Sections Ten and Twelve we note that the deaths of righteous people and prayer can affect God's decrees.

The flow of the homily also is aided by the repetition of phrases within individual sections. This is the case in Section

Two where the phrase: "How laughter is mingled with grief that the measure of justice came upon it" ties a series of examples together. This type of editorial device is found again in Section Three where the phrase: "God says to the wicked, 'The righteous do not rejoice in my world and you want to rejoice in my world'" holds the section together as it is repeated after each example cited to prove this point.

Thematic flow between sections is another way in which uniformity in the homily is achieved. The deaths of Nadab and Abihu become the focus from Sections Four to Nine and again from Sections Eleven to Thirteen. Further evidence of shaping if this kind is evident in the repeated usage of certain words and phrases. The word tzadik appears in Sections One, Two, Three, and Five, and Ten. The phrase, "How joy is mingled with grief" is introduced in Section Two and is picked up again in Section Eight. The verse from Job, "Even at this my heart trembles" is used in Section Five and again in Section Eleven as a petihta text. In addition, the Psalms texts, "God will rejoice in His works" (Ps. 104:3) and "Israel will rejoice in His works" (Ps. 149:2) introduced in Section Three as the rejoinder to the wicked that neither God nor Israel rejoice in this world, are used again at the end of the homily as the peroration. Another repetition is that "Nadab and Abihu had no children" (Nu. 3:4), which is used first in Section Seven and then again in Sections Ten and Thirteen. Another word play that ties sections together is that of m'hulal (mingled) which is found in Sections Two and Three.

Therefore, we can conclude that this homily is well-developed and edited as the result of clear thematic development achieved by the repetition in different sections of key ideas, words, and phrases.

Despite this, one can see occasional extraneous material in the homily. For example, in Section One the applications of "Like befalls all" (Eccl. 9:2) only had to be to Abraham and Nimrod and then to Aaron's sons and the congregation of Korach. The other applications obscure matters by taking the focus away from Nadab and Abihu and the main point that God judges the righteous and wicked in the same manner. However, the other applications do help to make the point that God judges all people no matter who they are. In Section Two, the editor could have limited himself to the application to Elisheva, the daughter of Aminadav, since the focus there and of the homily in general is the deaths of Nadab and Abihu. In Section Four, the entire text dealing with the High Priest's prayer is superfluous, since the phrase, "May this be Thy will" itself emphasizes the thematic point that we accept what God decrees for the year. Section Nine which discusses the succession of the High Priesthood could be seen as extraneous, though it does emphasize Aaron's acceptance that God determines the succession within the High Priesthood.

The editor(s) develops the homily's theme in an intelligent manner, which comes to a climax at its close.

The theme of God as the judge who makes decrees develops

from the general to the specific and then focuses on the deaths of Nadab and Abihu as the main example of how God makes decrees via His measure of justice that we must accept. The general point is made in the first section that God judges all people good and bad, in Sections Two and Three this becomes more specific with applications to certain personages and that God can decree that joy be turned to mourning. By the time we reach Section Four the focus is on Nadab and Abihu which is then carried to the end of the homily. The focus on Nadab and Abihu also moves from the general to the specific. The point that they died is brought up and then specific reasons are given for their deaths, along with the notion that Aaron had to accept what God decreed for Nadab and Abihu. The homily builds to its climax in the final section, as the grief over the death decrees is transformed by the peroration which stresses that as God was with us and Aaron during a time of distress so, too, will God redeem us in the future and we and God will rejoice.

V. COMPARISON AND CONTRAST AMONGST THE THREE HOMILIES

— These three homilies which are based on the pericope text, "After the deaths of the two sons of Aaron" (Lev. 16:1), share the same overall theme that God is the judge who makes decrees concerning all people which they must accept. As we have seen, the three homilies are all fairly well-developed, shaped, and edited by the same editorial devices.

The major difference amongst the homilies is their length. The Kahana and Tanhuma homilies are both rather lengthy, having eleven and thirteen sections respectively, while the Rabbati homily is fairly short, including only four sections. The difference in length enables the Rabbati homily's editor to make the deaths of Nadab and Abihu and Aaron's acceptance of the death decree the focus much earlier than either the Kahana or Tanhuma. In the Rabbati this becomes the focus by the end of the first section, whereas in the Kahana and Tanhuma homilies it doesn't become the focus until Section Four.

Another significant difference amongst the three homilies involves their perception of the means that can be employed to affect God's decrees. While the Rabbati informs us that prayer, repentance, and meritorious deeds affect God's decrees, the Kahana has that only the deaths of the righteous atone for Israel and can affect God. In comparison, the Tanhuma incorporates both ideas, stressing both that prayer can annul half of God's decree and that the death of the righteous atone for Israel.

What is striking in comparing these three homilies is the lack of parallel material amongst the three, but the extensive sharing of material between the Kahana and Tanhuma. It should also be noted that there is some sharing between the Rabbati and Tanhuma.¹

The only shared material among all three homilies is the petihta in Section Three of the Rabbati and Section Four

in the Kahana and Tanhuma. In the Kahana and Tanhuma this is one of a series of petihtot at the start of the homily, while in the Rabbati this is a petihta text used in the body of the homily after a series of exegetic comments. It is found in the middle of the section and not at the start of a section as is the case in the Kahana and Tanhuma. The shared material starts with the text, "Does the eagle mount up at your command?" (Job 37:1). This text is followed by God giving glory to Aaron and the point that God's presence resided in the First Temple on the rock and in the Second Temple on the crag of the rock. In the same section, another bit of shared material is present, that being the prayer of the High Priest and how he looked out and predicted the agricultural prospects for the year on Yom Kippur. However, the Rabbati does not include the entire text of the prayer, as do the Kahana and Tanhuma. The Rabbati only includes the opening phrase, "May it be your will O Lord Our God." This is followed by a final parallel tradition that Aaron's sons died after God gave glory to Aaron and is accompanied by the text, "The young men drown on their own blood" (Dt. 1:30). This material is placed equally well thematically in all three homilies. In the Kahana and Tanhuma, after applications to Aaron, Abraham, Issac, God, and Israel who were righteous and accepted God's decrees, we are lead to Aaron who was also righteous and accepted God's decrees. In the Rabbati, it is used as the last application to righteous people who though struck by God's measure of justice did not cry out against it. Therefore, the

the material is used well in all three to continue the thematic flow.

However, we should ask the obvious question: What does the sharing of only one block of material tell us about the relationship of these three homilies? First, we can assume that this block of material was an old tradition that was found in a source used by all three editors, and second that the editors of these three homilies utilized different sources to compose their homilies on Lev. 16:1 (except for the Kahana and Tanhuma, because the Tanhuma probably used the Kahana as its source since they are almost identical).

Between the Rabbati and Tanhuma there are two pieces of shared material. In Section One of each, we find the idea that God told Moses to comfort Aaron after the death of his two sons. In addition, material is found in Section One of the Rabbati which is paralleled in Section Twelve in the Tanhuma. These parallel traditions spin on Dt. 9:20, "God was angry with Aaron to destroy him." Both of them comment that this means that God would destroy his sons. However, since Moses prayed on Aaron's behalf, Elazar and Ithamar were spared. These compilations, therefore, share the idea that prayer annuls half of God's decree. In my opinion, the placement of this material fits better in Section One of the Rabbati than in Section Twelve of the Tanhuma. Note, in this regard, how the Rabbati returns in Section Four to this theme, that even though we have to accept God's decrees we can affect them by our actions. It also recalls

the idea presented at the start of the Section that prayer annuls half of God's decree. It leads us to conclude that we have to accept God's decrees no matter what the circumstances, which is continued in Section Two of the Rabbati. In the Tanhuma this material fits the theme that we have to accept God's decrees, but this has been spelled out well in previous sections. It appears to be inserted to assuage those who have prayed to annul God's decrees, but still felt God's measure of justice. While the placement of this material in Section Twelve of the Tanhuma does augment the theme of accepting God's measure of justice, it is not as well placed as in the Rabbati.

In contrast, when we compare the homilies in the Kahana and Tanhuma (Buber edition) we are struck by their near identity. The homilies almost mirror each other exactly from Sections One to Five with a few differences. The difference in Section One is that the Kahana has Noah as the righteous man juxtaposed to Necho as the wicked man, while in the Tanhuma, Abraham is righteous and Nimrod wicked. The contrast between the one who sacrifices and the one who doesn't sacrifice is Josiah and Ahab in the Kahana and Solomon and Jereboam in the Tanhuma. The other applications are identical. In Section Two, in the application of the petihta text from Eccl. 2:2, the Tanhuma excluded the incident about the father whose joy was turned to grief when his son died on the day he gave the pre-wedding feast. Another difference is found in Section Three

where the Tanhuma does not repeat how Elisheva saw four joys in one day, which was turned to grief when her two sons entered to sacrifice and were consumed by fire. From here on, the sections parallel each other in material, but not in placement of material. Thus, Sections One through Eleven of the Kahana are parallel to Sections One through Ten of the Tanhuma.

The additional material in the Tanhuma not found in the Kahana aids in the thematic flow and in addition the material in Section Twelve of the Tanhuma that is parallel to Section One of the Rabbati adds the important sub-theme, that prayer annuls half of God's decree. Also, the material in Section Eleven of the Tanhuma reinforces the point that all people must accept God's decree. This is underscored here by Elijah's acceptance of the deaths of Nadab and Abihu. Section Twelve adds to the theme development with the important sub-theme that although we must accept God's decrees and measure of justice, we can affect God's decrees through prayer. This leads us to the peroration in Section Thirteen, which is not found in the Kahana, that God is with us in our distress and will redeem us in the future. The Messianic idea here supplements our theme by making it clear that God will decree our redemption in the future and we and God will rejoice.

Though the relationship amongst the three homilies is fairly clear, there remain some important questions for us regarding them: How do the homilies compare in thematic development as they build to a climax in revealing thematic

points?; Which homily(s) holds together as the result of shaping and editing?; And how does their structure affect theme shaping?

As was pointed out in the thematic overviews on each homily, I believe that they all build to a climax as they develop their themes. However, the Rabbati, because of its terseness, reveals thematic points much sooner than either the Kahana or Tanhuma. The Rabbati develops the theme that although we can affect God's decrees by our actions, we still have to accept them at the outset. The Rabbati also moves along faster in its focus on the notion that Aaron had to accept God's decree of death for his two sons sooner than either the Kahana or Tanhuma. This point is made in general in Section Two and more specifically in Sections Three and Four of the Rabbati. By contrast, the Kahana and Tanhuma reveal thematic points slowly while building to a climax. They both start with the general idea that God is the judge of all people and that people have to accept God's decrees. The application to Aaron accepting God's decree does not occur in both till Section Four, and then only briefly. After this, in each one the thematic point that Nadab and Abihu died for specific sins is encountered, which leads to the idea that even God had to accept His decree of death on Nadab and Abihu. The point the Rabbati raises at the start, that although we can affect God's decrees, we must accept them, is not raised in the Kahana until the last section and not in the Tanhuma until Section Ten. Thus, the Kahana and

Tanhuma reveal thematic points more slowly than the Rabbati while building to a homiletic climax.

In my opinion, all three homilies have substantial theme development based on word ties, and the repetition of ideas and phrases. It appears that the editors of all three homilies were very concerned with shaping and editing.

However, at times it is clear that the Rabbati is more concerned with editing than the Tanhuma or Kahana. This is evident in the excising of shared, yet superfluous material in the Rabbati and also in the terseness of its expression. On the other hand, at times the Tanhuma is more concerned with editing than the Kahana. It removes some of the shared material and also includes the important point that we can and do affect God's decrees by prayer. In addition, a greater sense of shaping can be seen in the Rabbati and Tanhuma than in the Kahana by looking at the concluding sections of each. The final section of the Rabbati ties us back to its opening section, by having meritorious deeds act as another way of affecting God's decrees, while in Section One prayer and repentance were means of affecting God's decrees. This tying of the first and last sections of the homily gives us the feel for overall shaping by the editor. In the Tanhuma, the concluding section returns us to the reasons given for the deaths of Nadab and Abihu, thus recalling the other sections that emphasized this idea and again making their deaths the focus of the homily. Another example of shaping in the Tanhuma is that the closing texts

used as the peroration, "God will rejoice in His works" (Ps. 104:3) and "Israel will rejoice in His works" (Ps. 149:2) repeat texts cited in Section Three. In doing this, the editor has tied the beginning and closing of the homily together.

Finally, as to how the loosening of structure affects the theme we must look at the Rabbati and Tanhuma as compared to the Kahana. The Kahana has a clear tripartite structure: a series of petihtot, the body, and the peroration. In contrast, the Rabbati has two petihtot, a body that includes a petihta, and a petihta that acts as the peroration, while the Tanhuma has a series of petihtot, body, another petihta, exegetic comments, and a peroration. The loosening of structure in the Rabbati aids the thematic development in the homily in that the petihta at the end of the homily enables the editor to make the point that meritorious deeds affect God's decrees just as do prayer and repentance. If the Rabbati had to follow a tight structure, this point might not have been made. In addition, as I mentioned earlier, this helps tie the opening and closing of the homily together. The breakdown of structure in the Tanhuma also aids the theme development, as Section Eleven, a petihta, returns us to the point that Nadab and Abihu entered to sacrifice and were consumed by fire. This leads to the point that since Moses prayed on behalf of Aaron that only Nadab and Abihu died and Elazar and Ithamar were spared. We now return to a focus on their deaths which in turn moves the homily along to Section Thirteen, in which we read again the reasons for their deaths. This, in

turn, reinforces the theme that just as we accepted what God decreed in the past, we will accept God's decree of redemption in the future.

A final note of comparison of the homilies is that each of them has a peroration that has a futuristic tone: the Kahana stresses that God will continue to allow for atonement on behalf of Israel, the Rabbati says that if Israel keeps the covenant, she will live and have peace, and the Tanhuma's peroration is that just as God redeemed Israel in the past from Egypt, He will again redeem her in the future.

CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSION

In our investigation of the extent of editing and shaping in the Homiletic Midrashim and our comparison of parallel sections in the Pesikta De Rav Kahana, Pesikta Rabbati, and Tanhuma we have raised and examined some important questions. These include: What is the extent of theme development in the Homiletic Midrashim?; What is the extent of shaping and editing in the Homiletic Midrashim and its effects on theme development as the homilies reach a climax?; How does structure and structural breakdown affect theme development?; How does the selective usage of material influence theme development?; and Because of the large extent of shared material in the Homiletic Midrashim, which source(s) borrowed from the others?

It is my sense that the Homiletic Midrashim contain homilies that are highly artistic and edited works, comprising a single unit with a unifying theme. We notice this in all six of the homilies into which we have delved, including the three homilies on Nu.7:1. Pisqa One of the Kahana has as its overriding theme the significant place the mishkan maintains in the relationship between God and Israel. As we saw, this theme is carried throughout the homily. The unifying theme of Pisqa Five of the Rabbati is the unique love relationship between God and Israel as exemplified by the mishkan. This unifying theme is developed in each section so that by the conclusion of the homily we have a real sense of a shaped unit based on the central place the mishkan occupies in God's relationship with Israel. Tanhuma Parashah Naso, Sections 19-29, is also

a single unit having as its unifying theme how the mishkan brings God's presence to Israel and cements the relationship between God and Israel. This is carried throughout the homily.

Moving to the homilies on Lev. 16:1, "After the deaths of the two sons of Aaron," we notice that these three homilies also are single units in which a single theme unites each respective homily. Pisqa 26 of the Kahana develops the theme that each person is subject to God's decrees and must accept them. As we saw, this is first stated in a general sense and then specific applications are made to the deaths of Nadab and Abihu to underscore that all people must accept God's decrees. Pisqa 47 of the Rabbati has as its overall theme that God ordains decrees that human beings have to accept, even if they have attempted to influence them by prayer, repentance, or meritorious deeds. This theme is developed throughout the homily and there can be no doubt that this homily is a single well-edited unit. The last of the six homilies we examined, Tanhuma, Parashah Aharei Mot, Sections I-13, has as its basic theme that God is our judge who makes decrees that we have to accept. This theme is carried throughout each section, evincing the fact that this homily is well developed, and a single unit.

The extent of editing and shaping in the Homiletic Midrashim is seen by the different devices the editors utilize to weld the different sources they gathered into a single unified homiletic unit. These devices include: sub-themes that are derived from the main theme which tie sections together, internal flow

between sections of the homilies, repetition of ideas, words, and phrases, and constructing the homilies so that they build to a climax at the end of the homily.

Sub-themes developed in sections that hold the homily together are evident in all six pisqa'ot. For example, Pisqa One of the Kahana, the sub-theme of the nuptial relationship between God and Israel as represented by the mishkan is found in Sections One, Two, Three, Five, and Eight. In the same homily, the notion of how the mishkan brings the shechinah to earth, causing her to reside with Israel is found in Sections One, Four, Five, and Seven. The sub-theme of the love relationship between God and Israel as exemplified by the mishkan is seen in Sections One, Two, Four, Eight, Five, Nine, Ten, and Eleven of the Rabbati, Pisqa Five. Looking to the Tanhuma, Parashah Naso, the emphasis on the mishkan bringing God and Israel closer together is found in Sections Nineteen, Twenty, Twenty-One, Twenty-Four, Twenty-Eight, and Twenty-Nine.

Examining our homilies on Lev. 16:1 we notice that the sub-theme of people accepting God's decrees is played out in almost all sections of the three homilies. An important association of sub-themes is found in both the Kahana and Tanhuma. One, of these, is that God, too, must accept His decrees. This is found in Sections Three, Five, and Six of the Kahana, and Sections Three, Five, and Eight of the Tanhuma. An important usage of a sub-theme in different sections, thus demonstrating good editing is found in Sections One and Four of the Rabbati, Pisqa

47, in which the idea that we can affect God's decrees is present. In Section One we see that prayer and repentance affect God's decrees, and then in Section Four, the last section of the homily, we read that meritorious deeds affect God's decrees. This is also good evidence that the editor of the Rabbati had a keen eye towards editing and shaping his homily by tying the first and last sections together.

Examples of internal flow in these homilies also demonstrates their highly edited and shaped nature. In the Kahana's homily on Nu. 7:1, the motif of the marital relationship between God and Israel is introduced in Section One, and then spelled out in greater detail in Section Two (the mishkan), and in even greater detail in Section Three (the mitzvot). Examining the Tanhuma's homily on Nu. 7:1, internal flow occurs from Sections Twenty-Four through Twenty-Eight. In Section Twenty-Four the general idea of how the mishkan returns the shechinah to earth, her pristine place, so that God will dwell with Israel is introduced. This is then spelled out in Section Twenty-Five in which the building of the mishkan ends the competition between God and Israel, causing peace to reign between them. Then God blesses Israel in Section Twenty-Six, with the flow continuing as the blessings are actualized in Section Twenty-Seven. Finally in Section Twenty-Eight the wedding day of God and Israel is symbolized by the day the mishkan was built. Other good examples of internal flow are recognizable in the Kahana's and Tanhuma's homilies on Lev. 16:1. Both Sections Seven through Nine of the Kahana and Tanhuma discuss the Rabbis' reasons for the deaths

of Nadab and Abihu. Another example of internal flow in these homilies is the notion that even God had to accept His decree of death for Nadab and Abihu, which is discussed in Sections Six through Nine. Similarly, in the Tanhuma homily on Lev. 16:1 thematic flow between sections is evidence of editing and shaping. The deaths of Nadab and Abihu are the focus from Sections Four to Nine and again from Sections Eleven to Thirteen.

Within these homilies there also are numerous examples of how the repetition of ideas, words, and phrases aid in thematic unification. Let me cite just a few examples that will show us how the editors utilized this literary device to meld their homilies into single units. In Pisqa One of the Kahana the idea that the mishkan represents the bridal chamber for God and Israel on their wedding day is found in Sections One, Three, Four, and Five. In addition, the notion of the centrality of Moses in Sections One, Three, Five, Six, and Eight holds the homily together. Similarly, in Pisqa Five of the Rabbati the idea that the erection of the mishkan developed a strong nuptial relationship between God and Israel is found in Sections Four, Five, Seven, and Ten. While in the Tanhuma, Parashah Naso, Sections 19-29, the homily is held together by the notion that all Israelites - willingly gave a half-shekel to build the Tabernacle, is found in Sections Nineteen, Twenty, and Twenty-Three, and by the idea that the mishkan reconciles God and Israel after the sin of the golden calf which ties Sections Twenty-One, Twenty-Two, and Twenty-Five together.

Our analysis of the three homilies on Lev.16:1 also demonstrates that the repetition of ideas holds these homilies together. The idea that a leader must accept the communal position that God has ordained for him is found in Sections Three of the Kahana and again in Section Nine. This repetition is also found in Sections Three and Seven of the Tanhuma. In the Kahana Pisqa 26 and the Tanhuma Parashah Aharei Mot, Sections I-13, the contrast between righteous and wicked people also holds various sections of these homilies together. In both of them, this juxtaposition occurs in Sections One, Three, and Five. In addition, the idea that joy is mingled with grief is repeated in both of these homilies. In the Kahana this idea binds Sections Two and Nine together, while in the Tanhuma it holds Sections Two and Eight together. Similarly, repetition of ideas ties sections of the Rabbati Pisqa 47 together as well. Two repetitions of ideas that accomplish this are: the concept of middat ha-din introduced in Section Two and carried out in Section Three, and the idea that we can affect God's decrees by our actions which is found in Sections One and Four.

Consequently, these few examples of idea repetition found in these Homiletic Midrashim demonstrate the extent of shaping and editing in the Homiletic Midrashim.

Word and phrase repetitions are another important literary device which the editors used to mold their material into unified sermons. In Pisqa 26 of the Kahana, the constant usage of mishkan ties all the sections together. Here also the

repetitive usage of S.S. 5:1, "I have come into my garden, my sister bride," and S.S. 3:11, "Go forth daughters of Zion," ties sections together. The Rabbati homily on Nu. 7:1 uses the word gan (garden) in Sections One, Four, and Five as a means of bridging sections. Turning our attention to the Tanhuma homily on Nu. 7:1 the word nitnadvu (they willingly volunteered) appears in Sections Nineteen and Twenty uniting them, while the phrase ma'aseh yedaychem (by the work of your hands) appears in Sections Twenty and Twenty-Nine uniting the beginning and end of the homily.

Examining the three homilies on Lev. 16:1 we also find that the literary device of repetition is utilized to shape material. Within these homilies there are numerous examples of word and phrase repetition that tie sections together. Examples of this in the Kahana are the term m'hulal (mingled) and holalim (arrogant) in Sections Two and Three, yarim keren (raise a horn) in Sections Three and Four, and tzadikim and reshaim in Sections One, Three, and Five. In the Rabbati, the repetition of gezerah (decree) in Sections One and Two ties these sections together. In Section Two of Pisqa 47 of the Rabbati, the repetition of the imagery of water and the words associated with it such as rachatz (washed), yam (sea), and tzamah (thirsted) aid in unifying this section. Finally, in the Tanhuma's homily on Lev. 16:1 the phrase, "How joy is mingled with grief," appears in Sections Two and Eight; the verse, "Even at this my heart trembles" (Job 37:1) is initially found in

Section Five and then repeated in Section Eleven, and the Psalms texts, "God will rejoice in His works" (Ps. 104:3) and "Israel will rejoice in His works" (Ps. 149:2) introduced in Section Three are repeated at the close of the homily in Section Thirteen as the peroration.

Therefore, the few examples of word and phrase repetition cited here make it clear that the editors intended to shape the material which they drew from different sources into homilies with unified themes.

Further evidence of editing and shaping is seen in how each homily develops its theme intelligently, building to a climax at the conclusion. This has been pointed out in the thematic overviews on each homily.

As a result of the above evidence of theme development, and editing and shaping in the Homiletic Midrashim we examined, I would conclude that the Homiletic Midrashim are compilations of different sources composed by editors who transformed these variegated sources into highly artistic homiletic units that have unifying themes and elements.

Since there is a clear tripartite structure to the Kahana homilies which is not found in the Rabbati and Tanhuma homilies, we need to draw some conclusions as to how the structural breakdown in the later Homiletic Midrashim affects their theme development. We have noticed that the structural breakdown in Pisqa Five of the Rabbati enabled its editor to move from the more general to the specific within the development

of its theme and to a conclusion that ties things together. By placing material that is presented as a petihta in a series of petihtot in the Kahana as the peroration, the editor of the Rabbati was able to tie up the entire theme of the marital relationship between God and Israel. The structural looseness of the Tanhuma, Parashah Naso, Sections 19-29, also aids the theme development by allowing new ideas to augment the theme of the importance of the mishkan, viz., the relationship between God and Israel. By placing in Section Twenty Four a petihta after exegetic comments in previous sections, the implicit question of how the mishkan causes the shechinah to dwell on earth finally is dramatically answered. In addition, by closing the homily with a petihta, the editor ties the theme of the significance of the mishkan to the relationship between God and Israel together.

Similarly in Pisqa 47 of the Rabbati, and Tanhuma Parashah Aharei Mot, Sections 1-13 we see the same results of the breakdown of structure. The editor of the Rabbati, by employing a petihta at the end, is able to tie the first and last sections of the homily together. The idea that we affect God's decrees by prayer and repentance was raised in Section One and by having a petihta conclude the homily the idea of how meritorious deeds also affect God's decrees can be added. The breakdown of structure in the Tanhuma also aids the theme development as Section Eleven, a petihta returns us to the scene of Nadab and Abihu entering to sacrifice and being consumed by fire.

The editor then can add that Moses only prayed on Aaron's behalf, and as a result only Nadab and Abihu died; Ithamar and Elazar were spared. This point would not have been made if it were not for structural breakdown in the homily. We have returned to a focus on their deaths, which in turn moves the homily along to Section Thirteen in which we read again the reasons for their deaths. This, in turn reinforces the theme that just as we accepted what God has decreed in the past, we will accept God's decree of redemption in the future.

As a result of these examples of how structural breakdown leads to better theme development, I am lead to the conclusion that the later we go in the Homiletic Midrashim there is a greater sense of editing and shaping.

This conclusion is also buttressed by the fact that the later we go in the Homiletic Midrashim there is less superfluous material. In addition, there is a greater sense of selective usage of shared material and prooftexts. We have seen that as we move from the Kahana to the Rabbati and to the Tanhuma there is less concern with providing a large amount of prooftexts, and that the Rabbati and Tanhuma do not utilize all the material available to it from the Kahana. Examples of this are evident amongst the parallel homilies in Nu. 7:1. The Tanhuma uses only one interpretation of Vayehi (Section Twenty-Four) and two interpretations of kelot (Section Twenty-Six) rather than the several found in the Rabbati (Sections Seven and Eight). Similarly, the Tanhuma in its description

of Issachar being the tribe that is knowledgeable about the Torah and instructs the chiefs about the sacrificial process (Section Twenty-Two) does not use all the material available to it from the Kahana (Section Eight). Another example, is that the Tanhuma has only one line about the day the mishkan was built as the wedding day between God and Israel (Section Twenty-Eight) rather than the large amount of material found on this subject in the Rabbati and Tanhuma homilies.

Regarding the parallels between the Kahana and Rabbati on Nu. 7:1, one notices that the Rabbati edits out much material from the Kahana. The editor of the Rabbati leaves out material on the sacrifices, the irrelevant comment that Moses spent three days erecting and taking apart the mishkan (Section Two), and just mentions the idea of an earthly and heavenly mishkan (Section Eleven) rather than going into a detailed description of the heavenly Tabernacle.

Focusing our attention on the three parallels based on Lev. 16:1 we also notice more selective usage of material the later we go. It has already been pointed out that there is a lack of shared material amongst all three homilies¹. However, in the shared material between the Kahana and the Rabbati, the Rabbati makes selective usage of Kahana material. Note for example, that the Rabbati (Section Three) does not include the entire text of the High Priest's prayer on Yom Kippur as does the Kahana (Section Four). Also the Tanhuma makes selective usage of the shared material with the Kahana, despite the fact

that they are almost identical homilies. The Tanhuma excludes the application to the father whose joy was turned to grief when his son died at the pre-wedding feast(Section Three) and does not repeat how Elisheva saw four joys turn to mourning when her two sons entered to sacrifice and were consumed by fire(Section Two). The Tanhuma is also selective in its usage of shared material with the Rabbati. It does not go into a long discourse on Moses's prayer on Aaron's behalf saved Elazar and Ithamar(Section Twelve) nor in its usage of the idea of how Moses comforted Aaron does it contain the lengthy discussion that is in the Rabbati(Section One).

In conclusion, we clearly see that the later we go in the Homiletic Midrashim there is a greater extent of editing because of the selective usage of material as well as structural breakdown.

Finally, since there is shared material amongst the homilies we need to pose one more question: Is there internal borrowing and by whom? It is my opinion that both the Rabbati and Tanhuma borrowed from the Kahana, and in addition the Tanhuma borrowed from the Rabbati. I base myself on the fact that the editors of the Rabbati and Tanhuma in borrowing from the Kahana not only edited out material, but also changed the placement of material. The Tanhuma also borrowed from the Rabbati.²

Our investigation of the extent of editing and shaping in the Homiletic Midrashim has focused on two sets of par-

allel homilies, based on Nu. 7:1, "The day Moses completed erecting the Tabernacle," and Lev. 16:1, "After the deaths of the two sons of Aaron." Our major concern has been the development of theme in these homilies as demonstrated by the utilization of certain editorial techniques. Since the observations we have made are based on our study of only six homilies, the limited scope of our study makes it difficult to draw general conclusions about the nature of the Homiletic Midrashim. As a result other parallel pisqa'ot in these compilations will have to be analyzed with an eye to testing our tentative conclusions regarding the edited nature of these homilies. Such analyses and comparisons will also answer questions, such as: Are there other editorial devices used to shape the derashot in the Homiletic Midrashim?; Does structural breakdown necessarily mean better theme development?; and Finally, is there always a greater sense of theme development, editing, and selective usage of material the later we go in the Homiletic Midrashim? These questions will need to be investigated to make further determinations about the nature of the Homiletic Midrashim.

APPENDICES

The appendices are charts of parallel material in the three homilies on Nu.7:1ff and Lev.16:1ff. The charts will be horizontal, and parallel material is designated by a color scheme so that the reader at a glance can find the material that is shared in the homilies.

Color Key

-  -signifies parallels in all thtee homilies.
-  -signifies parallels in the Kahana and Rabbati.
-  -signifies parallels in the Rabbati and Tanhuma
-  -signifies parallels in the Kahana and Tanhuma.

APPENDIX A: CHART OF PARALLEL MATERIAL ON NUMBERS 7:1

Pesikta De Rav Kahana, Pisqa One	Pesikta Rabbati, Pisqa Five	Tanhuma Naso, Sections 19-29
1: God smells the odor and comes to the gan. This teaches the groom manners not to enter the bridal chamber until the bride invites him in. Seven wicked generations remove the shechinah from earth and seven righteous return it. Moses brings the shechinah back to earth by building the mishkan.	This is a halachic petihta. The question raised is may the person translating the Torah look at a written text, and the answer is no. There is a special relationship between God and Israel by virtue of Israel possessing the Torah and Oral Law.	19: This is a halachic petihta that asks the question what was prior to creation. One answer is the mishkan. The mishkan causes the shechinah to dwell on earth.
2: S.S. 3:9. The mishkan is the appropriate place for the mature intimate relationship between God and Israel. The mishkan is like a cave at the sea.	Moses erected and took apart the mishkan for seven days.	20: This is a composite petihta on Prov. 27:18. It is applied to Moses and Bezalel who are rewarded for their work on the mishkan.
3: S.S. 3:11. God reconciles opposites. God instructs Moses on building the earthly mishkan by showing him the heavenly mishkan.	Prov. 30:4 is applied to God, Elijah and Moses. With the mishkan, the world was put on a firm base. The mishkan equals the creation of the world.	21: God forgives Israel for the sin of the golden calf. The mishkan reconciles God and Israel.
4: Prov. 30:4 is applied to God, Moses, and Elijah. With the mishkan, the world is established on a firm base. The mishkan equals the creation of the world.	The erection of the mishkan is the bridal day for God and Israel. The groom learns not to enter the bridal chamber until the bride gives him permission. Gan, is genui, the hupah.	22: Issachar describes the sacrificial procedure. All sacrificial law is according to Issachar. The sacrifices bring Israel and God closer together.

CONTINUATION OF PARALLEL MATERIAL ON NUMBERS 7:1

Pesikta De Rav Kahana, Pisqa One	Pesikta Rabbati, Pisqa Five	Tanhuma, Naso, Sections 19-29
5: The day the <u>mishkan</u> was erected was the <u>bridal day</u> of God and Israel, <u>Moses erects and dis-</u> <u>mantles the mishkan for seven</u> <u>days.</u> The day the <u>mishkan</u> was erected all the demons left the world.	S.S.5:1 The day the <u>mishkan</u> was erected was the <u>bridal day</u> between God and Israel. It was the day the beloved entered the <u>bridal chamber.</u>	23: We give to God according to our strength. In the desert sacrifices appropriate to the <u>mishkan</u> and in Jerusalem sacrifices appropriate to the <u>Bet Mikdash.</u>
6: Moses anoints and sanctifies each part of the <u>mishkan</u> and ties this world to the world to come.	Eccl.2:21 is applied to Moses and Bezalel who are rewarded for their work on the <u>mishkan.</u>	24: The seven wicked generations removed the <u>shechinah</u> to the seventh firmament and the seven righteous returned it to earth. Moses by building the <u>mishkan</u> returned the <u>shechinah</u> to earth.
7: The chiefs of Israel offered the sacrifices which were in six wagons. The wagons represent: the six days of creation, the six Orders of the Mishnah, the six patriarchs, and the six commandments that a ruler must follow.	Vayehi means that the <u>mishkan</u> caused the <u>shechinah</u> to dwell with Israel. It also refers to how seven wicked generations caused the <u>shechinah</u> to be removed to the seventh firmament and how seven righteous men returned it gradually to earth. The last is Moses who by building the <u>mishkan</u> brought the <u>shechinah</u> back to earth.	25: Moses enters the <u>Tabernacle</u> and hears how God is reconciled to Israel because they built the <u>mishkan</u> (Ps.85:9)

CONTINUATION OF PARALLEL MATERIAL ON NUMBERS 7:1

Pesikta De Rav Kahana, Pisga One	Pesikta Rabbati Pisga Five	Tanhuma, Naso, Sections 19-29
8: The tribe of Issachar explains the sacrificial process. The oxen who were designated for the work of the <u>mishkan</u> lived long; therefore, <u>Israel</u> who is consecrated to the <u>mishkan</u> will live eternally and is in an eternal covenant with God.	Vayehi means the day of greatest joy for Israel. was the day the <u>mishkan</u> was built.	26: The day the <u>mishkan</u> was built God came laden with blessings.
	9: God, the first born, the angels, and the nations cried 'Woe' the day the <u>mishkan</u> was built.	27: The day the <u>mishkan</u> was built all evil spirits left the world. God blesses and keeps <u>Israel</u> from evil.
	10: It came to pass on the wedding day. The Priestly benediction protects Israel. The day the <u>mishkan</u> was built all evil demons left the world. The <u>mishkan</u> reconciles God and <u>Israel</u> after the Golden calf.	28: Kelot means the day the bride entered the bridal chamber.
	11: S.S. 3:11. Moses hears God in the tabernacle and gets assurance that God has forgiven Israel and is reconciled to Israel. The <u>mishkan</u> ends the enmity between God and Israel. God forgives Israel (Ps. 85: 9-10). There are parallel <u>mishkanim</u> in heaven and earth.	29: God will bless Israel in the future in Jerusalem when the Bet Mikdash will be rebuilt.

APPENDIX B: CHART OF PARALLEL MATERIAL ON LEVITICUS 16:1

Pesikta De Rav Kahana, Pisqa 26	Pesikta Rabbati Pisqa 47	Tanhuma (Buber) Anarei Mot, 1-13
1: A composite <u>petihta</u> on Eccl. 9:2, "Like befalls the righteous, the wicked, the pure, the impure, the one who sacrifices, the one who doesn't sacrifice, the one who vows and the one who fears vows." The applications are to Noah, Necho, Moses, Aaron, the spies, Josiah, Ahab, David, Nebuchadnezzar, Zedekiah, Samson, as well as to Aaron's sons (righteous), and to Korach and his group (wicked).	The halahic <u>petihta</u> questions which is greater, prayer or repentance? Two answers are given: prayer annuls half the decree and repentance the whole decree as well as the opposite point of view. Since <u>Moses prayed on behalf of Aaron, God cut His decree in half and only killed Nadab and Abihu.</u> <u>Moses comforted Aaron.</u>	A composite <u>petihta</u> on Eccl. 9:2, "Like befalls all, the righteous, the wicked, the good, the pure, the impure, the sinner, the one who sacrifices, and the one who doesn't sacrifice, the one who vows and the one who fears vows." The applications are to: Abraham, Nimrod, David, Nebuchadnezzar, Solomon, Jeroboam, Zedekiah, and Samson. A final application of the righteous and wicked is Aaron's sons and Korach and his congregation, both of whom are consumed by fire. <u>Moses comforts Aaron.</u>
2: A composite <u>petihta</u> on Eccl. 2:2, "Laughter is mixed with grief." The applications are to Solomon and the father and son incident. Then the phrase, "that the measure of justice came upon is applied to the generation of the flood, the people of Sodom and Gemorrah, and Elisheva the daughter of Aminadav.	This is a <u>petihta</u> on Ps. 63:2-4. God cleansed the infants born in Egypt at the dunghills, Israel praised God at the Red Sea, and Israel thirsted for God in the desert. God acted with love when he killed Nadab and Abihu because if they had lived they would have been lepers. Aaron praised God for this. Moses comforts Aaron because he accepted middat ha-din.	A composite <u>petihta</u> on Eccl. 2:2, "Joy is mingled with grief" is augmented by the phrase, "that the measure of justice came upon," and is applied to Solomon, the generation of the flood, the people of Sodom and Gemorrah, and Elisheva the daughter of Aminadav.

CONTINUATION OF PARALLEL MATERIAL ON LEVITICUS 16:1

Pesikta De Rav Kahana, Pisqa 26 3: This is a <u>petihta</u> on Ps. 75:5 and then the phrase, "God says to the wicked, 'The righteous cannot rejoice in my world and you want to.' This is applied to Adam, Abraham, God, Israel, and Elisheva.	Blessed is the man upon whom chastisements have fallen and overcame his anger and did not cry out against God's measure of justice. This is applied to Adam, Abraham, Issac, and Aaron.	Tanhuma, Aharei Mot, 1-13 The <u>petihta</u> text Ps. 75:5 is cited. Then the phrase, "God says to the wicked, 'The righteous cannot rejoice in my world and you want to' is applied to Adam, Issac, Moses, God, and Israel.
"Does the eagle rise up at your command" (Job 37:1). Aaron was given much glory by God. God resided in the First Temple on the rock and in the Second Temple between the crag of the rock. Aaron's prayer as the high priest. Aaron's sons died and we read the text, "They drowned on their blood" (Dt. 1:30).	"With wise advice you shall make war" (Prov. 17:28). The word <u>tachbolot</u> means leader and is applied to Moses, Joshua, and Samuel. The word also means <u>bundles</u> of meritorious deeds and these deeds of Israel are enumerated because they accompanied Aaron into the Tabernacle. If Israel keeps the covenant she will live and enjoy peace.	"Does the eagle rise up at your command" (Job 37:1) is used as the <u>petihta</u> text. Aaron caused the Divine Presence to descend on the ark. God's presence resided in the First Temple on the rock and in the Second Temple on the crag of the rock. The prayer of the High Priest on Yom Kippur was: "May it be Thy will O Lord our God
"Does the eagle rise up at your command" (Job 37:1) is used as the <u>petihta</u> text. Aaron caused the Divine Presence to descend on the ark. God's presence resided in the First Temple on the rock and in the Second Temple on the crag of the rock. The High Priest offered this prayer on Yom Kippur: "May it be Thy will God that this	144	144

CONTINUATION OF PARALLEL MATERIAL ON LEVITICUS 16:1

Pesikta De Rav Kahana Pisqa 26	Pesikta Rabbati Pisqa 47	Tanhuma Aharei Mot, 1-13
4: that this be a good year... a year that Israel will not Lord it over one another. The High Priest looked out and saw the agricultural prospects for the year. Aaron's sons died. "They choked on their own blood" (Dt. 1:30).		be a good year... a year in which Israel will not Lord it over each other. Aaron's sons died. "They choked on their own blood." (Dt. 1:30).
5: "At this my heart trembles" (Job 37:1). Aaron's sons who are righteous are contrasted with Titus. He entered the holy of holies, tore the curtains, and left in peace. But, Nadab and Abihu entered to sacrifice and were consumed by fire.		"At this my heart trembles" (Job 37:1). Aaron's sons as righteous people are juxtaposed to Titus, the wicked. He entered the holy of holies, tore the curtains, and left peacefully. Aaron's sons entered and were consumed by fire. "To punish the righteous beyond measure is not good" (Prov. 17:16). The deaths of Nadab and Abihu were difficult for God.
6: To punish the righteous beyond measure is not good. (Prov. 17:16). The deaths of Nadab and Abihu were difficult for God.		R. Eliezar taught that Nadab and Abihu died because they taught the law in the presence of Moses.

CONTINUATION OF PARALLEL MATERIAL ON LEVITICUS 16:1

Pesikta De Rav Kahana, Pisqa 26
 7:R.Eleazar taught that Nadab
 and Abihu died because they
 taught the law in the presence
 of Moses.

Pesikta Rabbati, Pisqa 47

Tanhuma Aharei Mot, 1-13

The deaths of Nadab and
 Abihu were difficult for
 God. Bar Kappara said they
 died because they drew near
 the Divine Presence, offered
 an extra sacrifice, brought
 a strange fire, and did not
 take advice from one another.
 R. Joshua of Siknin said they
 died because they entered
 the sanctuary drunk, did not
 wash their hands or feet,
 did not wear the prescribed
 garments, and had no children.
 R. Aha said they died because
 they were arrogant. They felt
 that no women were appropriate
 wives for them. They also
 hoped Moses and Aaron would
 die so that they could take
 over. The rejoinder by God
 is: "Don't pray for tomorrow
 because you do not know
 what the day will bring (Prov.
 27:1). Many young donkeys
 have been made into saddle
 covers for their mothers.
 They also died because they
 gazed at the Divine Presence
 at Mt. Sinai.
 The deaths of Nadab and
 Abihu were difficult for
 God.

CONTINUATION OF PARALLEL MATERIAL ON LEVITICUS 16:1

Pesikta De Rav Kahana Pisqa 26	Pesikta Rabbati Pisqa 47	Tanhuma Aharei Mot 1-13
8: The deaths of Nadab and Abihu were difficult for God. Bar Kappara said they died because they drew to near the Divine Presence, offered an extra sacrifice, and did not take counsel from one another.		The deaths of Nadab and Abihu were difficult for God. God's joy was mingled with grief since He decreed that Nadab and Abihu would die at Mt. Sinai and carried this out on the day the Tabernacle was erected.
9: R. Mini said they died because they entered drunk, did not wash their hands and feet, did not have the prescribed garments, and had no children. R. Levi said they were arrogant because they felt that no women were suitable wives for them. They also were arrogant because they could not wait for Moses and Aaron to die so that they could take over. The rejoinder to them by God is, "Don't pray for tomorrow because you do not know what the day will bring" (Prov. 27:1). Many brazen young donkeys have been made into saddle covers for their mothers. God's joy was mingled with grief because He decreed at Sinai that Nadab and Abihu would die, but enacted the decree when the Tabernacle was erected. The deaths of Nadab and Abihu were difficult for God.		Nadab and Abihu had no children. Then there is a discussion on the succession of the priesthood.

CONTINUATION OF PARALLEL MATERIAL ON LEVITICUS 16:1

Pesikta De Rav Kahana, Pisqa 26 Pesikta Rabbati, Pisqa 47	Tanhuma Aharei Mot, 1-13
10: Since Nadab and Abihu had no children there is a discussion concerning the succession of the High Priesthood.	The deaths of the righteous atone for Israel. The deaths of Miriam, Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu atone for Israel as does the Day of Atonement.
11: The deaths of the righteous atone for Israel. The deaths of Miriam, Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu atone for Israel as the Day of Atonement atones for Israel.	"Even at this my heart trembles" (Job 37:1). Elijah saw Nadab and Abihu enter to sacrifice and were consumed by fire.
	12: <u>Moses's prayer annulled half of God's decree on Aaron's sons.</u> "God was angry with Aaron to <u>destroy him</u> " (Dt. 9:20) is taken to mean to kill his sons. But, since Moses prayed on Aaron's behalf God spared Ithamar and Elazar.
	13: Nadab and Abihu died because they had no children, when they followed Moses and Aaron they hoped they would die so that they could take over, and because they gazed at the Divine Presence at Mt. Sinai. God is with Israel in her distress and will redeem Israel in the future, and then God and Israel will rejoice.

NOTES

NOTES ON CHAPTER ONE

- ¹Samuel Lehrman, The World of The Midrash, (N.Y. Thomas Yoseloff, 1961), p. 11.
- ²Jacob Neusner, "History And Midrash," Judaism 9(1960):48.
- ³Ibid., p. 50.
- ⁴Joseph Heinemann, "Profile Of A Midrash: The Art Of Composition In Leviticus Rabbah," Journal Of The American Academy Of Religion 39(1971):142.
- ⁵Ben-Zion Wacholder, "Prolegomenon: A History Of Sabbatical Readings Of Scripture For The Triennial Cycle," by Jacob Mann: The Bible As Read And Preached In The Old Synagogue (N.Y.: Ktav Publishing Co., 1971), p. XXV.
- ⁶Lehrman, The World Of The Midrash, p. 15.
- ⁷Ibid., p. 16.
- ⁸Leopold Zunz, Ha-Derashot Be-Yisrael, (Jerusalem: Albeck, 1892), p. 33.
- ⁹Lehrman, The World Of The Midrash, p. 22.
- ¹⁰Samuel Mirski, "Le Mehuto Shel Midrash Tanhuma," Sura 3(1957): 111.
- ¹¹Samuel Mirski, "Ha-Derashah Be-Tekufat Ha-Mishnah Ve-Ha-Talmud," Horeb 7(1973):78.
- ¹²Richard Sarason, "Towards A New Aggendum For The Study Of The Homiletic Midrashim," in Studies In Honor Of Joseph Heinemann, editor Jacob Petuchowski (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1981), p. 65-66.
- ¹³Joseph Heinemann, "The Proem In The Aggadic Midrashim," Scripta Hierosolymitana 22(1971):100.
- ¹⁴Norman Cohen, "Leviticus Rabbah: Parashah 3: An Example Of A Classic Rabbinic Homily," JQR 72(1981):18.
- ¹⁵Norman Cohen, "Structure And Editing In The Homiletic Midrashim," AJS Review 6(1981):19-20.
- ¹⁶Sarason, "Towards A New Aggendum For The Study Of The Homiletic Midrashim," p. 58.

NOTES ON CHAPTER ONE CONTINUED

- 17 Ira Chernus, "On The History Of A Pericope Text In The Midrash Tanhuma," Journal For The Study Of Judaism 21(1980):53.
- 18 Cohen, "Leviticus Rabbah: Parashah 3: An Example Of A Classic Rabbinic Homily," p.27.
- 19 Sarason, "Towards A New Agendum For The Study Of The Homiletic Midrashim," p.67.
- 20 Robert Alter, The Art Of Biblical Narrative (N.Y.: Basic Books, 1981), p.47.
- 21 Ibid., p.11.
- 22 Ibid., p.94.
- 23 Ibid., p.2.
- 24 Cohen, "Leviticus Rabbah: Parashah 3: An Example Of A Classic Rabbinic Homily," p.19.
- 25 Chernus, "On The History Of A Pericope Text In The Midrash Tanhuma," p.63.
- 26 Cohen, "Structure And Editing In The Homiletic Midrashim," p.2.
- 27 Ibid., p.2.
- 28 Ibid., p.7.
- 29 Ibid., p.20.
- 30 Heinemann, "The Proem In The Aggadic Midrashim," p.121.
- 31 Ibid., p.101.
- 32 Ibid., p.107.
- 33 Ibid., p.109.
- 34 Richard Sarason, "The Petihtot In Leviticus Rabbah: Oral Homilies Or Redactional Constructions," JJS 33(1982):558.
- 35 Ibid., p.564.
- 36 Hermann Strack, Introduction To The Talmud And Midrash, (Philadelphia: JPS, 1959), p.210.

NOTES ON CHAPTER ONE CONTINUED

- 37 Bernard Mandelbaum, "Introduction," Pesikta De Rav Kahana (N.Y.: JTS, 1961), p. 7.
- 38 Bernard Mandelbaum, "Prolegomena To The Pesikta," PAAJR 23 (1954): 41.
- 39 Mandelbaum, "Introduction," p. 14.
- 40 William Braude, "Introduction," Pesikta De Rav Kahana, (Philadelphia: JPS, 1975), p. XVI.
- 41 Mandelbaum, "Introduction," p. 13.
- 42 Ibid., p. 7.
- 43 Ibid., p. 14.
- 44 Ibid., p. 16.
- 45 Ibid., p. 7.
- 46 Zunz, Ha-Derashot Be-Yisrael, p. 85.
- 47 Braude, "Introduction," p. XI.
- 48 Zunz, Ha-Derashot Be-Yisrael, p. 107.
- 49 These homilies are: 20, 27, 28, 29, and 30 of the Pesikta De Rav Kahana.
- 50 Norman Cohen, "The London Manuscript Of The Pesikta Rabbati: A Key Text Witness Comes To Light," JQR 73 (1981): 209.
- 51 William Braude, "Introduction," Pesikta Rabbati (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), p. 12.
- 52 Zunz, Ha-Derashot Be-Yisrael, p. 118.
- 53 Braude, "Introduction," pp. 21-22.
- 54 Ibid., p. 22.
- 55 Bernard Bamberger, "A Messianic Document Of The Seventh Century," HUCA 15 (1940): 429.
- 56 Braude, "Introduction," p. 23.
- 57 Zunz, Ha-Derashot Be-Yisrael, p. 120.

NOTES ON CHAPTER ONE CONTINUED

- 58 Ibid., p.120.
- 59 William Braude, "Overlooked Meanings Of Certain Editorial Terms In The Pesikta Rabbati," JQR 52(1969):271.
- 60 These common homilies are: 15-18, and 33 in the Rabbati.
- 61 Ben Zion-Wacholder, "Prolegomena: A History Of The Sabbatical Readings Of Scripture For The Triennial Cycle," p. XLII.
- 62 Zunz, Ha-Derashot Be-Yisrael, p. III.
- 63 Louis Ginsburg, "Ma'Amar Al Ha-Yelamedenu," Ginzei Schechter, vol. I, (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1960), p. 512.
- 64 Mirski, "Ha-Derashah Be-Tekufat Ha-Mishnah Ve-Ha-Talmud," p. 85.
- 65 Chernus, "On The History Of A Pericope Text In The Midrash Tanhuma," p. 63.
- 66 Ginsburg, "Ma'Amar Al Ha-Yelamedenu," p. 450.
- 67 Mirski, "Le-Mehuto Shel Midrash Tanhuma," p. 62.
- 68 Chernus, "On The History Of A Pericope Text In The Midrash Tanhuma," p. 55.
- 69 Cohen, "Structure And Editing In The Homiletic Midrashim," p. 5.

NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO

- I Refer to Appendix A to see the extent of shared material that was excised by the Rabbati in its usage of the Kahana.

NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE

- I Refer to Appendix B to see the extent of shared material between the Rabbati and Tanhuma.

NOTES ON CHAPTER FOUR

- I Turn to page II5 for more information on this topic.
- 2 Refer to Appendices A and B to see the shared material between the homilies and the varied placement of this material in the homilies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

Pesikta De Rav Kahana. Edited with an introduction by Bernard Mandelbaum. 2 vols. N.Y.:JTS.,1961.

Pesikta De Rav Kahana. Edited and Translated with an Introduction by William Braude. Philadelphia:JPS.,1975.

Pesikta Rabbati. Edited with an Introduction by Meir Friedmann. Jerusalem:Keter Publishing Co.,1963.

Pesikta Rabbati. Edited and Translated with an Introduction by William Braude. New Haven:Yale University Press.,1968.

Tanhuma. Edited with an Introduction by Solomon Buber. Jerusalem: Export Enterprises Ltd.,1978.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

Alter Robert, The Art Of Biblical Narrative.N.Y.:Basic Books Inc.,1981.

Bamberger, Bernard. "A Messianic Document Of The Seventh Century." HUCA 15(1940):425-431.

Braude, William. "Overlooked Meanings Of Certain Editorial Terms In The Pesikta Rabbati." JQR 52(1969):264-272.

Cohen, Norman. "Leviticus Rabbah:Parashah 3: An Example Of A Classic Rabbinic Homily." JQR 72(1981):18-31.

_____. "The London Manuscript Of Pesikta Rabbati: A Key Text Witness Comes To Light." JQR 73(1982):209-237.

_____. "Structure And Editing In The Homiletic Midrashim." AJSReview 6(1981):1-20.

Chernus, Ira. "A Wall Of Fire Round About: The Development Of A Theme In Rabbinic Midrash." JJS 70(1979):68-79.

_____. "On The History Of A Pericope Text In The Midrash Tanhuma." Journal For The Study Of Judaism 21(1980):53-65.

Encyclopedia Judaica, 13th.ed.S.v. "Pesikta De Rav Kahana," by Bernard Mandelbaum.

_____. "Pesikta Rabbati," by Daniel Sperber.

_____. "Tanhuma-Yelamdenu," By Moshe David Herr.

Ginsburg, Louis. "Ma' Amar Al Ha-Yelamedenu." In Ginzei Schechter vol. I, pp. 449-513. Edited by Solomon Schechter. N.Y.: Herman Press., 1969.

Gottlieb, Issac. "Formula Comparison In Midrash Research." JQR 70(1970):28-40.

Heinemann, Joseph. "Profile Of A Midrash: The Art Of Composition In Leviticus Rabbah." Journal Of The American Academy Of Religion 39(1971): 141-150.

_____. "The Proem In The Aggadic Midrashim." Scripta Hierosolymitana 22(1971):100-122.

Lehrman, S.M. The World Of The Midrash. N.Y. Thomas Yoseloff, 1961.

Mandelbaum, Bernard. "Prolegomena To The Pesikta." PAAJR 23 (1954): 41-58.

Mann, Jacob. The Bible As Read and Preached In The Old Synagogue. N.Y.: Ktav Publishing Co., 1971.

Mirski, Samuel. "Ha-Derashah Be-Tekufat Ha-Mishnah Ve-Ha-Talmud." Horeb 7(1973):75-91.

_____. "Le Mehuto Shel Midrash Tanhuma." Sura 3(1957):93-119.

Neusner, Jacob. "History And Midrash." Judaism 9(1960):47-54.

Rabinowitz, C.F. "The Study Of A Midrash." JQR 58(1967):143-161.

Sarason, Richard. "The Petihtot In Leviticus Rabbah: Oral Homilies Or Redactional Constructions." JJS 33(1982):557-568.

_____. "Towards A New Aggendum For The Study Of Midrashic Literature." In Studies In Honor Of Joseph Heinemann, pp. 55-71. Edited by Jacob Petuchowski. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1981.

Segal, Eliezer. "The Same From Beginning To End: On The Development Of A Midrashic Homily." JJS 32(1981):158-165.

Strack, Hermann. Introduction To Talmud And Midrash. Philadelphia: JPS., 1959.

Wacholder, Ben-Zion. "Prolegomena: A History Of The Sabbatical Readings Of Scripture For The Triennial Cycle." In The Bible As Read And Preached In The Old Synagogue, vol. I pp. XI-XCI. by Jacob Mann. N.Y.: Ktav Publishing Co., 1971.

Zunz, Leopold. Ha-Derashot Be-Yisrael. Jerusalem: Albeck, 1892.