



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

#### **Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

#### **About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY  
AH 58SR 9

Harvard Depository  
Brittle Book

209  
Echah  
Abrahams

209  
Echab  
Abraham



HARVARD UNIVERSITY

LIBRARY OF THE

Semitic Department

ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY  
MDCCCX  
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS





THE

21421  
FICKEL 13

SOURCES OF THE MIDRASH

**ECHAH RABBAH.**

A CRITICAL INVESTIGATION.

BY

JOSEPH ABRAHAMS, B. A., PH. D.

BERLIN.

J. GORZELANCZYK & Co.

1883.

~~to Harv. 1904~~  
~~Harvard University~~  
~~Semitic Dept. Library~~

ANDOVER-HARVARD  
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY  
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

H 74.691  
May 12, 1949

863

209

2000

2000

TO THE MEMORY OF  
THE LATE JACOB ABRAHAM FRANKLIN, ESQUIRE,  
FOUNDER OF THE JACOB FRANKLIN CHARITABLE TRUST  
FUND

THIS ESSAY IS DEDICATED BY THE AUTHOR.



#### INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

"THERE was once a dense forest into which no one ventured to enter, for it was impossible to secure a safe journey back. One man, however, who had long been brooding over the difficulty resolved at last to make an attempt to overcome it. Accordingly, he began by gradually cutting away the trees, until he succeeded in forming a road, by means of which he could penetrate into the heart of the forest, without fear of going astray. The great obstacle was now removed, for it lay in the power of every comer to enter and return along the path thus cleared by the original traveller."<sup>1</sup>

Even such a forest is presented to us by the multitude of Midrashim and Hagadoth; and I have availed myself of the path indicated by the profound scholar Zunz, who first succeeded in arriving at clear statements and definite conclusions with respect to the origin and arrangement of this branch of our Wise Men's labours. The present investigation is based on the following passages of "Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden":<sup>2</sup>

"The so-called Midrash Rabbah is by no means the work of one author. The expression Midrash Rabbah was unknown to the older writers, who invariably cite the different books, each by its own special name; it came first into use when the Hagadoth on the Pentateuch and on the Five Megilloth were arranged together and joined to one body". "The three Hagadoth, Bereshith Rabbah, Echah Rabbah, and Vayikra Rabbah, are the oldest of all." "Bereshith Rabbah was probably composed in the sixth, and Vayikra Rabbah about the

<sup>1</sup> Midrash Bereshith Rabbah, ch. XII.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 179—181, and end of ch. X.

middle of the seventh century. The next place<sup>1</sup> with respect to priority must be assigned to the Hagadah on the Lamentations. This Hagadah is usually called Midrash Echah Rabbathi; and in the work of Rabbi Nathan, by whom it is first mentioned, it bears the name of Megillath Echah. The introduction to this Midrash forms a prefatory Hagadah consisting of thirty-three sections (not numbered), all of which — except the last — begin with the words פתח . . . רבי. They contain discourses which are connected with the contents of the Lamentations though based on extraneous texts, and which tend to awaken mournful reflections on the downfall of our national independence. As a rule, each discourse ends with the first words of that book.<sup>2</sup> The introduction is followed by the Hagadah to the book itself arranged and divided into sections according to the verses of the text. It is interspersed with tales and legends describing the unhappy lot of the Jews, with instances of the talents and the genius of the Israelites (including ten narratives in which natives of Jerusalem and of Athens are introduced), with accounts of the persecutions by the Romans, and with a description of the manner in which the Jews were ridiculed in the Roman comedies. The work is full of extracts from the Talmud Yerushalmi<sup>3</sup> and from the Bereshith Rabbah; and since the incident of the Mother of the Maccabees is related as having taken place in the time of the emperors, it seems that the author of Echah Rabbah did not know the Books of the Maccabees. One passage appears to hint at the Arabian rule.<sup>4</sup> The Hagadah on the first chapter is as large as that on the remaining four chapters together, although the latter contain many repetitions; and in the fifth chapter the Midrash is reduced to a minimum. This leads to the conclusion that the last four chapters are all later additions; and the completion of the whole work

<sup>1</sup> After the Bereshith Rabbah.

<sup>2</sup> איכה ישובה בודד or איכה.

<sup>3</sup> I wish it to be particularly noticed that no evidence is adduced by Zunz in support of this assertion.

<sup>4</sup> Ch. I, sec. 42. מקדן קשה . . . . . מלכות אדום ואלו מלכותו יון קשה ואדום מלכותו . . . . . "The Grecian rule was severe, but Edom's sway was mild . . . . . Macedonia's, severe, but Arabia's, mild."

cannot be fixed at a date prior to the second half of the seventh century, although the authorities quoted *by name*<sup>1</sup> are not later than the Talmud Yerushalmi. Echah Rabbah was compiled in the same country as Bereshith Rabbah,<sup>2</sup> and it is worthy of remark, that a complete Latin phrase<sup>3</sup> occurs therein. In our text we find many interpolations, explanatory notes and corrupt passages. After Rabbi Nathan, Rashi makes the first distinct use of this Midrash<sup>4</sup>.

In the eleventh chapter of the same work, Zunz shows that, besides the two Midrashim known by the name of Pesikta<sup>4</sup> — Pesikta Rabbathi and Pesikta Zutarta — there must have existed a third Pesikta, different from the other two both as regards its form and its age. It was not a Midrash on the Torah,<sup>5</sup> but on twelve Haphtaroth,<sup>6</sup> and on the portions of the Law read on the Festivals, Shabbath Hanucah, and the four distinguished Sabbaths viz., Shekalim, Zachor, Parah, and Hachodesh; it contained twenty nine Piskoth, and was composed about 700 c. E. Zunz thus discovered the lost Pesikta<sup>7</sup> solely by the aid of his careful researches, and by the power of his penetrating intellect; his results have since been verified in a most remarkable manner. Thirty-six years after these conclusions had been published<sup>8</sup> Salomon Buber edited the "Pesikta derab Kahana",<sup>9</sup> with a learned introduction and

<sup>1</sup> The italics are Zunz's.

<sup>2</sup> i. e. Palestine.

<sup>3</sup> "Vive domine imperator". וְיִבְרַח מֵאֵרֵץ אֲשֶׁלְטָוֹר. Ch. I, sec. 31.

<sup>4</sup> I shall have occasion to explain the signification of the words Pesikta, Piska, and Piskoth, when I treat of the relation between Midrash Echah and the Pesikta derab Kahana.

<sup>5</sup> As Azulai asserts. Comp. Gottesdienstl. Vorträge, p. 194, note a.

<sup>6</sup> דְּרִשׁוֹ: שׁוֹבָה: דְּבָרֵי יִרְמְיָהוּ: שְׁמֵעוּ: אִיכָה: נַחֲמוּ: וְהִאֲמַר צִיּוֹן:  
עֲנִיָּה סְעִדָּה: אֲנֹכִי אֲנֹכִי הוּא מִנְחַמְכֶם: רְנֵי עֲקָרָה: קוּמִי אֲרִי: שׁוּשׁ  
אֲשִׁישׁ. Gottesdienstl. Vortr., pp. 203, 204, 220, 221, 222, 222, 223,  
224, 224, 225, 225, 225, respectively.

<sup>7</sup> Rapoport first called attention to the Pesikta quoted by the Aruch, but it was reserved for Zunz to describe its characteristic features, and thus to effect its restoration. Comp. Gottesd. Vortr., p. 199.

<sup>8</sup> In 1868 (Lyck).

<sup>9</sup> This name was not unknown to Zunz, who says that it probably refers to the Hagadoth on the twelve Haphtaroth. Comp. Gottesdienstl. Vortr., p. 193.

instructive notes, under the auspices of the society "Mekitse Nirdamim". This work is printed from a MS. which was found in Zafed and copied in Egypt;<sup>1</sup> and it corresponds almost completely with the third Pesikta described by Zunz.<sup>2</sup> In the introduction the editor observes that many of the Midrashim, and among them Echah Rabbah,<sup>3</sup> frequently quoted this Pesikta anonymously.

It remains to be noticed that according to Frankel ("Mebo Hayerushalmi", p. 53), Echah Rabbah quotes freely from Talmud Yerushalmi, with explanations and additions of its own.<sup>4</sup> According to Rapoport ("Erech Millin", p. 253), the accounts of the Midrash and Talmud Babli respecting the Wise Men of Athens, are both drawn from the same source, and the narrative in our Midrash is much older than that in the Talmud.

To sum up: the opinion now generally in vogue is, *that the Midrash Echah Rabbah is the work of one author; that it was composed in Palestine; and that its principal sources are the Talmud Yerushalmi, the Midrash Bereshith Rabbah, and the Pesikta derab Kahana. The number of introductory Piskoth is thirty-three in Zunz's opinion, and in the ordinary printed texts thirty-four.*

The present investigation is an attempt to prove that *all these propositions can only be received with qualification; because —*

I. The Midrash Echah Rabbah, in its present form, is the work of at least *two* authors or compilers, the latter of whom was thoroughly acquainted with the Talmud Babli.

<sup>1</sup> The editor had three other MSS. before him — Oxford, Parma, Fez; he faithfully records the variations in the readings of the four MSS. in his הערות ודקויות. In his opinion the Pesikta was composed towards the end of the fourth century.

<sup>2</sup> The differences between the real Pesikta and the one reproduced by Zunz, are enumerated by Buber in the Hebrew periodical "Haschachar", (edited by P. Smolensky, Vienna,) 1871, pp. 49—66.

<sup>3</sup> No proof is adduced for this statement; the reader is referred to the notes, where the variations in the readings of Echah Rabbah and the the Pesikta are carefully given.

<sup>4</sup> Three passages are brought in support of this view, all of which will be fully discussed in due order.

Not only has he cited whole passages from that Talmud, but in some instances he has *altered the language of the original Midrash into that of the Babli*. The first recension of Midrash Echah was composed in Palestine, and the second in Babylon.

II. So far from the assertion that the Talmud Yerushalmi is one of the chief sources of the Midrash Echah being self-evident, the latter, in its original form, was *completely independent of the Talmud Yerushalmi*.

III. Buber's view concerning the relation between Echah Rabbah and the Pesikta derab Kahana can be strengthened in such a manner as to defy a direct refutation. Nevertheless, the counter-hypothesis viz., that the Pesikta is dependent on the Midrash, it at least *equally tenable*. The introduction consists of thirty-eight Piskoth.

IV. With respect to the Bereshith Rabbah, I am at one with the general opinion in as far as it is regarded as a source of Midrash Echah: and the latter is older than the Vayikra Rabbah.

Of the earlier works which have been handed down to us, the author of the first recension can only have been acquainted with the Mishnah, Mechilta, Sifra, and Sifri, and Bereshith Rabbah; he must, however, have known various collections of Hagadoth similar to; perhaps the same as, those which provided the matter for a large portion of the Talmud Yerushalmi. In the second recension traces of both the Talmud Babli and the Yerushalmi may be noticed. Accordingly, the first edition of Midrash Echah was completed before the end of the fourth, and the second after the sixth century.<sup>1</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Gottesd. Vortr., pp. 53, 54. Wiesner is of opinion that the Talmud Yerushalmi was composed much later than the Babli, between the years 760—900. (See *Gibath Yerushalaim*, p. 52). Although this view is an isolated one, it is still interesting to enquire how it would affect my conclusions respecting the compilation of Echah Rabbah. According to this hypothesis, it is impossible for us to find an adequate and sufficiently definite epoch *before* which the completion of the first recension of our Midrash can be fixed; we must content ourselves by saying that it took place *after* the final revision of the Mishnah, Mechilta, Sifra, and Sifri, i. e. after the beginning of the fourth century. The period at which the second

view which I take of the composition of this Midrash would go to support the opinion expressed by R. Hirsch Chajes,<sup>1</sup> that the Hagadoth of the Yerushalmi are considerably later than the Halachoth. The Targum on the Book of Lamentations is universally admitted to be a late production; it cannot therefore be regarded as a source of the Midrash. Nor need I take account of Targum Onkelos, since there are only very few passages which bear any resemblance whatever to sections of our Midrash.<sup>2</sup> It is not within the province of the present essay to investigate whether that Targum was really written by Onkelos; or whether it is a mere translation from the Greek version of Akylas, Onkelos being identical with Akylas, — as maintained by Prof. Graetz.<sup>3</sup> The former theory is defended by R. Hirsch Chajes<sup>4</sup> who explains the fact that Onkelos is not mentioned by the authors of Midrash Rabbah,<sup>5</sup> by the assumption that his commentary was so well known as to require no special reference.

In holding Midrash Echah to be an earlier work than the Talmud Yerushalmi and, at the same time, later than the Bereshith Rabbah, I tacitly affirm that the latter is also older than the Yerushalmi — a relation which I am not warranted in assuming, it may be urged. I am willing to admit that, should a conclusion legitimately drawn from my views be directly opposed to any fact firmly established beyond the shadow of a doubt, the insufficiency of my reasoning would be proved, and my theory must fall. But I venture to question whether the proposition, that the Bereshith Rabbah is dependent on the Yerushalmi, rests on so sure a footing. It

---

recension was finished, would remain unaltered by Wiesner's view, if we supposed — and that supposition, as such, were not improbable — that the compilers of the Midrash and the Yerushalmi both used the same or similar sources. The former would then be, even in its present form, entirely independent of the latter.

<sup>1</sup> "Igereth Bikoreth" (edited by Brüll), p. 35 b, note.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. "Gottesd. Vortr.", p. 93, note f.

<sup>3</sup> "Geschichte der Juden", vol. IV, note 13, pp. 435—437.

<sup>4</sup> "Igereth Bikoreth", p. 40 b, (edit. by Brüll). Dr. Adler (in the Introduction to *לגן נתינה*) writes: רבה הובא ח"א: הנה גם במדרש רבה הובא ח"א: כמה וכמה פעמים [כדבר המפורסם ונודע] בלי הוכרת שמו:

<sup>5</sup> Except: במ"ד פ"ט (Introd. *לגן נתינה*).

is not for me to consider this point; it has been lately discussed by another. There has recently appeared in the "Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums" a series of articles, by Dr. Lerner, entitled "Anlage des Bereschith Rabba und seine Quellen", in which the author seeks to show, that this Midrash, in its original form, is independent of the Talmud. Whether the arguments there adduced be answerable or not, there is one thing certain, they must be met by the supporters of the opposite view, and the task will prove, I think, no easy one.

In all critical investigations it is of paramount importance to know, whether the subject-matter at our disposal is trustworthy or not. We have seen that Zunz regards the ordinary text of Midrash Echah as corrupt; but this is a point which requires the utmost care. If too much stress be laid upon mistakes and interpolations of the copyist or the printer, there is an end to all true research. Any proposition may be proved by pronouncing as corrupt every passage that might appear to contradict such a proposition. Therefore, while making due allowance for interpolations, explanatory notes and corrupted passages, in the long run, the critical judge, like the civil one, can only decide according to the evidence he has before him. *אין לו לדיין אלא מה שענינו רואותי*.

There is another consideration of great moment. The language of the Hagadoth, the names occurring therein, the expressions by which biblical verses are introduced, the manner in which single passages are suited to the general context, these are the principal criterions which led Zunz to his conclusions. But he does not give any fixed rules by which the relation of the several Midrashim to each other could be established. Müller in the Hebrew periodical "Haschachar" (1870, p. 389), — in an article entitled "Bikkoreth Hapesikta", — lays down the following three canons.

1. "If similar passages occur in different Midrashim, we must first ascertain which of the latter is their source, their original place. In this endeavour we shall succeed, if we

---

<sup>1</sup> Niddah, 20b.

carefully study the sections themselves, if we seek to discover upon what foundations they rest, and how they are suited to the context in each Hagadah. Any additions to the original words can then be easily detected.”

2. “If in one Midrash a strange and unusual expression is found, instead of which in another Midrash a more familiar and common one is used, the latter is the later of the two works. But particular care is indispensable to the correct application of this rule.”

3. “As a rule the legends of all countries were at first short and concise both in substance and form; the national bards and poets enlarged them in the course of time. Even so is the case in regard to most Midrashim; the earlier Hagadoth are short, the later contain additions, both in the substance of the narratives, and in the quotations from Scripture.”

Müller proceeds to apply these canons to the problem before him — how is the Pesikta related to Bereshith Rabbah on the one hand, and to Vayikra Rabbah on the other hand. He comes to the conclusion that the true order of succession is — Bereshith Rabbah, Pesikta, and Vayikra Rabbah.

In the next annual issue of the periodical “Haschachar” there appears an article by Buber entitled “Sanguria” in which the writer says: “In my introduction to the Pesikta and also in my notes, I have frequently called attention to what Müller calls his third law. Nevertheless these laws are not sure guides by which we can determine for certain which Midrashim are earlier and which later.” He argues as follows.<sup>1</sup> Müller’s first proof is that, of the Piska *שור פישב* — which occurs in all three Hagadoth, — Bereshith Rabbah must be regarded as the source, for the principal “Derash” is constructed on the verse<sup>2</sup> *ויזכר אלהים את נח וכו’*; the compilers of Vayikra Rabbah and Pesikta introduced it afterwards into their works. But we can with equal positiveness aver the contrary — that the original place is in

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 47, 48.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. VIII, 1.

Vayikra Rabbah; and who shall decide? The whole passage in question is an exposition on a verse neither of Genesis nor of Leviticus but of Psalms,<sup>1</sup> צדקתך כהררי אל וכו', which text is just as applicable to<sup>2</sup> 'שבעת ימים וכו' as to 'ויזכר אלהים וכו'. Therefore this rule affords us no sufficient criterion. Nor are the second and third laws to be depended upon. Although Müller quotes instances showing that Bereshith Rabbah contains short and difficult sections; yet several Hagadoth are rendered in that Midrash with numerous details and with clear and familiar expressions, whereas in the Pesikta these same Hagadoth occur in a considerably abbreviated form, and couched in anything but easy language. If the correctness of Rules H and III be admitted, we are landed in a gross absurdity; for Bereshith Rabbah, inasmuch as on the one hand, it contains passages more concise than the corresponding sections in the Pesikta, — those adduced by Müller, — and on the other hand passages more detailed, — those brought forward by Buber, — must be, at one and the same time, both an earlier and a later compilation than the Pesikta.

I acknowledge that I am at a loss to comprehend the force of the first argument. We are told, that the most careful study of similar passages occurring in different Midrashim does not guide us in fixing their relative dates of composition, *because* in the case of the Piska שור או כשב we are unable to discover in which Midrash it first appeared. That Rule I is not *universally applicable*, Buber has certainly proved; but its *intrinsic sufficiency* he has not examined. In other words; in answer to the question, *is a certain law valid*, he asserts, *a given instance is no case of that law*. This looks very much like an example of *Ignoratio Elenchi*.

Since he is of opinion, that Bereshith Rabbah, in its present form, is the work of one author, Buber is perfectly justified in his criticism on the second and third of Müller's canons: for they culminate in a difficulty which is really insurmountable. But it has been recently shown, to my mind

---

<sup>1</sup> Ps. XXXVI, 7.

<sup>2</sup> Lev. XXII, 27.

conclusively, that this Midrash contains indubitable marks of the hand of a second redactor;<sup>1</sup> further, that nearly every one of the passages cited by Ruber belongs to an epoch later than that of the original Midrash, or is at least of an uncertain character.<sup>2</sup> Viewed in this light, the apparently formidable dilemma breaks down, or at all events, one of its horns is blunt. The truth is, the *Rereshith Rabbah* *does* contain some sections which are older, and others which are later than the *Pesikta*.

Notwithstanding the failure of Ruber's reasoning to refute the three canons, it does not follow that they are correct. To the third, as stated above, I would give no assent. Let us examine the following cases, taken at random, and which could be easily increased a hundredfold: — Midrash *Shochar Tob*, Ps. XVII, 'בגן ר' שמעון בן יוחאי ובנו שהיה וכו', *Midrash Tanchuma*, Par. *Shelach Lecha*, 'ויאמר להם הקב"ה, והנה דבר ה' אליו וכו', *Yalkut, Bereshith*, 'אתם בכיהם וכו' and the corresponding passages in *Bereshith Rabbah*, ch. LXXIX; *Echah Rabbah*, ch. I: and *Bereshith Rabbah*, ch. XLIV, respectively. The accounts in the former works are more concise than those in the latter; and if the rule in question be accepted, the *Shochar Tob*, *Tanchuma*, and *Yalkut* must belong to the older Midrashim, and the *Rereshith Rabbah* and *Echah Rabbah* to the later, — propositions which every critic, including Müller, would pronounce to be absurd. Indeed it is surprising that Müller should have failed to appreciate such instances as those just adduced; but his omission can easily be accounted for. In his praiseworthy eagerness to simplify the subject, and to fix definite laws, which shall be always valid, he has overlooked one of the plainest truths, viz., that while a writer often dilates on his predecessors' compositions, yet he not unfrequently, for the sake of convenience or clearness, *shortens and condenses them*. The mere circumstance, then, that one account of a *Derash* is longer and more detailed than another, proves absolutely nothing.

<sup>1</sup> "Anlage des *Bereshith Rabba* und seine Quellen."  
<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* Appendix C.

We have now arrived at a rather unsatisfactory stage. Rule III is insufficient, Rule II is precarious, as the author himself indicates in the final clause, and Rule I cannot always be brought to bear, as Buber proves. Nor is it an easy task to suggest a means of extrication from this difficulty. Owing to the countless differences in the readings of the Midrashim, the great variety in their modes of expression, and the endless considerations which must be taken into account, the particular instances are far too numerous and too complicated to admit of dogmatical generalization. If these three laws were our sole guides, we should be assailed on every side by the most conflicting opinions deduced from the same premises; for, as Buber so ably expresses it, "every man would judge according to his taste,"<sup>1</sup> איש איש לפי רובו יטעם טעם.

Thus the critic must be guided chiefly by circumstances in conducting his enquiries. Nevertheless there are two fundamental considerations (based on Müllers observations) that are well worthy of the student's notice, and that might afford him great assistance. —

When similar passages occur in different Midrashim, we should examine them carefully, and look well into the context by this means the original can *often* be detected.

If one account of a Derash is shorter than another the relation between the two works containing those narratives cannot be determined by that fact alone. Should the longer (B) however, assume the form of a commentary on the more abbreviated version (A); or should it be perfectly clear, that the author of B used systematically a different mode of expression, and different language from that in which A is written; we are entitled to infer that A is independent of B. But that B is dependent on A we are not warranted in concluding: there remains the hypothesis that both B and A obtained their matter from the same source.

Yet another word of explanation. I commenced the present essay under the influence of the general opinion that

---

<sup>1</sup> "Haschachar", 1871, p. 47.

the Yerushalmi is one of the chief sources of Echa Rabbah. After a time I discovered that this assumption is open to serious objections. I therefore cast all prejudice aside, and applied myself to the solution of this problem, — we have before us two works, is the relation between them one of dependence?

Let us now proceed to investigate the relation of Echa Rabbah 1) to Talmud Babli, 2) to Talmud Yerushalmi, 3) to Pesikta derab Kahana.

---

#### I. TALMUD BABLI.

It will be necessary, in the first instance, to establish the fact, that one of the revisers of Echah Rabbah was acquainted with the Talmud Babli. This point, as the sequel will show, constitutes the chief corner-stone on which the whole construction of the views here set forth rests: it is most unaccountably ignored by Zunz, and no critic has yet recognized its due significance.

Let us compare 1) Echah Rabbah ch. IV, sec. 18, and Maccoth, 24 a—b. The author of the Midrash very appropriately connects this narrative with the text 'על הר ציון וכו'; since the second half turns on this verse. And yet the original place for the whole account is in the Babli. It is there related that Rab says he trembles when he reads the verse 'ואכלה אתכם ארץ אייביכם', but Mar Zutra seeks to remove his fears by reminding him that the verb 'אכל' need not necessarily signify "to consume entirely", it may also denote "eating as of herbs etc.", i. e. where only a part is destroyed, and the remainder is untouched; and in order to strengthen this exposition the narrative in question is adduced. Hence it is introduced by the words 'וכבר היה וכו'. Whereas in E. R. these words are quite inexplicable, unless we assume them to be a quotation. For how else can any one begin a paragraph 'על הר ציון ששמתם וכבר היה' E. R. bearing in mind what follows, specializes the general expression 'ברוך מהלכין בררך' into 'נבנסין לרומי'. The usual reading of the next word is, in the Babli, 'מפלטה'. In a marginal note the reading 'מפטילומ' is given, and probably the author of E. R. had this second reading before him, since he writes 'מפוטלילומ'. [In the opinion of the author of the commentary *Mattenoth Kehunah* it is the name of a place.] The second half of the narrative appears in E. R. in a more

developed form: e. g. עקיבא לעולם אהיה מחמיה עלינו ואם יבטלו וכו'. The author of E. R. has slightly altered the end of the passage so as to make it more suitable to his purpose, and it is worthy of remark that he does not give the reduplication 'עקיבא נחמנו עקיבא נח'. We shall have occasion to notice other similar omissions in the course of these remarks

2) E. R., ch. I, sec. 20, and Menachoth, 53b. The Midrash renders the whole narrative more lively and powerful by considerably enlarging the Babli text. Thus על עיסקי בני is much more forcible than בני היכן הם באחי; and לא היו בהן צדיקים is a more reasonable question than שמא בשוגג הטאו. Again, how could Abraham for one moment suppose that the Holy One Blessed be He, the same Merciful Father who would have spared Sodom and Gomorrah had He found ten righteous men there, that that God would have driven His children into exile for the sake of a small minority that had sinned? The author of E. R. fully appreciating this consideration writes לך להסתכל היה לך שמא מיעוטן הטאו. He adds the explanatory phrase חייך כפרו בה and, since he regards as foreign to his context the consolatory conclusion of the Babli, he omits it.

3) E. R., ch. I, sec. 24. 'א'ר איבו וכו', and Sanhedrin, 104b. A glance at this passage is sufficient to convince us that E. R. must have used the Babli text. The Midrash adds בן תשורה ("a princely son" in the opinion of some, according to others "a son of her old age"), and also explains the immediate cause of Rabban Gamliel's weeping, viz., the remembrance of the destruction of the Temple.

4) E. R., ch. H, sec. 14; and Nedarim, 65a, from וגם ששמטו כרים מתרחיהם till במלך נבוכדנצר. The version in the Midrash looks more like a commentary on the Babli account than a reproduction of the corresponding passage. It will be observed that not a single incident of material importance is added, the leading ideas and the gist of the whole narrative remain the same in both works. The phrase ובמה השביעו ר' יוסי בר' חנינא אמר במזבח הפ' may have been suggested to the author by the Pesikta derab Kahana, Pis. 27, p. 168b.

5) E. R., ch. I, sec. 3, and Sanhedrin, 104a, היתה כאלמנה וכו': The Midrash explains distinctly that the Derash is derived from the prefixed ב, and the following words are the same in both works.

6) E. R., ch. I, sec. 19, and Erubin, 53b. Of the six anecdotes cited here by the author of the Midrash only three occur in Babli. The second and sixth appear to be developed forms of the Babli accounts. E. R., anticipating the child's answer, renders R. Joshua's question איו דרך קרובה ארה הוא לעיר instead of באיה דרך נלך לעיר: and adds also רחם וכו' further on ומעשה suggests a quotation from another work, whereas in the Babli R. Joshua speaks in the first person; we may notice also the complement בדרך שמיעטת בגריסין הללו. With respect to the first narrative I am inclined to think that E. R. obtained it from the same source which supplied the other three. For the Babli explains distinctly why R. Joshua deserved the rebuke כבשוה לסטים כמותך כבשוה. The counter-assumption that Babli is dependent on the Midrash, and that the original text was purposely condensed for convenience' sake, is refuted by the considerations respecting anecdotes 2 and 6. It likewise fails to account for the fact, that the most striking of all the incidents — the fifth — is omitted.

7) E. R., ch. I, sec. 45, and Gittin, 57b מעשה בר' מאות ילדים וכו'. This passage occurs in the Babli among others depicting the sorrowful events which followed the downfall of our national independence. In the Midrash, grown up persons take the place of children, and the tyrant is mentioned by name (Vespasian). The division of the martyrs into three classes, the heroic fortitude they displayed by breathing their last with texts on their lips, and the mourning of the ריה"ק are incidents added by the author of the Midrash.

8) E. R., ch. II, sec. 20, and Sanhedrin, 104b. These words occur again in Ch. III, sec. פ. Inasmuch as the author of the Midrash wishes to describe the sin of the whole community, he renders the statement more general by omitting the word מרגלים.

9) E. R., ch. IV., sec. 3, and Gittin, 55b—56a. This section affords an excellent illustration of the manner in which a later writer works out and develops the text he has before him. E. R. adds *על וישב בין האורחים* also *אריסטו*; and substitutes *שנאי* for the more difficult expression *בעל דכבא*. The Midrash explains the significance of the words *הואיל ואראי שבקן* by writing *אל תביישני*. The author of E. R. makes Bar Kamza offer — 1) to pay for what he consumes<sup>1</sup>; 2) under the same circumstances to abstain from enjoying anything; 3) to defray the expenses of the whole banquet. According to the Babli he is willing to pay for what he enjoys, then for half, lastly for the whole of the feast. The Midrash tells us distinctly that R. Zechariah ben Abkylas was present at the banquet and could have interfered, but remained silent, — thus rendering more intelligible the remark: "The modesty of Zechariah ben Abkylas was the cause of the burning of the Temple." In the Babli, this observation refers to R. Zechariah's excessive zeal in guarding against everything which could be considered as a violation of the Law. The Midrash is careful to supply details the absence of which renders the account in the Babli very improbable, — a Roman officer accompanied Bar Kamza, but the latter succeeded in eluding his vigilance. The Babli stops short at the end of the narrative; it leads us to infer that the offering was not brought, and that Bar Kamza was not slain, owing to R. Zechariah's objections. The Midrash causes the priest to change the offerings as his natural resource; it is therefore unnecessary to inform the reader that Bar Kamza inflicted such a blemish on the animal "as rendered it unfit for a sacrifice according to the Jewish Law, but perfectly suitable to the altar according to the heathen regulations." E. R. explains exactly how the matter ended.

10) E. R. ch. I, sec. 46, and Gittin, 58a. In spite of

<sup>1</sup> *דמי דסעודתא* cannot mean the expenses of the whole banquet, for there would be no climax according to this translation, and besides, in order to express "the whole feast" the Midrash writes *כל הדין סעודתא*. (See "Mattenoth Kehunah")

the similarity between these two narratives, they are independent of one another. The language of E. R. is not that of the Babli, but Palestinian Syriac; and the whole narrative — leaving the introduction out of account — beginning with the words *לברר ימין איירית* belongs to the original Mi-drash. The first author could not have used the Yerushalmi, for this passage does not occur there. He either composed it himself, or reproduced it from some collection of Hagadoth.

The first nine instances — six of which are taken from chapters I and II — are sufficient to prove, that one of the revisers of E. R. thought fit to insert passages written in the language of the Talmud Babli. These sections have all been shown to be of a later date than the corresponding passages in the Talmud; and we are naturally led to conclude, that the latter furnished the reviser with his matter. The only hypothesis which can be suggested against it is, that the author of E. R. had at his disposal a collection of Hagadoth similar to those occurring in Babli. This gratuitous assumption — which should never be proposed except as a last resource — is, in the present instance, repugnant to all philosophical reasoning. For “the most important maxim in regulation of philosophical procedure when it is necessary to resort to an hypothesis” — says Sir W. Hamilton<sup>1</sup> — is the “Law of Parcimony”, which implies that “neither *more* nor *more onerous* causes are to be assumed than are necessary to account for the phenomena”. And the signification of the expression “more onerous”, for the particular question of Causality is: “that the explanation of an effect by a cause of which the very existence is hypothetical, is more onerous than its hypothetical explanation by a cause otherwise known to exist.” Applying this rule to our case, it would be inconsistent with the true method of philosophical enquiry to assume, without the slightest reason, the existence of a collection of Haga-

<sup>1</sup> Appendix to Discussions. pp. 628—631.

<sup>2</sup> “Examination of Sir W. Hamilton’s Philosophy” by J. S. Mill, p. 469 (First edition).

doth, when the fact that certain paragraphs occur in E. R. can be accounted for by the presence of the Talmud Babli.

All further considerations on this point must be deferred until we are in a position to examine the additional data, which are furnished by comparing E. R. with the Palestinian Talmud.

#### H. TALMUD YERUSHALMI.

If it were possible to conceive a universally accepted axiom in regard to the sources of our Midrash, that axiom would run: Echah Rabbah obtained the greater part of its matter from the Talmud Yerushalmi. It has been already observed that Zunz does not think it necessary to adduce any proof whatever for this proposition, he expects that, on being stated, it will be at once received; Frankel does almost as much, though he goes the length of citing three examples. Let us see what we can gather from the facts of the case.

1) E. R., ch. III, sec. 10, 'ר' הוה פשיט קרייה וכו', and Yerushalmi, Chagiga, ch. II, 'כי הנה יוצר הרים וכו'. This passage belongs probably to the original Midrash. The Yerush. contains a long explanation to the verse 'ויאמר שמוא', even more detailed than the corresponding passage in the Babli (Chagiga, 4b), and of this explanation not a single word occurs in the Midrash. The conclusion is quite different in both. In E. R. the question is 'ומי כותבן', and in Yerushalmi 'ומי מגיד לאדם הכל היוצא מפיו'. Again, the Yerushalmi places the two verses quoted in the conclusion of the E. R. account — 'יתן בעפר פיהו' and 'בקשו ה' וכו' — at the beginning, thus rendering the introductory words more systematic. זה אדר. משלושה מקרייה שהיה ר' קורא אותן ובוכה. Altogether the Yerushalmi looks very much like a commentary on E. R. and an attempt to arrange its scattered parts into some order; it is absolutely impossible to assert that the Midrash obtained this section from the Yerushalmi.

2) E. R., ch. III., sec. 1, 'גוד ררכי בנייה בעת לוד וגו', and Yer., Maaser Sheni, Ch. V, 'נקיי הו שמש וכו'. The word

ספרא in E. R. is difficult, for it must be explained to signify first an attendant and then a teacher. The author of the commentary *Mattenoth Kehuna* is of opinion that our reading is correct, and that the word can easily be taken in both meanings, and can refer to one and the same man. The Yer. removes all doubts by writing שמש, and the name רבנא (in all probability a misprint for רבנא) is added. This point would suggest that the writer of Yer. was aware of the indistinctness of E. R.'s reading, and that he altered it accordingly. Of the מרשרי רמהלל the Midrash knows nothing. The whole description of the רב בר נש is considerably more detailed in the Yer., where a conversation between the owner of the ox and the Babilonian is related. E. R. is remarkably concise — a circumstance which is strange enough if we assume that its author was acquainted with Yer. Apart from these considerations let us look at the context. The first three accounts seem simply quoted to introduce the fourth, and the whole appears to be, and probably is, a citation from some older source. But was that source the Yerushalmi? The Mishnah, upon which our passage in the Talmud expatiates, runs: "Lydda is situated at a distance of one day's journey from Jerusalem." The Talmud asks, how can the Mishnah make this assertion, while there are instances on record which prove that the journey can be accomplished in a much shorter time? The last of these instances has no reference whatever to the question. How did it come to be inserted in the text? The only admissible explanation is, that it was found together with the really serviceable narratives in an older work, and the author of Yerushalmi adduced the whole passage as it originally stood. From the examination of the context, both in the Midrash and in the Talmud, in which our paragraph occurs, we are led to conclude that the former was the source of the latter. We have already noticed other reasons for assuming that Yer. is simply a lengthened account of E. R. Without pressing this point there is one thing certain, the Midrash is not dependent on the Talmud.

3) E. R., Pethicha II, רבי הוה משלח וכו', and Yer., Chagiga, ch. 1 ר' יודה נשיא שלח וכו'. In the Yer. we meet

למעבר בקרייתא דארעא דישראל למתקני' לון ספרין ומתניין with עלון לחר אתר ולא אשבתן לא ספר ולא מתניין אמרי וכו'.

The corresponding words are in

Pesikta derab Kahana, Piska XV.	Echah Rabbah.
דיפקון ויברקון קרייתא דארעא	דיפקון ויתקנון קרייתא דארעא
דישראל והוון עלין לקרחא	דישראל והוון עלין לקרייתא
ואמרון וכו'	ואמרין כו'

Again

Pesikta.	Echah Rabbah.	Yershalmi.
אילין נטורי קרחא אילין	אילין נטורי קרחא אילין	אילין אינון נטורי קרחא
אינון הרובי קרחא	תרובי קרחא	לית אילין אלא הרובי קרחא

In these instances the Yer. is certainly clearer than both E. R. and Pesikta, and appears to be an endeavour to render the subject more intelligible. But the concluding words 'שום הוים וכו' are added in the Midrash which fact of itself would lead us to suppose that E. R. is seeking to explain the Yer. In this conflicting state of affairs our only resource is the hypothesis that E. R. and Yer. are independent of one another. The former is, however, closely connected with the Pesikta derab Kahana.

4) E. R., Pet. II, 'כו' לה יכו' and Yer., Rosh Hashanah, ch. III 'וכו' אמר וצבא וכו'. [Compare also Pesikta derab Kahana, Piska 15.] This is one of the passages cited by Frankel. The אימורי of the Midrash would favour the supposition that the Yer. was used by the author of E. R., but the expression כל זמן farther down in the paragraph, betrays its Pesikta origin. There is a very remarkable peculiarity which should not remain unnoticed. We find the two expressions אימורי המלכות גזרה גזרה וגזרה מצלחת בשעה כל זמן שישראל משליכין דברי תורה לארץ and כל זמן שישראל משליכין דברי תורה לארץ ומצלחת side by side. How is this recapitulation to be accounted for? Let us omit the first part in E. R. till בפשע בפשעה וכו', the whole of the

latter portion is clearly an explanation and a more detailed reproduction of the corresponding section in the Pesikta; hence the כל זמן, and hence the משליכין ר"ה וכו'. The author of the Midrash wanted to deduce, from the verse itself, the idea of the necessary connection between the despising of the Law on the part of Israel and the success of the foreign powers. He found the פשע explained in the Pesikta before him; and a suitable exposition to צבא and תמיד he obtained from the Yerushalmi; in introducing which into the E. R. text he adhered to the language of that Talmud. He therefore retained the אימתי and the reduplication וכו' משליכין. This passage then is a composite one — an attempt to unite Yer. and Pesikta into a uniform whole; but the latter supplied its chief features. Accordingly it is of a comparatively recent date and probably the work of the later reviser, who, since he was acquainted with the Babli, was certainly in possession of the Yerushalmi also.

5) E. R., Pet. XXIII וכו' לזולה וכו' ירהנן האומר, and Yer., Berachoth, ch. IV ר' ירהנן האומר וכו'. [Compare Bereshith Rabbah, ch. XXXVII וכו' בארץ שנער וכו'.] The beginning proves that this passage is independent of Yer. In the latter we read וזו בבל שהוא זוטו של עולם of which there is no trace in E. R. And ירהנן ר' is mentioned twice in Yer., whereas in the Midrash his two dicta are blended into one. The order in E. R. is the same as that in Bereshith Rabbah: תרומה ומעשר comes before תשנק, and מבעטין בתו' is a correction for מביטין in B. R. The words בלא שביעיה seem to be a later addition.

6) E. R. ch. I, secs. 14—18, and Yer., Maaser Sheni, ch. IV רבנן אמרין דברי הלומות וכו'. These sections in the Midrash contain accounts of certain heathens who pretended to be interpreters of dreams, and it is narrated how they were exposed by R. Ishmael ben Jose. The only point which the Yer. and the Midrash have in common is the dream itself and R. Ishmael's interpretation. Yet even here we notice many variations — variations which of themselves are almost sufficient to warrant us in concluding that the authors of Yer. and E. R. had each his independent source. In sec. 14:

of the whole of the introduction till *אמא הר*, and of the heathen's interpretation, there is no trace in Yerushalmi. Had the latter furnished the author of E. R. with his matter, he might have added a word or two, even a phrase, of his own in explanation of a difficult expression; or he might have substituted an easy word for a less intelligible one. But he would hardly have introduced such a new incident as to give the whole narrative a totally different purport. According to the Midrash a heathen spreads a report that he is an interpreter of dreams; the news reaches the ears of R. Ishmael, who determines to counteract any evil influence which the impostor may attempt to acquire over the credulous multitude; he listens first to the false interpretation, and then gives the true meaning. The Yer. on the other hand simply tells us that R. Ishmael was asked to give the signification of a dream.

The second narrative is connected with the first in E. R. *הר בר נש*, in the Yer. it is quite separated from it, *אמא הורן*. The author of the Midrash would scarcely have altered the explicit words of the Yer. *עיני נשקה הבלייה*, and R. Ishmael's clear explanation *לאחרתיה הוא הכים*, into *עניי הר בלעה הבירתה*, and *תרין ברין אית ליה וחד מהון הכים לחבריה*. Four dreams are now interposed in the Yerushalmi. They certainly appear later on in the Midrash, but the fact that there is no obvious reason for this change of order would be an argument for the independence of the one account from the other. The verses from which R. Ishmael inferred that the dreamer murdered an Israelite are quite different in E. R. (*הבט נא השמימה*) and in Yer. (*דרך כוכב*). In the next dream we notice *היפה רוחיה דהווא נברא* in the Midrash version, whereas these words are wanting in the Yer. Indeed the latter uses this phrase only when the dreamer has committed a grievous crime, in all other cases R. Ishmael gives his interpretation without making any remarks. No such distinction is made in E. R. In E. R. we read *אפי' הוא* which is clearer than the corresponding solution in Yer. *תנורין את עביר תרתין עיניך ועיניה דתנורא*. The following dream is related in Yer. as two separate events.

Here again חִסְפָּה רוּחִיה וכו' is used indiscriminately in the Midrash and is absent in Yer. The first part of this dream remains without explanation in E. R., but is fully interpreted in the Yer. The absence of חִסְפָּה רוּחִיה וכו' in several instances in the Yer. and its continual presence in E. R. can be satisfactorily explained by regarding it, in the latter, as referring to the Kuthi, who invariably attempted to deceive his hearers, and therefore justly merited R. Ishmael's rebuke; whereas in the Talmud the phrase relates to the man himself who had beheld the vision, and of course R. Ishmael felt himself warranted in censuring his conduct only when that conduct was truly sinful. The next dream, apart from the facts that the number is 24 in E. R. instead of 12, and מִרְרָעָא occurs for אִי־מִוּוּא, contains the important addition וְהָא כְּתִיב מִן הַבָּא וכו' which is not mentioned in the Yer. Both R. Ishmael and the Kuthi notice this point in their interpretations. It is unnecessary to examine the following dream minutely, for it is quite different in the two accounts. The last narrative in sec. 14 contains two separate dreams, out of which the Yer. makes three. There is a great difference in the wording of the two passages — in E. R. מִי־חָמַר לִי הַכֵּן זֶרֶק אֲצַבְעוֹתַי and in Yer. רַבְל עָמָּא מַרְמִין לִי בְּאֲצַבְעוֹתַי; further, in E. R. רַבְל עָמָּא מְנַפְחִין לִי בְּלוֹעֵי־חַוּוֹן וּמְקַלְסִין לִי; נִרְתָּ; further, in E. R. מִי־חָמַר לִי הַכֵּן תְּהוּי נִפְחָא בְּפִי־יָדַי and in Yer. . . . . בְּפִי־יָדַי אֲצַבְעוֹתַי and in Yer. . . . . הַכֵּן זֶרֶק אֲצַבְעוֹתַי — and also in their explanations inasmuch as in the Midrash the dreamer is informed that he will certainly suffer loss, while the Yer. leaves the question undecided. Sec. 15. The most important point of the whole narrative, namely, that the Kuthi had beheld no vision but that he invented a falsehood in order to ridicule R. Ishmael, is entirely wanting in E. R., but distinctly mentioned in the Yerushalmi. The phraseology of the two works and the exposition of the various points, are by no means identical. In E. R., the punishment pronounced by R. Ishmael is death; in the Yer., everlasting illness, וְהָיָה נִבְרָא יָרִיב מִדֶּרֶךְ. The second half of the section is a continuation of the former narrative, and R. Ishmael is again consulted; in the Yer. the order is different, and R. Jose bar Halephta is addressed. As to the passages themselves —

Echah Rabbah.	Yerushalmi.
זיתא בשעת נצבא:	לבוש הר כליל דזית:
המי נהור סגין:	דאח מתרוממת:
זיתא בשעת הבטא:	לבוש כלילא דזית:
תקן הרציה למחאתה:	דאח מלקי:

the Yer. is clearer than E. R., in the last expression. Again the final remark 'זיתא בשעת וכו' is far less forcible in E. R. — where the exact seasons of the year are given — than in the Yer., where the second applicant, although relating what had befallen him in almost the same words as those of his predecessor, receives a totally different and highly unfavourable answer. Sec. 16. Apart from the fact that the event is recorded in the name of R. Jochanan in E. R., and R. Akiba in the Yer., the words of the former זרע ולא רצר are explained in the Yer. ומה דאח זרע לית את כנש. Sec. 17. Let us compare —

Echah Rabbah.	Bereshith Rabbah. <sup>1</sup>	Yerushalmi.
פעליא:	פעליא:	מרלא:
עשרים:	עשרים:	עשר:
לית הינין עשרים וכו'	לית בהון עשרים וכו'	wanting
מלעילא להתא וכו'	מנראשיהון לסופ' וכו'	wanting
ומן הן יליף ליה וכו'	ומנן יליף ליה וכו'	wanting

All these considerations prove that E. R. is connected with B. R. and not with Yer. This passage is interesting, for it is quoted by Frankel as an example of the dependence of E. R. on the Talmud Yerushalmi. Sec. 18. —

Echah Rabbah.	Bereshith Rabbah. <sup>2</sup>	Yerushalmi.
שריתא רביתא	שריתא רביתא	תיניחא רביתא
פקעה:	תבירא:	מיתברא:
אולת וכן הוה לה:	אולת והוה לה כן:	אולה וילדה בר דכר:
אשכחת תלמודי	אשכחית תלמידיה	אמרן לה תלמידי
יתבין בבי ספרא	יתבון תמן ורבהון	לית הוא הכא:
ורבהון לא הוה תמן:	לא הוה נביוון:	

<sup>1</sup> Ch. LXVIII.

<sup>2</sup> Ch. LXXXIX.

There can be no doubt that the Midrash Echah is simply a detailed form of B. R., and not of Yer. The fact that the woman came a second time, received the same tidings from R. Eleazar, and witnessed again the verification of the Rabbi's prediction, is an addition on the part of the author of E. R. According to the Yer., the disciples inform the woman that she will bear a son, and that her husband will die. We find no trace of the first statement either in B. B. or in E. R. After a time R. Eleazar returns and his disciples tell him what has happened — this is the Yer. version; in E. R. and B. R., the woman, on hearing the sad fate that awaits her, commences to weep bitterly, R. Eleazar hears her voice, asks his pupils the cause of her lamentation, and thus learns the truth. As an additional proof of the connection between E. R. and B. R. we may quote the following expressions —

Echah Rabbab.	Bereshith Rabbah.	Yerusalmi.
איברתון נברא:	איברתון נברא:	קטלתון נפש:
לא בן כתיב וכו':	לא בן כתיב וכו':	שנאמר וכו':

The Author of E. R. must have had a special source for the greater part of secs. 14—18, though he is dependent to some extent on Bereshith Rabbah and the Pesikta.

7) E. R., ch. I, sec. 23, . . . . ארשב'י אמר הקב"ה לישראל . . . . ותשא כל העדה וכו', and Yer. Taanith, ch. IV, 'על נהרוח בכל'. The explanatory dicta of R. Ebo and R. Jehudah bar Simon are sufficient to show that this passage is something more than a detailed reproduction of two lines in the Yerushalmi. Such a striking observation as ארר ביהוד מדינתא, וארר בבבל וכו', especially when coupled with the name of R. Jehudah bar Simon, is not simply an emanation from the mind of the author of E. R., it is a quotation from some collection of Hagadoth.

8) E. R., ch. I, sec. 51. ומה הנאה יש לעולם מן וכו' and Yer., Taanith, ch. IV 'תני אנשי משמר היו וכו'. The Yer. explains every statement by means of a biblical verse, and on one occasion in a very detailed and lucid manner יהי מאורות מארת כתיב. We meet with no trace of any of these

expositions in E. R. The second half of this paragraph from 'וכו' till וְהָיָה אֵין מִתְעַנֵּן וְכו' has no corresponding passage in the Yer. It is worthy of remark that a biblical verse is here introduced by a most unusual phrase וְכוּכּוּ אֲמַר בְּרִינְיָאֵל. Altogether this section belongs to the original Midrash, and it is either the work of the author himself, or a quotation from some work other than the Yer.

9) E. R., ch. I, sec. 54, 'ואת מוצא בשעה שנלו ישראל וכו'; and Yer., Taanith, ch. I, 'הני ר' שמעון בן יוחי בכל מקום וכו'. If this passage proved anything, it would prove that Yer. is dependent on E. R. One consideration will suffice to show this.

Echah Rabbah.	Yerushalmi.
גלו לעולם שכינה עמהם רכתיב ושמתי כסאי בעולם:	גלו למרי וגלת שכינה עמהן מר מעמא ושמתי כסאי בעולם ואין עולם אלא מרי כר"א ואני בשושן הבירה אשר בעולם המדינה:

The Talmud introduces another phase of the Captivity גלו למרי based on the word עולם which occurs in the Midrash. Accordingly the Yer. carries the deduction from the text one step further. Again, 'גלו למצרים וכו' is wanting in E. R. These points compel us to assume that E. R. is independent of any known work: for although a connection between the Midrash and Mechilta<sup>1</sup> is suggested by the occurrence of גלו לעולם in both, yet the absence of 'גלו למצרים וכו' in E. R. is sufficient to convince us that no such connection exists. And if we bear in mind that the Mechilta commences with a prefatory generalization 'וכן את מוצא בכל מקום וכו', of which there is no trace in E. R., our conviction becomes considerably strengthened.

10) E. R., ch. II, sec. 4. 'ר' יוחנן הוה דרש שיתין אפין נלכודה ביתר ר' הוה דרש, and Yer., Taanith, ch. IV, 'בבלע ה' וכו' וכו'. On reading the first passage of this long narrative we cannot fail to remark that the version of the Midrash dates from a later reviser, for we find the expression ועל זה אמר

<sup>1</sup> Parahath Bo, sec. 14.

וכי (which is not the language of the original Midrash), and ובשעה שהיו יוצאין למלחמה is a translation of וכו' נפק לקרבה in the Talmud; further, the words סקבל וכי are not met with in Yer., and appear to be, not an original explanation of the reviser of E. R., but a reproduction of a current tradition. The passage קולו של שמונים בני אדם does not occur in E. R.; and בני אדם after רבוא suggests that the author of Midrash Echah had the Bereshith Rabbah text (ch. LXV) before him. The following comparison furnishes us with an important consideration:

Echah Rabbah.	Yerushalmi.
והיה דורש ובוכה ומתנחם:	והוה דרש ואינן בכי ומשתתקין
היינו מלבא משיחא:	וקיימן לון: דין הוא מלבא משיחה:

Instead of the West or Palestinian Syriac of the Yerushalmi, we find either pure Hebrew, or the East Syriac of the Babli. Indeed the whole of sec. 4 is strongly impregnated with the language peculiar to the latter Talmud. In this instance the author of the Midrash has somewhat marred the effect of his text, for the Yer. וקיימן בני אדם is rather more impressive than וקיימן בני אדם. The whole account of R. Eleazar Hammodai is of a recent date, for it is a commentary on, rather than a reproduction of its original text. This passage affords us another example of a peculiarity in the style of E. R. that has been pointed out above<sup>1</sup>, viz., the absence of the reduplication, אל תשב ברין וכי. And בעא ארדיאנום מייל ליה is translated into נתן דערנו להויר. The speech of the Kuthi is lengthened to a considerable extent in E. R., and the words כל יומן דהרא הרנגולתא וכי are added. The Midrash anticipates the events which follow by relating that the bystanders inform Bar Chozeba<sup>2</sup> that R. Eleazar is about to surrender

<sup>1</sup> P. 18.

<sup>2</sup> "Chozeba" is the name of a town. (In I Chron., IV, 22, it is spelt כִּזְבָּא). Bar Chozeba's enemies derived this word from the root כִּזַּב "to lie" and thus designated him "The Impostor"; whereas

the city to the enemy. The Yer. tells us that they simply brought the Kuthi to Bar Chozeba. The Kuthi's statement as given in E. R. differs considerably from the Yer. version but the reason for this divergence may be easily conjectured. The author of the Midrash found a great difficulty in understanding the words of the Yer. — a difficulty which every attentive reader must encounter. The Kuthi says he would rather be sentenced to death by the king than be executed by Bar Chozeba, and he addresses that general in these terms: "If I tell thee what passed betwen us (i. e. between the Kuthi and the general's kinsman) I commit an act of treason against the king, if I remain silent I offend thee; I prefer to fall at the king's hand." As a matter of fact, he *does* reveal the supposed conspiracy. This great inconsistency in the man's conduct — on the one hand, his pretended loyalty to the king, and on the other hand, his deliberate treachery, — is avoided by the Midrash, according to which his words run: "I prefer to be punished by *thee*, so that the secrets of the king may not be divulged" ולא תהפריסין מיסטידין רמלכותא; and hence Bar Chozeba *inferred* the existence of a plot. This change for the purpose of arranging the various parts of the context in an intelligible and logical manner, indicates an epoch posterior to that of the original Midrash. The commentary continues — נתמלא דאנא בצלוחי קאימנא וכו' also נתמלא רגוניה. Whereas the Yer. is clear in the exposition of the verse — הווי רועי האליל וכו' — the Midrash furnishes us with another peculiarity further examples of which will be forthcoming. We read סימת זרתען של ישראל וסימת עין ימינם, now סימת (thou hast blinded) can be used in reference to עין ימינם, but it can hardly be applied to זרתען של ישראל. We next notice זיל ואייהיה לי a stronger term than כותי, and לי פטומיה corresponds with the Yerushalmi עכנא for "serpent" instead of the Yer. הכינה. Strange to say, in the next account the author

---

his friends named him Bar Kochba, thus altering כוויבא (the spelling in the Midrash) to כוכבא "The Star", with reference to the verse (Numbers XXIV, 17), "There shall come a Star out of Jacob."

of E. R. omits מלא קומה ופישוט ידים. The substitution of הטוב שלא for הטוב שלא הסרירו and משנינונו for יום שניהנו suggests that the author of E. R. had in mind Babli Taanith, 31a. The next passage begins at once with the narrative in E. R., and in Yerush. it is given in the name of R. Jose — a point which warrants us in doubting whether the Midrash is a later form of the Yerushalmi, inasmuch as our Wise Men never withheld the names of their teachers from whom they heard Halachoth or Hagadoth, as we read in Aboth (ch. VI) כל האומר ויבר בשם אומרו מביא נאולה לעולם. Again, the Midrash ובר היה סליק חד מנהון requires explanation: "When any one (*not* belonging to the Elders) went up to Jerusalem etc." The difficulty lies in the word מנהון which, one should think, refers to the subject of the preceding sentence; but this gives no meaning, and we are compelled to assign to it the rather distorted signification just mentioned. On the other hand in the Yer. there is no ambiguity וברו דהון דמי בר נש סליק. For ירושלים the Midrash writes a contemptuous expression דרא זירא "that corner". Now it is a well known fact that our Wise Men invariably attached great importance to the use of pure and unpolluted language. It is regarded as a special merit of R. Jochanan be Zachai<sup>1</sup>, that on one occasion he substituted ומסקין בטומאה for ואין מוסקין בטורה. Can we imagine that a writer, belonging to the class of such men as R. Jochanan, would have designated Jerusalem, which "is builded as a city that is compact together: whither the tribes go up, the tribes of the Lord, unto the testimony of Israel, to give thanks unto the name of the Lord: for there are set thrones of judgment, the thrones of the house of David" — would have called this holy city דרא זירא "that corner"? It is probable, nay certain, that, had the author of Yer. found this expression, he would have altered it to ירושלים. But the supposition that the author of E. R. made the change which, if Yer. had been his source he must have done, is repugnant to the spirit of our Wise Men's writings. This passage, then, belongs to

<sup>1</sup> Pesachim, 3 b.

the original Midrash and is independent of Yer. E. R. narrates the next passage in the name of R. Jochanan, the Yer. adduces it anonymously. This dictum really seems to emanate from R. Jochanan, for we find something similar in Rabli (Gittin, 58a). But the passage beginning with *יש אומרים* in the Yer. shows that the reading in the Talmud is a combination of two different accounts; and the Midrash had but one source. This paragraph also is part of the original Midrash, and is not dependent on the Yerushalmi. Take the following paragraph: —

Echah Rabbah.	Yerushalmi.
ולא הוון שבקין רומאי עבר	והוון רומים אזלין עליהון
חמן דלא הוון קמלי יתיה:	ומקטלין לון:
ניתי כלילא דאדריאנוס וניהיב	ניתי כלילא על רישיון אמרין
בראשו של (אלו) שמעון דהא	מבדיקין אוף הר זמן:
רומאי אחון:	

Here the Midrash explains the exact meaning of the personal pronouns in *ומקטלין לון*, it was the two brothers who harassed the Romans and not *vice versa*; and the second phrase is rendered quite clear in E. R. There is an uncertainty in the Midrash as to the reading *שמועון* or *שלו*. The author does not seem to have been certain whether both brothers were to have been crowned (אלו), or the leader alone (שמעון). This passage is clearly a detailed reproduction of the Yer.; but it is of a recent date as the following observations will show. The whole of the passage occurring at the end of the account of Bar Chozeba, beginning with the words *אמר מאן קטיל אילין* is repeated again in E. R. (and not in the Yer.) with a remarkable alteration, which can be best illustrated by means of the following comparison.

Echah Rabbah.	Echah Rabbah.	Yerushalmi.
Story of the 2 brothers)	(Story of Bar Chozeba)	(Story of Bar Chozeba)
אייתי לי פטומיהו	זיל ואייתיה לי	חמי לי פטומיה

These last words of E. R. are a combination of the Yer. and the former narrative in the Midrash; and the Babli term *עכנא* is again used for the Yerushalmi *הכינה*.

In the next narrative the Midrash has altered the complicated words of the Yer. *היו מוכרין ארבע חנויות מהורות* into the more intelligible expression *'היו מוכרי מהר' ארבע חנויות של מוכרי מהר*. The words *דמרקוע לקייטא כל ערובת שובא* are omitted in E. R., also the statement respecting the *ריבה* is omitted in the Yer. This point, coupled with the facts that *שהיו משחקין בכרוז* is introduced into the Yer. anonymously, in E. R., on the other hand, in the name of Rab Hunna, and qualified by *בשבת* at the end, would suggest that E. R. obtained its matter from some source other than the Yerushalmi. The destruction of R. Elazar ben Harsum's property is not mentioned in the Midrash. Probably the author had Babli (Yoma, 35b.) before him, and was anxious to leave on the mind of his readers an impression of the magnitude of R. Elazar's wealth. In the following narrative the Midrash differs, already at the beginning, in two points from the Talmud. In the former the locality of the cities is specified — in the South — further, they are termed *עירות* (cities) and with reason, for the name *כפר* (village) is hardly appropriate to a town, the inhabitants of which number 1,200,000 men, besides many women and children; and yet the Talmud has this latter word. E. R. explains *לעבירה* by the well known term *אכסניא*, and considerably expands the account of Chephar Dichrin. The words *א"ר ירמון קפצה* are quite out of place as they occur in the Midrash; but in the Yer., where they are cited in the name of R. Haninah, they suit the context very well. The following narrative in E. R. is hardly dependent on Yer. Notice the alterations: E. R., Rab Hunna, for Yer., R. Jochanan; E. R., 300, for Yer., 80; E. R., R. Jeremiah in the name of R. Chiya bar Abba, for Yer., R. Jochanan. Also the tale of the 80 priests (in the Talmud 80 *pairs* of priests) is differently given in the two works. According to the Talmud, they were simply married beneath a vine; according to the Midrash, they were already married, and were executed, with their wives, under the vine. The dictum of R. Jeremiah in the name of R. Chiya bar Bo respecting the *שמונים שידות וכו'* does not occur in the Midrash. The

account of the avenging of Zachariah's blood occurs no less than three times in Midrash Echah, and a careful examination of it will lead us to a striking result. Notice the change at the beginning: —

E. R. Chs. II and IV.	E. R. Pethicha 23	Yerushalmi.
בעזרת ישראל או בעזרת נשים אמר ליה לא	בעזרת נשים או בעזרת ישראל א"ל לא בעזרת	בעזרת הנשים או בעזרת ישראל א"ל לא בעזרת
בעזרת ישראל ולא בעזרת נשים:	נשים ולא בעזרת ישראל	ישראל ולא בעזרת הנשים

Now it is clear that these two variations occurring in the Midrash have one object in view, viz., symmetry between the wording of the question and of the answer. In the one passage the words of the answer in E. R. are so arranged as to correspond with those of the question, which is cited in the exact form that the Talmud gives it. In the two remaining cases (chs. II and IV) the answer of the Yer. is retained and the question in E. R. is altered accordingly. How can we explain the circumstance that the same end is sought in two instances by one, and in the third instance by another method? In all probability we have before us the work of two writers,<sup>1</sup> both of whom give an independent version of the Yerushalmi. For if our Midrash were the product of one composer we should be compelled to tax him with great inconsistency: — he first altered the Yer., and then repeated himself faithfully in one case, and in a different manner on another occasion. The context shows that the Pethicha is not the original place for this narrative, since it is there suggested by the words והוא מזכיר עון להתפש זה עינו של זכריהו without reference to what precedes, and what comes after it. Nor can Ch. IV (sec. 16) claim the priority, for it is there introduced, as a separate paragraph, as an exposition to the verse מרמאת נביאיה ועל אותה שעה וכו'. Now the massacre of the Israelites depicted in

<sup>1</sup> This is merely an incidental point. The principal argument for the fact that the Midrash is the work of two authors will be fully enunciated farther on. See p. 43, note 2.

this narrative is a very suitable appendage to the text בלעז under which it is quoted in Ch. II, besides it is adduced there among a number of similar sad events which befell the unfortunate Jews. These considerations prove that true order of occurrence, arranged according to priority, is: Chapter II, Chapter IV (both of which may have emanated from one writer), and Pethicha 23. The only differences between Chs. II and IV, besides that already mentioned are; the latter adds the words נחין עילוייה before א"ל זכריה טובים (this is a minor point), and further הכי לית זכי וכו' which must be explained as follows. According to the reading in Ch. II the sense is: "And since he (Nebuchadnezzar) spake unto them thus (i. e. threatened them 'אנא מפריקנא וכו'), they said unto him, wherefore shall we conceal the truth from thee etc."; according to Ch. IV, "And since he spake to them, it is not so (i. e. you are trying to deceive me), they said etc." With these exceptions, Ch. IV may be regarded as a repetition of Ch. II; it will be sufficient for us to confine our attention to the latter and Pet. 23. In all three passages the Midrash places צבי before איל, no doubt because this is the order usually observed in the Torah.<sup>1</sup> Ch. II writes, as the Yer. gives it, חמן כתיב and Pethicha alters this to רכתיב ביה. The fact that the same account is quoted from the same source in two different forms, is an indication of the existence of two different authors. The Midrash adds in all three cases והללו את השם, and without this, as in the Yer., we must reckon שבת ויום כפורים as *two* transgressions in order to make up the seven. The expression קא רתח which occurs in Ch. II is taken from the Babli (Sanhedrin);<sup>2</sup> the Pethicha prefers the Yer. רוסם. Both words are equally intelligible. The substitution of מאי האי (Ch. II), for the Yer. מה טיבו של זה is also due to the Babli; here again the Pethicha retains מה טיבו of the Yerushalmi. Ch. II omits דאישתפוך; and the Pethicha alters the Yer. ע"ג המזכר into שהיינו מקרי' ע"ג המזכר and (as in the Yer.) adds פרים וכבשים to ואילים —

<sup>1</sup> e. g. Deut. XV, 22.

<sup>2</sup> 57b.

both of which points have no equivalent in Ch. II. We need but glance at the following paragraph to be convinced that E. R. in the three cases used the Babli and not the Yerushalmi. Ch. II comes back afterwards to the Yer. 'נתמלא הקב'ה וכו' והררר נבזרארן וכו' though in very few words, and though 'והררר נבזרארן וכו' is taken from the Babli. But the Pethicha ends completely as the Babli, with the slight alteration פ'רדשנא for פ'רמא. The Pethicha quotes 'מאי נימא לך וכו' word for word from the Babli, whereas Ch. II works out this point in a very detailed manner. Strange to say, the connecting link of the Babli 'והא כמה שנים וכו' is omitted in Ch. II and reappears in the Pethicha, where also the explanatory phrase is added 'פ'רצו וכו' לקיים מה שנ' פ'רצו וכו' which is wanting in Ch. II. The Pethicha introduces from the Yer. 'פ' אלף פ'רדי וכו' and adds 'עד שרניע וכו', both of these phrases are wanting in Ch. II. The following is an interesting consideration —

Echah Rabbah. Ch. II.	Echah Rabbah. Pet. 23.	Babli.	Yerushalmi.
רצונך שיאבדו כולם:	ניחא לך דליכלינהו לכולהו:	ניחא לך דאיקטלינהו לכולהו:	אה בעי נובד כל אומתך עלך:

It is evident that the Pethicha is simply a reproduction of the Babli with a slight change; but Ch. II is clearly a paraphrase, in easier language (pure Hebrew), of the Yerushalmi. I think that sufficient has been said to establish the following fact beyond doubt: — The two accounts of the avenging of Zechariah's blood, which occur in E. R., are emanations from two distinct writers, each of whom was acquainted with the Babli and the Yerushalmi, and each of whom produced a different combination of the same two sources. The passage in the Yer. from א'ר יורגן שמונים אוד מוצל till אלפים פ'ירדי כהונה ברדו להם לתוך קלחותים וכו' does not occur in the Midrash. The following narrative is cited in the name of R. Johanan in the Yerushalmi, and anonymously in E. R. The latter adds וכיין מניני זרב, and very properly introduces the exclamation "Let us first drink" after having told us, that the Ishmaelites produced the salt-

ed food and the empty waterbottles; the author of the Midrash probably thought, that the words of the Yer. רבו לן נשתי ראנן צרתי ought to be omitted, since they anticipate too much. The whole passage is a detailed reproduction of the Talmud, and it is unnecessary to adduce proofs. The concluding paragraph of sec. 4 is probably dependent on the Bereshith Rabbah (Ch. LVI) since R. Judan is quoted.

We have seen that the whole of Section 4, in its present form, dates from a later period than that of the original Midrash, for the Babli is frequently cited. Nevertheless we have also observed that those portions which belong to the original Midrash are independent of the Talmud Yerushalmi.

11) E. R., Ch. IV, sec. 28, and Yer., Shabbath, Ch. XVI ר' ר' חייא רבא ור' ישמעאל בי ר' יוסי היו יושבין וכו'. The Midrash omits R. Chiya and Raba, and writes עם השכה, for the Yer. מן המנחה ולמעלה. According to E. R., Rabbi insists, that what has befallen him is a punishment for some sin which he has committed; but R. Ishmael says "Even if we were not engaged with this subject (i. e. with the verse<sup>1</sup> which is immediately afterwards cited), and this had happened to thee, I should have said so; now how much more reason have I to exclaim, 'The breath of our nostrils, the anointed of the Lord, was taken in their pits.'" The meaning is that Rabbi suffered for the sin of the whole community. Now the Yer. is remarkably clear and requires no explanation. When Rabbi accuses himself, R. Chiya says, "it is in consequence of our iniquities that thou sufferest, as it is written 'The breath of our nostrils etc.'" R. Ishmael continued, "even if we were not engaged with the subject we should be obliged to speak thus, how much more so now, since we are so occupied". Again, the latter half of this narrative as given in E. R. contains pure Halachah, and has nothing corresponding with it in the Talmud. This passage, then, is independent of the Yerushalmi; and the same source

<sup>1</sup> Lam. IV, 20.

that supplied the author of E. R. with the second half, probably furnished him also with the first half of the section.

12) E. R., Ch. V, sec. 15, and Yer., Sota, Ch. IX, א"ר  
הסרא בראשונה היתה. The Midrash cites the verse בשיר  
וכו' לא ישתו וכו' which occurs in the Mishnah. The accounts  
in E. R. and Yer. are very similar; both are written in  
the same language, viz. Hebrew, and both are very well  
suited to the context; so that it is impossible to decide  
which of the two is the older. It is true that the Yer.  
interpolates בראשונה לא היו נפרעין אלא וכו' and that, had  
the author of E. R. used the Talmud, he would probably  
have quoted the whole passage as he found it; but I do not  
insist on this point, for he may have omitted these words,  
since they have no reference to his text. From this passage  
nothing can be proved.

13) E. R., Pet. 33; Yerushalmi, Taanith, Ch. IV; Babli,  
26 b (Mishnah) and 30 b—31 a.

Echah Rabbah.	Babli.	Yerushalmi.
שבהן יוצאות בנות ישראל	שבהן בנות ירושלים יוצאות	שבהן בני ירושלים יוצאים

The Midrash differs in three points from the Yer.: בנות:  
for בני, the more general term ישראל for ירושלים, and the  
verb is placed before the subject. Now the last two alte-  
rations are points of no great moment, although they  
tend to enhance the effect. But the important change בנות  
for בנו was probably suggested to the author of the Mi-  
drash by the Babli. The following consideration removes  
all doubts as to the question whether E. R. is here depen-  
dent on the Babli or not.

Echah Rabbah.	Babli.	Yerushalmi.
בשלמא יום הכפורים יום סליחה וכפרה לישראל יום שנתנו בו לוחות אחרונות אלא ט"ו באב מאי היא:	בשלמא יום הכפורים משום דאית ביה סליחה ומחילה יום שניתנו בו לוחות האחרונות אלא ט"ו באב מאי היא:	ניחא ביום הכפורים שהוא כפרה על ישראל בט"ו באב למה:

The words 'יום שנת' do not occur in the Yerushalmi,

and *מאי היא* . . . *אלא . . . בשלמא* is the ordinary expression of the Babli for *למה . . . נזירא* of the Palestinian Talmud. It would be difficult to adduce a stronger proof that the author of E. R. used the Babli, and preferred its language (for reasons which will be explained) to that of the Yerushalmi. I am inclined to think that he had the Yer. before him in this instance, and that he thence obtained the words *כפרה* and *ישראל*; the order in which the separate portions of the whole narrative follow one another would lead us to the same conclusion. But yet the whole passage *ר' יהודה אמר* till *יום שהותרו* does not occur in Yer., and is taken from the Babli.

14) E. R., Ch. I, sec. 51. *כי רחוק ממני וכו'*; Yer., Berachoth, Ch. II *רבנן אמרי וכו'*; Babli, Baba Bathra, 75b, and Sanhedrin, 98b. The whole introduction (in E. R.) from *ר' יהושע בן לוי* till *כי רחוק וכו'* is taken from the Babli. It is not at all strange that the author of E. R. added *למדינתא* *רשמ'*, because that may have been a current proverb. The first thing that strikes us on examining the narrative itself is, that the beginning of the Yer. account is cited at the end of the Midrash version, after a long quotation from the Babli. The author did this possibly for the sake of the general effect. The Midrash alters *יהודאי* to *בר נש*, because farther on the Arabian asks the man what he is, and our author does not wish to anticipate his answer. This undue elongation of the Yerushalmi text by the author of E. R. is anything but elegant. The following phrase, for instance, which occurs in the Talmud *בר יהודאי שרי תורך וכו'* is far more powerful than the corresponding tedious dialogue in the Midrash. The latter has *בריה ליה יהודה* *מן בירה מלכא רבית לחם יזוזה* *קנקנך* for *פרנך* and *מן בירה מלכא רבית לחם יזוזה*. According to E. R., the man asks the mother why she does not come forward and purchase; in the Yer. it is related that, from the conversation of the women standing around him, he learns that Menachem's mother has purchased nothing. The remarkable phrases *רדשיי קשי לינוקא* and, afterwards *רדשיה קשיי אפילו על רגליה וכו'*, do not occur in the Yer. The

Yer. ומעניניה<sup>2</sup> is better suited to the context than ורמפיניה.<sup>1</sup> The Midrash repeats ולא כך אמרית וכו' and creates thereby a great difficulty. The first part of the mother's words על ריגלי הריב was fulfilled, for the child was born just after the destruction of the Temple. But the second half has no meaning. As a matter of fact the Temple was *not* rebuilt during the lifetime of the child, nor even after his death.<sup>3</sup> This anomaly might perhaps be avoided in the Talmud by explaining ברגליה מתבני as follows: The man comforts the mother by instilling in her the hope, that the Temple may be rebuilt for her child's sake.<sup>4</sup> Although this hope was never realized, yet the man was fully justified in his endeavours to console the afflicted mother by means of it. The Midrash now adduces a passage from the Babli, and places the dictum of R. Chanina before that of R. Janai. Neither in the Babli nor in the Yer. do we find ר' ביבא סגוריא. This narrative as we have it was composed by a late writer, since the Babli is so freely used. In all likelihood the original Midrash contained this passage, but it was afterwards remodelled according to the Babli and Yerushalmi combined. There are points which render it difficult to assume that E. R. is directly dependent on the Talmud Yerushalmi. Besides those mentioned, we must notice ר' שמואל בר יצחק in E. R. for רבנן in Yer. This is the third and last instance quoted by Frankel.

15) E. R., Ch. IV, sec. 4; Yer., Horaioth, Ch. III; Babli, Gittin, 58a. The Midrash על פתרו לברקו is a combination of the Babli בית האמורים and the Yerushalmi והלך ר' יהושע לברקו כיון שהגיע על פתרו בני ציון היקרים הממולאים בפו שהגיע על פתרו וכו' are taken from the Yer., but the whole passage from ר' ישמעאל בן אלישע till שמובטח אני is quoted almost *word for word* from the Babli.

<sup>1</sup> "And snatched him away".

<sup>2</sup> "And carried him off".

<sup>3</sup> Compare my remarks on סיבת ורוען וכו' (p. 32).

<sup>4</sup> The Yer. writes ברגליה and for רגליה על the former of which expressions may perhaps be translated "for his sake".

We are now in a position to arrive at a definite result with regard to the composition of Midrash Echah Rabbah, in as far as the two Talmudim are concerned. Let us proceed to collect our premises. We have seen that the Midrash, in its present form, is written in two totally different styles; the West or Palestinian Syriac stands side by side with the East Syriac, and with the usual modes of expression peculiar to the Talmud Babli. This use of the Babylonian language is not confined to the last chapters,<sup>1</sup> we have had occasion to notice a striking instance in one of the introductory Pethichoth. We have likewise observed that Midrash Echah not unfrequently exhibits a strong tendency to combine the Yerushalmi and Babli versions of the same narrative; that it often shows a decided preference in favour of the latter Talmud, by rendering into the Babylonian phraseology single words and whole sentences which, we have every reason to believe, were originally written in the Palestinian dialect. Lastly we have examined instances which point to the conclusion that, where similarity exists between Echah Rabbah and the Yerushalmi alone, the Midrash is independent of the Talmud. The question arises, what are we warranted in inferring from these data?

In the first place, Midrash Echah is no homogeneous compilation, for two such distinct styles as characterize its composition could never have emanated from one and the same writer; it is therefore the work of at least two authors.<sup>2</sup> *Secondly*; the later reviser was acquainted with both Talmudim. *Thirdly*; the first recension of Midrash Echah was

<sup>1</sup> Compare Zunz's remarks on the last chapters which are quoted at p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> The two authors who wrote the different accounts of Zechariah's death (pp. 36—38) were both acquainted with the two Talmudim, and both belong to the later period. Accordingly I ought to have asserted, at the onset, that our Midrash is the work of *three* authors. But then we have only one example in favour of this assertion, and the writer of one of the accounts just mentioned may have confined his work to a very small portion of the Midrash. He would then not be entitled to be styled "a reviser or an author of the Midrash." Besides I am satisfied to make out my point, that Midrash Echah emanated from two compilers *at least*.

composed in Palestine (the language in which it is written proves this), and the second recension, in Babylon. If Echa Rabbah contained passages cited word for word from the Babli, and sought occasionally to translate the original language of the Babli into the Palestinian dialect, we should be entitled to conclude that the second composer lived in Palestine. But as a matter of fact we find that the Babylonian dialect has been copiously used, even in cases where the Palestinian Talmud is adduced. There can be only one reason for this deviation from the words of the text. The author of the Midrash preferred the Babylonian dialect, because that dialect was best understood by his readers; in other words, because he was in Babylon. *Fourthly*; the original Midrash is independent of the Talmud Yerushalmi. Our previous investigations have established the fact, that all those passages that are really taken from the Yerushalmi date from a period posterior to that of the first recension. Since the original Midrash contains a large number of Hagadoth,<sup>1</sup> which have nothing corresponding with them in Yerushalmi, and since those sections which do correspond with similar narratives in the Talmud, are, as far as we have seen, independent, we are justified in asserting that the same source which supplied the author with the former, furnished him also with the latter.

The only passages which seem, at first sight, to militate against this position, but which on mature deliberation, prove to have a neutral effect, are the following.

16) E. R., Ch. II, sec. 22; Yerushalmi, Berachoth, Ch. I. There is a slight variation at the beginning. The Yerushalmi runs thus, ארבע אשמורות ביום וד' אשמורות בלילה, and the Midrash places לילה before יום, probably because the verse standing at the commencement of the section is קומי רוני בלילה וכו'. Again the Midrash has לעת אחר מכ"ד לעונה העונה אחר מכ"ד לעונה: and the Yerushalmi לעת אחר מכ"ד לעונה: לשעה העת אחר מכ"ד לעונה. According to the Yerushalmi the

<sup>1</sup> Compare Ch. I, secs. 4—14.

שעה is  $24 \times 24$  times as long as the עת, and 24 times as long as the עונה. The words of the Midrash are not intelligible.

The proof for R. Nathan's assertion that the night has only three watches — namely the words ראש אשמורה לא היה, is omitted in E. R. The latter substitutes לא היה ארהא (נ"א שהרא) אחיא ומשכה בא ודוד ישן לידו רמך. The passage from ויהי יצרו till ומה היה עושה is omitted in E. R. — a point which is rather suspicious if the Midrash is exclusively dependent on the Yer. We have now a remarkable change to notice. According to the Yer. the Wise Men of Israel used to hear David playing the harp, thence they inferred that he was about to study the Law, and they thereupon considered themselves bound to follow so noble an example. They argued thus: If the great King deprives himself of his sleep for the purpose of learning the signification of our Holy Precepts, surely we are bound to do so likewise. The Midrash, on the other hand, tells us that David was accustomed to rise in the middle of the night to play the harp. But here the account suddenly breaks off; a passage from the Babli (Berachoth, 3 b) is interpolated *word for word* as it stands in the Talmud 'ר' לוי וכו'; and the narrative continues to the effect that *David* heard the sound of the harp, and thereupon rose and commenced his studies (as related in the Babli); then all Israel (not alone the Sages) heard David (not playing, but) learning, and were thus induced to imitate the King's example. Here we have a characteristic feature of the Midrash with which we are by this time quite familiar — the Yer. and Bab. accounts of the same story are blended together; and therefore, in spite of the agreement between the general outline of this passage as it occurs in E. R. with the corresponding Yer. account, it does not militate against my position, for it is the work of the second author. The language is, for the most part, Hebrew.

17) E. R., Ch. I, sect. 47, 48; and Yer., Kethuboth, Ch. 5, וכושמת וכו' והתני מעשה במרת.

is wanting in the Yerushalmi, though something similar occurs in Sifri, Deut., XXXI, 14. This fact together with the following variations, renders it improbable to assume that E. R. is directly dependent on the Talmud. The Midrash after telling us that the Wise Men allowed Miriam a certain quantity of wine asks, how could they have done so, since a Boraitha distinctly says, it is not lawful to provide a widow with wine והוא תניא אין פומקין יין לאשה. The Yer. knows nothing of this Boraitha. The whole passage from אע"פ כן till אמן is wanting in E. R. The end of sec. 47 in the Midrash is quite different to the conclusion in the Yer. narrative. Indeed the end of the first account in E. R. corresponds with the end of the second story in Yer., and the conclusion of the second narrative in E. R. with that of the first in Yer. The Midrash writes ברו של נקדימון and the Yer. ברו של שמעון בן גורין, and the explanatory phrase of the Yer. ולא היתה אלה שומרת יבם does not occur in E. R. The words (with which sec. 48 concludes) אל תקרי גדידות אל גדידות are wanting in the Yer. and occur in the Sifri. It is not unlikely that both the Yer. and E. R. are dependent on the Sifri and on some other source now unknown to us; and that we have before us two independent reproductions of the same originals. The language in which these sections are written, is Hebrew.

18) E. R., Ch. I, sec. 52, אך ברכיה אמרה כנמת שיראל, לפני הקב"ה לשעבר הייתי וכו' and Yerushalmi, Bikkurim, Ch. III, וברכים וכו'. The introduction till וברכים is wanting in the Yer., and since it is introduced by אך ברכיה it is probably not an exposition of the author himself, but a quotation from an old Boraitha. The language is Hebrew, with the exception of the last words ועכשיו ארדם רמומה which are wanting in the Talmud, and which are an addition of the author.

19) E. R., Ch. III נרפשה ורכינו; and Yer. Taanith, Ch. II, ר'. E. R. is dependent on the Yerushalmi, but we have here the work of the second author. Let us examine the following point. —

Echah Rabbah.	Babli, Faanith, 16 a.	Yerushalmi.
אפילו טובל בכל מימי	שאפילו טובל בכל	אפילו טובל במי שילוחו
בראשית אינו טהור	מימות שבעולם לא	או במי בראשית אין
לעולם השליך השרץ	עלתה לו טבילה	לו שהרה עולמית
מידועלתה לו טבילה	זרקו מידוכיון שטבל	השליבו מידו מיד
במ' טאה:	במ' טאה מיד עלתה	טהור:
	לו טבילה:	

The general outline in E. R. corresponds with Yer., but the expressions עלתה לו טבילה and במ' טאה clearly show that we have, in this passage, another instance of the combination of the Yerushalmi with the Babli account. The phrase in the Midrash נקשט עצמן ואה"כ נקשט אחרים: seems also to be a reproduction from the Yerushalmi נקושש גרמן עד דלא נקושש אחרים, and the Babli (Sanhedrin, 18a קשט עצמן ואה"כ קשט אחרים).

20) E. R., Ch. V, sec. 16, and Yer., Sota, Ch. IX, 'ר' ירמיה שיבשב וכו'. This passage consists of but three lines and is probably a later addition, introduced for the sake of giving some exposition to the verse נפלה עטרת ראשנו. It is dependent on the Talmud, but it might have been quoted by the second author.

### III. PESIKTA DERAB KAHANA.

THE Midrash Echah Rabbah opens with a prefatory Hagadah consisting of thirty-four<sup>1</sup> sections, most of which commence with the formula פתח . . . . . רבי and hence the word Pethicha is derived. When the dictum of a Hagadist is introduced with פתח, it generally implies, that the Hagadist usually commenced his exposition of a particular topic, or his lecture on a particular theme, with the words that stand at the beginning of that dictum.<sup>2</sup> That this is the true explanation of the term we learn from Megillah;

<sup>1</sup> Although the true number is 38 (as I shall afterwards show) yet, in order to avoid confusion, I adhere throughout this essay to the number which is usually given in the printed texts.

<sup>2</sup> "Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums", 1880, p. 172.



bah had, according to this opinion, two models before him — the Bereshith Rabbah arranged according to the chapters of the Book of Genesis, and the Pesikta consisting of sections usually beginning with the formula פתח . . . . . — a combination of which furnished him with the plan for the construction of Midrash Echah. The introductory Pethichoth are an imitation, to a certain extent a reproduction, of the Pesikta, and the arrangement of the body of the work corresponds with that of the Bereshith Rabbah. The author of Midrash Vayikra, on the other hand, frequently dispenses with the prefatory Pethichoth, and commences at once with the exposition of this text.

B. Nearly every Pethicha concludes with the first words of the Book of Lamentations, usually preceded by כיון שרמאו בין שרמאו וגלו וכיון שגלו רחמיך ירמיה מקונן עליהם. No such regularity is to be found in the Pesikta, hence it is an older work than Echah Rabbah.

C. An examination of certain passages occurring in both treatises convinces us that Midrash Echah is dependent on the Pesikta.

1) E. R., Pet. I; and the corresponding passage in Pesikta derab Kahana, Piska XIII. This section is complete in itself and is well suited to the context in both works. It concludes in the Pesikta with the verse דברי ירמיה, and in E. R. with איכה. The words צהלי קולך בבחי כנסיות are added in E. R., whereas the phrase שיש קולך לבלין קולך is omitted; in all probability it stood there originally but has slipped out in the course of time. E. R. has another addition, הקשיבי לצדקות ומעשים טובים, but the Pesikta דברי תורה is altered to דברי נבואה, and the words דברי חוכמות are wanting. The Midrash is here later than, and probably dependent on, the Pesikta, and the words קונן עליהם emanate from the author of the Midrash.

2) E. R., Pet. 9; P. d. K. Piska XIX. In the Pesikta this passage is an exposition to the verse Ps. LXIX, 21, and although the greater part of the section is devoted to the first words הרפה שבירה לבי, yet the conclusion of the text is also discussed, and serves to introduce the words

that stand at the head of the Piska מנחמכם הוא אנכי הוא אנכי. Now the object of the author of E. R. is not to console his readers, on the contrary, he wishes to bewail the downfall of the Temple, and the desecrations which accompanied that sad event. He therefore chooses a different text, the leading idea of which coincides with that of Ps. LXIX, 21, but the conclusion of which is more closely connected with the subject of the narrative. He omits 'בין שגורמו וכו' but adds 'ידו פרש צר וכו'. He renders the description more vivid by writing 'לא היו ישראל וכו' in the 2nd. Pers. Pl. "Did ye not say (addressing the enemies), that this nation did not worship idols? Behold what we have found." He writes 'באותה באותה ווי ווי כולן כורא הא כל אפיין שוין שוין' and ends with the usual 'כיון שרמאו גלו וכו'. In this instance the Pesikta is older than the Midrash, though it is strange that the latter adduces this narrative in the name of R. Isaac, and the former cites it anonymously.

3) E. R., Pet. 25; and P. d. K., Piska XIX. עשר ממעות. There is a slight difference in the order in which the journeys took place — in E. R. מן החצר לגג ומן הגג למזבח מן ומזבח למזבח וממזבח לגג ומגן. With these exceptions the two accounts agree, and neither is connected with Babli (Rosh Hashanah, 31a). The concise phrase of the Pesikta 'ואיפשר בן ויצא וכו' is rendered in E. R., by 'ויצא לא היה צריך קרייה למימר אלא ויבא ואח' and 'אומרת ויצא וכו'. But Buber remarks that the Oxford and Parma MSS. have both the same reading as the Midrash. The author of E. R. adds 'בכעם', and alters 'והיה מנשק בכתלים' into 'והיה חוזר ומנפף ומנשק בכותלי פלמין ובעמודי פלמין ומנפף בעמודי' thus clearly dilating on the words of P. d. K. The pathetic exclamation 'הוי שלום בית יקרי וכו' is likewise due to the author of E. R. Buber considers the whole passage from 'והיה חוזר ומנפף' till 'יהודה בר' an addition by a casual reader, and that it is quite foreign to the subject. There is no doubt that the Midrash is here dependent on the Pesikta.

4) E. R., Ch. I, sec. 33 'בזמן שישראל וכו' and P. d. K., Piska XXVI. This section is clearly a detailed reproduction

of the Pesikta version. E. R. writes לוי בר טרפון for the P. d. K. לוי בר פרמא, and Buber is of opinion that the reading in the Midrash is a typographical error. The whole explanation of the verse ורבנן בשם ר' וילכו בלא כה וכו' from שם is inserted in E. R., and does not occur in the Pesikta.

5) E. R., Ch. I, sect. 57, and P. d. K., Piska XVI רמא בר אש. The Midrash prefaces the words אה מוצא שבדבר בו. There is a slight variation in the order in which the several incidents follow one another. The Pesikta invariably employs the following mode of expression רמא בעין ולקו בעין רמא בעין ומסקרות עינים בו, whereas the Midrash, with the exception of the first instance, writes simply רמא כראש דכ. This is no valid argument in favour of the originality of E. R., for the author may have found the continual repetition of the same formula tedious, and he may have therefore chosen a more concise form. The Midrash introduces a new point רמא ביש. E. R. is here dependent on P. d. K.

6) E. R., Ch. II, sec. 6, ורשיב ארוך ימיני וכו', and P. d. K., Piska XVII. The two narratives are remarkably similar, but the expression in E. R. עמו אנכי בצרה כתבתי בתורה appears to be later. The Midrash commences with "R. Azariah in the name of R. Judah bar Simon", and in the Pesikta "R. Azariah and R. Abahu in the name of Resh Lokesh" are cited. It is strange that E. R. omits רבון העולמים and כיוצא בו. Towards the end the readings in E. R. and in P. d. K. are both corrupt, though E. R. is a little clearer than Pesikta. The Pesikta applies this exposition to the verse Ps. CXXXVII, 5; but the author of the Midrash, finding that he had a suitable text in the Book of Lamentations (II, 3), naturally preferred it.

7) E. R., Ch. III, להם גמול, and P. d. K., Piska III. The Midrash places the destruction of the Temple at the commencement, because it is the subject special to the whole Echah Rabbah. The Pesikta expression אדם הראשון is rendered more general in E. R. אדם, and in the passage וישקף שמואל בו the author of the Midrash prefers to adhere to the literal

meaning of his text, he therefore writes חריכות חריכות instead of זרים זרים. The Midrash is later than the Pesikta, although it omits the words ר' חנא ר' חנא. Buber remarks that they occur only in the Oxford MS.

8) E. R., Ch. V, sec. 1. ומלך אלקים. This appears to be a combination of two passages in P. d. K. viz., Piskoth, III and XVIII. Buber is of opinion that the reading in E. R. is corrupt; even in the Pesikta it is anything but clear. He suggests the following explanation. According to R. Abba bar Kahana, only the walls themselves were destroyed, but the foundations remained intact; according to R. Levi, the foundations shared the same fate as the walls. At all events the Midrash is later than the Pesikta for it seeks to explain its text. We may notice the alteration of על דעויה to מאן דאמר.

These then are the considerations which support the opinion that Midrash Echah is dependent on the Pesikta. That they are not absolutely convincing we shall presently see.

A. If we assume that the Pesikta and Vayikra Rabbah are treatises of a more recent date than Echah Rabbah, we can equally well explain the outward forms in which the former Midrashim are written. The Pesikta selected the style of the Introduction, to the exclusion of that of the body of Midrash Echah; the Vayikra Rabbah, on the other hand, preferred the latter to the former.

B. We must now arrive at a clear understanding with regard to the true number of Pethichoth. A Pethicha need not necessarily begin with פתח. No less than 69 instances occur in P. d. K. where sections are introduced without any set form, and Pet. 34 of E. R. commences at once with the biblical verse. Now Pet. 2 contains two distinct sections, that are not connected with one another, and both of which end in the same manner viz. מקונן עליהם איכה. The second half, beginning with the verse וקרואו חתבונו is complete and independent in itself, and owing to a printer's mistake, it has been incorporated with the preceding portion, because it does not happen to begin with פתח. In the same manner we

must divide Pet. 31. When א"ר occurs in a Pethicha, it may signify either a further explanation of the foregoing words, i. e. a continuation of the same Pethicha, or the commencement of a new Pethicha. It is in the latter sense in which it must be understood in Pet. 9, where again we have two distinct sections joined together. And lastly Pet. 25 must be divided, for עשר מטה forms the commencement of a new subject, and occurs in P. d. K. disconnected from what precedes it in E. R. Subjoined is a list of the Pethichoth arranged according to the true division, which is marked by the Hebrew letters.

	Ordinary Division.
א' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . כיון שבא הפורענית קונן עליהם איכה	I.
ב' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . וכיון שהשליכו דברי תורה לארץ התחיל ירמיה וכו'	2.
ג' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . וכיון שמתו כולם התחיל מקונן עליהם וכו'	3.
ד' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . איכה ישבה בדר	4.
ה' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . וקוננתי עליהם וכו'	5.
ו' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . כיון שהטאו גלו וכו'	6.
ז' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . כיון שהטאו גלו וכו'	7.
ח' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . ישבו לארץ ידמו וכו'	8.
ט' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . כיון שהטאו גלו וכיון וכו'	9.
י' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . כיון שהטאו גלו וכיון וכו'	10.
יא' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . איכה ישבה בדר	11.
יב' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . איכה ישבה בדר	12.
יג' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . כיון שהטאו גלו וכו'	13.
יד' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . כיון שהטאו גלו וכו'	14.
טו' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . כיון שהטאו גלו וכו'	15.
טז' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . ואומר להם איכה	16.
יז' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . והלקי אלזים לעולם	17.
יח' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . וקוראין קינין ונתי ואיכה	18.
יט' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . איכה ישבה בדר	19.
כ' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . חוי על נהרות בבל א'כה	20.
כא' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . וישבתי לי לבדי איכה	21.
כב' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . איכה	22.
כג' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . כיון שהטאו גלו וכו'	23.
כד' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . כיון שגלו היה ירמיה וכו'	24.
כה' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . וישבו בנים לגבולם	25.
כו' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . על אחת כמה וכמה	26.
כז' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . עשר מסערת	27.
כח' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . כי נשבה עדר ה'	28.
כט' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . מקונן עליהם איכה	29.
ל' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . שבע אלמא ביתון איכה	30.
לא' אבא בר כהנא פתח . . . באלמא ביתא	31.

	Ordinary Division.
זבדי בן לוי פתח . . . . .	29.
זבדי בן לוי פתח . . . . .	30.
ר' שמעון בן יוחאי פתח . . . . .	} 31.
הוי טריא ונגאלה . . . . .	
ר' חנינא פתח . . . . .	32.
ר' זעירא פתח . . . . .	33.
על ההרים אשא בכי ונהי . הארץ הנשכחה תעבד תחת אשר היתה וכו' .	34.

XXXVIII.

The regular ending appears in 31 out of the 38 Pethichoth, the remaining 7 conclude with other biblical verses. Now in those cases where the usual formula occurs, we cannot fail to notice a vast difference in its suitability to what precedes. How pathetic and forcible is it in Pet. 13 (ל"ג)! "Had you deserved it, you would now be entitled to read in the Torah **איכה אשא לברי** אשא, but now since you have proved yourselves ungrateful children, you must exclaim **איכה** אשבה." Let us contrast with this the final words of Pet. 23 (כ"ג). "R. Alexandri inferred it (i. e. the dictum that the captivity is to last just as long as the Israelites persisted in worshipping idols) from this verse (Lev., XIII, 46), 'All the days wherein the plague shall be in him, he shall be defiled.' Echah." The presence of "Echah" here — inasmuch as it has not the slightest connection with R. Alexandri's statement — appears to be an addition by some later editor, in order to preserve as far as possible a unanimity in the conclusions of the Pethichoth. This assumption is not so bold as it might otherwise appear, for we know that Midrash Echah is really the work of an older and a later author. No less than eight Pethichoth (viz., 6, 9, 11, 21, 22, 23, 29, 34 : א"א : כ"א : ו : ט : ט : ט : ט : ט) bear testimony in favour of this view. The original Midrash contained at most 23 Pethichoth with the regular ending, though the number may have been much smaller, for there are very few instances where the conclusion is as well adapted to the context as in Pet. 13. The aim of the later reviser was to establish a universal agreement between the endings of the sections composing the

Introduction. Why did he leave those seven instances, mentioned above, just as he found them? A little reflection will give us the true reason. Pet. 26 (י"ב) concludes as follows: "It is written (Jer., XXXI, 16), 'Thus saith the Lord: Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears: for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the Lord: and they shall come again from the land of the enemy', and it is further written (v. 17), 'And there is hope in thine end, saith the Lord, that thy children shall come again to their own border'". Pet. 38 (י"ח) ends with these words, "At some future time every thing will return to its former prosperous state, as it is written (Ezek., XXXVI), 'And the desolate land shall be tilled, whereas it lay desolate in the sight of all that passed by.'" It is evident that the writer of the Introduction was actuated by a strong desire to impress on the minds of his readers the great truth that, "even when they be in the land of their enemies, the Almighty will not cast His people away, neither will He abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break His covenant with them, for He is the Lord their God." Accordingly, the mournful tone of the whole Introduction is changed here and there into a consolatory and cheerful strain. It would have been both unmeaning and absurd on the part of the reviser to place such words as "How doth the city sit solitary etc." after texts reminding us of the Allmerciful's lovingkindness and comforting promises. For this reason we find no addition at the end of Pethichoth 18 (י"ח), 27 (י"ז), and 28 (י"ח); in the last two cases the idea uppermost in the writer's mind is some good quality characteristic of the Jewish nation, viz., Honour evinced to the remains of king Hezekiah, and, the union and concord that reigned among the Israelites after they had been driven into exile. The omission of the usual set form of conclusion can be satisfactorily accounted for in five instances. Pet. 8 (י) ends with the verse "The elders of the daughter of Zion sit upon the ground, and keep silence" which, since it is taken from Lamentations (II, 10), is sufficiently expressive in itself, and requires no further text to awaken sad recollections of the past. Pet. 31. (י"א) is certainly much better as it stands

than it would be if "Echah" were added at the end. Nevertheless that word would be quite as appropriate here, as it is in Pet. 23, and perhaps it did stand in the text as revised by the second author, for its omission may be due to a typographical error. Even were this not the case, one solitary exception would not be sufficient to overthrow the theory here upheld, after the proofs that have been adduced.

The original Midrash contained at most 23 instances of regularity out of 38. The Pesikta derab Kahana consists of 32 Piskoth, of which 20 conclude with a regular ending.<sup>1</sup> There is a slight difference in the proportion in favour of Echah Rabbah's being less regular.

Should it be urged that the similarity in the conclusions of the sections of the Introduction tends to prove that Midrash Echah is later than the Pesikta, it may be answered that this similarity is due to the second author, the original Midrash was not more systematically arranged than the Pesikta. Again, the formula *זה שאמר הכתוב* to introduce a biblical verse marks a later stage in Midrash literature. And this expression occurs but once<sup>2</sup> in Echah Rabbah, and several times in the Pesikta derab Kahana.

C. An examination of the following passages will lead to some important results.

9) E. R., Pet. 34, and P. d. K., Piska XIII. This last Pethicha corresponds with no less than six sections in P. d. K. The order is quite different in the two works. The opening words of the first of the six sections in the Pesikta, are added later on in the Midrash. The passage respecting Nebuchadnezzar's three mandates is cited in E. R. in the name of R. Acha, and in the Pesikta anonymously. Had the author of the Midrash used the Pesikta alone, whence could he have obtained the name of R. Acha? The commencement of the narrative in E. R. is considerably more detailed than the corresponding portion in P. d. K. But is it probable that the Midrash would have altered *שכל הדין* to *דהא כמה שנים*

<sup>1</sup> See "Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums", 1880, p. 207.

<sup>2</sup> Pet. 24.

שנייא? Farther on, the Midrash, explaining how the term "a shedder of blood" was applicable to Jeremiah, writes: "The king left several injunctions to the effect that thou shouldst suffer no injury, nevertheless thou wilfully desirest to suffer evil, so that the king may hear it and slay this man (i. e. the speaker.)" The Pesikta runs: "For if the king should hear what thou hast done with thyself (although I have done nothing to injure thee) he would send and execute this man (i. e. the speaker)." The former is evidently an attempt to explain the officer's speech. The expression in E. R. ולא קבל והוא הפרשתי כמו שנאמר במדף הפרשתי appears to emanate from a later writer. The words ואני אמר ר' ארמא כביכול אני והוא are omitted in E. R. This fact is not surprising, for a similar exposition of the expression והוא אמר בויקים precedes the above mentioned words in P. d. K. The author of E. R. cited the explanation in the first instance, and, since he had an aversion to reduplications (as we have seen), he contented himself in the second case with חכמותיה כתיב ואני בתוך הגולה. The Midrash now adduces a passage with the following heading: "R. Jacob and R. Abba and there are some who say, R. Elazar and R. Jochanan." The names given in the Pesikta are "R. Elazar and R. Jochanan." Now it is evident that the writer of Midrash Echah had two accounts of the same narrative before him — one in the names of R. Jacob and R. Abba, and the other, (which may have been the Pesikta, but with equal probability the source drawn upon by the author of the Pesikta), in the names of R. Elazar and R. Jochanan. Further, the principal source of the author of E. R. must have contained the names of the Rabbis first quoted; to the other source, (either identical with, or used by, the Pesikta), he could only have attached a secondary importance, since R. Elazar and R. Jochanan are cited last, and since they are introduced by the formula "and there are some who say." Again, R. Jochanan's dictum extends, according to E. R., as far as verse 16, ושבו בנים לנני, and according to P. d. K., only as far as verse 10, ונאלו מיד חזק ממנו. The whole exposition of the verse Jeremiah, IX, 9, as given in E. R., appears to be rather a paraphrase than a mere re-

production of the passage in P. d. K. For instance, instead of the Pesikta על ההרים הגבוהים שנעשו מדבר אשא קינה, Midrash Echah writes על אותם הרים נאים ושובחים אשא בני עקב שיהפכו לקינה. As to the next portion, it is very unlikely that the author of E. R. would have altered עוף כנף of the Pesikta to עוף טם. (This latter expression occurs in Yerushalmi, Taanith, Ch. IV). A passage is now adduced in E. R. from the Babli (Yoma, 54a) 'בהמה בנימטריא נ'; and the Pesikta specifies the particular fish שיבוטא, while E. R. writes simply שיבוטא. The passage beginning with "R. Zera said etc." is independent of the Pesikta, and owes its existence probably to the principal source mentioned above. For the answer to the question "Wherefore does Palestine bring forth an abundance of fruit?" is given in the Pesikta anonymously ריין, whereas in Midrash Echah the Amoraim are distinctly named; they are, R. Chanina and R. Joshua ben Levi. And the entire explanation of the manner in which the earth was digged and turned over כהרין דסערי סאה סה דלעיל נחית לרע does not occur in E. R., and appears to be an addition on the part of the author of the Pesikta. The conclusion of the Midrash from שנתאמר לקיים סה שנאמר has nothing corresponding with it in P. d. K. This Pethicha in its present form dates from a period more recent than that of the early Midrash, for we find a quotation from the Babli, but the original Midrash was certainly based on some source other than the Pesikta, and was in all probability independent of the latter.

10) E. R., Ch. I, sec. I, and P. d. K., Piska XV. לםטרונה כ'. All that the two works have in common is the parable itself, in which they agree almost word for word. The Midrash has בכבודם which is wanting in Pesikta, but the latter has the explanatory word בורבנה which does not occur in E. R. Accordingly as far as the narrative itself is concerned, the Pesikta, could just as well have been taken from the Midrash as *vice versa*. But there is another point to be considered. The author of Echah Rabbah, constructed his introduction out of the parable itself. Now if he had had the

Pesikta before him, how could he have overlooked the excellent preface which that work supplies?

11) E. R., Ch. I, sec. 23, and P. d. K., Piska 17. The usual form of words in the Pesikta is *בלילה זה לילה ולילו*: constituting, as Buber rightly remarks, a *גזירה שוה* on the word *לילה*. The whole point is missed in E. R., where the form of expression is simply — *ולילו של סנהריב שכחוב בו*, and in the other instances the Midrash has instead of the last two words, the word *דכתיב*, whereas the Pesikta maintains a strict regularity throughout, and adds two new incidents which are wanting in E. R. — the passages referring to Ahasuerus and Haman. The Pesikta is also more detailed further on where *ואתח ואתח* occurs for the Midrash *ואתח*. The Pesikta exposition of the verse (Ps. LXXVH, 10), "Hath God forgotten to be gracious?" assumes the form of a commentary on E. R. And now a peculiar alteration takes place. The dictum which is given in E. R. in the name of R. Alexandrai appears in the Pesikta in the name of R. Samuel bar Nachmeni; and what is related in the name of the latter in E. R., appears in the name of R. Alexandri in P. d. K. This consideration leads us to conclude that the two passages emanate from different sources. Although the Midrash omits *גלגל לבנה חולה בו* which occurs in the Pesikta, but little importance can be attached to this omission, for it is probably a printer's mistake. Otherwise we cannot account for the plural *לשמשיהו* which follows, inasmuch as only the case of the sun is mentioned. Of the conclusion, the passage *וציין אוסרה בו* was added by the author of the Pesikta; it does not occur in E. R.

If these two narratives are not independent of each other, then the Midrash must have been the source of the Pesikta.

12) E. R., Ch. HI, sec. 'מ; and Pesikta derab Kahana, Piska VII. The beginning of this section is quite different in the two works. In the first place the Midrash adduces sayings in the names of R. Levi and R. Berachya, which do not occur in P. d. K. Even the phrase that is quoted in both E. R. and Pesikta, is given in the former in the

name of R. Hunna, and in the latter in the name of R. Judah. The introductory words in the Oxford MS. of Pesikta run thus, אמר ר' אבא בר יודן מה יתאוונן אדם והוא הי, ריו לאדם שהוא הי, א"ר ברכיהו חיותך בידי וחי ואתה מתאוונן, א"ר לוי מה יתאוונן אדם לחי העולמים אלא אם מבקש אדם להחאוונן גבר על המאיו:

Now although this almost corresponds with the Midrash, yet we notice: the dictum of R. Abba bar Yudan is given anonymously in the Midrash, and had the author of the latter been acquainted with the Pesikta, according to the Oxford MS., he would not have withheld the name<sup>1</sup>; the dicta of R. Berachya, R. Levi and R. Judah (which are afterwards cited) in the Oxford MS. are given in the Midrash in the names of R. Levi, R. Berachya and R. Hunna, respectively; the order is also different in the two works. The expression of the Pesikta בני תרעומנין בני תרעומנין is an improvement on, and more forcible than that of the Midrash בני תרעומנין, and the whole narrative in the P. d. K. appears to be a detailed version of the corresponding passage in E. R. For instance, the Midrash writes, אף ציון כן היא, והאמר ציון עובני ה' וארני שכרני, whereas P. d. K. runs, אף ציון כך עושה לי אני עסוק עמה להעביר, את המלכיות מן העולם, לא כבר העברתי בכל ומרי ויון, ועתיד אני להעביר את מלכות אדום, והיא מתרעמת לפני ואומרת עובני ושכרני. Here again, if the relation between E. R. and P. d. K. be one of dependence, it is the latter that obtained its material from the former.

We have seen that the author of Midrash Echah was acquainted with some work, now unknown to us, which contained narratives and expositions similar to those occurring in Pesikta derab Kahana; and further, that there are cases in which the Pesikta accounts are decidedly later than the Echah versions. There is no valid reason to hinder us from going one step farther and asserting, that those passages which appear to be dependent on the Pesikta (see above examples 1—8) are in reality derived from the unknown work just mentioned. And since such a collection of Hagadoth must

<sup>1</sup> See p. 33.

have existed, we assume no new work, and are therefore within the limits of Sir W. Hamilton's "Law of Parcimony." That Midrash Echah is older than the Pesikta; that the outward form of the latter and some modifications in its text are due to the Midrash; can be maintained with as much reason as the statement that Echah Rabbah is dependent on the Pesikta. Which of these two counter-hypotheses is the correct one, I do not undertake to decide.

#### IV. BERESHITH RABBAH AND VAYIKRA RABBAH.

A careful examination of the points of coincidence in Echah Rabbah and Bereshith Rabbah, and Echah Rabbah and Vayikra Rabbah, has convinced me that the B. R. is earlier, and the V. R., later than Midrash Echah. Since this is also the view generally held, it is unnecessary to quote examples in support of it. But there is one instance which would point to a contrary conclusion with regard to R. R., but which, according to the view I take of the composition of the whole of the Midrash, admits of a very easy reconciliation.

E. R., Ch. I, sec. 41, מִמְרוֹם שְׁלֹחַ אֵשׁ בֹּי, and V. R. Ch. XXVI. Without going into details we see at once that E. R. is later than V. R. In the first place the Echah account is longer; and secondly, it is evidently an interpolation, perhaps in order to introduce the concluding words בִּלְעֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לִנְצוֹה, whereas the corresponding account in V. R. is excellently suited to the context, and is much shorter. This difficulty is, however, easily overcome when we bear in mind that this portion may be the work of the *second* author of E. R., and a part of the *original* Vayikra Rabbah.

Freely as I have ventured to disagree with some of the most eminent Midrash critics, I trust that I have always done so without violating the respect that is due to the careful study they have devoted to the subject. As I remarked at the onset, I have simply endeavoured to follow

in their footsteps, and<sup>1</sup>, "it is the strength, not the weakness of a systematic intellect, that it does not shrink from conclusions because they have an absurd look, when they are necessary corollaries from premises which the thinker, and probably most of those who criticise him, have not ceased to regard as true."

---

<sup>1</sup> "Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy", by J. S. Mill, p. 559.













