BURTON L. VISOTZKY

Golden Bells and Pomegranates

Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism
94

Mohr Siebeck

Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism

Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum

Edited by

Martin Hengel and Peter Schäfer

94

Burton L. Visotzky

Golden Bells and Pomegranates

Studies in Midrash Leviticus Rabbah

Mohr Siebeck

Burton L. Visotzky, born 1951; Prof. Visotzky holds the Nathan and Janet Appleman Chair in Midrash and Interreligious Studies at the Jewish Theological Seminary, New York.

978-3-16-158747-4 Unveränderte eBook-Ausgabe 2019
ISBN 3-16-147991-2
ISSN 0721-8753

Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at *http://dnb.ddb.de*.

The book was typeset by Martin Fischer in Tübingen using Times typeface, printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Heinr. Koch in Tübingen.

Printed in Germany.

Acknowledgements

The preacher was quite right, there is no end to the making of books. This monograph on Midrash Leviticus Rabbah has been long in the making and I owe gratitude to many scholars who have commented on the work in progress over the years. I have benefited by being able to present my work on Leviticus Rabbah to my colleagues in a variety of academic fora over the years and I here express my thanks to the following: JTSA colleagues (2000, Faculty Lunch and Learn), Hebrew University (1999, Dinur Center and Ettinger Forum), SBL International (1998, Krakow), Ecole Biblique and Sorbonne (1998, Jerusalem Colloquy on Jewish-Christianity), SBL Annual Meeting (1982)

Thanks also to those who have read and commented on various chapters of the work in a variety of forms: Profs. Shaye J. D. Cohen, Sebastian Brock, Richard Sarason, Seth Schwartz, Gwynn Kessler (each of whom read selected chapters in earlier drafts), Lieve Teugels (who was kind enough to read through the entire manuscript and make dozens of suggestions, particularly bibliographic); Stephen Hazan Arnoff, Rabbis Jill Hammer and Pat Fenton; and to yet other colleagues who critiqued an earlier version of the manuscript. Special thanks to my research assistants over the years: Susan Lazev, Danielle Upbin, Rachel Kranson, and Tzipora Sofare.

Finally, my appreciation to Profs. Martin Hengel and Peter Schaefer, with whom I am delighted to be working again. I also acknowledge my debt to the remarkable staff at Mohr/Siebeck, under the direction of Jewish Studies editor Dr. Henning Ziebritzki. My final and best thanks, as always, to my wife Sandy. These last seven years have been as but a few days, such is my love for her.

New York, October, 2002 Burton L. Visotzky

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

Leviticus, the central book of the Torah, sets out the rules for the priesthood, while the final book, Deuteronomy, attests to the centrality of the levitic priesthood and its pride of place in Jerusalem, "the place where the Lord God chose to establish His name." Yet disaffection with the sacrificial cult of the Jerusalem Temple had begun even before its destruction by Roman troops in the year 70 CE. This difficult phenomenon is a necessary backdrop to this study. The beginnings of the synagogue and its attendant study and worship,[1] the break-away communities at places such as Qumran,[2] and the nascent Christian community,[3] all point to an unease, if not a complete rupture with the Jerusalem cult. This disaffection constituted an enormous problem in the history of the religious development of the Jews. The sacrificial system of the central book of the Torah had, by the middle of the first century of the common era, ceased to exercise the dominant hold it had on the people Israel during much of its existence. The destruction of the Temple was the beginning of a journey toward the solution to this problem.

In the century or two following the destruction of the Temple, perhaps especially following the debacle of the Bar Kokhba revolt, a certain kind of nostalgia for the Temple cult held sway. Even as Judaism reconstituted itself as a new form of religion, one which functioned independent of animal

---

[1] Among many other studies, see, most recently, Lee I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 2000).

[2] Which seems to have housed varying ideological communities during its years of existence, all apparently sharing the common denominator of rejection of the Jerusalem cultus. See Geza Vermes, *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1998); T. H. Lim, et al, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999); and the article by John Kamper in edd. R. Kugler and E. Schuller, *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999) 185–97; et passim.

[3] Anti-Temple feeling can be traced in the Gospel of John 2:13–22, see the commentary of Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John* The Anchor Bible, vol. 29 (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1966), vol. 1, p. 122; and the bibliography cited by Brown, ibid., p. 125; especially Oscar Cullman, "L'opposition contre le Temple de Jerusalem," *NTS* 5 (1958–59) 157–73; and Robert L. Wilken, *The Land Called Holy* (New Haven: Yale, 1992), 50, et passim; as well as in the Epistle to the Hebrews 8–10, with the commentary of George W. Buchanan, *To the Hebrews* The Anchor Bible, vol 36 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1972), ad loc.; and as a final example, The Epistle of Barnabas, Ch. 16.

sacrifice, one which offered atonement without the blood of animals or resorting to an hereditary priesthood – even so, much of the revolution in Jewish religion was carefully couched in the language of the moribund Temple and its procedures.[4] Throughout the earliest layers of rabbinic literature – the library we refer to today as Tannaitic literature[5] – the language of the levitic cult was carefully preserved, as was its basic agenda. One is left with the impression, which though unsaid is nevertheless overwhelming, that the rabbis who authored these texts became, as it were, the new priesthood. The rabbis co-opted the timeframes of the Temple[6], the tithes of the priesthood, the system of purities of the cult, etc.[7] The message of the early literature, and particularly the Tannaitic rabbinic work on Leviticus – Sifra DeBei Rav or Torat Kohanim – seems to be that the rabbis are now the guardians and interpreters of the Temple cult.

Reflexes of this piety remain in later rabbinic literature. Yet, by the time of the redaction of Palestinian Amoraic works (between the mid-fourth and end of the fifth century, ca. 363–500 CE) a sharp change in the attitude of the rabbis is noticeable. The rabbis seem less concerned with the details of the long gone cult than they are with the minutiae of their own curriculum. Torah and its study – and this means rabbinic oral Torah – replaces the earlier focus on the Temple and its cult. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the Amoraic collection devoted to Leviticus, the midrash called Leviticus Rabbah (LR).

---

[4] I echo the acute observations of Jacob Neusner on perceptions of Jewish religious thinking about the Second Temple throughout rabbinic literature. For some of his works on this subject see the bibliographies in his *Introduction to Rabbinic Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1994). Other strong influences on my thinking on this subject are the works of Shaye J. D. Cohen, e.g., *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987) and the teacher of both of these scholars, the late Morton Smith, see "Palestinian Judaism in the First Century," now in *Studies in the Cult of Yahweh* vol. 1, ed. S.J.D.Cohen (Leiden: Brill, 1996) along with Smith's other essays on ancient Judaism collected there. I am still also under the sway of the incisive thinking of Gerson D. Cohen on these topics. See his *Studies in the Variety of Rabbinic Cultures* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1991).

[5] Mishnah, Tosefta, the so-called Halachic Midrashim on the Torah and the various Baraitot scattered through the Palestinian Talmud (and those baraitot in the Babylonian Talmud, too, though I admit them to this loose canon with less enthusiasm). I date the content of the Tannaitic midrashim as contemporary with Mishnah, perhaps even slightly before it, ca. 170–220; although I assume the final redactive dates of the documents to be post-Mishnaic. For general information and bibliography, see H. L. Strack, G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (English translation by Markus Bockmuehl, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992).

[6] From the very outset of the Mishnah, see, e.g., mBer. 1:1.

[7] Neusner's many books on the orders of Mishnah/Tosefta dealing with purities are most instructive in this regard. See n. 4 for a key to his massive bibliography.

It is tempting to offer conjecture as to why this shift occurred. I surmise that the rabbis had more or less grown used to their own system of power and culture at the same time that they accepted the likelihood (and perhaps welcomed the realization) that the Temple would not be rebuilt. By this time, Christianity had become firmly established in Palestine.[8] The Emperor Constantine's mother, Queen Helena, had made her pilgrimage tour and endowed the building of churches seemingly almost everywhere. The Jews of Palestine could not miss the boom in construction nor the churches that stood as mute testament to the Christianity's arrival as a power to contend with.

The debacle of the Emperor Julian and his proposal to rebuild the Jewish Temple as a response to all this Christian building must have also had its effect. After 363 CE, there were few pretensions that the Temple would be rebuilt in this lifetime. The constant pilgrim traffic, the various Church councils, the rise of Christian militancy[9] – all of these gave birth to an image of Esau more foreboding than anything the rabbis had even yet dared to imagine.[10] The rabbis turned toward their oral Torah and away from any pretensions toward a revival of the Temple cult and all it entailed. They no longer had a vision of a Jewish Temple cult administered by a dynastic

---

[8] Robert Wilken, *The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought*; Guenter Stemberger, *Jews and Christians in the Holy Land: Palestine in the Fourth Century* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000).

[9] I offer a partial bibliography less as an attempt to thoroughly outline the complex of issues raised here than as a window into what has shaped my thinking about this transitional period in Roman/Christian/Jewish history. Samuel Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire* (Cleveland: Meridian, reprint 1958, orig. 1898); J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire* 2 vols., (New York: Dover, 1958); M. L. W. Laistner, *Christianity and Pagan Culture in the Later Roman Empire* (Ithaca: Cornell, 1951); almost anything Ramsay MacMullen has written, especially, *Christianizing the Roman Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984) and *Corruption and the Decline of Rome* (New Haven: Yale, 1988) and now, *Christianity and Paganism in the Fourth to Eighth Centuries* (New Yaven: Yale Univ. Press, 1997); the same is true for the works of Peter Brown, two titles may suffice: *The Making of Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978) and *Augustine of Hippo* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967). Augustine, though technically Western, not only remained in contact with the fathers of the Holy Land, but was a seminal figure in the rise of Church militancy. As well as Brown, see Henry Chadwick, *Augustine* (Oxford, OUP, 1986). Chadwick's work still defines the twentieth century's perceptions of the period. See, too, Robin Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986) and Averil Cameron, *The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity* (London: Routledge, 1993) and *The Later Roman Empire* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993). A final work that is instructive on the immensity of the Roman apparatus which the Jews faced is Amnon Linder, *The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987).

[10] See Gerson D. Cohen, "Esau as Symbol in Early Medieval Thought," in *Studies in the Variety of Rabbinic Cultures*, pp. 243–269.

priesthood except as a distant messianic vision. For the near term, accommodation with Rome, even the hated Christian Rome, caused them to refocus their gaze away from the Temple's sacrificial cult and toward the sanctuary of Torah, its teachers, and the synagogues and academies where they held forth.[11]

I offer this historic scenario as a conjecture to explain why the stark shift in rabbinic literature about Leviticus occurred. But the purpose of this study is to explore and map the shift in the literature with a thorough examination of LR. The radical nature of the rabbis' departure from devotion to the Temple cult is most apparent in LR. Ostensibly a midrash on Leviticus – Torat Cohanim, it is much more a book about rabbinic practice and ideology. Virtually ignoring the details of Leviticus, LR focuses on *aggadah* over *halachah*, and on rabbanism over the workings of the priesthood. No longer content to co-opt the language of the Temple and the cult, LR works toward the replacement of the old system with the now firmly established Rabbinic Judaism.

In order to show that LR ignores the sacrificial systems of Leviticus as it replaces them with Torah and its study, it is necessary to thoroughly outline the content of LR. Further, novel elements of style, structure and redaction place LR at a turning point in rabbinic literature. Some of these features of LR have been debated for a century and more.[12] Others have yet to be observed or offered as part of the scholarly agenda. This monograph undertakes to survey and synthesize the broad areas necessary to understand LR, while at the same time offering detailed studies of both structure and content.

The first part of this monograph will undertake to explore the structural issues, or form over content. One of the conclusions we will reach is that the form – a miscellany – in some measure determines the broad variety of content in LR. Even where topics are collected under a common rubric, they may well be mutually contradictory, or at the least appear to be a somewhat motley collection. Hence we begin the next chapter with the oft discussed problem of just how to consider LR – is it a collection of synagogue

[11] Again, Neusner's influence should be apparent. He has outlined the plan and program of both Genesis and Leviticus Rabbah as responses to Christianity, see *Comparative Midrash* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) among others. I am far less convinced that the individual works, particularly LR, are written in direct response to Christian argument. See below on LR's sporadic responses to Christianity.

[12] Starting, of course, with Leopold Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vortraege der Juden, historisch entwickelt* (Berlin: A. Asher, 1832), passim. Among other early works see David Kunstlinger, *Die Petichot des Midrasch Rabba zu Leviticus* (Krakau: Verlag des Verfassers, 1913). The overwhelming majority of interest has been in the last four decades, for which, v. infra.

homilies or an edited rabbinic anthology? We survey the apparent themes of each of the thirty-seven chapters of the book. These themes are compared and contrasted with the listings of other scholars in an attempt to find consensus. Norman Cohen's work on thematic unity and Jacob Neusner's theories of LR are taken up here.[13] In addition to considering the "thematic unity" of the chapters, we also take up the question of whether these chapters each have clearly definable "messianic perorations." Finally, we will first advance our suggestion of "text clusters" as a means of understanding the thirty-seven chapter groupings in LR.[14]

We turn in chapter three to the most prominent structural feature of each of the thirty-seven chapters of LR, its division into *petihah*[15] and *gufah* segments. Various theories are discussed in the context of LR's relationship to its contemporary midrashim, in particular, Pesikta deRav Kahana (PdRK). It will not be giving away the ending to state here that I am of the opinion that LR takes materials from Pesikta. This, of course, implies that PdRK precedes LR at least somewhat in time and redaction date. Nevertheless, I believe that the *petihah* and *gufah* terms (particularly the latter which is unique to LR) have a distinct usage in LR, subtly different than the *petihah* does in other midrashim which employ it. This distinction is due in part to the influence of hellenistic historiography on the forms and redaction of LR.

Since the *petihah*s of LR often recast earlier, traditional aggadic materials, the structural section of this monograph continues with a chapter on LR's relationship to earlier midrashim, particularly Sifra, Pesikta de Rav Kahanah, Genesis Rabbah and the Talmud Yerushalmi.[16] Later texts that quote LR are also briefly surveyed. This allows us to offer a possible

---

[13] N. Cohen, "Leviticus Rabbah, Parashah 3," *JQR* 72 (1982) 18–31 and, idem., "Structure and Editing in the Homiletic Midrashim," *AJSReview* 6 (1981) 1–20. Neusner's theories are expressed in *The Integrity of Leviticus Rabbah* Brown Judaic Studies 93 (Chico: Scholars Press, 1985), *Comparative Midrash: The Plan and Program of Genesis and Leviticus Rabbah* Brown Judaic Studies 111 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) and *Judaism and Scripture: The Evidence of Leviticus Rabbah* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986). The summary of his voluminous midrashic labors may be found in his *Introduction to Rabbinic Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1994), where there is a thorough, if partial, bibliography.

[14] This final point is based on my "Aggadic Exegesis: Some Redactional Principles of Leviticus Rabbah." [Hebrew] in edd. Elbaum, Hasan-Rokem, Levinson, *New Directions in the Study of Midrash and Aggada: The Jonah Fraenkel Volume* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, forthcoming).

[15] The term is commonly used for a given form of midrashic text, see chapter 3 below for complete bibliography. It should be noted that the term does not appear in LR in either Hebrew, or Aramaic (*petihta*), although the introduction to the form, *Rabbi ploni patah*, is ubiquitous.

[16] Cf. Ofra Meir, "The redaction of Genesis and Leviticus Rabbah," [Hebrew] *Te'udah* 11 (1996), 61–90.

redaction date, further buttressed by a survey of the most frequently cited rabbis, generally Palestinians living in the third through fifth generations of Amoraim, viz. ca. 300–360 CE. All of these data point to a likely date of redaction for LR between the mid-fourth to the end of the fifth century.[17]

Having looked at LR's treatment of traditional rabbinic material, in chapter five we discuss the role of Aramaic as a folklore and dialogue marker. The relationship of Aramaic to Hebrew in the varying sections of the work will also be examined. In this treatment of folklore, it is important to blur the distinction between high and low culture. One might be inclined to treat the traditional rabbinica as high and the folk literature as low. However, both flourished together in the atmosphere of the *Bet midrash* and the *Bet Knesset*. A brief review of the folklore studies on LR rounds out this chapter.

In the chapter on the *petihtah*, LR was considered under the influence of hellenistic literary genres. In order to demonstrate this hellenistic influence, I survey LR for its signs. I begin by noting the pervasive Greek vocabulary in the work. Chapter six then turns to Greek heuristic models for LR, considering Hirschman's theory of the encyclopedia model (which he proposed for Ecclesiastes Rabbah), as well as models of the hellenistic history. It also undertakes a comparison of parallel motifs shared between LR and a Greek work of Symposium literature, Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*. I conclude by returning to the phenomenon of text clusters in Rabbinic literature. This type of clustering was first pointed out by Avigdor Shinan in his work on Targum. The phenomenon of clustering, combined with the hellenistic backdrop to LR's redaction, points to the hellenistic Miscellany as an heuristic model for LR.[18]

The second part of the monograph is devoted to the various themes of LR. We begin with a survey of LR's attitude towards the priesthood. Although one would expect an ostensible commentary on Leviticus to dwell at length and with much praise upon the priesthood, LR actually treats it quite differently. There are a limited number of texts bearing directly on the priesthood and these are of a decidedly mixed nature. There are texts which offer praise to the priesthood and offer it as a model for the rabbinate. Yet, there are also texts which are acutely critical of the priesthood. In between these extremes

[17] See Mordecai Margulies, *Midrash Wayyikra Rabbah* 2nd printing (Jerusalem: Wahrmann Books, 1972). This is the edition of LR, without which no critical work could be accomplished. Margulies' introduction (Part Five of his edition) remains the best overall guide to LR, even if one may – as I do – quibble with details or strike out into new areas. The research in this book is based entirely upon the LR text presented by Margulies. Exceptions to this text edition (e.g. from MS. Munich) are always noted.

[18] Some of these structural sections were initially surveyed in my "Aggadic Exegesis: Some Redactional Principles of Leviticus Rabbah," op. cit.

are texts that point to the replacability of the priesthood and to the tensions that exist between Moses as rabbinic model (*Moshe rabbenu*) and the priests. This variety of opinions is in keeping with two observations: the first is the miscellaneous/encyclopedic nature of LR itself. The second is the fact that LR collects traditional materials; hence there is an aggregate of opinions. Some of these are more inclined to praise the priesthood. Others are at a far distance from an actual working priesthood, and hence, more at ease with criticizing it.

This ambiguity in the treatment of the priesthood and its limitation to a small cluster of verses points to another noticable phenomenon in LR. The midrash actually treats a relatively small proportion of the biblical book. When compared with the overwhelming number of citations of verses from Genesis in Genesis Rabbah, or the frequency of citation of Leviticus verses in Sifra, the paucity of citation of Leviticus verses in LR stands in stark contrast. It is almost as though LR uses the verses of Leviticus as the pretext for its own agenda, rather than as the central focus of its exegesis. In other words, LR is more concerned with gathering aspects of the rabbinic agenda than it is with exposition of the levitic program.

To some extent this diversion away from the centrality of Leviticus may be seen in LR's treatment of the sacrificial cult. Here it must be noted that the lack of a Temple altar profoundly colors LR's attitude. Inability to offer sacrifice forces the rabbis to find a substitute harmatology and concomitant system of atonement. It should come as no surprise that LR offers the joint rabbinic activities of prayer and study as replacement for Temple offerings.

In chapter eight, the focus then shifts to the rabbanization of Leviticus. Torah study in all of its manifestations is celebrated in LR. Various aspects of this celebration are considered. There is also a discussion of the exegetical terminology which defines the rabbinic approach to the Bible, as it is used in LR.

Following these chapters considering the rabbanization of Leviticus, we turn to the rabbinic ideologies reflected in the work. We begin on earth, with the mundane. Rabbinic anthropology is surveyed, particularly focusing on LR 4, which considers the soul and the relationship between body and soul.[19] Of course, rabbinic anthropology emphasizes the *anthropos*, male.

[19] This is based in part on a previously published study, "The Priest's Daughter and the Thief in the Garden: The Soul of Midrash Leviticus Rabbah," in edd. Wiles, Brown, et al., *Putting Body and Soul Together: Essays in Honor of Robin Scroggs* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1997), 165–171. The chapter has benefitted as well from exposure to colleagues at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in Nov., 1999, where I lectured to the Dinur Institute and Ettinger Association. The dialogue on that occasion bore much of the fruit harvested here.

In chapter ten of the monograph there will be a consideration of the ways in which LR treats women as a not unrelated, but separate category. Here, too, the anthological and encyclopedic character of the work will be underscored by the broad range in attitudes expressed toward women. Finally, we observe the powerful sympathy the rabbis express for the human condition, notably the condition of poverty (LR chaps 3, 34). The rhetoric of absolute moral commitment of the rabbis to assist those in need is contrasted with rabbinic censure of those who ignore the poor.

From earth, we move to the heavenly realms, exploring the theology and angelology of LR in chapter twelve of this study. This includes certain LR texts related to eschatology. The end of days cannot be considered without a view of non-Jews and how they shall fare. We survey LR's attitudes towards Christianity,[20] Jewish-Christianity,[21] and paganism. Chapter thirteen is rounded out by an overview of how LR treats Rome, whether as a pagan or as a christian empire. With this survey of the "other" in LR, we complete our content appraisal of LR and its particular rabbinic *Weltanschauung*. As will be clear from the content materials surveyed, the ambiguities and contradictions of the collected texts point further to the encyclopedic nature of LR as a rabbinic miscellany.

The monograph ends with a brief final chapter of summary and conclusions on the "book" we know as LR. Margulies' own introduction to LR ran forty pages, and remains very valuable. Hanoch Albeck wrote an eighteen page article on LR[22] and Joseph Heinemann wrote a profile of LR in the early 1970's.[23] In the mid-eighties, Jacob Neusner turned his attention to LR in a number of volumes.[24] There have been many studies on individual aspects and texts of LR in the last half century.[25] This is the first monograph

[20] Based in part on my earlier study, "Anti-Christian Polemic in Leviticus Rabbah," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 56 (1990), 83–100, reprinted in my, *Fathers of the World: Essays in Rabbinic and Patristic Literatures* W.U.N.T. 80 (Tuebingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1995), 93–105.

[21] Based in part on my study, "Jewish-Christianity in Rabbinic Documents: An Examination of Leviticus Rabbah" *Le Judeo-Christianisme dans tous ses Etats: Actes du Colloque de Jerusalem, 6–10 Juillet, 1998* edd. Simon Mimouni and F. S. Jones (Paris: Editions Cerf, 2001) 335–349.

[22] "*Midrash Vayikra Rabbah*" [Hebrew] in edd. Lieberman, et al., *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume* (New York, 1946).

[23] "The art of composition in Midrash Leviticus Rabbah," [Hebrew] *HaSifrut* 2 (1971) 808–834, epitomized in English as "Profile of a Midrash," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 39 (1971) 141–150; also, "Leviticus Rabbah," *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (1972) vol. 11:147–150.

[24] See n. 13, supra.

[25] Bibliography will be provided infra, passim.

length study of LR in the last fifteen years. It is a different approach from previous work, and covers much new ground.

This work is intended to stimulate further discussion of the redactional-structural aspects of LR and its content areas. It is also hoped that having laid the groundwork through an examination of the literature, this book will spur historians to renewed examination of this exciting and seminal period of rabbinic and Jewish history. Any century that gives birth to a new library, perhaps even a new canon of Jewish literature, must be a time that continues to capture our academic interest even as it offers us the wisdom of its Torah.

Chapter 2

Structure: The Problem of Thematic Unity

Just what type of a book is LR? Earlier rabbinic works, with the notable exception of the Mishnah,[1] are commentaries of one sort or another. The Tosefta and the Talmud Yerushalmi serve as commentaries on the Mishnah, while the Tannaitic Midrashim and Genesis Rabbah comment on the books of the Torah.[2] The Pesikta dRav Kahana, which I date marginally earlier than LR, bears similarities with the earlier commentaries[3] and yet also shows some of the editorial originality of LR.[4] This first section of the monograph ponders LR's singular structure: its novel contribution to rabbinic literature, its place within rabbinic literature, its relationship to hellenistic literary genres and the effect of all of this upon the varied contents of LR.

It is a commonplace that rabbinic aggadic midrashim may be divided into exegetical and homiletical works.[5] This presumes, at least initially, that the latter category preserves aggadot that had their origins in the *Sitz im Leben* of the Palestinian synagogue. But in the last decades, midrash scholars have

---

[1] Jacob Neusner has focussed on the similarities between LR and Mishnah, particularly in his *Judaism and Scripture: The Evidence of Leviticus Rabbah* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986). This comparison also informs his *The Integrity of Leviticus Rabbah* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1985) and his *Comparative Midrash: The Plan and Program of Genesis and Leviticus Rabbah* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1986). It will be clear that I am continually in dialogue with these three works throughout this half of the monograph. See below for more detail on LR and the Mishnah. Cf. David Halivni, *Midrash, Mishnah, and Gemara* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1986).

[2] See below at chapter four for more on the relationship of these works to LR.

[3] In that it is ostensibly structured as "commentary" on the lectionary cycle.

[4] In its tendency to collect materials in clusters, its use of proems to set off chapters, and the like. See chapter three below for more on the close relationship of LR and PdRK.

[5] Beginning with, inter alia, Y. L. Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstliche Vortraege des Judens historisch entwickelt* (Berlin: A. Asher, 1832); J. Theodor in *MGWJ* (1879–81); and recently, even in popular Judaica, e.g. Barry Holtz, "Midrash," in *Back to the Sources* (New York: Summit, 1984). This artificial division is found with equal prevalence among Israeli scholars, see, e.g. Jonah Fraenkel, *Darkhei HaAggadah VehaMidrash* (Givataaim: Yad LaTalmud, 1991) and more recently in *Midrash VeAggadah* (Tel Aviv: HaUniversitah Hapetukha, 1996). But some softening of the division has been made in recognition of cross-over, e.g., Ofra Meir, *Hasippur HaDarshani Beverishit Rabbah* (Hakibbutz Hameukhad, 1987) – where Meir attributed homiletics to Genesis Rabbah, which is usually classified as exegetic.

Index of Biblical and Rabbinic Sources

These entries are primarily found in the footnotes.

Bible

Rabbinic Sources

Babylonian Talmud

Ecclesiastes Rabbah (Qohellet R.)

Lamentations Rabbah

Tanhuma

Tanhuma Buber

Targum

Pirke Rabbi Eliezer

Midrash Mishle

Index of Other Ancient Sources

These entries are primarily found in the footnotes.

Index of Subjects

These entries are primarily found in the body of the text.

Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism

Alphabetical Index

For a complete catalogue please write to the publisher
Mohr Siebeck • P.O. Box 2030 • D-72010 Tübingen/Germany
Up-to-date information on the internet at www.mohr.de