

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-46174-0 - The Midrashic Process: Tradition and Interpretation in Rabbinic Judaism

Irving Jacobs

Excerpt

[More information](#)

CHAPTER I

What is 'Midrash'?

In the context of a scholarly study, the question, what is *Midrash*, may appear to be trivial, if not irrelevant. For more than a century, *Midrash* has been the subject of intensive and extensive academic study and research. Its language and terminology have been analysed in detail. It has been exhaustively excavated as a mine of information relating to the religious beliefs and attitudes of the talmudic sages and to the political, social and economic conditions in which they lived. In more recent years, a new dimension has been added to the study of *Midrash*, through literary analysis. The phenomenon of *Midrash* has captured the attention of literary theorists, who have reinterpreted it in the light of the contemporary theory of intertextuality.¹ Consequently, this ancient corpus of specifically Jewish literature, which represents centuries of development as a living process in the ancient synagogues and school-houses of the Holy Land, retains its place in the forefront of modern scholarly interest.

Yet, despite this considerable and wide-ranging scholarly activity – or perhaps, in some measure, because of it – insufficient attention has been given hitherto, to one or two basic issues relating to the nature and the underlying rationale of the midrashic process. For example, what were the criteria upon which the selection of proemial and proof-texts was based? The early preachers frequently cite verses in support of their statements, or as the basis of a proem, with apparently scant regard

¹ For a résumé of the work currently being done in this field, see *Midrash and Literature*, ed. G. H. Hartman and S. Budick, Yale 1986.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-46174-0 - The Midrashic Process: Tradition and Interpretation in Rabbinic Judaism

Irving Jacobs

Excerpt

[More information](#)

for the plain meaning of their chosen text, or of the context from which it was taken. In many cases, no word of explanation is offered to justify the application of a particular verse from Job to Noah and the Generation of the Flood, or a specific quotation from the Psalms to Abraham or Moses. Have these midrashic expositions been transmitted defectively, omitting this crucial information which the compilers of midrashic texts, or subsequent generations of copyists, took for granted?

Although it is generally accepted that the material preserved in our extant midrashic works is derived from homilies and expositions which were actually delivered to live audiences in the ancient synagogues and study houses of the Holy Land, it is extremely unlikely that these have been preserved in an unedited form. This is particularly the case with the *petihot* or proems, which are a salient feature of the post-talmudic *midrashim*. In its simplest form, the proem consists of a 'distant' verse usually taken from the Hagiographa, which the preacher proceeds to relate to the *seder* verse, i.e. the opening verse of the weekly lection from the Torah according to the triennial cycle of the Holy Land. Frequently, the proems are very brief, containing little more than a germ of an idea, as will be seen from a number of *petihot* discussed subsequently. In such cases, we can safely assume that the living address on which the literary *petihah* is based, was originally more expansive. We cannot assume, however, that the congregants in the ancient synagogues were so familiar with the Hebrew Bible that they could recognise the source of a quotation instantly. Preachers probably prefaced their biblical quotations with stock phrases like *כך אמר איוב*, 'Thus Job said', or, in the case of Psalms and Proverbs, *אמרו בני קרח, אמר שלמה*, 'the Sons of Qorah said', 'Solomon said'.

While this kind of simple device may have proved sufficient for an audience to identify the source of a quotation, were these early congregants able to recognise the relevance of the preacher's quotation for his chosen theme? Did congregation and preacher share an awareness of certain exegetical traditions, linking aspects of pentateuchal narratives with specific sections of other biblical books, so that the mere mention of Job

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-46174-0 - The Midrashic Process: Tradition and Interpretation in Rabbinic Judaism

Irving Jacobs

Excerpt

[More information](#)*What is 'Midrash'?*

3

in the context of a homily on the Flood, would have been sufficient to indicate the relevance of the source for the theme? Before attempting to answer this kind of question at length, as we propose to do in the following two chapters, it is necessary in our view, to begin by re-examining briefly the basic issue of what is *Midrash* and how did the midrashic process operate?

In simple terms, *Midrash* is the oldest form of Bible interpretation. For more than twenty centuries, the Bible has challenged the imagination and ingenuity of its interpreters. *Midrash* represents the response of the earliest generations of Jewish scholars to this challenge.

Clearly, the challenge of interpreting the Bible was not perceived in identical terms throughout the last two thousand years. For the great masters of the middle ages, like Rashi and Ibn Ezra, who laid the foundations of modern Bible scholarship, Bible exegesis was the pursuit of *peshat*. They saw it as their task to establish the plain meaning of the biblical text, primarily through a process of defining precisely the grammatical functions and structures of its language. This does not imply that the scholars of the talmudic period, who were capable of producing tolerably literal Aramaic translations of biblical texts, and who developed mishnaic Hebrew as a superb medium for their halakhic, midrashic and liturgical compositions, were incapable of appreciating the plain meaning of the biblical text.² Nor were they unaware of the 'mechanics' of its language, even though they did not develop a comprehensive technical terminology to describe them. On the contrary, as we shall endeavour to prove, they acknowledged plain meaning – *as they perceived it* – to be the boundary within which the midrashic process was obliged to function.

² However, this is an issue which has provoked considerable scholarly discussion and debate. See, for example, J. Z. Lauterbach, *Peshat*, *JE* vol. 9, pp. 652f; L. I. Rabinowitz, *Peshat*, *EJ* vol. 13, pp. 329–31; M. H. Segal, *Parshanut Ha-Miqra, S'qirah al Toldoteha v'Hitpathuta*, repr. Jerusalem 1980, pp. 7–9; E. Z. Melamed, *Mephar'shei Ha-Miqra*, Jerusalem 1978, vol. 1, pp. 5–8; B. J. Gelles, *Peshat and Derash in the Exegesis of Rashi*, Leiden 1981, pp. 1–8; also the literature cited by R. J. Loewe in his study, 'The Plain Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis', in *Papers of the Institute of Jewish Studies*, vol. 1 (ed. J. G. Weiss), Jerusalem 1964, pp. 140ff; and most recently, D. Weiss-Halivni, *Peshat and Derash*, Oxford 1991.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-46174-0 - The Midrashic Process: Tradition and Interpretation in Rabbinic Judaism

Irving Jacobs

Excerpt

[More information](#)

However, the determining factor in early Jewish scriptural exegesis, was the rabbis' perception of the Bible itself. They saw it as the revealed word of God, not only in terms of its eternal validity, but also with regard to the uniqueness of its language, which transcended the ordinary medium of human communication. In the context of this 'Divine Language', the most common-place terms and expressions – even particles of speech indispensable to the functioning of Hebrew – were to be regarded as 'containers' of deeper meanings, which the interpreter was required to unlock.³ Consequently, the main challenge of the Bible, as perceived by the ancient Jewish exegetes, was to decode its messages, to reveal the inner significance of the text.

This might involve the most extrinsic forms of exegesis, which seem to transcend any concept of plain meaning, but were perceived by the rabbis as functioning within the permissible parameters of the text. This can best be illustrated by an unusual device developed by the early rabbinic exegetes, to which we will refer fairly frequently in the course of our subsequent discussions, climatic exegesis. This is based on the assumption that a scriptural expression, regardless of its usual connotation, or plain meaning, can absorb a new and quite unrelated meaning from the context or climate in which it occurs. A particularly good example of this device is preserved in *Leviticus Rabbah* 23:2 (p. 528) where, following on the assertion that God experienced the utmost difficulty in releasing Israel from Egypt because of their total assimilation, the *Amora*, R. Shemuel b. Nahmani declared:

³ The best-known example of this type of exegesis, particularly in the realm of *Halakhah*, is provided by the early *Tanna*, Nahum of Gimzo, who interpreted every **את** and **גם** in the *Torah* as a **ריבוי** (an amplification or extension of the scope of the text) and every **אך** and **רק** as a **מיעוט** (a limitation). This method was adopted and propagated by his pupil, the outstanding exegete of the Yabneh period, R. Aqiva (see *Genesis Rabbah* 1:14 and the parallels cited by Theodor in his edition, p. 12). As is well known, this extrinsic treatment of the language of Scripture was not without its opponents, notably R. Aqiva's colleague and chief antagonist in halakhic debate, R. Ishmael, who insisted that the language of the *Torah* functioned in the same way as human speech (**דברה תורה כלשון בני אדם**; see, for example, *Sifrei Numbers* 15:31, 112 (p. 121); also *Genesis Rabbah* 1:14).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-46174-0 - The Midrashic Process: Tradition and Interpretation in Rabbinic Judaism

Irving Jacobs

Excerpt

[More information](#)*What is 'Midrash'?*

5

'Had God not bound Himself by an oath, Israel would not have been redeemed from Egypt! [As is implied in the following verse], "Wherefore (לִכְן) Say unto the Children of Israel: 'I am the Lord and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians (Exodus 6:6).'" Now the expression לִכְן connotes an oath, as it is said, "And therefore (וְלִכְן) I have sworn unto the house of Eli ... (I Samuel 3:14)".'

There are, however, many examples of midrashic exegesis which illustrate both the early rabbinic exegetes' awareness of plain meaning and their hermeneutic approach to the biblical text. While a number of these will be cited subsequently, it may be useful at this juncture, to analyse a few examples taken from well-known contexts.

(a) In the narrative of the *Aqedah*, related in Genesis 22, a comparatively rare term is used for the knife which Abraham took to slaughter his son, **מַאֲכֵלֶת**. This expression occurs only four times in the Hebrew Bible, twice in Genesis 22 (verses 6 and 10) and again in Judges 19:29 and in Proverbs 30:14. The earliest midrashic commentary to the Book of Genesis, *Genesis Rabbah*,⁴ records two views on the significance of this term:

R. Hanina said: 'Why is [a knife] called **מַאֲכֵלֶת**? Because it renders food fit to be eaten.' The Rabbis said: 'Abraham's knife was so designated, because all the benefits which Israel enjoys in this world are on account of the merit of that knife.'

Despite the terseness of his comment, R. Hanina has presented his listeners with an effective definition of a rare term. Without recourse to grammatical terminology – which, in all probability, he did not possess – he has identified **מַאֲכֵלֶת** as a present participle of the *hiph'il* of **אָכַל**, 'to eat', with the meaning of 'causing to eat', or simply, 'feeding'. Thus **מַאֲכֵלֶת** is an implement which feeds, or allows food to be eaten, through the ritual act of slaughter. While modern grammarians might take issue with this,⁵ R. Hanina has none the less addressed himself to the plain meaning of this term and has

⁴ 56:3, p. 598.

⁵ As **מַאֲכֵלֶת** is usually taken as a feminine noun of the *maqal* form (compare **מַמְלֵכָה** and **מַלְאָכָה**).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-46174-0 - The Midrashic Process: Tradition and Interpretation in Rabbinic Judaism

Irving Jacobs

Excerpt

[More information](#)

offered a plausible explanation for designating a knife as **מאכלת**.

The anonymous rabbis cited in the same passage did not dispute R. Ḥanina's explanation; they too understood **מאכלת** to be an implement which feeds. However, they were looking beyond plain meaning to the inner implications of this term in its specific context. According to their view, Abraham's knife was called **מאכלת** to indicate its significance for the fate of all future generations of his descendents. Abraham's knife would 'feed' them in perpetuity with the benefits of his singularly meritorious deed.

(b) At the point when Abraham is about to slaughter Isaac, the angel intervenes, crying, 'Abraham, Abraham . . .' (verse 11). This repetition of the patriarch's name provoked the following two comments, recorded once again in *Genesis Rabbah*:⁶

R. Ḥiyya taught: '[This repetition implies] affection and urgency.'

R. Eliezer said: '[This was addressed to Abraham] himself and to future generations, implying that there would be no generation without [a man] of the calibre of Abraham.'

Both the early teachers cited here were reacting to the same phenomenon, the repetition of a word in a text where any apparently superfluous term, or even a single letter, was intended to convey a message. However, R. Ḥiyya recognised that, in this instance, the repetition was to be interpreted in the light of its context. It was an effective means of expressing urgency at the crucial moment in a tense and dramatic situation, while at the same time, indicating God's especial affection for Abraham, which his supreme act of love had inspired. R. Ḥiyya's explanation of the phenomenon, therefore, is clearly in line with the plain meaning of the text as he perceived it. R. Eliezer, on the other hand, has interpreted the phenomenon in keeping with the broader concept of the Bible as the revealed word of God, which was intended to convey a message of both specific and eternal relevance. Thus, God addresses Himself both to Abraham in the immediate context

⁶ 56:7, p. 602.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-46174-0 - The Midrashic Process: Tradition and Interpretation in Rabbinic Judaism

Irving Jacobs

Excerpt

[More information](#)*What is 'Midrash'?*

7

of the *Aqedah*, and to all future generations of his descendants, for whom that singular event would have eternal significance.

(c) *Exodus Rabbah*, the first part of which is an exegetical *midrash* like *Genesis Rabbah*, and may be of a similar age, records the following exposition of Moses' first encounter with the family of Jethro, narrated in 2:16–19:⁷

'Now the priest of Midian had seven daughters . . .' Does not God hate idolatry, yet He granted Moses refuge with an idolater?! However, our Rabbis have said that [originally] Jethro was a priest to idolatrous worship, but realising that it was without substance, he rejected it and considered repenting even before Moses' arrival. Consequently, he summoned his fellow-citizens and said to them, 'Until now I have served you, since I am now old, choose another priest!' Thereupon he arose, brought forth all the trappings of idolatry, and gave them everything. They arose and excommunicated him, so that nobody associated with him! They would not do any work for him, and they would not tend his sheep. He asked the shepherds to tend his sheep, but they refused, so that he was obliged to employ his own daughters. 'And they came and they drew water' – this indicates that they were coming [to the well] early, for fear of the shepherds!

'And the shepherds came and drove them away' – Is it possible that he was the priest of Midian, yet the shepherds were driving away his daughters?! This indicates that they had excommunicated him, and drove away his daughters like a divorced woman.

The passage appears to be purely an apologia, defending Moses' close association with an idolatrous priest, who would play an influential role in the life of the future leader and teacher of Israel. In reality, however, the anonymous aggadist was functioning within the parameters of plain meaning. He had focused his attention – and that of his listeners – on a serious problem presented by the text, for which no solution is offered in the biblical narrative. It had long been acknowledged by early Jewish exegetes that Jethro's title **כהן**, did not simply connote a religious functionary. He was a ruler or governor of the Midianites, a notion which was widely popularised in talmudic times and is no less acceptable today as a

⁷ See *Exodus Rabbah* 1:32.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-46174-0 - The Midrashic Process: Tradition and Interpretation in Rabbinic Judaism

Irving Jacobs

Excerpt

[More information](#)

plausible interpretation of Jethro's role.⁸ How was it possible, therefore, that his daughters were required to perform the menial task of tending his flocks and how could the shepherds have dared to assault their ruler's children? Our unknown exegete was clearly aware of this problem, for which he has endeavoured to provide a solution, by his reconstruction of the background to the biblical narrative.

(d) A seminal source for our discussion regarding the early rabbinic concept of plain meaning and its relationship to received traditions regarding the interpretation of a biblical passage, is *BT Shabbat* 63a. *Mishnah Shabbat* 6:4 records opposing views on the question of bearing arms on the Sabbath as an accessory to male attire. R. Eliezer (b. Hyrkanos) permitted the practice on the grounds that weapons may be regarded as an adornment. His colleagues, on the other hand, forbade it, declaring that weapons are intrinsically ignoble in function and purpose. Consequently, they are destined to be 'recycled' in the messianic age, as predicted by the prophecy of Isaiah (2:4): 'and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks'. In the ensuing discussion among the *Amora'im* on these opposing views, the question was raised:

On what did R. Eliezer base his view that weapons are to be regarded as an adornment for a man? On the verse, 'Gird your sword upon your thigh, O mighty one, your glory and your majesty (Psalm 45:4)'. R. Kahana said to Mar, the son of R. Huna: 'This [verse] was written with reference to the words of the *Torah*!' He retorted: 'A verse does not lose its plain meaning (אינן מקרא יוצא מידי פשוטו)'. R. Kahana said: 'When I was eighteen years old, I had already learned all the Six Orders [of the *Mishnah*], yet I did not know that a verse does not lose its plain meaning until now!'

The midrashic exegesis of Psalm 45 is the subject for special study in a later chapter.⁹ Consequently, at this point, it is sufficient to note that there is adequate evidence both in *BT*

⁸ On Jethro's role as a ruler and a judge in early sources, see R. Eleazar of Modi'in's interpretation of Exodus 18:1 in *Mekhilta d'Rabbi Ishmael, Yitro, Massekhta d'Amaleq* 1, p. 190, also *Targum Onqelos* to Exodus 18:1 and Josephus, *Antiquities* 1, vii, 2.

⁹ See pp. 95ff.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-46174-0 - The Midrashic Process: Tradition and Interpretation in Rabbinic Judaism

Irving Jacobs

Excerpt

[More information](#)*What is 'Midrash'?*

9

Shabbat – where this discussion is recorded – and in other rabbinic sources notably the Babylonian *Talmud*, to show that this psalm, with its description of the physical attributes and attire of a royal prince, was treated as an allegory alluding to the sages and their pursuit of *Torah* learning. Our main concern here is the precise implications of the maxim which Mar, the son of R. Huna, cites.

We have taken פשוטו – like its cognate expression פשט – in the usual sense of ‘plain meaning’, which was accepted already in the middle ages.¹⁰ However, this is not universally accepted by modern scholars. Loewe, for example, suggests that in talmudic sources, פשט connotes authoritative rather than plain meaning.¹¹ Weiss-Halivni, on the other hand, argues that the term connotes extension, continuation, hence context.¹² Is it possible, therefore, to determine with any degree of certainty, what this crucial expression actually means here?

We should perhaps begin by asking what was the point at issue between the two *Amora'im*? It is inconceivable that either R. Kahana or Mar, the son of R. Huna, was unfamiliar with the simple meaning of the Hebrew terms in Psalm 45:4, for reasons we have stated above. Moreover, judging by Mar, the son of R. Huna’s unquestioning acceptance of R. Kahana’s assertion that the psalm is to be treated as an allegorical description of the *Torah* and its sages, we can assume that he was equally aware of this exegetical tradition, which was in vogue in Babylon.

The point at issue between them, we would suggest, was the implications of the traditional interpretation of a biblical passage for its plain or simple meaning. R. Kahana had assumed that the only meaning which might be legitimately attached to a passage – or a verse – was that assigned to it by tradition. The traditional exposition totally displaced its plain meaning. Consequently, the term הַרְבּ in Psalm 45:4 no longer connoted a sword. It had been completely divested of its plain

¹⁰ See Weiss-Halivni, *Peshat and Derash*, pp. 79ff.

¹¹ ‘The Plain Meaning of Scripture’, p. 158.

¹² *Peshat and Derash*, pp. 53ff.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-46174-0 - The Midrashic Process: Tradition and Interpretation in Rabbinic Judaism

Irving Jacobs

Excerpt

[More information](#)

meaning and was purely an allegorical symbol for halakhic acumen, the cut and thrust of dialectical argument.

Mar, the son of R. Huna, on the other hand, insisted that plain meaning has an independent integrity and, therefore, cannot be obscured by traditional interpretation.¹³ Consequently, as the text speaks of a sword in the most positive terms, it provides adequate scriptural support for R. Eliezer's view that such a weapon may be regarded as an adornment and not simply as an ignoble instrument of destruction.

However, Weiss-Halivni seeks support for his contention that פשט connotes extension or context from the use of the cognate Aramaic phrase פשטיה דקרא, which occurs notably in the Babylonian *Talmud*.¹⁴ In a number of instances where this phrase is employed, the suggested 'plain meaning' of the text in question, would hardly be acceptable to the modern reader. For example, *BT Hullin* 6a records how R. Meir sent a disciple to purchase wine from the Cutheans (i.e. Samaritans). He encounters an old man who challenges him with Proverbs 23:2, 'and put a knife to thy throat, if thou be a man given to appetite'. The text continues:

To what does the *peshat* of the text relate? To a disciple sitting in the presence of his master. As R. Hiyya taught, 'When thou sittest to eat with a ruler, consider well him that sitteth before thee; and put a knife to thy throat if thou be בנל נפש (lit.: "a man given to appetite").' If a disciple knows that his master is able to give him a

¹³ See Rashi's comment on this maxim in *BT Yevamot* 24a: 'Even though we may expound a verse midrashically, it cannot totally lose its plain meaning.' This source is of special significance as it cites the one case in the whole of Scriptures where this maxim does not apply, Deuteronomy 25:6. Referring to the child of a levirate marriage the text states: 'And it shall be that the first-born that she beareth shall succeed in the name of his brother that is dead, that his name be not blotted out in Israel.' According to its simplest meaning, the verse implies that the child should be given the name of its father's deceased brother. However, on the basis of a word analogy (גזירה שוה) with Genesis 48:6, 'they shall be called after the name of their brethren (על שם אחיהם)', the operative term שם is taken as a reference to the property of the deceased. In connection with this, Rava declared that contrary to the general rule of אין מקרא יוצא מידי פשוטו, the word analogy here has totally divested the verse of its plain meaning, leaving no residual obligation to name the child after the deceased (see Rashi, *BT Yevamot* 24a; see also *BT Yevamot* 11b).

¹⁴ For a full review of all the relevant sources where this phrase occurs, see Weiss-Halivni, *Peshat and Derash*, pp. 63ff.