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The narrative of קין and והבל is perhaps one of the most puzzling stories in all of Tanach. A number of questions can be raised regarding this passage and קין’s character as depicted therein:

The Torah never explicitly states that קין was a רשע nor that he was the type of person who would brutally murder his brother; one can thus ask, if there is seemingly no mention of קין’s negative qualities, why was his קרבן not accepted by הר in the first place?

Furthermore, after הר rebuked קין regarding his attitude about his rejected קרבן, why did קין neglect to do תשובה? What led to קין’s jealousy and hatred for his brother, והבל, which ultimately caused the first murder in human history?

Additionally, after the murder, why did קין answer הר with the famous words, והשמר אחי אנכי? What is the meaning of this response?

Moreover, when קין said מגדע עוני מנשא was this a sincere declaration and commitment to do תשובה? Or was this comment perhaps a sarcastic and cynical reaction to the punishment הר had just given him?

In this essay, we will examine the interpretations of ירל, קרד, רמב and רשבמי. We will see that they all attempt to provide answers to these perplexing questions, and through their
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different interpretations of the text, several different understandings of this story and דرأس's true nature emerge. In addition to serving as a case study of the methodologies of different分析师, these understandings will help us answer the looming questions enumerated above.

Let us begin with ר"ש. In his commentary, he provides crucial background details that help clarify many ambiguities in the text. For instance, we know that כל המבול was a shepherd and כל man a farmer. ר"ש tells us that the reason כל separated himself from working the land and turned to sheep instead, was because the land had been cursed as a result of אדם's sin. As the תורה clearly expresses, the land was cursed because of him. However, דرأس did not do as his brother did and separate himself from working the land.

In the following the verse explains that כל gave a קרבן to ה. ר"ש explains that the קרבן was from the worst of כל's produce. ר"ש's understanding of the פסוק can be explained by the fact that the next פסוק describes קרבן קרבן of כל's produce. Conversely, כל's קרבן lacks description, thereby portraying the sacrifice's triviality.) Likewise, כל's קרבן contained a personality, aspects of himself that he was donating to ה. When describing כל's sacrifice, the פסוק says, emphasizing that it was his flock, whereas when describing דرأس's, there is no such description.
It thus seems that from the very beginning, יֵשָׂר depicts קֹנֶן as a negative persona – a man with no redeeming qualities. As the story unfolds, this characterization continues. קֹנֶן reacted very strongly to the rejection of his קָרְבָּן. He was jealous of his brother’s worthy קָרְבָּן, when, in reality, he had no right to be. He responded to קֹנֶן’s irrational anger by asking him 'ו:בראשית ד:ז why did you anger me and fall into sin;' then told קֹנֶן that if he changed his attitude he would be forgiven; however, if he failed to do so, he would continue to sin, and he would not have the power to rule over his temptations. As it says 'ו:בראשית ד:כ if you do well, you will be lifted up, and if you do not, sin will crouch upon you.' יֵשָׂר comments that 'ו:בראשית ד:כ:הלא אם תטיב' was telling קֹנֶן that if he would improve his actions and do תְבִין, he would be forgiven, yet האל oficially קוראدول פ хотел him to do רָאוּפ. יֵשָׂר explains that this phrase refers to the יִמְשָׁל הַרָע which constantly desired and longed to occupy קֹנֶן’s being and cause him to sin; however, יֵשָׂר clarifies that had קֹנֶן wished to exercise his free will, he would have had the ability to overcome his יִמְשָׁל הַרָע.

From יֵשָׂר’s understanding of these פָסּוקי, the reader is given a clearer picture of his view on קֹנֶן’s character. יֵשָׂר views קֹנֶן as a person with a strong יִמְשָׁל הַרָע, driven by impulse and desire. He did not strive for excellence in serving 'ו, yet 'ו gave him an opportunity to doו:בראשית ד:כ. Even so, in the next פסוק, it appears that קֹנֶן did not take 'ו's message to heart; he murdered his brother הבָּל. What caused קֹנֶן to completely disregard 'ו's warning and kill his
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brother? "explains that the enigmatic word in the verse refers to a quarrel between and , which gave and a pretext to kill . adds that this is the simple reading of the verse, but there are also many . He does not, however, indicate which he is referring to.

In , there are many interpretations of the events that triggered ’s murder of . One interpretation says that and were having a conversation about dividing the world between them. The narrates the conversation: said “one of us will assume the position of ruling over the land and one of us will rule over the chattel,” to which replied, “you are standing on my land,” and then responded, “what you are wearing is mine!” This caused to get up and kill his brother. Conversely, in the name of says that they were fighting about where the would be built. Since they could not agree about whose land the would be built in, got angry and killed . A third opinion suggests that and were fighting about their sister that was born together with . The argument proceeded as such: “give her to me, because I am the older one,” to which responded, “she was born with me, so she belongs to me!” This angered .

בראשית רבה: - "אמר קין אלabella "इ"רש מספר של מקרא, the simple reading of the verse, but there are also many . He does not, however, indicate which he is referring to.

In , there are many interpretations of the events that triggered ’s murder of . One interpretation says that and were having a conversation about dividing the world between them. The narrates the conversation: said “one of us will assume the position of ruling over the land and one of us will rule over the chattel,” to which replied, “you are standing on my land,” and then responded, “what you are wearing is mine!” This caused to get up and kill his brother. Conversely, in the name of says that they were fighting about where the would be built. Since they could not agree about whose land the would be built in, got angry and killed . A third opinion suggests that and were fighting about their sister that was born together with . The argument proceeded as such: “give her to me, because I am the older one,” to which responded, “she was born with me, so she belongs to me!” This angered .
and caused him to kill Ḥab. According to רבי יוחנן, when קין and Ḥab were fighting, Ḥab was overpowering קין, and קין said to Ḥab, “what will you tell our father if you kill me?” Then had mercy on קין and let him go. רבי יוחנן took this opportunity and overpowered Ḥab, consequently killing him. The common denominator of all of these ideas is that the quarrel was motivated by mutual jealousy and rivalry, of which Ḥab was also guilty. קין, though, acted on his emotions and killed Ḥab.

After this episode transpired, ר' asked קין a rhetorical question: איזו בל אחיך? י"רש explains that ר' initiated a conversation with him, in the hope that this would trigger קין’s repentance; however, קין disappointed ר' and answered, The common denominator of all of these ideas is that the quarrel was motivated by mutual jealousy and rivalry, of which Ḥab was also guilty. קין, though, acted on his emotions and killed Ḥab.

Consequently, ר' punished who responded, קין indirectly told ר' "You are the ruler over the higher and lower realms, can You really not tolerate my sin?" From י"רש’s interpretation of these פסוקים, clearly, קין remained unrepentant to the end.

רש"י’s פירוש on these פסוקים is very interesting, and typical of his approach of clarifying the פסוקים, and using מדרש as a tool to solve textual problems. For example, he uses the מדרש in
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to explain that קין’s קרבן was from the worst of his crops. Additionally, רש"י quotes מדרש תנחומא,27 which elucidates that he brought flax seed as his קרבן. These מדרשים help us understand why ‘ה accepted קרבן, but not קין’s קרבן. Without the usage of these מדרשים, one would not understand why קין’s קרבן, which was from the “fruit of the ground,” was not accepted by ‘ה.

Yet, in explaining ויאמר קין אל הבל אחיו 28 רש"י alludes to the מדרשים but does not quote them. Apparently, he felt that his explanation of the simple meaning of the text was sufficient, and he did not need the מדרשים to aid him. Perhaps, רש"י did not quote the מדרשים not only because it wasn’t necessary on a purely textual level, but also because it was not needed even on a deeper, philosophical level. In this case, according to רש"י, the מדרש isn’t needed since the details of what led up to the climax of the murder are trivial. The most important detail of the story is that קין did not do תשובה, did not listen to ‘ה, and his יצר הרע overpowered him, triggering his murder of הבל.

רד"ק’s approach to this topic is fundamentally similar to רש"י’s but differs on some nuances. He holds that קין and הבל learned from אדם that bringing קרבנות was a symbol of gratitude to thank ‘ה for the blessings He had bestowed.29 Like רש"י, he explains that קין’s קרבן was of poor quality, or – based on the מדרש תנחומא – that his קרבן came from the leftovers of his crop. קין’s קרבן was given in a despicable manner, which is why ‘ה was not willing to accept it.

רד"ק adds that קין’s קרבן was not from the ביכורים as was that of הבל. רד"ק then elaborates on the nature of אדם’s קרבן in ד:ה then elaborates on the nature of אדם’s קרבן in ד:ה.
was brought with כבוד. Not only was it from the הביכורים, but it was also from the best of his flock. Since רבי knew that he had ulterior motives, and rejected the offering. As a result, קין became angry, resentful, and embarrassed, just like אדם after he committed his sin. Up until this point, רד“ק’s view is very similar to רashi’s.

Then, in ו:בראשית ד then gives several possibilities regarding what קין could have said to הבל before he killed him. One possibility is
that told what רַּע had just said to him, and accused רַּע of being the cause of all his misfortune. However, רַּע did not get up and kill רַּע right then and there out of fear of his father. He waited until they were both alone in the field, at which point he provoked רַּע.

also quotes the aforementioned רַּע in וְרַּע that provides other possibilities regarding the events that led to the murder. After killed רַּע, רַּע spoke to רַּע, which, according to רַּע, was meant to teach רַּע that he is unable to hide from ר. Moreover, this was meant to teach רַּע that every single action of man is known by Him. רַּע thought that by being in an isolated field whilst he murdered his brother, he could hide just as רַּע had — however, he believed that his seclusion would work, unlike his father’s had. Likewise, just as רַּע asked a rhetorical question of רַּע, here too רַּע asked רַּע a question of a similar nature. He asked him, "לָמָּה הָרַגְתָּ הָבָל אָחָךְ?" אָלָם אֵין וְאֵין.

says that since רַּע didn’t specifically ask, רַּע thought that רַּע did not know what had happened; he denied it by responding, "אַיּוֹ אֶלְהָנַי נֶפֶשׁ אִנֵּךְ; אֵין אָנַי אֵין אָנַי אֵין אָנַי - I do not know where he is; he went to go do his work, and I went to do mine; do I watch where he goes with his flock?"

contrasts רַּע to his father. רַּע was not deceitful in his response to ר, since he knew that ר is omniscient. Although ר said רַּע, which may have implied that ר did not know what רַּע had just done, He said רַּע to reveal His knowledge of man’s sin, and to give רַּע the chance to explain his action. The only reason that רַּע hid was because of his tremendous feelings of embarrassment.
In contrast, קין did not fully realize 'ה omniscience; therefore, when 'ה asked him קין, he responded condescendingly and did not own up to his sin. He truly believed that he could outsmart 'ה.

After 'ה gave קין his punishment, קין responded condescendingly and did not own up to his sin. He truly believed that he could outsmart 'ה.

רבד"ק explains this to mean, my punishment is too great for me to bear. He goes on to say that קין did do השבח; he experienced regret for what he had done, and he asked 'ה to lessen his punishment. Here ק"ר differs somewhat from יי"ר ר"י. Whereas יי"ר ר"י views קין as unrepentant to the end, according to ק"ר, he ultimately did תשובה.

רבד"ק's methodology seems to be a combination of both a פשט understanding of the text as well as a דרש understanding; ק"ר incorporates many מאמרי חז"ל in his פירוש.

His usage of both פשט as well as דרש can be seen regarding his understanding of פסוק ח, which says ויאמר קין אל הבל אחיו ג, where רבד"ק explains what exactly קין said to הבל. He first gives a פשט-oriented answer, and says that קין told the rebuke he just received from 'ה, then, רבד"ק goes on to quote the דרש in בansom ר"י. Within one פסוק, he gives two very different answers to solve the question of what קין may have told הבל.

From the very beginning, רמב"ן's commentary differs from that of רש"י and רבד"ק. The רמב"ן comments that קין was born after the sin of אדם and חוה. According to רמב"ן, when said ותجرى וחוה את קין (after the birth of קין), she meant that when she and אדם died, he would be the person who would serve 'ה in their place. From the onset, רמב"ן is painting a positive picture of קין as one who possessed the potential to be an עבד ה as well as a ירא שלמים.

Interestingly, רמב"ן does not comment on whether the קרב of קין was of lesser or greater quality than that of הבל's, or why,
in fact, his קרבן was not accepted. Rather, רמב"ן introduces a tremendous כנעל in his פירוש which may perhaps shed light on the actual story itself. רמב"ן explains that קין and חבל understood the power of קרבנות, as did נח. He brings in the גמרא which says that even קין and חבל understood that giving קרבנות would cause ה to display נחת רוח towards them.

Here, רמב"ן explains that this פסוק פסיק פסח disproves those who misunderstand the nature of קרבנות. He is referring to רמב"ם in מורה נבוכים who says that the purpose of the command for קרבנות was because the other nations were serving animals as עבודה זרה, so he commanded קין and חבל to give animal sacrifices to ה in order to separate His people from the גויים. Yet, רמב"ן indicates that there is clear evidence that both קין and חבל gave קרבנות when there was no trace of עבודה זרה anywhere in the world; therefore, רמב"ם's assertion of the reason why ה commanded קרבנות cannot be accurate. רמב"ן seems to skip over the part of the story that discusses ה's favoring חבל's קרבן. Perhaps the reason רמב"ן does not comment on this is because it is clear that the point of bringing the קרבנות was to praise ה and cause Him to display נחת רוח. If so, because the text openly describes קין's offering as not worthy of being accepted, it must mean that its poor quality did not allow it to fulfill its purpose.

The commentary continues with an explanation of פסח.49 When ה only accepted חבל's קרבן, the embarrassment and jealousy mounted in קין, his brother. ה then asked to him why he was jealous of his brother—utilizing the words חרה וкомпонו. ה tells קין "if you can act in your brother's ways, then you will rise to an even higher level than he, because you are the בכור and you have a
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greater potential.” However, then explained to that if he would choose not to change his ways, then not only would dominate, but would be present at all times, working hard to get him to fail in everything he does. Finally, told that if he would be able to conquer his and do, he would rule over his evil inclinations, and he would be forgiven.

thus maintains that the root of ’s sin was based on the fact that he felt embarrassed in front of his brother, and he became jealous of him. further explains that he disagrees with the opinions of and , regarding what said to before he killed him. Focusing on the words, he explains that told to come into the field, a place they would be alone, and then killed him. took into an empty field to murder him so that no one could prevent from carrying out his plan.

explains that after accepted and not , became worried and was left to assume that the descendants for the rest of the world would come from because he, in essence, had been “accepted.” As a means of preventing this, , the murder was premeditated, and not merely a spontaneous act of rage.

further disagrees with regarding the meaning of and says that this was a sarcastic statement made by towards . maintains that, according to the , this was a statement of , one of . quotes the and explains that when said these words, he realized the severity of his sin, and forgave him. also asked not to add anything else to his punishment. elaborates that pleaded with and said to Him, “my sin is too great to be forgiven, , Your judgment is just, even though You have punished
me harshly. From now on I will be a wanderer, I will not have a place to rest, Your face will be hidden from me, and I will no longer be able to pray and give a קרבן or a מנחה before You. In your kindness, You have spared me from death, but please do not make me suffer more than I already will be suffering, please give me protection so that the wild animals do not kill me.” Like ירמיהו, רבי קדום views כל as ultimately repentant. Whereas רבי קדום maintains that רבי קדום was triggered by remorse over his punishment, רבי מגנס first considered his sin too great to endure, and then reflected on the ramifications of his deed - one of which is longer being connected to שמים.

The fact that רבי מגנס does not comment on a large portion of the פסוקים in this section is quite perplexing. For example, רבי מגנס does not comment on י-פסוקים ט, which discuss the murder and קין’s response to the query אי הבל אחיך. Perhaps רבי מגנס intentionally leaves these few פסוקים unexplained. He stated earlier that the root of קין’s sin was embarrassment, jealousy, and threat. Perhaps קין lied and said השמר אחי אנכי because he was unable to control his feelings of embarrassment. After he killed הבל, he was even more embarrassed and ashamed of his actions. However, רבי מגנס leaves this section ambiguous and unclear because he feels that in truth no one besides שמים can understand why קין denied his actions.

Rabbi Shimon Bar of Sarson employs his unique method of etymological analysis and comparison of the שורשים of various words to ascertain their connotations, and arrives at a very different
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perspective on this episode. He first comments on the words of אשה; when naming her son קין, she said. 

explains that from the very beginning of their existence, the תורה highlights the differences of personality between קין and חוה. The first usage of the word קנה is defined as an acquisition by strength and power. חוה, in essence, pronounced that by the expenditure of her strength, and with חיה’s cooperation, she had acquired a son. One might have hoped that after having given birth to the first son in the history of the world, חוה would have acted more graciously towards חיה: instead, she seemed to attribute much credit to herself. From this understanding of the פסוקים, it is possible to assume that חוה influenced קין with her “tendency of character.” קין’s name alone highlights the fact that חוה, the child’s first influence, imprinted feelings of egotism and self-centeredness onto קין, which were the root of his later character flaws.

Regarding the words Tillerson 바 הרש explains that the different occupations chosen by the two brothers reflects on their personalities and characters. קין was an עבד אדמה. Working the land demands that one devote his entire life to his physical existence. Tillerson says that just as קין’s mother, חוה, displayed traits of ego-centrism, קין also fell prey to the possibility of becoming an עבד רכוב in the most literal sense - a slave to his field as opposed to an עבד חיה. This comes with a risk; one who is a farmer and slave to his field may forget that חיה controls this world and the fruits of the land. Tillerson posits that life of a shepherd is more elevated; his entire spirit is not as involved in his labor, and thus he remains more open to Godly values.
Therefore, Rav Hirsh infers that perhaps the reason יהו did not accept קרבן קין’s קרבן, rather it had to do with the person giving the קרבן. קין’s attitude when giving the קרבן was unsatisfactory, hence his קרבן was deemed unpleasing to יהו. Rav Hirsh also comments on the words גם הוא and says that this seemingly superfluous phrase teaches that one should not have expected יהו to bring a קרבן. He clarifies that קין, the בכור, did not only bring קרבנות for himself, rather he brought them on behalf of his entire family; therefore, יהו did not have to bring a קרבן at all.

Rav Hirsh observes that יהו brought this קרבן either because he did not feel adequately represented in קין’s קרבן, or because קין was too “caught up in his egoism,” and therefore קין did not want to include יהו when he brought the sacrifice. Rav Hirsh explains that this קרבן was a silent protest, a questioning of קין’s קרבן’s worthiness in being the בכור. By accepting יהו’s קרבן and not קין’s קרבן, Rav Hirsh confirmed יהו’s true worthiness of being the בכור and left קין feeling unworthy and depressed. However, in פסוק ז, He expresses words of comfort to קין.

According to Rav Hirsh’s explanation, יהו asked קין, “why does this depress you and why do you feel so hopeless? It was only because I accepted יהו’s קרבן that I accepted יהו’s קרבן! It was not a reflection of the fact that קין did not deserve to be the בכור. He focuses on the word וישע, and explains that this means a “momentary turning towards,” as opposed to the word פנה which means a stronger, more permanent turn. יהו told קין that if he used his privileges as the first born appropriately, and if he utilizes his occupation of working the land in a positive manner, (in order to develop human civilization thus elevating his physical associations) he would no
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longer feel downcast. Ultimately though, the choice was in קין's hands.

then explains that 'does not explain what קין had just told him: that 's preference of קרבן was just temporary. יושב then compares the words ויקם אל, to the story in ספר שמואל, where told his men that they were not to attack שאול, and states א shalt not arise א shalt not arise. In this story, the attack was unexpected as seen by the descriptive language used and not ויקם על. This literally translates as to go towards the other, which leads יושב to conclude that קין and בהבל were not within close proximity of one another. Each was engaged in his own individual activity, when suddenly the idea came into קין’s head to kill בהבל.

When asked קין the rhetorical question, ואהבר אחיך, the response from קין was “it is not my duty to know the whereabouts of my brother or to look after him!” יושב explains that קין, at the root of his being, was filled with the “every man for himself” attitude. After ' gave קין the punishment, יושב comments that גדול עוני מנשוא does not mean, “my sin is too great to be forgiven,” rather it means, “my sin is greater than I can bear.”

Kין had just realized, that through his paranoia of not being accepted and his קנאה of his brother's קרבן, he was brought to kill his brother. Thus, he severed all ties between himself and the earth upon which he worked, as well as the ties between himself and 'ו. He realized that he had forfeited everything because of this crime and now needed to face the consequences.

However, קין came to this realization not by thinking about the murder he committed, but rather after conceptualizing what
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he had indirectly done to himself. Not only did he murder his brother, but he murdered himself. One could therefore assume that he did not recognize the sin against his brother as much as he recognized his destructive acts towards himself. Not only did he murder his brother, but he murdered himself. We thus have a third model of viewing התשובה as a בえない התשובה.
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According to ק"רכ סולוביץ, in על התשובה, two types of התשובה were discussed: התשובה מאהבה, repentance motivated by love, and התשובה מיראה, repentance motivated by fear. התשובה מאהבה entails rectifying the evil that has been done, or repairing oneself in order to attain elevation from the sin. On the other hand, התשובה מיראה calls for a total annihilation, or “erasing” of the evil.
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Because of the fact that קין only did וידוי after the punishment was given, his התשובה may be considered התשובה מיראה, a result of his regret for his actions. This was done in order to ease his punishment; his motivation to repent was not based on true remorse or a desire to change and elevate his מדות, rather it was to alleviate his punishment. However, according to ק"רכ סולוביץ, his התשובה may have been twofold: it could perhaps be considered both התשובה מיראה as well as התשובה מאהבה.
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According to ק"רכ סולוביץ, explains that וידוי of this sort...infuses him with a burning desire to come as near as he can to the Creator of the universe and attain spiritual heights undreamed of before he sinned. ח62
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When explaining the importance of a witness in a capital case giving an accurate and faithful testimony, the משנה quotes קהל דמי אחים צועקים אין מ המא: the sounds of your brother's bloods are screaming out to Me from the ground. The המשנה asks why ה' used the word דמי as opposed to the singular דם? The then answers that דמי is used to teach that not only did קין kill歙, but he also “killed” all of歙"s future descendants by preventing them from ever being born into the world.

The המשנה continues to impart to the עדים the significance of each and every person in the world, and then explains that every person was created individually by ה'. Not only do the witnesses learn the importance of every individual life, but they are also infused with the powerful message of ה' s greatness. Unlike a human who produces every single coin exactly the same as one another, ה' has the power to create every single being in the image of אדםameron, yet also guarantee that each person will be a complete individual; כל מלך מלכי המלכים הקדוש ברוך הוא תיבותו: נפח כל אדם Created as the image of Adam, and therefore each person will be a complete individual.

Perhaps from this message one can learn that because ה' created each person as an individual, there are countless individual ways to do התשובה. The story of קין produces several models, and there may be others as well. Each individual has the power to choose the best, subjective way to do התשובה, and strengthen his or her connection with ה'. If one's התשובה is sincere, and if one has a genuine desire to constantly connect with ה', then regardless if one's התשובה is מאהבה or מיראה, it will be accepted. As the המשנה says,
because each and every person is extraordinary, everyone is obligated to say בושliğe דברי העולם the world and everything in it was created for me. It is therefore man’s obligation to use all that ה has created in order to enhance life on earth while strengthening our relationship with ה everyday.