



ASSOCIATION FOR JEWISH STUDIES NEWSLETTER

No. 14

June 1975

Editor: A. J. Band

EDITORIAL

With the last of the Third Series of regional conferences now behind us, we can attempt an initial evaluation of this three-year effort, certainly the most ambitious and sustained venture of the Association to date. Mounting ten regional conferences in three years was, in itself, a formidable task and elicited the cooperation of many of our members, let alone the tireless attention of our Executive Secretary. A major part of my responsibilities during the past two and one half years has been the overall administration of these conferences, the occasion for numerous instances of agony and ecstasy, as is to be expected in a project as ambitious as this. The agonies, the personal disappointments, the tale of human vanity will wait for a future autobiographical moment. What deserves mention now is the sense of accomplishment. The simple historical fact that these regional conferences did take place is eloquent testimony of the new academic reality. One can set a learned symposium in an astonishing variety of places in this country since there are now hundreds of scholars — mostly young — engaged in Jewish Studies on the campus throughout the land. Consider the geography of these conferences: we began in 1973 where we felt secure, at U.C.L.A. and at Brandeis; we marched inland in 1974 to Pennsylvania, Duke, H.U.C. (Cincinnati), and Toronto; and we have finished this campaign this year at Michigan, Indiana, Berkeley, and N.Y.U.

Initially supported by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, these conferences were designed to bring to universities throughout the country models of scholarly excellence and to afford the opportunity for intellectual discourse on topics selected from the complex area of Jewish Studies. To be sure, not all conferences were equally successful, just as not all departments in any university are equally distinguished. But the overall level of discussion was erudite and imaginative and attested to the existence of a maturing area of studies, a growing awareness on the part of the entire academic community that here is an area of intellectual interest that deserves attention and support. The most tangible results are, of course, publications: there will be several volumes of published proceedings (the Goitein volume has been distributed; the Katz volume is in press); the Association *Newsletter* has been enriched by the conference abstracts; some papers will appear in the *AJS Review*. Less tangible, but no less important, a sense of common purpose and concern was fostered.

There is no doubt that the regional conferences should continue past the initial period for which we received the original N.E.H. grant, though their scope and format may change. One meeting a year is not enough and not everyone can make a meeting on the eastern seaboard. A minimum of two regional conferences is plausible: one in the Midwest and one on the Pacific coast. Regional provincialism should not be one of the characteristics of our Association.

IN THIS ISSUE

Editorial	1
Library Resources for Jewish Studies	2
News of Appointments	2
Seventh Annual AJS Conference	3
New AJS Members	3
Submission of Articles to <i>AJS Review</i>	3

AJS REGIONAL CONFERENCE PROGRAM

"Hebrew and Jewish Languages"

*Conferences held at University of Michigan
and New York University, March-April 1975*

Abstracts of papers by

Jonas C. Greenfield (Hebrew Univ.)	4, 5
Joshua Blau (Hebrew Univ.)	4, 7
Herbert H. Paper (Univ. of Michigan)	5
George Jochowitz (Richmond Coll.)	6
Denah Lida (Brandeis Univ.)	7

"Judaism from Hellenistic to Roman Times"

*Conferences held at Indiana University and
University of California-Berkeley, March-April 1975*

Abstracts of papers by

Jo Milgrom (Graduate Theological Union)	8
Morton Smith (Columbia Univ.)	9
David S. Winston (Graduate Theological Union)	10

Agreement on "Academy Without Walls"	11
Positions Available	13

BIBLIOGRAPHIA JUDAICA

Book reviews by

Nahum M. Sarna (Brandeis Univ.)	12
Frank Talmage (Univ. of Toronto)	13
Jehuda Reinharz (Univ. of Michigan)	14
Steven T. Katz (Dartmouth Coll.)	16
Deborah E. Lipstadt (Univ. of Washington-Seattle)	19

Library Resources for Jewish Studies in the United States

The recently published 1974/75 *American Jewish Year Book* features a study on library resources for Jewish Studies in the United States written by Charles Berlin (Harvard College Library). The first survey of the post-World War II growth and development of academic Judaica collections, it describes the status, and explains the development, of such collections, especially on the American university campus; focuses attention on the major problems of these collections; and suggests how this bibliographic network of vital significance to the future of Jewish scholarship in America may be strengthened.

The role of the recently terminated Israel PL-480 Program is described as perhaps the single most important factor in the development of Judaica collections over the past 30 years. From 1964 to 1973, the Israel PL-480 Program supplied approximately 1,665,000 items, with an average of 65,000 items for each full participant. There is presently a lack of specialized dealers able to meet the needs of Judaica research collections. The source of supply provided by the vast quantities of Judaica made available on the market as a result of the upheavals experienced by the European Jewish communities in World War II has begun to run dry as more and more of this surviving material ends up in institutional custody. The demise of the Israel PL-480 Program; the lack of dealers; and the limited supply of materials all are adversely affecting the further development of these collections. The role of the Judaica librarian, training and qualifications needed, and the critical shortage of such personnel, as well as bibliographic services by which the contents of these collections are made available to scholars, are also described.

Judaica research collections are in five categories: rabbinical seminary libraries; libraries of research institutions under Jewish auspices; libraries in colleges of Jewish Studies; public libraries; college and university libraries. Twenty-seven university libraries have collections of more than 10,000 volumes; the largest is Harvard with 150,000 volumes, followed by UCLA with 90,000 volumes. Twenty-two libraries have Judaica collections ranging from 10,000 to 40,000 volumes. While the development of these Judaica library resources reflects the tremendous activity in Jewish Studies on the American campus in the post-World War II period, the study points out that the "the overwhelming majority of these programs have virtually no Judaica library resources behind them."

The financial support of this bibliographic network has come from a variety of sources: private Jewish philanthropy, public funds and organized Jewish communal philanthropy. The prime example of public support is the \$1.8 million spent from 1964 to 1973 under the Israel PL-480 Program for the acquisition of Israeli publications for American libraries. The multi-faceted bibliographic services offered by the Library of Congress in Hebraica and Judaica represent continuing public support. However, private Jewish philanthropy in various forms is probably the single most important source of funding. In the case of collections in non-Jewish universities, private

Jewish giving has been augmented by considerable support on the part of the universities themselves from their general operating budgets.

The study concludes with an "Agenda for the Future," in which a "Bibliographic and Documentation Center for Judaica" is proposed, to be modelled after the Slavic Bibliographic and Documentation Center established by the Association for Research Libraries.

News of Appointments

Previous affiliation noted in ().

David A. Altshuler (Dartmouth College)	George Washington University
S. Daniel Breslauer (Colgate University)	University of Nebraska at Omaha
Bernard D. Cooperman (Harvard University - g)	Harvard University
Harriet P. Freidenreich (University of Judaism)	Temple University
Evyatar Friesel (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)	Ohio State University (visiting prof.)
Moshe Gottlieb (Technion)	State University of New York at Binghamton
Gershon D. Hundert (Columbia University - g)	McGill University
Stanley J. Isser (State University of New York at Binghamton)	State University of New York at Albany
Marc E. Kellner (College of William and Mary)	University of Virginia
Jon D. Levenson (Harvard University - g)	Wellesley College
Dan Pagis (Hebrew University)	University of California at San Diego (visiting prof.)
Charles Primus (Brown University - g)	University of Notre Dame
David G. Roskies (Brandeis University - g)	Jewish Theological Seminary of America
Norbert M. Samuelson (University of Virginia)	Temple University
Haym Soloveitchik (Hebrew University)	Yeshiva University
Kenneth R. Stow (Jewish Theological Seminary of America)	Queens College - C.U.N.Y.
Uriel Tal (Tel-Aviv University)	University of Pennsylvania (visiting prof.)
Saul P. Wachs (Brandeis University)	Gratz College
Jack Wertheimer (Columbia University - g)	City College - C.U.N.Y.

Seventh Annual AJS Conference

The Seventh Annual AJS Conference will be held on 21-23 December 1975 at the Copley Plaza Hotel in Boston.

The occasion of the American Bi-Centennial will be marked by AJS with a tribute to Professor Salo W. Baron, leading Jewish historian of our time and one of the founders of academic Jewish Studies in the United States. The "Tribute to Salo Baron" will be delivered by Gerson D. Cohen, Chancellor of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, at the Conference Banquet on Sunday night, 21 December 1975. Professor Baron's address will be on the topic: "Is Jewish History Still Relevant?"

Program plans for all sessions are nearly complete and final details will be announced in the Fall Newsletter. Registration forms will be sent to all members in September. Among those scheduled to deliver papers at the Conference are the following: American Jewish History (Leon Jick, Brandeis, chairman); Naomi Cohen (Hunter) and Henry L. Feingold (Baruch); Medieval Exegesis (Frank Talmage, Toronto, chairman); Ivan Marcus (JTSA), Nahum Sarna (Brandeis), Moses Zucker (JTSA); Biblical Studies (Stanley Gevirtz, HUC-JIR, chairman); Robert Gordis (JTSA), Stephen Geller (JTSA); Emancipation and Enlightenment (Ben Halpern, Brandeis, chairman); Steven M. Lowenstein (YIVO), Moshe Pelli (Cornell), Stephen Poppel (Bryn Mawr); and Respondents: Frances Hoffman (Univ. of Mass. - Boston) and Hillel Levine (Yale); Historiography (Michael Meyer, HUC-JIR, chairman); Nahum Glatzer (Boston Univ.), Ismar Schorsch (JTSA) and Uriel Tal (Tel-Aviv Univ.); Midrash (Lou Silberman, Vanderbilt, chairman); William Braude (Providence, R.I.), Reuven Kimelman (Amherst), Yona Sabar (UCLA), and Ben Zion Wacholder (HUC-JIR); Renaissance (Benjamin Ravid, Brandeis, chairman); Steven Bowman (Indiana), Benjamin Braude (Harvard), Bernard Cooperman (Harvard), Arthur Lesley (HUC-JIR), David Ruderman (Univ. of Maryland).

In addition, a session will be devoted to a presentation of summaries of dissertations in Judaica which shall have been accepted for the degree of Ph.D. between June 1974 and Fall 1975. (Chairman: Raymond Scheindlin, JTSA).

Submission of Articles to AJS Review

Those desiring to submit articles for consideration for publication in the *AJS Review* should send *two* (2) copies of each manuscript (typewritten double-spaced) to the Editor, care of the AJS office, Widener M, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

Authors should try to adhere as closely as possible to the format prescribed by the *Chicago Manual of Style*. English spelling should be according to U.S. usage. Footnotes should be typed at the end of the article and not placed on the same pages as the text.

Articles in Hebrew will be considered for publication. Hebrew text, however, should not appear in the body of an English article.

New Members

(New Regular Members, January - May 1975)

Moses Aberbach	Baltimore Hebrew College
Avigdor Bittmann	Stern College
Daniel Boyarin	Jewish Theological Seminary of America
Hayyim J. Cohen	Hebrew University; visiting prof., Yeshiva University
Shaye J. D. Cohen	Jewish Theological Seminary of America
Herbert A. Davidson	University of California, Los Angeles
José Faur	Jewish Theological Seminary of America
Albert H. Friedlander	Leo Baeck College
Morris I. Goldwasser	Hebrew University
Yair Hoffmann	Tel-Aviv University
Henry R. Huttenbach	City College, C.U.N.Y.
Max Kapustin	Wayne State University
Samuel T. Lachs	Bryn Mawr College
Carol Meyers	University of North Carolina
George L. Mosse	University of Wisconsin
Jakob J. Petuchowski	Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
Bezalel Porten	Hebrew University
Mayer E. Rabinowitz	Jewish Theological Seminary of America
Moshe Rinott	University of Haifa
Jacob Roth	Beit Berl College
Yosef Salmon	Ben-Gurion University of the Negev
Moshe Sokolow	Yeshiva University
Arie A. S. Strikovsky	Machon Pardes
Matitahu Tsevat	Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
Ernest Y. Weiss	Herzliah-Jewish Teachers Seminary

In the case of long extracts, the text should be translated into English and, if desired, the original Hebrew be included in a footnote. In the case of a short passage or one or several words, the passage or word should be translated and/or transliterated. Any recognized scientific system of transliteration may be used according to the judgment of the author (e.g., EJ, HUCA, LC, JE, conventional biblical Hebrew transliteration, etc.). More popular systems (ch for *het* or *khaf*, apostrophe for *sheva*) should be avoided.

Reproduction of facsimiles and illustrations will be considered as will articles in other western European languages.

Please note that *all* correspondence is to be addressed to the Editor care of the Association's office.

Languages of Palestine

by Jonas C. Greenfield (Hebrew University)

During the Persian period the two principal languages of Palestine were Hebrew and Aramaic. There may have been a gradual penetration of Greek from the coastal cities where Ionian merchants were already found but this should not be exaggerated since the presence of a product does not guarantee that its name is known. During the Persian period there was an influx of Iranian loanwords into both Hebrew and Aramaic. With the conquests of Alexander and Ptolemaic rule over Palestine the use of Greek became widespread for administrative and other purposes. Greek speakers were settled in many parts of the country but Hebrew (in Judea) and Aramaic (in the north) remain the languages of the rural and lesser urban population. Hebrew is the prime religious language among Jews; Aramaic is used for literary purposes, too. In the course of the third century BCE there is a growing number of Jews — beginning with those Palestinians who participated in the Septuagint, to the hellenistic writers — who can use Greek properly. The Tobiades would be examples of the assimilated classes. Note that Ben Sira is written in Hebrew at the end of this period.

With the conflict over hellenization and the success of the Maccabees there is a return to Hebrew during the second century for formal administrative uses. This does not mean the abandonment of Greek. Greek is important for diplomatic purposes (cf. Eupolemus) and for contact with the by now extensive Greek-speaking diaspora. Greek is used in Palestine in the many heathen cities absorbed by the Maccabean conquests and works are written in Greek or revised for the diaspora. Hebrew and Aramaic are both used in Judea now, religious literature is written in both languages and translations are made in both (cf. the variety of material from Qumran). There is a penetration, begun earlier, of Greek loanwords into Hebrew and Aramaic and some become part of the language. The Hasmoneans use both Hebrew and Greek on their coins while the epithet on Jason's tomb is in Aramaic and Greek. The inscriptions on ossuaries are often also bilingual. With the later Hasmonean rulers and under Herod, the Greek element becomes stronger, especially in Jerusalem and the other large cities. Inscriptions in Greek are found (synagogue dedications, temple warnings, etc.) and new cities, pagan in culture, are founded. Jews from the diaspora settle in Jerusalem and bring their "tongues" with them. There are counterpressures from the Pharisaic leadership in favor of the use of Hebrew. Hebrew is the language of the rural population in Judea; Aramaic, in the Galilee. But there is clear indication of some knowledge of Greek among the scholars, and of use of Greek administrative terminology. Josephus may have apologized for weak Greek but Justus of Tiberia knew Greek well.

With the destruction of the Temple there was a retrenchment with Hebrew emphasized, yet Greek was used as the supervised revision of the Septuagint shows. Bar Koseba documents show Hebrew used alongside of Aramaic and Greek in letters and legal documents. This is in the south. After 135 there is a population shift to the north;

but southerners, especially rustics and domestics, still know Hebrew. In Galilee Greek and Aramaic dominate. Latin is used only in the legions and for official inscriptions. Hebrew is the language of the Tannaim in the study hall. There is propaganda for the continued use of Hebrew in speech. Epitaphs in Beth Shearim and Joppa witness the use of all three languages. By 200 Aramaic is the main language in use by the various elements of the country's population.



The Historical Periods of the Hebrew Language

by Joshua Blau (Hebrew University)

Hebrew is attested in two classical forms: Biblical Hebrew and Middle Hebrew. Biblical Hebrew is surprisingly uniform, owing to its being a standardized language, on the one hand, and to later changes, on the other (addition of vowel letters, vowel marks and cantillation marks). It exhibits archaic syntax, but a rather late stage of development in phonetics and morphology. Historical investigation of Biblical Hebrew utilizes the broadening of our knowledge of the Northwest Semitic background, whereas synchronical studies, in the main, examine the various traditions of Biblical Hebrew.

The Middle Hebrew of the *tannaim* was derived from the living spoken language of Judea, as proved by its use in some of the Bar-Kokhba letters. It became extinct after the suppression of the Bar-Kokhba revolt. Accordingly, the Middle Hebrew of the *amoraim* has no living Middle Hebrew language as its background. As all the later layers of Hebrew (including Modern Hebrew), it is an amalgamated tongue (the Biblical Hebrew component became stronger) and is influenced by the vernacular of the surroundings (Aramaic). Since copyists and printers tried to harmonize Middle Hebrew with Biblical Hebrew, Middle Hebrew has to be studied from reliable manuscripts and oral traditions.

Modern Hebrew is open to all layers of Hebrew, freely drawing from them. Its morphology is mainly Biblical, yet the choice between competing forms was often made under the influence of Middle Hebrew (personal pronouns, infinitives). Since the revival of Hebrew exhibits its adaptation to Western culture, new terms and phrases had to be coined. These are partly taken from sources and partly newly coined, according to the accepted rules of Hebrew word formation. Yet Modern Hebrew also changed by inner development (*ben dōd* : *bat dōdā*, *yākhōl hāyā*, *'ēn lī ōtō*) and mainly through the decisive influence of Modern Standard European on its phraseology, and, to a smaller extent, on its syntax. This is also the case with other languages adapting themselves to Western culture, as Modern Standard Arabic.

Aramaic Dialects

by Jonas C. Greenfield (Hebrew University)

Our information concerning the Aramaic dialects begins with the ninth century BCE. Already in this period the division into Eastern and Western dialects of Aramaic is discernible. During the Assyrian Empire Aramaic became the lingua franca, at least in the Western part of the empire. It continues in this role during the Babylonian period and assumes a broader role during the Persian period when Aramaic is for all intents and purposes the official language of the Achaemenian realm. In the Babylonian and Persian periods it is Eastern Aramaic that becomes dominant. It is best known in its documentary and epigraphic form as Reichsaramaeisch (Aramaic of the Empire) but a literary dialect — Standard Literary Aramaic — also develops. Traces of other dialects can be found during this period, i.e., in the Hermopolis papyri and in the proverbs of Ahiqar found at Elephantine.

The Jews of Elephantine used Aramaic for their everyday needs. The legal documents from Elephantine reveal diverse sources that have flowed together: Ancient Near Eastern, West Semitic and those which may be considered purely Judean. They are linguistically conservative. With the break-up of the Achaemenian empire various trends become visible. Greek replaces Aramaic as the predominant political and juridical language; local Aramaic scripts and dialects come to the fore. In Palestine we find the following trends: during the Persian period Aramaic ostraca found in Persian administrative centers throughout the land; the Dallya papyri from the Samaria area attest to the use of Aramaic in the northern part of the country. The documents in Aramaic in Ezra show that this was the administrative language of the area (they are in Reichsaramaeisch). The literary works written during the Hellenistic period — the Aramaic sections of Daniel, Tobit, Enoch, the Genesis Apocryphon and other Aramaic works found at Qumran (note well: there are no sectarian works in Aramaic) are in Standard Literary Aramaic. This is also the language of the Targum Onkelos and the Megillat Ta'anit.

In Palestine we find other Aramaic dialects in use. In Judea there was the local dialect found in various inscriptions and also in the Bar Koseba letters and documents; in the south there was Nabatean used by Arabic-speaking tribes as their written language; in the Samaria area there is the dialect used by the Samaritans in their Targum, learned works and liturgy. In the Galilee we find the language of the Palestinian Talmud, midrashim and targumim as well as synagogue inscriptions and legal documents (known from the Geniza). There is also an important Christian dialect known as Christian Palestinian Aramaic from the southern part of the country. These three dialects — Jewish, Samaritan and Christian — share many features and are our main source for Western Aramaic.

In the East we find a variety of dialects — Syriac, Mandaic and Jewish Babylonian Aramaic being the main literary representatives of Eastern Aramaic. In Jewish Babylonian Aramaic there are, be-

side the Babylonian Talmud, various Geonic and Karaite works and a host of magic bowls as well as some 'mystic' literature.

Compositions in late literary Aramaic range from liturgical works to poems like Aqdamot and Yah Ribbon to the Zohar. It should also be noted that spoken Aramaic has remained alive among the Jews of Kurdistan.

Judeo-Persian

by Herbert H. Paper (University of Michigan)

Judeo-Persian is the term that conveniently applies to all forms of Modern Persian used by Jews in the entire geographic expanse of the Persian-speaking world from the 8th-9th century C.E. to the present day. The language includes (1) the spoken forms or dialects spoken today in Iran, Afghanistan, Central Asia (Uzbekistan and Tajikistan), Caucasus, and areas of subsequent migration such as Israel; and (2) forms of the language preserved in numerous manuscript and printed texts in the Hebrew alphabet. The very earliest texts in the Modern Persian language happen to be Judeo-Persian texts.

Judeo-Persian texts include the following major varieties:

1. Standard Classical Persian of Islamic authors transcribed (not merely transliterated) into Hebrew letters.
2. Standard Classical Persian by Jewish authors on Judaic subjects with varying amounts of Hebrew-Aramaic loanwords; e.g., the poets Shakin, Imrani, et al.
3. Bible translations — the earliest is a manuscript in the British Museum dating to 1319 C.E. (now published in H. H. Paper, *A Judeo-Persian Pentateuch* [Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi Institute, 1972] and with other texts in the same author's *Biblia Judaica-Persica: Editio Variorum* [Ann Arbor: Xerox University Microfilms, 1973]).
4. Several Cairo Geniza letters.
5. Late 19th and early 20th-century printed materials from the Bokharan community in Jerusalem — especially works by the remarkable R. Shimon Hakham. These were printed with full Tiberian vocalization reflecting the pronunciation of the Bokharan dialect or what is more generally known as Tajik (or Tadjik) in the USSR. It is suggested that a reasonable additional rubric 'Judeo-Tajik' is justified.
6. Judeo-Tat of the Jews of Daghestan (northeastern Caucasus).

Research into Judeo-Persian is not only of great importance for its own sake and in relation to the 'interlinguistics' of Jewish languages, but also for the light that Judeo-Persian data can shed on the history of the Modern Persian language in general. It has already been shown by a number of scholars in recent years that Judeo-Persian orthographic, phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical data are preserved in a form quite independent of the Islamic-Arabic-script tradition and are therefore of unusual value for Persian studies in general.

Judeo-Romance Languages

by George Jochnowitz (Richmond College - C.U.N.Y.)

The best known and most widely spoken Judeo-Romance language is generally called *Ladino*, *Judeo-Spanish*, or *Judezmo*, although other names for it exist as well. In all probability, the speech of Spanish Jews exhibited distinctive characteristics even before the expulsion of 1492. The form *el Dyó* 'God', and the word *afilu* 'even, still', of Hebrew origin, are both attested in pre-expulsion documents. Early Ladino works include translations from the Old Testament and a glossary. A secular literature appeared in the 19th and 20th centuries.

Scholarly works describing modern spoken Judezmo have been published, but many areas remain to be investigated. The Sephardic pronunciation of Hebrew is not uniform, and a comparative study of the different traditions of reading Hebrew could lead to the reconstruction of the proto-Hispanic or proto-Romance system of Hebrew pronunciation. Another problem is that of determining the relationship of early texts, written in an artificial style, to the spoken language of their time.

Judeo-Italian, which is called *Italkian* by Dr. S. A. Birnbaum and the Modern Language Association, is spoken by a tiny number of Italian Jews. Its literature includes an original poem composed in the 12th or early 13th century, translations of the daily prayer book dating from the 15th and 16th centuries, and sonnets and a play published in the early 20th century. The prayer books are written in the artificial style characteristic of all translations done by the Jews of Europe (and perhaps elsewhere) during this period. There are very few Hebrew words, and the syntax of the original Hebrew is rigidly followed.

The modern texts share with the earlier translations some morphological peculiarities, such as the lack of a gender distinction in the plural. The contemporary language, however, is full of words of Hebrew and Aramaic origin, as well as words formed of Hebrew roots and Italian affixes.

Judeo-Italian varies sharply from city to city, and articles have been written describing aspects of the different dialects. Vittore Colomi has stressed the fact that there are major differences in the Jewish dialects of different parts of Italy, and has concluded that Judeo-Italian came into existence after the establishment of ghettos in the 16th century. Umberto Cassuto has stated that a koine existed in the Middle Ages that is the ancestor of the modern language. These theories probably do not contradict each other: the similarities among the dialects show they share a common heritage; the differences show that they were out of touch with each other during their development.

The department of Vaucluse in southern France is roughly coextensive with the old area called the Comtat Venaissin. Before the

French Revolution it was papal territory, and so its Jewish residents did not have to leave when Jews were expelled in the 14th century. The Jewish language of this area has been called *Shuadi* or *Shuadit*, apparently from *Yehudi* 'Jewish'. It is also called *Judeo-Provençal* and *Judeo-Comtadine*. There is to my knowledge one living person, the writer Armand Lunel, who remembers hearing this language spoken, and can sing the Passover song *Had Gadya* in it.

Judeo-Provençal glosses are found in 12th-century Hebrew texts. A 14th-century fragment of a version of the Book of Esther has survived, and a translation of the daily prayers exists. In about 1820, a comedy called *Harcanot et Barcanot* appeared. There are works apparently created by non-Jews that contain elements of Judeo-Provençal, or perhaps caricatures of it. Sections of Christmas carols and a curious sermon of uncertain age called *Lou Sermoun di Jusiou* 'The Sermon of the Jew' are composed in what is supposed to be Jewish dialect. It is hard to know how to interpret documents that may have been distorted for comic effect, but if common elements are found, let us say, in both non-Jewish and Jewish sources, then we might reasonably conclude that these elements were part of the language of Comtadine Jews.

Judeo-French is also called *Zarphatic*. The earliest fragments of it are 11th-century glosses. Rashi's glosses are the most numerous and the best known, and are considered quite important by Romance philologists, since Rashi's use of a French word may be the oldest attestation known. An original Judeo-French poem, the *Elegy de Troyes*, exists.

Important as Judeo-French documents may be, there is doubt about whether they provide any evidence concerning the existence of a Jewish type of speech in medieval France. Menachem Banitt believes that they do not, since there is no way to determine whether a word found in a text was really used in conversation, or was simply invented for the sake of translation.

David Blondheim has studied the lexical items common to the various Judeo-Romance languages, and has concluded that these languages have a common origin. I believe that his theory is valid, but the fact that a number of words of Romance origin have been found that occur only in Jewish texts does not in itself prove that modern Judeo-Romance languages go directly back to the Roman Empire. Scholars have commented on the artificiality of the translations of religious works during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. The existence of a large body of lexical items common to the Judeo-Romance languages proves only that they all followed the same tradition of translating.

What is more significant is the fact that some medieval traits survive to this day. In addition to the loss of gender in the plural in Judeo-Italian, referred to above, there is the word *meltare* or *meldar* 'study, read, teach'. This word, which is of Greek origin and at-

Continued on page 7

Medieval Judaeo-Arabic

by Joshua Blau (Hebrew University)

Medieval Judaeo-Arabic exhibits a language mixture of Old Arabic and Neo-Arabic elements. Since no medieval texts written in pure Neo-Arabic exist, Judaeo-Arabic texts are composed either in Standard Middle Arabic (that is: in Neo-Arabic with a Classical Arabic admixture) or in Substandard Middle Arabic (that is: in Classical Arabic with Neo-Arabic admixture).

Jews used Arabic even in commentaries and tracts on religious law, presumably, because Arabic superseded Aramaic, which was also utilized in these fields. In poetry, however, Hebrew was used for several reasons: Jews had no active command of Old Arabic in which Arabic poetry was composed; no religious poetry in Arabic existed; and Jews continued the Hebrew *piyyut* tradition. Judaeo-Arabic differs from other branches of Middle Arabic by the almost general use of Hebrew script (the importance of which as psychological barrier between Jews and Muslims must not be underestimated) and by the use of Hebrew (and Aramaic) words. Yet even if the proportion of Hebrew words is high in a given text, it has to be considered Arabic, rather than Hebrew, because Arabic functional words and bound morphemes may occur in Hebrew phrases, but not *vice versa*. With some exceptions, Hebrew words are absorbed to a surprising degree into the patterns of Arabic. The main field in which Hebrew words have penetrated into Judaeo-Arabic is religious literature, but since the realm of Judaism is not restricted to religious life proper as in Western civilization, all kinds of words occurring in Talmudic law may be taken over (*me'ubbād*, *mutamalsin*, *mītā*, *ša'ar*). Also a special tradition of Judaeo-Arabic obtains (as *ratt* "boar," used in the sense of "bullock;" the use of *'an* marking indefinite attributes). Accordingly, one is inclined to regard Judaeo-Arabic as a special sociolect of Middle Arabic.

Judeo-Romance Languages (Continued from page 6)

tested in the Septuagint, is found both in early texts and modern speech, and is generally unknown in non-Jewish Romance languages. It is a valuable piece of evidence pointing to a continuous history of Judeo-Romance.

When Jews were finally expelled from France in 1394, the majority of them moved east and merged with the Ashkenazim. Although a few Romance words entered Yiddish, it may be that words of Hebrew origin were among those brought into Yiddish by the speakers of Judeo-French. There is something about the choice of merged Hebrew words in the Jewish languages of Europe that suggests that the borrowings from Hebrew-Aramaic were not made independently in each language. Consider the adverb *afilu* 'even, still'. Is it a coincidence that it exists in both Judezmo and Yiddish? I think not. It has no religious significance and there is no reason for the two languages to have borrowed this function word from Hebrew. However, this theory cannot be tested, since any Hebrew-Aramaic element could be borrowed by any community at any time. Nevertheless, the remarkable similarity of the Hebrew-Aramaic components of Yiddish and the Judeo-Romance languages suggest that the latter are very old indeed.

Ladino

by Denah Lida (Brandeis University)

The intention of the paper is to focus on a variety of problems inherent in any attempt to define what is meant by Ladino or Judeo-Spanish language and what literary works may be included under the heading of Judeo-Spanish literature in different historical periods and geographical surroundings: pre-Inquisition, post-Inquisition, post-expulsion, for example. Basic traditional definitions and the problems they raise are considered. However, reference is made throughout to the importance of the interplay of a distinctive language and a content informed by Jewish ethical, religious, social, philosophical or traditional concerns.

In the early Middle Ages the Jews have a command of the vernacular — Romance — as well as Hebrew, Latin and even Arabic which are the languages generally used by the educated population. The intellectual work of Jews is well-received and, while there are certain restrictions on them, Jews are not as threatened as they will be later on merely because of their religious identity. In this period the golden age of Mediaeval Judaic creativity flourishes. It has been assumed either that the literary production should be categorized as Judeo-Spanish, regardless of the language in which it is written and of its content because it was written by Jews of Spain, or that it should be classified under the literature of the language in which it is written, ignoring author and content. In the latter instance the assumption has been that in each case the languages had no features peculiar to Peninsular Jews. There is now evidence that in the two dominant languages, Romance and Hebrew, certain distinctive characteristics are displayed, whether in the use of the language or in the Hebrew symbols. Without rejecting the possibility of including other works, a few are singled out as being especially identifiable as Judeo-Spanish, Ladino or Judezmo texts because of their combination of a vernacular language bearing certain group-related traits, a Hebrew script with special elements and a content that has its roots in Judaism.

In the later Middle Ages the climate becomes increasingly more uncomfortable for Jews and Muslims in a predominantly Christianized Spain. Under the Inquisition one avoids expressions of Judaic ethnicity or any of the tell-tale signs which could be the basis for denunciation to the Holy Office. Some examples are given. This is especially true after 1492 for those who remain as converts or New Christians, crypto-Jews and Marranos. The problems for the scholar in this period are the understandable paucity of manuscripts we have, many of which must have been destroyed, and the determination of what texts to include when faced with the fact that Jews or people of Jewish descent sometimes wrote works displaying profound Christian zeal and expressed themselves with eloquence in the Spanish of their day.

The remainder of the paper studies the history of Judeo-Spanish language and literature in the Diaspora, particularly in the Eastern communities of the Ottoman Empire. Note is taken of the fact that the Western communities, notably those in Italy and Holland, but including Belgium, France and North Africa, at first fol-

Continued on page 8

Ladino (Continued from page 7)

lowed the development of the language in the Peninsula because of their proximity to it and traffic with it, and later became assimilated, except for North Africa, adopting the language of their host country. But the major portion of the discussion is devoted to a description of the language in Eastern communities and the works produced.

First, those features which are common to all of the communities are outlined, describing a kind of basic Ladino understood in different geographic areas. These include phonetic characteristics, syntax, morphology and vocabulary. Basic Hebrew lexicon is listed. Regional variations are outlined taking into account the influence of host languages plus the proximity to and relationship with Spain.

A resume follows of the needs of the communities which determined the kind of literary production that developed: translations of European, especially Spanish, literary works, the Bible, or individual books of the Bible, guides of different kinds relating to the daily life and practices of Jews — the slaughter of animals, agricultural cultivation, family relations —, historical and travel accounts such as the *Extremos y Grandezas de Constantinopla*. With time, more people, especially women, were less educated in Hebrew and the gap between their fifteenth-century Spanish and the development of the language in the Peninsula increased, so that they were left linguistically impoverished. Probably because of this lack of command of a language on a high literary level, creativity of original works is low in the Eastern communities. However, Biblical commentaries in Judezmo were cultivated, enlivened by anecdotes, parabolic tales, practical advice and useful knowledge. The best of these, the *Me'am Lo'ez*, was begun by Jacob Hulli in 1730 and was continued by many collaborators into the nineteenth-century. Hulli had a great deal of talent for combining the serious and scholarly with the light and diverting. Although he belittled the latter aspect of his work, its initial popularity, if not its later significance, surely depended on it. Unfortunately, Hulli only lived to work on *Genesis* and *Exodus*.

The area of greatest interest to Hispanic scholars is that of the oral literature of the Sephardim: proverbs, songs and ballads. The significance to Spanish scholars lies in the fact that, given the conservatism of the Sephardim in the East, the transcription is often a clue to late mediaeval pronunciation and the texts, especially of the ballads, may be a key to old versions. The paper brings up some of the problems which have not been addressed by scholars and which need attention, giving examples, such as the source of certain proverbs, the precedence of Hispanic or Hebrew versions, etc. The need for Hebrew scholars to participate in this area was mentioned. The paper ends with the quotation of three stanzas of a popular song which integrates the two languages, Spanish and Hebrew, in a Jewish theme — the birth of Abraham —, as an example of a work created in the Diaspora which is an expression of uniquely Sephardic creativity.

Midrash in the Paintings of the Dura Europos Synagogue by Jo Milgrom (Graduate Theological Union)

The Dura Europos synagogue contains the earliest known significant continuous cycle of biblical images. Extensive figural decoration of similar complexity does not appear in Christian art until the 5th century; the Dura synagogue can be dated CE 244-245. Old debates were reopened by the discovery in art and historical circles. Were in fact the origins of Christian art rooted in an antecedent, but now lost Jewish art? Was rabbinic Judaism of the third century really so rigidly iconoclastic as scholars had assumed? Was rabbinic Judaism normative Judaism? Art historians have asked how the Dura paintings are related to early medieval art, for Dura Europos has preserved the largest body of ancient wall-paintings from the classical period outside of Italy. Equally intriguing is the visual hybridization on these walls, the hellenized orient on the western edge of Parthia. In the 40 years since Clark Hopkins' amazing discovery major works have been written on the above questions, even though Dura is not as well known or widely publicized as the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Located in N.E. Syria on the right bank of the Euphrates, between Damascus and Bagdad, Dura was founded by the Seleucids around 300 BCE and settled by Jews perhaps in the 2nd century CE, although there is some historical basis for the belief that Jews deported by the Assyrians in 722 BCE were carried to the nearby city of Nisibis (2 Kings 17.6 and 18.11). Dura was occupied by the Romans in 165 CE and destroyed by the Sassanian invasion of 256 CE. The synagogue, rebuilt and redecorated on the site of an earlier and smaller one, was dedicated in 245. Its preservation was due to the Roman defenders who apparently filled the synagogue with dirt fill during a siege.

This paper will not deal with the problem of Jewish antecedents to Christian art, nor with the hybrid characteristics of the paintings. Rather, it will ask the question: aside from the fact that these are biblical paintings, in what way are they an expression of the Judaism that flourished in Dura in the first half of the 3rd century? A cursory examination of the paintings reveals that liberty has been taken with the biblical narrative. Most of the panels are immediately identifiable. In a few cases of doubt, Aramaic graffiti have come to the rescue. In many, iconographic features have been introduced which give us clearly to understand that interpretive elements have been superimposed as midrash upon the canonical text. The express purpose of this paper is to examine midrashic elements in these paintings, what they may have meant to the people of that community, and the literary structure of the individual midrash.

One of the most delightful and intriguing departures from canon can be seen on the SW corner of the southern wall in the 3rd and 4th paintings of an Elijah cycle that begins on the fragmented east wall with the ravens feeding Elijah at the brook of Cherith, and seem-

Continued on page 11

Varieties of Judaism in the Early First Century C.E.
by Morton Smith (Columbia University)

The question to be discussed is one of extreme complexity because of the quantity and variety of the evidence - archaeological data (including the Qumran material), the history of the text of the Hebrew Bible and its translations, apocrypha and pseudepigrapha of various sorts, Philo, Josephus, fragments of other historians and Greco-Roman writers, the New Testament and the later Christian writers, especially the heresiologists, Rabbinic literature and liturgical material both Jewish and Christian. Other complicating factors are the number and variety of the sects reported, the length and intensity of the study and consequent mass of scholarly material and variety of theories, the apologetic and polemic motives that have so often perverted the study, and the basic misunderstandings with which it began.

Accordingly I shall limit the discussion to Palestine (the Judaism of the diaspora is a different problem). For Palestine I shall first describe briefly the whole situation, and then comment on particular points.

Basic to the situation as a whole is the fact that in first-century Palestine the term "Jew" (*Ioudaios*, *Yehudi*) had two meanings not clearly distinguished then and often confused now. As a territorial term it meant a native of Judea; as a religious term, a worshiper of the God of Jerusalem.

This ambiguity was mainly due to the Maccabean conquests and compulsory conversions of 125-76 B.C.E. During the subsequent century the converts seem to have been largely homogenized, as to religion, to the sort of Jew whom the Pharisees called or would later call an *'am ha'ares*; his religion was probably not much different from that of the average territorial Judean, to whom the Pharisees would apply the same term, but he was probably less attached to the Temple, less at home in Hebrew, and less familiar with Hebrew holy books. This religious homogenization did not obliterate territorial and ethnic distinctions: Idumeans, Galileans, etc. remained distinguishable and were commonly distinguished. But in spite of this "the Jews" *en masse* seem to have formed a readily recognizable religious group and this fact supposes that most of them were characterized by at least some sort of recognizable religious Judaism.

By following the legal thread we are able to explain a number of the peculiarities of the history, for instance: Josephus' introduction of the legalist sects immediately after Jonathan's acceptance of the High Priesthood may reflect difficulties precipitated by increasing Maccabean divergence from Pentateuchal law. Such difficulties, in turn, would explain the Maccabees' later policy of forced conversion, and this, in turn, the multiplication of the more eccentric sects. Legal beliefs, too, will explain the long-term success of the Maccabean policy, and the formation of the great body of the Jewish *'am ha'ares*.

Unfortunately the legal profile of the average *'am ha'ares* before 70 remains somewhat uncertain. Here the question of the value of the different sorts of evidence becomes acute. It will be argued that the best evidence is that of Josephus' *Jewish War* (though even this must be used with careful observance of its limitations) and the traits it attests will be described: Observance of circumcision; of the Sabbath (but not the Sabbath year); of the major festivals (but this Josephus probably exaggerates); reverence for the Temple and for Jerusalem (also probably exaggerated); reverence for the priests, not for the levites (Josephus' bias?); synagogue worship; reverence for the scrolls of the Law; observance of some food laws; hostility to images; hostility to gods other than Yahweh; Messianic expectations. This complex of observances - and non-observances - is explicable, to a considerable extent, from the legal history of the group, though for lack of documentation the explanations must remain conjectural.

It is possible, similarly, to explain on legal grounds the adherence of the upper priesthood and the rich to a legal party that denied the binding force of precedent in legal decisions (in other terms, the validity of "the oral law").

From this average Judaism were distinguished, on religious grounds, two considerable wings - the less observant and the more, or peculiarly, observant. The former was made up of a considerable number of persons "Jewish" by family, or territorial or political affiliation, but fairly indifferent to Jewish religious practices. The latter is much more complex, being really a catch-all for many different groups of quite different sorts who have in common only the fact of their divergence for religious reasons from run-of-the-mill Judaism. There were professionally religious groups like the priests and the levites, legalistic sects, revolutionary sects claiming legal justification, others expecting miraculous intervention to justify them, and sects who sought salvation by peculiar extra-legal practices, often immersions or secret meals, and who were sometimes the followers of one or another miracle worker. This list of categories immediately shows that the criteria for classification are not clear and simple, that many of the groups belong to one class in one respect, to another in another.

If we search for a thread to guide us through this maze we shall, I think, do well to begin with the Law - the Pentateuch and the complex of legal traditions and practices of which it was the center. The Pentateuch's preeminence had been established by the teaching and practice of the priesthoods of Jerusalem and Samaria through some two centuries (roughly from 375 to 175). Consequently, when sectarian groups begin to emerge they commonly expressed their differences with the establishment in terms of differences about legal questions, and defined their own positions by peculiar legal observances. This is not to say that sectarian splits were not then, as now, often consequences of personal incompatibilities, but it is to say that the disputes which arose were conceived and perpetuated as matters of law. (Contrast the apparent unimportance of differences as to matters of eschatological expectation.)

(Continued on page 20)

Philo's Theory of Eternal Creation - A Summary

by David S. Winston (Graduate Theological Union)

There is a passage in Philo's *De provid.* (1.6-9) which has survived only in an Armenian translation, according to which Philo teaches a doctrine of eternal creation. Scholars, however, have either ignored or rejected the testimony of this passage since the context in which it lies embedded appears to be contradictory. It is the aim of this paper to offer an interpretation of the passage in question which will remove the apparent contradiction, thus liberating this important Philonic text from the limbo in which it has long been languishing.

The paper begins with a detailed examination and analysis of *De provid.* 1.6-9 in the light of the debate over the meaning of the *Timaeus'* doctrine of creation. After noting that superficial observation often results in the belief that the world has existed from eternity independent of any creative act (the Aristotelian view), Philo immediately proceeds to attack the 'sophistic' view "elaborated with drawn-out quibbles," that God did not begin to create the world at a certain moment, but was "eternally applying himself to its creation." The intent of this formulation, says Philo, was to avoid imputing to God a most unbecoming inactivity which would otherwise have characterized his pre-creative state. But in this case, the absurdity of this hypothesis becomes immediately evident; for those who have espoused it in their desire to remove a minimal accusation against the deity have actually attached to him a maximal one. Their conception of God's creative act turns out, in the last analysis, to be one of bestowing order and form on a primordial matter which lacked all previous determination. Is this not equivalent, argues Philo, to making matter into a principle of creation alongside of God? While solicitously clearing God of the accusation of temporary inactivity they have thus nonchalantly overlooked the more genuine threat to his sovereign creative power.

Philo now states his own position. "God is continuously ordering matter by his thought. His thinking is simultaneous with his acting and there never was a time when he did not act, the ideas themselves existing with him from the beginning. For God's will is not posterior to him, but is always with him, for natural motions never give out. Thus ever thinking he creates, and furnishes to sensible things the principle of their existence, so that one always finds these two processes in conjunction." (1.7) At first sight, this passage seems baffling. Having concluded his denunciation of those who teach a doctrine of eternal creation on the grounds of their converting the Creator into the mere orderer of a primordial principle, Philo now seems to espouse just such a doctrine in turn. God, according to Philo, is eternally creating inasmuch as he is ever thinking, and his creativity is constituted by nothing more than the meticulously accurate division of a formless matter by his all-incising Logos. The solution, however, is not far to seek, if we focus our attention on some important modifications which Philo has introduced into his own theory of eternal creation. In the mystical monotheism of Philo, nothing really exists or acts except God; all else is but a shadow reality ultimately derivative from the truly existent. Unlike Plato, who was a pluralist, Philo was thus unwilling to allow even for a self-existing void, and so made its pattern an eternal idea within the divine mind. In Plato's conception of matter, the self-existing Re-

ceptacle is its most stable and permanent constituent: "It must be called always the same, for it never departs at all from its own character." (*Tim.* 50b-c). For Philo, however, not only are the phantasmagoric copies of the ideal four elements indirectly derived from God, but even the virtually non-existent void is but a shadow reflection of an idea in God. Hence the crucial defect in the Platonists' doctrine of eternal creation in Philo's view (i.e., the elevation of matter into an autonomous albeit passive principle of creation) has carefully been eliminated from his own version of that theory.

Continuing his argument with the Platonists, Philo now confronts them with what he considers to be an inner contradiction in their doctrine. If, says Philo, one refuses to acknowledge the simultaneity of God's thinking and creating, how can one explain the fact that matter which existed from all time was never found in a disordered state? What Philo seems to be arguing is that if one considers matter as an autonomous primordial element, rather than an indirect product of God's thinking, then how could it be maintained that it never was in a disordered state? Only if God's thinking is eternally bringing matter into being and simultaneously ordering it can one avoid a primordially formless state of matter. But, continues Philo, if there was a time when matter was disordered, then the origin of the world began when order was imposed upon it, and the Platonists can no longer speak of eternal creation.

Philo's theory of eternal creation can now be succinctly stated. Insofar as God is always thinking the intelligible 'Forms', he is eternally creating the intelligible world or Logos, and thereby also indirectly causing its shadow reflection, the sensible world, which he is constantly making to conform as closely as possible to its intelligible counterpart. Corroboration for this interpretation may be found in an oft repeated principle of Philo's theology that God is unchangeable, so that a temporal creation involving as it does a change in God's nature would thus stand in open contradiction to a fundamental assumption of Philo's thought. Nor is it possible to say as St. Thomas later would that God willed freely from eternity that the world should come into existence in time, for Philo has already stated (*De provid.* 1.7) that God's thinking is simultaneous with his acting or creating. In the light of all this we should have to conclude that the many passages in which Philo speaks of creation in temporal terms are not to be taken literally, but only as accommodations to the biblical or popular idiom.

The paper concludes with a brief analysis of Philo's doctrine of miracles in an attempt to see whether it is compatible with his doctrine of eternal creation. Although it would appear that in expanding the natural order to encompass the biblical miracles, Philo has strained it to the breaking point, it may be noted that he had a striking example of this kind of intellectual legerdemain in the attempt of the Stoics to incorporate divination with its many miracles into their philosophical system. In the light of this Stoic caper it is no longer surprising that Philo felt free to exhibit the biblical miracles as emphatically as he did. Moreover, just as the Stoics believed that the miracles of divination were included among the causes foreordained by Destiny, so Philo must have considered the biblical miracles as part of the complex patterns of an unchanging and eternal Logos, in which past, present, and future are one.

Agreement Reached on "Academy Without Walls"

At the AJS Annual Business Meeting held at the October 1974 Annual Conference, a resolution was passed urging the AJS Executive Committee to clarify the apparent intrusion into the academic community by what was ostensibly an adult education program - the American Jewish Committee's "Academy for Jewish Studies Without Walls." In accordance with this directive, representatives of AJS met on 26 February 1975 with representatives of the Academy. Agreement was reached regarding the proper role of the Academy relative to the field of Jewish Studies. There follows an excerpt from a letter by Yehuda Rosenman, the Academy's director, stating the terms of the agreement:

1. There is no basis or reason for any conflict or misunderstanding between the Association for Jewish Studies and the Academy for Jewish Studies Without Walls.
2. The American Jewish Committee and the Academy are committed to aiding the growth and expansion of Jewish studies on American campuses. We are equally committed to supporting the Association for Jewish Studies and the professional status and advancement of academicians engaged in or preparing for teaching and pursuing scholarship in Jewish studies. Four understandings follow from this basic commitment:
 - a. The AJSWW is primarily an adult Jewish education program. It was never conceived of nor is it presently seen as *in any way* being a substitute for Jewish studies on campuses.
 - b. The AJSWW will not do anything that might hinder the growth of Jewish studies on campuses.
 - c. The AJSWW has no intentions, nor has it ever occurred to its leadership, to become involved in planning for the field of Jewish studies on American campuses. We have always recognized and supported the Association for Jewish Studies as the professional academic body responsible in this area.
 - d. The AJSWW will consult with the Association for Jewish Studies before making any approach to colleges or universities to whom we might consider offering our courses. It is understood that such an approach would be limited to those schools which, in the judgment of your Association, do not now offer and are unlikely in the foreseeable future to offer any program of Jewish studies on their own. Furthermore, in communications to colleges or universities, we will indicate that Academy courses are not a substitute for Jewish studies to be offered in the regular curriculum of the school.

The above, we believe, represents the substance of our understanding. Its implementation follows clearly and obviously from it. It should be based on trust, mutual respect and

on as frequent consultations as necessary. More specifically, we are planning the following:

1. We will enlarge our Academic Advisory Council to include more professors of Jewish studies.
2. We will consult members of our Advisory Council about the content and spirit of the Academy's literature and promotional material, particularly such material which might have reference to academic institutions and concerns.
3. We shall provide the office of the Association for Jewish Studies with our educational material to be on file for reference.
4. The Association might very well suggest to an institution that has no staff in the field of Jewish studies, and that is unlikely to have such a staff, that the program of the Academy would serve their students.

Midrash in the Paintings of the Dura Europos Synagogue (Continued from page 8)

ingly ends on the west wall with the restoration of the widow of Zarephath's son. Paintings 3 and 4 are of Elijah and the prophets of the Baal. We have two altars before us, two bullocks, and two sets of supporting actors. On the left the prophets of Baal are hieratically posed, crowded around the altar (having shouted all morning for Baal to light the fire, according to I Kings 17). The surprise is the little man inside the altar, and the snake rapidly approaching him on the right, no hint of either being found in the Kings narrative. What was originally thought to be a 10th century midrash now turns up on a 3rd century mural: It is Hiel, who was hired by the prophets of Baal to hide in the altar, taking with him two stones and hatched flax which he would light at the propitious moment, only to be done in by the Holy One, who on Elijah's request, sends the snake. It should be noted in the English translation of this midrash taken from the Saul Lieberman edition of *Devarim Rabbah* that the midrash is framed by two seemingly unrelated passages from Amos 9:3 and Hosea 13:1. The midrash recognizes a conceptual nucleus in common and weaves them into the Hiel episode. Thus "... when he became guilty through Baal, he died" identifies Hiel who lived on the border of Ephraim (Hos. 13:1), while the Amos passage affirms "how fruitless it is to hide in the top of Carmel or in the deep of the sea; thence I will command the serpent and he shall bite them."

Hiel performed the forbidden deed of rebuilding the city of Jericho (I Kings 16:34) for which he paid with the death of his two sons (cf. the curse Josh. 6:26). But since the midrash feels that his biblical punishment was insufficient, he is reprogrammed as an agent of the Baal on Carmel where he meets his proper end. Thus the legend of Hiel enables the midrash to tie together the beginning and end of the Jericho affair, to bring together the dissociated verses of Hosea and Amos, and to do in the prophets of the Baal, not to speak of delivering a just verdict to an arch sinner.

To the Dura Jewish community it probably meant that idolatry was as impotent as the weak right hands of these eight prophets lined up around the altar, that the Lord of Israel could do anything, and that the Dura Jews were secure in their Judaism, not threatened by the many pagan sects in their immediate environs.

BOOK REVIEWS

Biblical Studies: Some Recent Publications by Nahum M. Sarna (Brandeis University)

Ktav Publishing House, Inc., of New York has recently produced two specialized collections of great help to students and scholars in the area of biblical studies. The first, by Sid Z. Leiman, is *The Canon and Masorah of the Hebrew Bible: An Introductory Reader* (Pp. 877; 1974). It contains 37 scholarly articles and essays selected from various publications organized around two major themes - canon and Masorah, each of which is broken down into sub-themes. Three such relate to the evidence for the Canon in biblical, extratalmudic, and talmudic and midrashic literature. The studies on the Masorah are distributed under the rubrics of pre-tannaitic (emergence of the Textus Receptus), talmudic and midrashic (the stabilization of the Textus Receptus), pre-Tiberian (the vocalization), Masoretes and Masorah, and masoretic Bibles.

Leiman's Preface makes clear that the purpose of the collection is to further the pursuit of study in the twin fields and to guide the student to the primary sources. It is to be regretted that he has not furnished the work with a comprehensive introduction describing the importance of the subjects, setting forth the basic issues, surveying the literature and delineating and evaluating the varied approaches. This lack of presentation of the state of the field is all the more unfortunate just because Leiman is uniquely qualified for the task. His own (unpublished) doctoral dissertation is an important and original contribution to the subject. Anyone untutored in the intricacies and complexities of the problems relating to the canon and its textual history will find the going here pretty rough. This undoubtedly valuable collection is obviously intended to supplement what appears in the books. More the pity, then, that neither bibliography nor index has been provided.

It is unfair to expect unanimity on any selection of this sort and it is instructive to compare the present work with that of S. Talmon, *Readings on the History of the Biblical Texts in Recent Writing* (Jerusalem, 1966), which includes, *inter alia*, essays by H. L. Ginsberg, Ch. Rabin, I. L. Seeligmann and P. Skehan all of which are here omitted. In this connection, it is worthwhile drawing the attention of students to the comprehensive article on the Masorah by Aron Dotan, hidden away in volume 16 of the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (cols. 1401-1480). This contains a bibliography, chaotic and unevaluated, of hundreds of entries.

The second collection of essays is that of Sidney Jellicoe, *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations* (Pp. LXII + 609; 1974). Thirty-five articles deal with Surveys of Septuagint Studies, Septuagint Origins (Studies, The Letter of Aristeas, Qumran and the Septuagint), Transmission History (Translations and Recensions, the Hexapla), Text, Translation Technique, The Septuagint in the New Testament and the Fathers, the Significance of the Septuagint.

One can hardly quarrel with the selection. Each is explained and justified in the annotated fifty page Prolegomenon which is a masterly survey of the field and a model for a work of this type. This reviewer would have included E. J. Bickerman's, "The Septuagint as a Translation," *PAAJR*, 28 (1959), 1-39, as well as S. Jellicoe's own "The Occasion and Purpose of the Letter of Aristeas: a Re-examination," *N. T. Studies*, 13 (1965-66), 144-150. Articles on the minor Greek versions have been excluded and perhaps will serve as the subject for another book. Incidentally, the S.B.L. recently published a collection of lexicographical studies, *Septuagintal Lexicography* (ed. Robert A. Kraft, 1972), which serve to supplement Jellicoe's work in a narrowly specialized area.

A major reprint of another kind is Benno Jacob's massive German commentary to Genesis, *Das Erste Buch der Torah*, first published in Berlin, 1934. Because of the tragic events of the time, this monumental study (1055 pages) never enjoyed the circulation and scholarly attention that it richly merited. (The commentary to Exodus has still not seen the light of day.)

Jacob wrote before the major discoveries from Nuzi and Mari and his *Genesis* is naturally not up to date. Yet the vast mass of philological and exegetical material that he managed to assemble, his own brilliant insights and his skillful synthesis of traditional Jewish with non-Jewish interpretation, make the work indispensable. It also has a special quality about it in that Jacob rejected the documentary hypothesis on scientific, not dogmatic, grounds even though he was not able to maintain the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. The reappearance of the Genesis Commentary (by Ktav) is a boon to those who can handle the German.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of the English abridgement by Ernst I. Jacob and Walter Jacob (Ktav, 1974). It is with the greatest reluctance that this reviewer finds it necessary to point out that the serious student will find the work of little use. This judgement is not based solely on the fact that the original has been emasculated and reduced to about one-third in an attempt to produce a "popular" version. Nor is it wholly due to the elimination of the technical philological material and the extensive argumentation against "Higher Criticism." Rather, it is because the selectivity is frequently injudicious and the English style leaves much to be desired. At times the comments are simply unintelligible. Witness that to Gen. 18:3 (p. 117):

"he knows that they are only passing and their destination." (Curiously, the same passage is rendered by the same translator in *Conservative Judaism*, Summer, 1961, p. 7, as follows:

"he knows where they are going and that they are only passing.").

Sometimes, the original comment is wholly obscured if not distorted. Thus, Jacob's observation on the singularity and significance of the phrase "the valley of Hebron" (Gen. 37:14) appears in the English as:

Continued on page 13

Joshua Baker and Ernest W. Nicholson, *The Commentary of Rabbi David Kimhi on Psalms CXX-CL*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1973. 190 pp.

Reviewed by Frank Talmage (University of Toronto)

In order to be fully satisfactory, editions of medieval texts should at least (a) make use of all available evidence of extant manuscripts, *testimonia*, and early editions; (b) provide such data concerning the manuscripts (provenance, date, condition) which might give some indication of their relative value. Failure to do so will only necessitate the redoing of such an edition as its short-comings become evident to scholars. Such a duplication of effort is found in the volume under review for the same material had previously been edited by J. Bosniak, *The Commentary of David Kimhi on the Fifth Book of the Psalms* (New York, Bloch, 1954). Bosniak's edition smarts of the parochialism characteristic of nineteenth and early twentieth-century editions of Hebrew texts: German scholars would use German and Austrian mss., Cantabrigians would study only British mss., and Americans would consult only those at J.T.S. Nowadays, with inexpensive and convenient microfilm reproduction, there is no need for such isolationism. In this regard, the present edition represents only a minor improvement if indeed it is an improvement at all. The only overlap with Bosniak's edition is the use of the Bologna 1477 and Naples 1487 editions and Ms. Adler 1318 (although the editors note where Bosniak provides a different reading in the body of the text. Both Bosniak and the present edition employ an eclectic text). Since the remaining mss. are in the Bodleian or the British Library, it is obvious that the mss. were selected only because of their location. Minimal descriptions are provided and for the Oxford mss. the reader is referred to Neubauer's *Catalogue*, itself inadequate. The problems inherent in the use of so few mss. are two: 1) It is possible that all the mss. used will agree on an obscure or corrupt reading as actually happened in Bosniak's edition (Ps. 110, end). Many, if not most, of the extant mss. present a more comprehensible text. 2) Important passages may have survived in only one or a few of the mss. and might be missed completely with only a random selection. (See the comment on Amos 2:6 adduced by S. Berkowitz in his somewhat more ambitious edition of Kimhi on Amos [unpub. Ph.D. diss., Cambridge, 1939]). It might indeed happen then - and with justification - that some curious and energetic scholar will wish to redo even this edition.

Nonetheless, if in one respect it is wanting, it is, if taken on its own terms, a work of great merit. The text is provided with an elegant and idiomatic translation - indeed the only translation of a sizeable portion of Kimhi's commentaries into current English. This imparts a certain neatness and convenience to the volume. There is no need for an *apparatus fontium* since rabbinic sources are indicated in the notes to the translation. No more extensive study of medieval grammatical and exegetical sources is attempted but perhaps in this instance it is not really required. The true value of this volume is as a text-book for introducing the student to medieval exegesis. It has all the features of such, including a glossary of post-biblical words and an attractive format and appearance. (This

despite the fact that the Hebrew is reproduced from typescript, an apparent victim of escalating publishing costs). The text is provided with an introduction which covers Kimhi's life and activities and a brief analysis of his exegesis. This introduction does well to underscore the manifold and apparently self-contradictory character of Kimhi's relationship to midrash (although the present reviewer would prefer to see this phenomenon as part of a general Provençal reaction to midrash rather than as the result of a fusion - as traditionally stated - of French and Spanish exegesis).

As might be expected in a work emanating from the British Isles (Dr. Baker is at Dublin; Dr. Nicholson at Cambridge), the work appears to be oriented toward the biblicist and as such would be a good tool for the preparation of whatever "set texts" a student of biblical Hebrew might need. It is, however, well suited to the needs of the North American classroom, either for an intermediate course in medieval Hebrew or biblical commentaries or for a survey, since here the student must grapple with biblical, rabbinic, and medieval Hebrew at once. The extensive bibliographic footnotes in the introduction will provide the impetus for further study of Kimhi and medieval exegesis.



Biblical Studies: Some Recent Publications (Continued from page 12)

"There Abraham was buried in the Valley like Moses
(Deut. 34:6)."

Alas, the infelicitous rendering has nullified the assertion of the cited proof-text! He who desires an English epitome of Benno Jacob's comments to at least Gen. 37-50 will find it more profitable to consult Eric I. Lowenthal's *The Joseph Narrative in Genesis* (Ktav, 1973).



Positions Available

The Department of Near Eastern Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, announces the opening of a full-time Lecturer position in Hebrew Literature, starting July 1, 1975, with a salary range of \$12,816 to \$14,832. The appointment is for one year, with the possibility of renewal.

Candidates must have a Ph.D. degree in Hebrew literature with an emphasis on the modern period. The appointee will be expected to have teaching competence in modern Hebrew literature with sufficient preparation to teach some courses in earlier periods of Hebrew literature.

Applications should be sent to Professor Mounah A. Khouri, Chairman of the Department of Near Eastern Studies, University of California, Berkeley 94720. Minority and women candidates are urged to apply.



Temporary, full-time position in Jewish Studies for Spring 1976. Ph.D. in history, with an emphasis in Judaic Studies, preferred. Vitas and proposed Jewish-history syllabus should be sent to Dr. Harry Ruja, Dept. of Philosophy, San Diego State Univ., San Diego, Ca. 92182. The University is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity employer and invites applications from all qualified persons of both sexes and all ethnic backgrounds.

S. Adler-Rudel, *Jüdische Selbsthilfe unter dem Naziregime 1933-1939*. Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr, 1974. xv + 221 pp.

A.J. Sherman, *Island Refuge: Britain and Refugees from the Third Reich 1933-1939*. University of California Press, 1973. 291 pp.

Reviewed by Jehuda Reinharz (University of Michigan)

Prior to the establishment of the Third Reich, the German Jewish community was noted for its multiplicity of organizations and its inability to form a unified, representative body. Since the latter part of the 19th century, all attempts to form such an organization failed. On the eve of the Nazi takeover there were more than 1,600 independent local community congregations (*Gemeinden*), as well as regional associations, cultural and charitable organizations, religious bodies, professional societies and political parties. Each entity functioned independently and often overlapped or even clashed with another. Only after Hitler took office on January 30, 1933, did German Jews recognize the need for unified leadership to better deal with their new situation. Two central institutions were formed: "The Central Committee for Relief and Rehabilitation" (*Zentralausschuss für Hilfe und Aufbau*) and "The National Representation of Jews in Germany" (*Reichsvertretung der Juden in Deutschland*).

These two organizations complemented each other by providing for the practical and political needs of the community in a centralized fashion. The *Zentralausschuss* was supported by all the influential elements in the community such as the *Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens*, the *Zionistische Vereinigung für Deutschland*, the *Hilfsverein der Deutschen Juden*, the *Jüdische Frauenbund*, the *Preussische Landesverband Jüdischer Gemeinden*, the *Agudas Jisroel*, the *Jüdische Gemeinde* of Berlin and others. It tried to coordinate and guide the efforts of various organizations engaged in rehabilitation and philanthropy. Other functions of the *Zentralausschuss* included organizing an orderly emigration and financing vocational training and retraining. The *Reichsvertretung*, on the other hand, was established to serve as the representative body of the Jewish community vis-a-vis the German government and Jewish organizations throughout the world. At the same time it attempted to solidify the German Jewish community. The objectives of the two organizations were formidable and not easy to achieve after decades of disunity and strife within the Jewish community. Even in the face of the Nazis various segments of German Jewry refused to submit to the organizations' authority. (See Abraham Margalio, "The Dispute over the Leadership of German Jewry (1933-1938)," *Yad Vashem Studies* X, 1974).

The monograph of S. Adler-Rudel deals almost exclusively with the *Zentralausschuss für Hilfe und Aufbau* established on April 13, 1933 and which functioned independently until incorporated by the *Reichsvertretung* in 1935. Between 1920 and 1933 the author served in local and national Jewish social work agencies, assumed the role of General Secretary of the *Reichsvertretung* in 1934, and subsequently became its representative outside Germany. His study stems primarily from an examination of the "Arbeitsberichte" and

"Informationsblätter" of the *Zentralausschuss*. As an actor in the events, however, Adler-Rudel's contribution is not limited to that of an historian. This "insider's perspective" is particularly significant here. The German Jewish organizations were completely aware that it was necessary to obscure their reports with oblique and vague phraseologies which would protect them against added harassment from the Nazis who were reading their papers. Thus, following the Kristallnacht pogroms of November 9-10, 1938, the *Reichsvertretung* dryly observed: "The Reichsvertretung resumed its work on November 29 after a temporary suspension." Adler-Rudel interprets and supplements the intentional gaps with first-hand information.

There is yet no comprehensive history of German Jewry's response to the events of 1933-1939. Various works, such as Ernst Simon's *Aufbau im Untergang*, approach the period through one particular issue. In addition, the Leo Baeck Institute has paved the way for future contributions to the historiography of the period through its many excellent publications. Adler-Rudel's monograph begins to fill the gap with detailed descriptions of the activities of the *Zentralausschuss*. He does so in a factual and objective manner, marshalling tables and statistics to make his points. He leads us carefully and systematically through the labyrinth of departments, committees and programs of this organization supplementing his description with important documentary materials in the appendices.

It is fortunate that Adler-Rudel undertook the task, but more work remains to be done. Adler-Rudel has created the foundations for future research which needs to investigate the sociological and psychological circumstances of the people who, under enormous stress, created this and other organizations. What was the decision-making mechanism of the German Jewish organizations and how did it function; what were the alternatives to various courses of action and why were they discarded or adopted; what were the conflicts that persisted throughout the period and how were they expressed by such organizations as the extreme assimilationists, the independent orthodox, the "Organization of State Zionists" and others. This "human element" in the organizational response of German Jewry remains to be explored.

One of the vital functions of the *Zentralausschuss* and the *Reichsvertretung* was to aid all potential emigrants whose numbers swelled as well over 200 anti-Jewish measures were promulgated by the Third Reich between 1933-1939. The first countries of immigration were the neighbor-states of Holland, Belgium and France. With time, however, Britain assumed a larger role both as a more secure haven and as a way-station for further emigration. At the twilight of World War II, Britain was not the sadly emasculated Island of today, but rather the symbol of a great democratic power which inspired hope in the oppressed of all countries. This special position of Britain accounts, perhaps, for the plethora of studies on its attitude to Jewish refugees. (Two recent dissertations: Joshua Berton Stein, "Britain and the Jews of Europe, 1933-1939," St. Louis,

1972 and Charles Henry Coker, "The British Reaction to Refugees from Germany: 1933-1939," South Carolina, 1973). Standard histories of this period portray Britain as they do other democracies of the period — as indifferent to the fate of refugees from the Nazi regime, lacking in generosity and basic human compassion. The monograph of A.J. Sherman sets out to modify this image and concentrates on an investigation of the decision-making process of the British government.

In Sherman's view the current assessment of Britain's stance toward the refugees is incorrect and reflects the policy in Palestine rather than the policy at home. Briefly stated his thesis is as follows: Until September 1935, refugees, few in number, obtained asylum in Britain without much fanfare. In addition, the British government cautiously supported the High Commissioner for Refugees in his diplomatic efforts but carefully avoided any government involvement in the refugee question. The persecution that followed the Nuremberg Laws of 1935 and the subsequent increase in emigration did not alter the Home Office policy of "rigid but sympathetic" control which resulted in the admission to Great Britain of several thousand "desirable, industrious, intelligent and acceptable persons" by 1937. One year later Britain imposed visa requirements on Reich nationals and thereby slowed the influx of refugees. In common with all other governments represented in the Intergovernmental Committee created at Evian, Britain did not offer any financial assistance to the refugees. In Sherman's presentation, the turning point came only after Kristallnacht when most countries imposed immigration regulations which were *more* restrictive while Britain responded with policies which were *less* so.

Sherman's book relies primarily on Foreign Office and Home Office papers hitherto unpublished, rendering it most likely the best documented monograph on the subject. Sherman adheres to a strict chronology made possible by his careful documentation. He recounts a familiar tale: a trickle of refugees in 1933 swells to a massive flight as the Nazis establish repressive regimes in Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia. With the increased demand for safer havens, there is increased opposition by native anti-alien, anti-Semitic and fascist groups joined by professional organizations fearing competition by the well-educated central Europeans. These groups are aided in their efforts, often unintentionally, by dozens of committees, intergovernmental agencies, high commissioners and others paralyzed by the niceties of diplomatic etiquette at best, but also by attempts to dissociate, obscure and studiously ignore the refugee problem. It is plain that Britain was reluctant to interfere, intervene or even plead on behalf of refugees lest the German Reich take offense.

Sherman's figures, facts and tables are meticulous. It is with his conclusions that I take issue. It is unacceptable to dissociate British

refugee policy at home from that in Palestine; the Home Office and the Colonial Office might have been at odds with one another, but they were still both arms of the same government. Britain's protestation on the grounds of the economic inability of Palestine to absorb refugees ("economic absorptive capacity") was obviously untrue. The Peel Commission had explicitly stated that immigration *increased* the economic absorptive capacity of Palestine by virtue of the capital assets of the German Jews. The real issue was of course *political* and not economic. This fateful policy, adopted in response to Arab pressures, culminated in the White Paper policy which Elizabeth Monroe has described as "convulsive gesture of self-preservation." Political considerations alone prompted the morally bankrupt rejection by Britain of the Yishuv's offer in November 1938 to accept for adoption 10,000 (the offer was later augmented to 100,000) children from Germany. Sherman implies ironically (top of page 264) that as a counter measure to its inhumanity in Palestine, Britain felt guilty enough to accept a few more refugees at home.

In 1933 the British Jewish community created the "Central British Fund for German Jewry" later known as the "Council for German Jewry." Otto M. Schiff organized a "Jewish Refugees Committee" later known as the "German Jewish Aid Committee." Throughout this period the British government refused to help defray any costs of the emigrating refugees, a refusal which, as Sherman puts it, "had virtually hardened into constitutional principle." This policy meant in practice that no Jews could be admitted into England unless the Jewish aid organizations had the funds to provide for them. In the summer of 1939, the British government agreed to help financially only "if other governments would join the effort." The financial aid which did come at the end of 1939 was niggardly and dependent on matching funds of the by now totally impoverished and overtaxed private Jewish organizations.

Refugees numbering 50,000 from the Reich and 6,000 from Czechoslovakia entered Great Britain between 1933 and 1939. In Sherman's opinion this is "not [an] unimpressive record," relative to the record of other countries, especially the U.S. to which he makes constant reference to demonstrate Britain's "generosity." One cannot fault this comparison. In the context of universal apathy and selfish material or geo-political considerations which led to doors slammed shut, Britain does not have the most dismal record and is even distinguished in comparison with the United States. But on its own merit Britain cannot expect to be remembered as "comparatively compassionate . . . even generous." Britain's record, as carefully documented by Sherman, as well as that of other Western states serves to underline Robert Weltsch's statement in his introduction to Adler-Rudel's book: "Experience shows that in a conflict between moral values and political interests, the latter always retain the upper hand."

The Jewish People: History, Religion, Literature Series.
 New York, Arno, 1973. 42 vols.
 Reviewed by Steven T. Katz (Dartmouth College)

There is no end to the making of books, and today there also seems to be no end to the remaking of books. As a natural extension of the ever-increasing field of Jewish studies publishers have been quick to see the economic potential of reprinting old and/or scarce items of Judaica. Arno Press has now entered this field in a major way with a collection of 42 volumes on various aspects of Judaica under the series title: "The Jewish People: History, Religion, Literature." The collection is edited by Jacob Agus, Louis Jacobs, Jakob Petuchowski and Seymour Siegel. The contents may be divided, into five general categories: 1) Jewish history throughout the ages; 2) Jewish-Christian relations in all their various manifestations; 3) Jewish philosophy and theology; 4) Jewish and Hebrew literature and poetry; 5) A few remaining miscellaneous titles.

I. *Jewish History* (9 volumes)

The historical material represents a thoroughly mixed selection. To begin with the editors have compiled three original anthologies on diverse historical themes. *Facets of Medieval Judaism*, ed. by S. Siegel, includes four disparate essays originally published in various journals by Walter Fischel, Jacob Rabinowitz, Salo Baron and Leo Strauss. The topics covered range from Fischel's discussion of "Jews and Judaism at the Court of the Moghul Emperors in Medieval India" to Strauss' "The Law of Reason in the Kuzari" and Baron's "The Jewish Factor in Medieval Civilization." The essays certainly do not lack intrinsic merit and students of medieval Judaism will learn from each. Strauss' essay remains essential reading on Judah ha-Levi's classic and the other essays, though a bit dated, remain significant contributions.

The second anthology is entitled *The Foundations of Jewish Life* and consists of three lectures by Israel Abrahams on "The Glory of God" (1925) and 12 papers by Adolph Buchler, most of which were collected and published as the *Buchler Memorial Volume* in 1956. Abrahams and Buchler were certainly major figures in the world of Jewish scholarship in the early part of this century, and both were especially important in disseminating Rabbinic scholarship among English only audiences. However, these studies, especially Buchler's historical studies, have, for the most part, been outstripped by the immense amount of new historical data produced by the various fields of modern scholarship, especially archeology and economic and social history. Moreover, the methodological technique of both scholars seems either primitive or non-existent by today's standards, this especially so in their totally uncritical and 'unhistorical' use of rabbinic materials as *sources* for the writing of Jewish history and theology. A case could be made that these essays are "classics" of a sort, even though they are not required reading today; however, they do not form, as the title suggests, "The Foundations of Jewish Life."

The anthology *Historical Views of Judaism* is still more eccentric. Except for Leopold Zunz' always interesting and historically important, though outdated (1855), essay on "The Suffering of Jews in the Middle Ages", the contents of this anthology are curiosities of little value to anyone but the most specialized modern student. The essays by G. Karpeles on 19th-Century Judaism, D. Neumark on the principles of Judaism and Diogene Tama on the Parisian Sanhedrin are simply museum pieces of *wissenschaft* arcana. It is hard to imagine what principle of selection was used to justify their reissue.

Of the remaining historical volumes there are four of value. Mann's collected essays, *The Responsa of the Babylonian Geonim* (1917-21), still constitute an important work. Though the individual essays, and hence the whole, lack cohesiveness and organization, and Mann's style leaves a great deal to be desired, the work represents a sustained and learned treatment of an important area of Jewish concern, and one which deserves more study than it has received. The same may be said, if somewhat more reservedly, about Max Radin's *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans* (1915). Unfortunately for Radin classical and Jewish scholars (especially notable being the well-known researches of Victor Tcherikover, Saul Lieberman, Erwin Goodenough and M. Stern to name only a few of the major modern students of the field) have unearthed and developed new sources of relevant material, drawing heavily on recent archeological findings among other disciplines and thus have made it impossible to recommend Radin as a primary source. Thirdly, Arthur Ruppin's *The Jews in the Modern World* (1934) is a significant and pioneering contribution to the sociological investigation of the Jew in the modern world. One of its advantages is that it was written before modern sociology developed to the point where almost unintelligible jargon was used to cloak almost vacuous platitudes in the name of some caricature of "scientific" respectability. A further interesting feature of this work is the "Introductory Essay" written on "The Jewish Question" by the eminent British constitutional historian L. B. Namier. The fourth work of interest in this section is *The Memoirs of Ber of Bolechow* (1723-1805), translated with an introductory essay by M. Vishnitzer in 1922. Though Ber of Bolechow is no Solomon Maimon and his memoirs lack the vitality and historical importance of those of his famous contemporary, they nonetheless give us additional information about 18th-century Polish Jewish life, struggling as it was to strike a compromise between the ghetto and modernity in the form of the *Haskalah* while always keeping an eye on the changing shape of Polish and central European institutions and regimes. A primary source like this is always welcome.

The remaining volumes which treat historical themes, such as H. P. Smith's *The Bible and Islam* (1897) and Uriah Engelman's *The Rise of the Jew in the Western World* (1944), were poor when originally issued and have no intrinsic or historical merit that calls for their republication. As a group the historical volumes are disap-

pointing. One gains the impression that the editors were hard put to find historical studies of substance that had not already been reprinted.

II. *Judaism and Christianity* (11 volumes)

A striking feature of this collection is the inclusion of 11 volumes (over 25 percent of the total) on themes relating to Christianity - a somewhat strange phenomenon in a collection devoted to the "Jewish People." Nevertheless we must be grateful to the editors because it is among these titles that some of the most important works in the whole collection are to be found.

To begin, there are two modern works of quality scholarship. The first of these is W.D. Davies' collection of essays, *Christian Origins and Judaism* (1962). Davies, a leader among Christian scholars in stressing the need for a reappraisal of the Jewish background of the early Church, is not always tough-minded enough about the differences between Judaism and Christianity but his general line of argument is unquestionably central to any adequate understanding of both 1st-century Judaism and the primitive Jewish-Christian Church. The second modern work reproduced here, David Daube's *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (1956), is of still more importance. Daube, one of the best Jewish scholars to deal in depth with New Testament themes, presents a series of seminal studies in this work. Daube sometimes overestimates Jewish-classical parallels and Jewish-Christian parallels but his work remains essential for every serious student of Jewish-Christian relations.

In addition to these modern works there are two worthwhile studies by Claude Montefiore, namely *Judaism and St. Paul* (1914) and *Some Elements of the Religious Teaching of Jesus* (1910). Though ancillary to his two-volume study of the *Synoptic Gospels* (2nd rev. ed. 1927, not included in this collection) these works are of interest. There is much to criticize in Montefiore's work with regard to both his image of "Judaism" and "Christianity" and the interaction between them, but its significance is beyond question. Moreover, Montefiore's work is the finest representative of an entire class of modern Jewish studies of Christianity which attempt to reclaim Jesus for Judaism firstly, by stressing Jesus' parallels with Rabbinic Judaism and secondly, by dissociating Jesus from Paul and Pauline theology to which the cause of the separation of Judaism and Christianity is then attributed. Of course, the best Christian scholarship has not let this popular Jewish apologia go unchallenged, and rightly so. Yet despite Montefiore's bias his studies are still worth reading — critically!

Unlike the historical anthologies, the one on *Judaism and Christianity* edited by J. Agus is well conceived. It contains some of the most suggestive essays, written primarily in the early part of this century, on topics of Jewish-Christian concern. Among these are George Foot Moore's rightly famous essay on "Christian Writers on Judaism" (1921) which marked a radical change in Christian scholarship on Judaism (as did Moore's work in general). Other still valuable essays to be found here are I. Abrahams' critique of Schurer's anti-Jewish position in his "Schurer on life under the

Jewish law;" and two essays apiece by Solomon Schechter and C.G. Montefiore.

The other volumes in this category are less distinguished. Kaufman Kohler's *Origins of the Synagogue and the Church* (1929), though valuable when it first appeared, is today dated. The remaining works were never major contributions: neither Emil Hirsch's *My Religion* (1925); nor Thomas Walker's *Jewish Views of Jesus* (1931), and certainly not J. Jacobs' *Jesus as Others Saw Him* (1903).

III. *Jewish Philosophy and Theology* (12 volumes)

The titles collected under this rubric are of considerable diversity. An anthology entitled *Modern Jewish Thought*, edited and with an introduction by Louis Jacobs, contains a few essays that accurately reflect the title of the volume. Among these are Milton Steinberg's "Kierkegaard and Judaism," a topic still much discussed, and Schechter's classic "The Dogmas of Judaism," first written in 1889. However, most of the other essays are obscure, and deservedly so. The striking feature of this anthology is its omissions. While it includes such philosophical irrelevancies as Barnet Brickner on "Religious Education" it does not include a single excerpt from the towering figures of modern thought; not Cohen, not Baeck, not Rosenzweig, not Buber, not Heschel and not even Kaplan. I say even Kaplan because the volume not only ignores the major modern Jewish thinkers, but also has a decidedly anti-existentialist, pro Reform and Reconstructionist bent, and still it excludes Kaplan. It is the group omitted that has dominated modern Jewish thought and their exclusion means that the volume, though including some essays of peripheral interest, is not representative, even marginally, of "modern Jewish thought."

Reprinted also is Jacob Agus' *Evolution of Jewish Thought* (1959). This is a history of Jewish thought from Biblical times to Mendelssohn. It is meant as an introduction to the subject drawn in broad strokes and this it is. It is not as useful or as rigorous as J. Guttman's *Philosophies of Judaism* (Engl. trans. 1964) and in places it is idiosyncratic and uneven, but it covers a great deal of ground and is useful for the tyro. Scholars will only want to quibble with most of Agus' generalizations. H. Walter's biography of *Mendelssohn* (1930) has also been reprinted. It is ironic that Walter's work should be reprinted at approximately the same time that Alexander Altmann's definitive and magisterial biography of Mendelssohn appeared (*Moses Mendelssohn*, Univ. of Alabama Press, 1973). Altmann's work makes all previous work obsolete and if you want to study the details of Mendelssohn's biography and his philosophical contribution one can recommend only Altmann in good conscience. As a companion volume to Walter's biography the present collection also includes the 1789 English translation of Mendelssohn's treatise on immortality, the *Phaedon*. Since the 18th-century text has been photo-offset, we are confronted with the printing and English style of the 18th century. This is of antiquarian interest, but it does not make for easy or pleasant reading. More importantly, the translation is inadequate and it is hard to see what scholarly purpose it can serve. What is needed is a new translation

Continued on page 18

and a modern edition of this work to make it fully accessible to the modern student.

Two collections of essays important to an understanding of Zionism are also included. The first is a collection of ten essays by Ahad Ha'am. Ahad Ha-Am's version of "spiritual Zionism" has been overtaken by the events of the 20th century, yet his vision of Zion retains not only historical interest but is still an important perspective in the ongoing debate over the meaning and future of Zionism and the State of Israel, even if one demurs in places. Ahad Ha-Am's writings also possess the additional virtue of lucidity. The second collection on Zionist themes consists of the essays of A.D. Gordon. Gordon's position is even less well-understood today than is Ahad Ha-Am's. So very different in temperament and outlook, mystical where Ahad Ha-Am is rationalistic, activist where Ahad Ha-Am is reflective, and most important, actually involved in the rebuilding of the land of Israel at Degania, Gordon was a leader-saint to several generations of *chalutzim* and deserves to be better known. The editors have done a service in including this volume. In rereading both collections on Zionism one is struck anew by the momentous import of Zionism for Jew and non-Jew alike and one realizes how history overran all ideology in the events that led to the creation of a "Jewish State."

The *Maimonides Octocentennial Series* volume issued in 1935 on the 800th anniversary of the Rambam's birth is also reissued. It includes four fine essays: "The supremacy of reason" by Ahad Ha-Am, a classic interpretation of Maimonides as rationalist; Alexander Marx's light yet competent biographical sketch; "Maimonides as codifier" by Chaim Tchernowitz which is a useful introduction to Maimonides' *halachic* work; and Isaac Husik's "Philosophy of Maimonides" which is a semi-popular resume of the general outlines of Maimonides' philosophical position. Though these essays were intended for a mass audience, one could do worse than start novices with them as an introduction to Maimonides.

The remaining volumes in this section are less distinguished. Adolph Franck's *The Kabbalah*, first issued in 1843 and enlarged in 1889, hardly deserves to be reprinted after the half-century of labours by Gershom Scholem and his school which have transformed the study of Jewish mysticism and put it on a sound scholarly base. Franck's study is crude even by the standards of 1843 and to reproduce it in 1973 shows poor taste. (There is a touch of black comedy to the re-issue of Franck's work at almost the same time as Scholem's masterful work also entitled *Kabbalah* [Quadrangle Books, 1974]). W. Hirsch's study of the soul in talmudic literature, misleadingly titled *Rabbinic Psychology* (1947), though not an anachronism in the same way as Franck's work, is nevertheless unsatisfactory. It reflects neither mastery of the talmudic and related rabbinic literature nor any methodological or critical sophistication — to say nothing of Hirsch's ignorance of matters "psychological." Nathan Stern's *The Jewish Historico-Critical School of the Nineteenth Century* (1901) is a work of slim scholarship. There remains only the 1902 edition of *The Ethical Treatises of*

Berachya, a work which though carefully done is of minor significance for all but the most serious student of the medieval period.

IV. *Jewish and Hebrew Literature* (4 volumes)

Of the four volumes to be considered two are among the best in this series, the other two are among the worst. Nina Salaman's translations of the *Selected Poems of Jehuda Halevi* (1924) are still a joy to read. The volume, including both Hebrew and English texts, is well produced in every sense and its value is obvious for medievalists and the Jewish scholarly community.

A second fine volume of Hebrew poetry is Israel Zangwill's translation of the *Selected Religious Poems of Solomon Ibn Gabirol* (1923). Gabirol's poetry is more complex and difficult than Halevi's but Zangwill has managed to capture some of its stylistic quality and its philosophical depth. On the other hand, the two volumes devoted respectively to Heinrich Heine's *Prose Writings* (1887) and *Memoirs* (1910) leave much to be desired. It is valuable to have Heine available for those who have no access to the original, but these particular translations are not inspiring and fail to capture the flavour of the "authentic" Heine — though on a second reading they seem less stiff and stilted.

V. *Miscellaneous* (5 volumes)

Of the five remaining titles two are volumes of "reminiscences," one by Josef Bloch (d. 1923) and the other by Isaac M. Wise (d. 1900). Wise's *Reminiscences* (1901) covers the first 11 years of his life in America (1846-1857) and will be of interest to students of American Jewish history and Reform Judaism, though it is not great literature. Bloch's self-portrait (1923) is valuable because of its author's role in the struggle against the growing middle-European antisemitism of the late 19th and early 20th century. The content of this work is historically important; therefore, I will refrain from commenting on the quality of its prose.

Finally, three random titles. Alexander Marx's *Essays in Jewish Biography* (1948) is a useful and enjoyable compendium. Marx was a careful and patient historian who was able to combine readability, accuracy, and a sense of the relevant in drawing his still worthwhile images of twelve very different and completely unconnected personalities, ranging from Saadia Gaon and Rashi to Solomon Schechter and Israel Friedlander. Ben Zion Bokser's *Pharisaic Judaism in Transition* (1935) is a study of the career and historic importance of Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, originally submitted as a doctoral dissertation at Columbia. This work is not without its value and Bokser clearly took pains with it. However, it is flawed by its lack of any critical methodology and by a certain simplicity which at times covers over rather than illuminates historical and *halachic* issues central to his topic. Especially after Jacob Neusner's recent two-volume study of Eliezer (*Eliezer ben Hyrcanus*, Brill 1974), it is not a work talmudists or even budding talmudists will find required reading. *The Jewish Marriage Contract* (1927) by Louis Epstein rounds out this collection. This is a sound piece of talmudic scholarship reflecting thorough rabbinic expertise and mastery of sources. Its

Continued on page 20

Abraham G. Duker and Meir Ben-Horin, *Emancipation and Counter Emancipation*. New York, Ktav and Conference on Jewish Social Studies, 1974. 413 pp.

Robert Chazan and Marc Lee Raphael, *Modern Jewish History: A Source Reader*. New York, Schocken, 1974. 376 pp.

Reviewed by Deborah E. Lipstadt (University of Washington, Seattle)

Salo Baron has commented on the tendency of students and laymen to "paint the emancipation era all white against an abysmally dark background of 'medieval' sufferings." Regrettably, many of the works produced in the area of modern Jewish history reinforce this gross generalization and misconception to which Baron has called attention. Those who operate under the delusion that the emancipation era was an unqualifiedly positive experience for the Jews and the medieval period was, conversely, a negative experience will, at best, concede that their construct of Jewish history is tempered by the existence of the Golden Age of Spain on one end of the spectrum and Kishinev and the Holocaust on the other. However, even the recognition of these exceptions to their rule does not guarantee that the study of Jewish history will be approached in a manner which is less simplistic and more conducive to a true comprehension of the historic condition of the Jews. Oftentimes these examples will be presented to students as glaring contrasts to the nature of the majority of events which transpired during the period in question.

The editors of *Emancipation and Counter Emancipation*, as well as those of *Modern Jewish History: A Source Reader*, were motivated by the desire to demonstrate the complexities and intricacies of the modern or emancipatory period of Jewish history and the significant changes wrought by these developments. Though neither work is limited to classroom use, both sets of editors conceive of this as one of the primary purposes for their works. The plethora of courses that are now being offered in this field have been in sore need of quality teaching and textual material. For this reason alone these volumes are welcome additions.

Chazan and Raphael compiled *Modern Jewish History* because of their conviction that the use of primary sources is a challenging and academically productive manner in which to teach history. It is difficult to argue with this premise. They admit at the outset that ultimately it is their "goal to fail" (page xiv), expressing the hope that the selections included in the volume will prove so engaging that this work will be but a prelude to a host of others.

Setting aside their goal of "failure," the question remains: given the objective of classroom usage, does the volume provide the student with a coherent sense of the drastic political, social, economic and demographic alterations in the fabric of Jewish life during the past 200 years? An initial perusal of the table of contents of this volume left this reviewer, who was already familiar with all the readings contained in it, with a sense of glaring lacunae and questionable choices. One is struck by the fact that the editors extended their choices beyond the limited barriers of traditional historical documentation. They drew upon sources of a more eclec-

tic genre including a number of autobiographical and fictionalized selections while avoiding vague sentimentalized memoirs or superficial romanticized accounts. Upon reading the volume it quickly becomes obvious that rather than weaken the work they added additional depth and dimension.

Portions from the works of Chaim Bialik, Isaac Babel, Abraham Cahan, and Mary Antin and selections from the *Bintel Briefs* illustrate the experience of the East European Jew. The significantly different experience and response of the West European Jew to the vicissitudes of the modern period is exemplified by selections from Wilhelm Dohm, the Assembly of Jewish Notables in Paris, Israel Jacobson, the Association for Reform of Judaism, Alfred Dreyfus and Emile Zola. The readings for the post World War I and the Holocaust periods successfully demonstrate the sorrows, tensions, and frustrations of those years. Recognizing that the events that have transpired in the twenty-six years since the establishment of the State of Israel constitute another era in the course of modern Jewish history, the editors did not conclude with 1948. They included a section on changes within the fabric of Israeli society, the present situation of Soviet Jewry, and the postwar American Jewish community. Regrettably this portion of the volume is weak, particularly when contrasted with the remainder of the work.

Notwithstanding hesitations about this last section, a close reading of the volume indicated to me that my initial reactions to it were unjustified and that the editors demonstrate an admirable sensitivity to the multitude of converging and conflicting forces which characterize modern Jewish history. Of equal value, given their academic objectives, is their pedagogical sensitivity to the manner in which primary documents can be presented to students, particularly those who approach this topic with an array of simplifications and misconceptions.

Emancipation and Counter Emancipation is compiled from articles which appeared in the journal *Jewish Social Studies*. The title of the volume indicates the designated parameters of the area with which the articles are concerned. By choosing astutely, Duker and Ben-Horin have produced a work which, though it is limited to a specific and quite particular topic, well nigh constitutes a text on the course of modern Jewish history.

A number of the articles have, since their initial appearance, become classics in this field because of the theses they pose and the questions they raise. A striking example of this is Hannah Arendt's essay "Privileged Jews." In it she argues that the institution of the Court Jew and the consequent division of the community into categories of privileged and unprivileged Jews constituted a divisive element and significantly weakened the community. It often propelled those who occupied a semi-privileged or marginal status, intellectuals in particular, into opting for conversion. Those who selected the alternative option of cultural assimilation found that course fraught with conflicts of a personal and communal nature. Cultural assimilation, Arendt argues, laid the foundation for social anti-Semitism.

Continued on page 20

The Jewish People: History, Religion, Literature Series

(Continued from page 18)

focus is narrow and it treats specific aspects of the *Ketubah* such as 'dowry' and 'mulag' (wife's private estate) in detail. However, despite its self-imposed limitations its considerations raise issues of broad concern, especially in the liberated age of Aquarius. This volume, along with David Feldman's *Marital Relations, Birth Control and Abortion* (Schocken paperback, 1974) and the recently issued English translation of Maimonides' *Book of Women* in the Yale edition of the *Mishneh Torah* (Yale U. P., 1972), would provide the basis for an intelligent course on that much discussed contemporary topic: the role of women in Judaism.

Conclusions:

On the whole, this collection is not impressive. It is not an important collection of Jewish "classics," though it does include some valuable studies and translations which are still worth reading and possessing. The principles of selection for inclusion in the series are unclear and it is hard to see how the editors can justify reprinting some of the volumes. One suspects that in the already crowded field of Judaica reprint publishing there were few titles of substance that had not already been re-issued. Out of all this, however, come two positive reflections. The first is that the field of Judaica must be thriving if a series of reprints such as the above is even offered. Secondly, and if only by indirection, preparing this review gave the present reviewer a renewed optimism about the state of the discipline in that he had the opportunity to compare the works of a Scholem to those of a Franck, those of an Altmann to those of a Walter, and those of a Neusner to those of a Bokser. From such comparisons one can take heart that not all the important work has already been done, and that we possess scholars of high quality who possess the erudition and incisive intelligence to do what remains to be done (or redone!).

Varieties of Judaism in the Early First Century C.E.

(Continued from page 9)

Discussion of the Pharisees must begin with Neusner's fundamental observation of the difference between the pre-Herodian and the post-Herodian traditions. For the pre-Herodian period the evidence of Josephus is now (roughly) confirmed by the Qumran material, but even so we have only legendary reflections of major events and cannot talk with confidence about legal positions. For the century-plus from Herod's accession to the fall of the Temple (37 B.C.E. - 70 C.E.) we have a double problem of sources: Josephus and the New Testament on the one side, rabbinic literature on the other. Fortunately the differences between the *Jewish War* and the *Antiquities* and *Vita* are paralleled by those between the earlier and later Gospel material. And the picture thus obtained is roughly compatible with that which emerges from Neusner's isolation of the rabbinic traditions about the Pharisees before 70, and with the evidence for the growth of Pharisaic influence after the fall of the Temple. Nevertheless, there remain many problems and a few of these will be specified.

Emancipation (Continued from page 19)

Salo Baron's "The Impact of the Revolution of 1848 on Jewish Emancipation" is another example of a classic. His study extends far beyond the confines of the revolutions, isolating and illustrating the manifold effects of these events on the Jewish social, political, and economic status during the latter half of the 19th and the 20th century. Many of the issues which were to emerge as crucial to the 20th-century Jewish experience — conditional emancipation, minority rights, socialist conceptions of Jewish nationalism, the stereotype of the radical Jew — were either direct results of 1848 or had their seeds sown during these tumultuous years.

The emancipatory experiences of the Jews in Poland and Italy are examined, as is anti-Semitism in France prior to the Dreyfus case. Also included are Edward Silberner's analysis comparing Marx's and Engels' attitudes towards the Jews and Oscar Korbach's article, "The Founder of Modern Political Anti-Semitism: Georg von Schönerer." In the latter, Korbach argues that the foundations for Nazi anti-Semitism, its theoretical and legal facets, became part of the fabric of German society and culture during the latter part of the 19th and early 20th century. His argument raises crucial questions for the study of modern anti-Semitism in general and German anti-Semitism in particular. An extensive bibliography on Jewish emancipation and counter emancipation by Abraham Duker comprises a valuable addition to the work.

With the publication of these volumes those entrusted with the teaching of modern Jewish history in the academy are provided with two sets of tools which, if properly used, will aid in dispelling the simplifications which have thus far characterized much of the writing and, consequently, the study of modern Jewish history.

Best documented of the Judean legalist sects in the period before 70 are the Qumran group, presumably the Essenes. The identification will be briefly defended; so will the chronology of the Damascus Document. In this case, however, the wealth of documentation raises new questions, of which one example will be discussed — the question of the Qumran "canon of Scripture."

This concludes the scope of the present paper, but does not terminate the applicability of legal analysis to the problem of sectarianism in Judaism of this period. It has recently been argued, for instance (by S. Isser), that the Dositheans were a legalist group in Samaria. "The Fourth Philosophy" claimed a peculiar legal basis. The work of the Baptist can be seen as, essentially, a legal innovation. And the peculiar relation of Jesus to the Law was an important topic in my seminar discussion on the problem of the historical Jesus as a problem of Jewish historiography.

