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14 Ayn Sheyne Historye fun aynem Mekhtikn Rovs Tokhter fun Konstantinopl un fun ayn Rov Zayn Zun fun Brisk (n.p., n.d.); see Roskies, 67-68.

15 Genesis Rabba, 68; Leviticus Rabba, 8; Numbers Rabba, 2. See also the introduction to Tanhuma ha-Katan. On the theme of predestination in the chapbook literature, see Roskies, 68-70.


19 Ezekiel Landau, Noda Be-Yehudah, 2nd ed. (Prague, 1811), Q. 27.


22 Yair Haim Bachrach, Havat Yair (Frankfurt, 1699), Q. 60. For a much less sympathetic attitude toward a similar case, see Jacob Reischer, Shvut Ya'akov (Halle, 1710, Offenbach, 1719, Metz, 1789), Part 2, Q. 112.


24 On the elite, see Gottlober, vol. 1, p. 85. That Jews married early was the common opinion in the Polish enlightenment. See Jacob Goldberg, "Jewish Marriages in Old Poland in the Public Opinion of the Enlightenment Period," (Hebrew), Galed, 4-5 (1975): 25-33.

25 Pinkas Medinat Lita, ed. Dubnow (Berlin, 1925), para. 128, p. 32.
26 Landau, 2nd. ed. Q. 54, p. 63 and Jacob Emden, She'elat Yavetz (Altona, 1738-59), Q. 14, p. 18. These two responsa contain general statements about the prevalence of child marriage in Eastern Europe, but virtually all of the responsa literature from the eighteenth century contains specific cases. Whether or not the practice was more common than earlier, it seemed to have constituted a more serious legal issue with authorities in both Germany and the East taking steps to curb it. On the legal history of child marriage, see Otzar ha-Poskim (Even ha-Ezer), Section 1, ch. 3, section 15.

27 Landau, Q. 52.


29 The responsa was by R. Meshulam, the court president of Pressburg, in Moses Teitelbaum, He'shiv Moshe (Lemberg, 1866), end of book.
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32 Shivhei ha-Besht, 81-84 and tale # 249. The latter was omitted from the second edition of the Baal Shem stories and can be found in English translation in Dan Ben Amos and Jerome R. Mintz, In Praise of the Baal Shem Tov (Bloomington, Ind. 1970), p. 258.

33 See Noam Elimelech, ed. by Gedaliah Nigal (Jerusalem, 1978), vol. I, fols. 2b-2c (pp. 10-11) and Nathan of Nemirov, Shivhei ha-Ran (Jerusalem, 1961), p. 17. On the latter, see Arthur Green, Tormented Master (University of Alabama, 1979), p. 55.

34 In the Megalleh Temirin (Vienna, 1819), two of the subplots involve Hasidim committing acts of seduction and adultery. On Perl's view of Hasidic theology, see Über das Wesen der Sekte Chassidim, ed. Abraham Rubinstein (Jerusalem, 1977), pp. 41-43.

35 Über das Wesen, 125 and 146.

36 "Childhood, Marriage and the Family in the Eastern European Jewish Enlightenment" (forthcoming).

37 See Aries, Centuries of Childhood and David Gillis, Youth and History (New York, 1974).

38 Ben-Zion Dinur (ed.), Mikhtavei Avraham Mapu (Jerusalem, 1970), 29 October 1860, p. 133.

39 For a cogent analysis of Aksenfeld's novel along these lines, see Dan Miron, Ben Hazon le-Emet (Jerusalem, 1979), pp. 177-216.


See Roskies, especially 223-262 and Dan Miron, A Traveler Disguised (New York, 1973), chs. 1 and 2. Roskies is the first to treat seriously the popular literature written in Yiddish.

In addition to Roskies's dissertation cited above, see his annotated bibliography of Dik's writings, The Field of Yiddish (Philadelphia, 1980).

Moses Feivish, Netivot Shalom (Konigsberg, 1858), Sec. 1, para. 2.


Y. M. Epstein, Arukh ha-Shulhan: Even ha-Ezer (Warsaw, 1905-06), Sec. 1, Para. 11:3.

Solomon Mordecai Schwadron, She'elot ve-Tshuvot Marasham (Warsaw, 1902), Part 1, Q. 195.


Pauline Wengeroff, Memoiren einer Grossmutter (Berlin, 1913), pp. 41-46.

Y. L. Peretz, "Zikhronot" in Kol Kitvei Y. L. Peretz (Tel Aviv, 1957), 146. Even Moses Mendelssohn, despite his claim not to have needed a marriage broker for his own wedding, is said to have taken a shiddukh commission. See Katz, Zion, 50.


I thank my colleague Elizabeth Fox-Genovese for suggesting this formulation.

NOTES TO "SECULAR RELIGIOSITY"

Mendes-Flohr

Despite the corrosive affects of doubt, an emotional attachment to one's religion may, of course, endure. Rosenzweig tells the story of a Jew who loved the Orthodox service, that is, he passionately enjoyed davening, but when called to read the Torah, the attestation of faith in God and His Torah, he declined because he no longer believed.

Coined by Schleiermacher, the term "religiosity" was systematically developed by the German sociologist Georg Simmel to designate the religious attitude independent of formal, institutional religion. Simmel, however, uses the term in a much broader sense than we, to refer to any attitude of devotion and fidelity be it to politics or stamp collecting. Our use is closer to Schleiermacher's. But whereas he employed "religiosity" to denote the religious emotion per se, we wish to designate by the term the abiding concern with religious and theological questions independent of one's commitment or lack thereof to a particular religion. For stylistic reasons I shall occasionally refer to secular religiosity as the "modern sensibility," and to the individual of secular religiosity as "the modern individual." I am aware that the modern sensibility and individual can be very far from the concerns we are presently considering.

In fact, in all his massive corpus Schleiermacher makes mention of revelation only once, in a footnote in Der Christliche Glaube (1884 ed., 1, Zustatz) Par. 10, pp. 57-63.


In the Jewish context, Krochmal's historiosophical treatise Moreh Nevukhei Ha'Zeman would be a clear exception to this observation.


My argument is not normative; therefore I deliberately say prospect and not danger. In The Heretical Imperative, Peter Berger argues that the process described by Geertz is not only inevitable but salutary. (Cf. my discussion of Berger's thesis in Section IV of this paper, also note 32). Although Berger might find the expression "spiritual solipsism" somewhat extravagant, it is meant only to highlight the process that he himself acknowledges, viz., that in the modern world religious sensibility dislodged from its moorings in an established religion is adrift without a fixed community, and one may wonder, to use Berger's terminology, whether also without a "plausibility structure"?

Cf. "It has been said of nineteenth-century Kulturprotestantismus that what it cultivates is not Protestantism but a pious reverence for Protestantism's past. A similar quip could be made, mutatis mutandis, with reference to modern Judaism. The name of Ahad Ha'am is the first to spring to mind when mention is made of modern, secular 'culture-Judaism,' but that of Mordecai M. Kaplan is no less significant from a sociological point of view. Kaplan's Reconstructionism which considers Judaism as a cultural-social totality is perhaps not a major formative influence, but it is surely a symptomatic expression of much contemporary Jewish life. In fact, it could be argued that much of what is called Judaism both in Israel and in the Diaspora is a series of variations on the Kaplanian theme, often coupled with a

When we consider the spiritual leadership appropriate for a post-traditional Jewry it would be well to recall Max Scheler's distinction between Führer and Vorbild, the executive leader who is to be followed through obedience, and the model person who is to be followed through emulation. The Führer, be he a military commander or business executive, issues orders which his subordinates are to obey. The Vorbild embodies paradigmatically values and modes of conduct which serve to inspire emulation. When instrumental objectives are to be attained in the most expedient manner the Führer is manifestly the more appropriate leader; when the objectives are spiritual and require not simply the subordination of the individual's will to a given task but the internalization of ideal values and attitudes, e.g., piety, righteousness and belief, the guide to the attainment of these objectives is the Vorbild. Cf. Max Scheler, "Vorbilder und Führer," Schriften aus dem Nachlass (Berlin 1933). For a masterful summary of Scheler's essay, see Arthur A. Cohen, "The Jewish Intellectual in an Open Society," in Philip Longworth, ed., Confrontations with Judaism (London, 1966), pp. 18-19.

In addition to the talmid chacham, there are of course, other ideal types of individuals, foremostly the zaddik and the hasid. As a Vorbild for classical Judaism, each of the latter types represents, as Scholem observes, "what we would call ethical values, values of the heart and of the deeds of man." The talmid chacham, on the other hand, represents an intellectual-cum-spiritual ideal. He is the ultimate "teacher of his generation," he embodies "the highest aim of education which the Jews have had over the last two thousand years of their history." Gershom Scholem, "Three Types of Jewish Piety," Ariel. Quarterly Review of Arts and Letters in Israel, No. 32, (1973): 9.


22Buber later discarded this typological distinction between "official" and "subterranean" Judaism as admittedly too contrived and artificial. Although he now recognized the spiritual subtlety of official, normative expressions of Judaism, he nonetheless continued to speak of authentic and inauthentic types of Jewish piety.

23For this reason recurrent attempts to establish an "alternative Jewish tradition," such as by Jewish socialists who celebrate the glories of past Jewish revolutionaries and anarchists, will always be sectarian and eventually dissipate.


26Cf. Briefe, p. 496f. He had hoped to write a comprehensive study of the mitzvoth and their meaning, but, alas, because of his illness he never realized this project.


33Ibid., pp. 66-87.

34To be sure, in Jerusalem, Mendelssohn acknowledges the Covenant, but only as the Law, or as he put it, "ceremonial laws," which convey universal religious (i.e., metaphysical)
truths in a symbolic fashion and which are to be observed by Israel until some such day that the rest of humankind will free itself from the lure of paganism, anthropomorphism, and the confusion of religion and political power. This "priestly" role as custodians of pristine religious truths exhausts the universal significance of the covenant and Israel's existence as a separate group. The centrality and, indeed, urgency of Israel to the universal process of Heilsgeschichte is thus largely obscured by Mendelssohn. In this context, it should be emphasized that Mendelssohn regarded these religious truths to be rational and thus accessible to all humans independent of Judaism, and of any revealed faith for that matter. This denial of Torah's exclusive claim on truth in effect deprives Judaism of its compelling cognitive force. Thus, it may be said, that Mendelssohn removed Judaism from the province of truth and history.

There is, of course, a logical distinction between "function" and "purpose". The former is epiphenomenal and secondary, the latter is primary, and may or may not be practical in intent.

Many contemporary Orthodox thinkers are more subtle and compelling. Mutatis mutandis, Joseph Soloveitchik and Yeshayahu Leibowitz, for example, argue that heteronomy, or rather theonomy, engenders a meta-empirical reality in which spiritual truths are apprehended.

I follow the apt formulation of Werblowsky, op. cit., p. 49.

NOTES TO "JUDAISM AND MARXISM"

Dobkowski


2 A cursory look at the published works of some of the most accomplished and significant Jewish scholars, philosophers, historians and sociologists including Y. H. Yerushalmi, Jacob Neusner, Marvin Fox, Arthur A. Cohen, Baruch A. Levine, Michael A. Meyer, Arnold Band, David Blumenthal, Stephen Katz, Lucy Dawidowicz, David Ruderman, Marshall Sklare, Nathan Glazer, Jehuda Reinharz, David Berger, Nahum Sarna, Ruth R. Wisse, Bernard Martin, Richard Rubenstein, etc., to name only a few, should substantiate the point. Those who have focused on the relationship between Judaism and Marxism like Abraham Leon, The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation (New York, 1970), are either polemical in their defense of Marxism or, like Robert Wistrich, ed., The Left Against Zion (London, 1979), Wistrich, Revolutionary Jews from Marx to Trotsky (New York, 1976); Julius Carlebach, Karl Marx and the Radical Critique of Judaism (London, 1978); Solomon Bloom, "Karl Marx and the Jews," Jewish Social Studies, 4:1, pp. 2-16, and Edmund Silberner's important essays on the attitude of socialism toward the Jews,
Hierosolymitana, 7 (Jerusalem, 1956), pp. 778-96, and "Anti-Semitism and Philo-Semitism in the Socialist International," Judaism, 2:2, pp. 121-40, are excessively critical. One refreshing exception is Norman Levine who in a number of articles, particularly his "On the Necessity of a Jewish-Marxist Dialogue" published in Judaism in 1976 has argued for a reasoned discourse between the two traditions with intelligence and insight. I am indebted to his pathbreaking efforts.

3Karl Marx, Early Writings (London, 1975), p. 239.


5See Nicholas Lash, A Matter of Hope (Notre Dame, 1982), for a brilliant attempt by a Christian theologian to negotiate an understanding between Christianity and Marxism. I have benefited substantially from his categories and insights.


9Marx, Early Writings, p. 423. See Lash, pp. 36-42.


11Ibid., p. 31. See Lash pp. 64-72.

12Marx, Early Writings, pp. 425-26. In the history of human thought there are few texts that have aroused such disagreement, controversy and conflicts of interpretation as this one.


14Early Works, p. 27.


16I am indebted to Yochanon Muffs for many of these conceptual insights.

17Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin 38.

18Midrash Tanhuma, Genesis, 7 and following.


For a good overview of Lurianic Kabbalism see David Blumenthal, Understanding Jewish Mysticism, (New York, 1978).


See Buber, Tales of the Hasidim (New York, 1947-1948), as an example. See Levine, "On the Necessity."


NOTES TO "CHURCH-SECT THEORY"

Ellenson

This article is a revision of an address originally delivered at the annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion in Baltimore, Maryland, on November 1, 1981. Several colleagues offered comments at the meeting. I acknowledge with thanks their helpfulness. I would also like to extend a special thanks to my colleague here at HUC-JIR, Stanley
Chyet, for his reading and discussing an earlier version of this paper with me.


2 Ibid., p. 106.


5 Ibid.


10 Johnson, "On Church and Sect," p. 541.

11 Steinberg, "Reform Judaism," p. 118.


17 Ibid.


20 The term "double bind" is mine, but arises from Liebman's discussion (Ibid., pp. 136-37), where he points out the task confronting Jewish religious groups in the modern world is, in fact, four-fold. That is, the Jewish religious group
must meet the group's needs in relation to 1) general society and 2) Jewish society, as well as the individual group member's needs in relation to 3) general society and 4) Jewish society. As this paper is primarily, though not exclusively, concerned with the former rather than the latter set of problems, it seems appropriate to speak of "double bind."

21 Steinberg, "Reform Judaism," p. 120.

22 Ibid., p. 117 and p. 125.


24 Esriel Hildesheimer, The Responsa of Rabbi Esriel (Tel Aviv, 1969), Orah Hayim, no. 7.


26 The Responsa of Rabbi Esriel, Orah Hayim, no. 7.

27 Der Orient, (1837), p. 358.

28 Ibid., pp. 357-60 and 362-64.


30 Ibid.

31 Ibid.


33 Cited in Ibid., p. 138.

34 See Meir Hildesheimer, "Contributions Towards a Portrait of Esriel Hildesheimer," (Hebrew) Sinai, (1964): 76. Other Hungarian rabbis who forbade the use of the vernacular by Jews were Moses Sofer, Responsa of the Hatam Sofer, Hoshen Mishpat, no. 197; Akiba Yosef Schlesinger, Lev Haivri, pp. 19a-21b; and Hillel Lichtenstein, Responsa of Bet Hillel, nos. 34, 35, and 39.

35 Cited in Moredecai Eliav, "Rabbi Hildesheimer and His Influence on Hungarian Jewry," p. 72.


38 For the exchange of letters between Hildesheimer and Assad on this issue, and Hildesheimer's contention that he would write in support of the creation of such a seminar to at least two journals, see Meir Hildesheimer, ed., "Rabbi Judah Assad and Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer," (Hebrew) Festschrift for Yehiel Jacob Weinberg, pp. 295-297.
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41 On the resolutions of the Mihalowitz Conference and Hildesheimer's view of them, see Esriel Hildesheimer, "Ein Beitrag zur Bedeutung von Chukot HaGoyim," in M. Hildesheimer, ed., Rabbiner Dr. I. Hildesheimer, Gesammelte Aufsätze (Frankfurt, 1923).

42 Eliav, ed., Hildesheimer Briefe, Letter 22 (Hebrew).


45 See Meir Hildesheimer, ed., Gesammelte Aufsätze, p. 57.

46 See Hildesheimer's essay, "Ueber die Zugeignuflaßigkeit der Ubertrete von Religionsgeboten," in Ibid., pp. 36-81, for a full discussion of his views on this issue.


48 Loew's attacks upon Hildesheimer in the pages of Ben Chananjah appeared throughout the decade (1858-1867) of his editorship.


54 HaMagid (1869), XIII, no. 26.


56 Ibid., pp. 29-30.


59 See Eliav, ed., Hildesheimer Briefe, Letters 65 and 69 (German) and 35 (Hebrew) for his views on this conference.
60Ibid.
61Ibid., Letter 69.
62Ibid., Letter 29.
63Ibid., Letter 86.
64Ibid., Letter 68. Also see The Responsa of Rabbi Esriel, Orah Hayim, no. 48; and "Novellae to the Orah Hayim," pp. 123-24, to read of Hildesheimer's concessions to the German environment where Orthodox Jewish children regularly affirmed the worth, and perhaps even superiority, of secular as opposed to Jewish education.

65Thus, in his Adass Jisroel congregation the rabbi wore a robe, there was a male choir, and a sermon was delivered in the vernacular. In addition, he continued to wear Western garb and, in his manner and bearing, resembled a German burgher. On this point, see a wonderful contemporary description of Hildesheimer from the viewpoint of a Polish Jew in Jacob Glatstein, Homecoming at Twilight (New York, 1962), pp. 69-71. I am grateful to Professor Steven Zipperstein of Oxford University for bringing this reference to my attention.

66Mordecai Eliav, ed., Hildesheimer Briefe, Letters 40 and 78.
67Ibid., Letter 61. This concern appears throughout Hildesheimer's works; this letter is just a single example.

NOTES TO "JEWS AND SOUTHERNERS"

Whitfield


15 Delmore Schwartz to Dwight Macdonald, July 25, 1943, in Box 45, Folder 1116, Dwight Macdonald Papers, Yale University.


26 Howe, Jewish-American Literature, p. 3; Isaac Rosenfeld, An Age of Enormity: Life and Writing in the Forties and Fifties (Cleveland, 1962), p. 272.


35 Ibid., pp. 39, 43.

36 Harap, Image of the Jew, p. 192.


NOTES TO "ARTSCROLL"

Levy

1 Issued by Masorah Publications, the series now contains five volumes on Genesis, three on Ezekiel, five on Psalms, and single volumes on Jonah, Joshua, Daniel and each of the five Scrolls. The beginning of the History of the Jewish People; The Second Temple Period is also devoted to the Biblical period. Eighteen volumes of the commentary were published between 1976 and 1980, while (as far as I am able to determine from the volumes available in Montreal) only three appeared between 1981 and 1982.


3 See Artscroll to Ruth, p. xxix, Bereishis, pp. 265, 327, 472, 708, etc. and Jonah 2:4. Inclusion of these sources and reliance on Berosus have been discussed in "Our Torah, Your Torah and Their Torah: An Evaluation of the Artscroll Phenomenon" pp. 146-147 and the article listed in note 2, pp. 91-92. The former study, completed in May of 1979, has been published in *Truth and Compassion: Essays on Judaism and Religion in Memory of Rabbi Dr. Solomon Frank*, edited by H. Joseph J. Lightstone and M. Oppenheim, (Waterloo, 1982), but has circulated widely since its completion. The latter is a brief presentation of its more salient points.

4 "Our Torah, Your Torah and Their Torah," pp. 147-162.
Aside from M. Segal's 130 page Hebrew book *Parshanut HaMiqra*', itself inadequate and long out of date, there is no book-length study on the history of Jewish Biblical interpretation. There are books on specific periods or schools of interpretation and important studies on all sorts of specific issues, periods, and commentators, but there is no work that brings Jubilees, the Zohar, Ibn Ezra, Yefet ben Ali, the Malbim, Philo and the Netsiv together and relates them as exegetes. The three volume *Cambridge History of the Bible* has covered Jewish interpretation in a very inadequate way, and Smalley's *The Study of The Bible in The Middle Ages* is similarly limited. I hope to correct this situation as soon as possible.

Hermeneutical literature is even more limited, for the lists of 7, 13, 32 and 49 middot are hardly a literature. The most extensive text of this sort is the Malbim's 613 rules called *Ayyellet HaShachar* and published as the introduction to his commentary on Leviticus.

The only thing that comes close is the brief Hebrew statement in the first volume on Genesis, discussed below. Judging from the lack of a systematic presentation, it may be somewhat hasty to assume that Artscroll actually has a hermeneutical program at all. Different rabbis have been designated to cull comments about Biblical matters from a host of secondary sources and their individual attitudes -- or those of the editors -- have shaped the series. A clear interpretative program, while no small task, would clarify for everyone -- including the various Artscroll writers -- exactly what Artscroll is trying to do. There are, however, some observable patterns in the volumes that allow for the generalizations about its attitudes and approaches.

Cf. the introductions of Ibn Ezra, Nachmanides and Epstein (Torah Temimah) to their commentaries on the Torah; Abarbanel's introduction to his commentary on the former Prophets; Rashban to Gen. 37:1, etc.

Thus, for example, Psalm 137 "By The Rivers of Babylon" is presented by Artscroll as Davidic, following Gittin 57b. Song of Songs Rabbah 4:1 lists Ezra among the contributors to the Psalms; allowing a post-Davidic date for part of the book, but no reference to this text has been included here. Attitudes of several medieval writers who dealt with this issue have been discussed in Uriel Simon's Hebrew book *Four Approaches to the Book of Psalms: From Saadya Gaon to Abraham Ibn Ezra*, (Ramat Gan, 1982). Ibn Chiquitilia, an approved Artscroll source (cf. below note 37), dated Psalm 137 to exilic times, and comments by Ibn Ezra and Radak are ambiguous enough to allow this position also, but it has been ignored.

I have discussed this more fully in "Our Torah, Your Torah and Their Torah," note 81. See, more recently, the discussion of the history of parallelism contained in James Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and its History* (New Haven, 1981).

This attitude pervades his introductions and commentaries on poetic passages and books.

This undated letter may be a reaction to the conclusion drawn in "Our Torah, Your Torah and Their Torah," that Feinstein supported Artscroll as an anthology but not a commentary. Other changes that may be responses to criticisms discussed there and
in "Judge Not A Book By Its Cover" include a more careful use of the term Haskamah ("Approbation") with reference to the letters of greetings published in many volumes and the elimination of the bibliographies, on which see further, note 37, below.

12 See note 4, above.

13 To some extent this principle has been developed by Maimonides, but his sources were late. Perhaps he assumed the antiquity of medieval pagan practices, which might then be compared to similarly ancient Jewish ones. The principle enunciated in the Guide (III, 50) is most important, however: "Just as . . . the doctrines of the Sabians are remote from us today, the chronicles of those times are likewise hidden from us today. Hence if we knew them and were cognizant of the events that happened in those days, we would know in detail the reasons of many things mentioned in the Torah." (Translation of Pines, p. 615.)

14 An interesting example is the story of Sennacherib's siege of Jerusalem in the eighth century BCE, related in Isaiah, Kings and Chronicles. The availability of Sennacherib's own annals should theoretically have answered many questions and has, but whether he besieged the city once or twice still remains a scholarly problem (for details see John Bright, A History of Israel, 2nd edition, (Philadelphia, 1972), pp. 296-308). What seems to have gone unnoticed is that the one invasion - two invasion problem was anticipated by Radak and Abarbanel, and no one has really improved on their observations very much, though new facts, theories and conjectures have clarified other aspects of the subject.

15 This should not be taken as a claim that archaeology or modern scholarship offers no challenge to the accuracy of any Biblical text; far from it. While the availability of new materials often confirms what was not accepted previously, it often poses new problems as well. But in which period of Jewish intellectual history was there no challenge from new modes of thought or sources of information? The challenges of modern discovery may be more solid than earlier philosophical ones, but the latter were probably taken more seriously by Jewish religious writers.

16 Modern Jewish scholars who have used the classical writers to great advantage include B. Ehrlich, Mikra KiPheshuto; Umberto Cassuto, commentaries to Genesis, Exodus; Moshe Held in a series of articles; Moshe Greenberg, Understanding Exodus; and others who have consciously endeavored to build a modern Jewish approach on the contributions of earlier writers. Non-Jewish recognition of this area is less frequent, but see B. Childs, Exodus (an excellent example); M. Pope, Song of Songs (Anchor Bible), etc.

17 There is an important attack on the Documentary Hypothesis that has been completely ignored: David Hoffman's Die wichtigsten Instanzen gegen die Graf-Wellhausensche Hypothese, originally published in 1904 and translated into Hebrew under the title Ra'ayot Makhriyot Neged Wellhausen. Hoffman's other works are cited frequently. Had Artscroll been prepared to admit being engaged by contemporary problems, it might have referred to this work also.

18 I appreciate the fears of those contemporary writers who oppose the use of "critical" editions and new texts that have
not been part of the traditional yeshiva education, but this is not justifiable. After all, Hebrew manuscripts have values other than providing aesthetically pleasing dustjackets.

These attractive illuminations are not without their own message, though. The bucolic scene of David playing his lyre while surrounded by animals (on the dustjackets of Tehillim) is a case in point. This was a very popular manner in which this king was portrayed by artists over the centuries, but many art historians have interpreted such pictures as a transfer to the Biblical David of the characteristics of Orpheus, son of Apollo, who charmed the wild beasts by playing on his lyre! It is indeed strange for Artscroll to have chosen this portrayal of David for the covers of several of its volumes.

19Maimonides: Guide, III, 29, 37, etc., Sefer HaMitzvot, Negative Commandments 42; Nachmanides: Introduction to Commentary on the Torah, end of Commentary on the Torah; Abarbanel: See the sources cited in M. S. Segal's collected studies entitled Massoret uBiqqoret, Jerusalem: n.d., pp. 255-257; Chajes: Mavo' HaTalmud, end of chapter 18 (English translation, pp. 152-3), etc. Interesting for comparison is Maimonides, Ibid., 10.

While spokesmen of more open approaches were not lacking, frequently their works had to be defended from attacks (real or anticipated) from innocent, ignorant, or foolish critics. One less known apologia of this type is found in the conclusion of Ibn Aknin's commentary on The Song of Songs (pp. 490 ff.), a work cited and approved by Artscroll. After admitting that his reputation might deter otherwise zealous antagonists from accusing him of heresy, Ibn Aknin outlined how some of his methods really derived from Chazal: Comparative philology derives from the rabbis' use of Greek and various Semitic and non-Semitic languages to explain many Biblical words. (Cf. The introduction to Ibn Janach's Sefer HaRigma for an earlier text arguing the same point.) Rav Hai, it is noted, used not only Arabic words but also love poetry, the Koran, and the Hadith for comparative purposes. Saadia did likewise even earlier, in fulfillment of the rabbinic teaching "Anyone who states something wise, even if he be non-Jewish, is called a wise man and one is obligated to transmit it" (Megilla 16a). Rav Hai, it was reported, even wanted to consult the local Catholics on the meaning of a verse in Psalms. When his messenger to the churchman hesitated, he reprimanded him, noting that the earlier authorities consulted members of other religions for linguistic information. It is not clear from this version of the story if the messenger or Hai himself then met the Christian leader, but the desired information was obtained and recorded.


21Ibid., p. 183.

22I have followed the text of J. I. Gorfinkle's edition, The Eight chapters of Maimonides on Ethics (New York, 1912) but the translation of this passage has been modified.

23Cf. the description of the stars as God's "emissaries to preside over the natural functioning of the universe" (Bereishis, p. 600).


Modern analyses of the creation and flood narratives by geologists and by historians of religion differ greatly. What scholars of Science may declare impossible or errors, scholars of the Humanities actually perceive as important religious advancements. Is there no way for Orthodox thought to accommodate itself to these different approaches?

Benedict de Spinoza, _A Theologico-Political Treatise_, Chapter 7.

But see the beginning of chapter 8, Ibid.

See, for example, Nachmanides on Genesis 18:1 and Maimonides' opinion, cited there and analyzed. Also of note are various sections of Joseph Sarachek, _Faith and Reason: The Conflict over the Rationalism of Maimonides_ (New York, 1935).

Of course I do not assume that the reconstructed history will be identical to the simple meaning of the Biblical text, but that must be the jumping off point.

On the history of rabbinic attitudes towards midrash and aggadah, see now the first chapter of Marc Saperstein's _Decoding the Rabbis: A Thirteenth-Century Commentary on The Aggadah_ (Cambridge, Mass: 1980). The emotional reactions that challenges to midrash still stimulate are exemplified by Fabian Schonfeld's letter in _Tradition_, 20:1. See also the response scheduled to appear in 20:4.

Chajes' attitudes pervade many of his writings, but a most important text is his _Mavo' HaTalmud_, available in English under the Title _The Student's Guide Through The Talmud_ (New York, 1960). The second part of this work, chapters 17-32, represents one of the most important breakthroughs of any recent writer on the religious position regarding the development, methods and authority of midrash and aggadah.


_How to Teach Torah_ (Lakewood, N.J.: 1972), pp. 3-4.


Ibid., p. 33.

The early volumes contain annotated bibliographies, but, as I have demonstrated elsewhere, they borrow some sentences from _The Encyclopaedia Judaica_ (without due credit) and contain a number of errors. Artscroll's response to this criticism has been to drop the bibliographies altogether. Thus Joshua and the last volumes of Genesis and Psalms lack this important section. As unfortunate as these shortcomings may be, the bibliographies are essential. How many readers can identify the Rabbi Moshe cited in Psalm 122:1 as Ibn Chiquitilla? The reference has
crept in via Ibn Ezra -- as happened with the Karaite Yefet ben Ali in Yonah. Does this mean that Ibn Chiquitilla is also an approved source? Besides, which non-specialist will be able to identify Chazah Zion, Minchas Shai, Ibn Yachya, HaYitzhari, Midrash Halsamari, R. Azaryah Figo, etc? Has Artscroll decided once and for all that the identity of a commentator is irrelevant to one's understanding his interpretations?

38See, for example, the letters to the editor of Tradition published in 19:2, 19:4 and 20:4. Thanks are due to Professor Jacob Neusner for requesting this article and to Mr. Joel Linsider for his assistance in proofreading.