דור לדור

DOR Le DOR

Our Biblical Heritage

Vol. XVII, No. 3 (ס"ז) SPRING 1989

דור לדור

DOR Le DOR

Founded by Dr. Louis Katzoff, Editor 1972–1987

A Quarterly Published by the

WORLD JEWISH BIBLE CENTER

(Founded by David Ben Gurion and Zalman Shazar)

In cooperation with the WZO Department for Education and Culture in the Diaspora

רפוס רפאל חיים הכהן בע"מ, ירושלים

MODERN BIBLICAL TRANSLATIONS

BY DAVID WOLFERS

The recent publication by the Jewish Publication Society of America of a total new English translation of the Hebrew Bible serves as an adequate excuse for this brief note on the deplorable practices of modern biblical translators. There are no more than two good reasons for undertaking the mammoth task of translating afresh the Bible, or any one of its 39 books. Such an enterprise must spring either from the conviction that, because of ehanges in the modern language, the current authorized translation has become so archaic as to be inaccessible to a substantial proportion of readers, or from the conviction that advances in the understanding of the text in the ancient language have made it possible to achieve a substantially more accurate interpretation of that text. In the main, the first motive will lead to institutionally sponsored new translations, while the second will lead to individual enterprise. In both cases, however, there will be a certain degree of admixture of motives.

In this article I propose to discuss principally four recent translations, two of eaeh kind. The New English Bible of 1970 (NEB); the translation of the Book of Job by N.H. Tur-Sinai (Torezyner) in 1957, revised in 1965 (T-S); Robert Gordis's translation of the Book of Job of 1978 (G); and the New Jewish Publication Society Version which appeared complete this year, but which has been published in parts over the past decade (NJPSV).

The translation of any part of the Bible should be seen as an awesome responsibility. Exeept for the Israeli public and a small proportion of Jews, the Hebrew Bible is aecessible only in translation. The translator is therefore directly affecting the religious beliefs of a substantial proportion of the human raee. He is, however, a translator, not a religious leader or innovator, and it is his urgent duty to exclude entirely his own religious leanings from any version which he produces. In none of the four translations we are considering do the religious

Dr. Wolfers is a medical practitioner and demographer who, since his retirement in Jerusalem in 1976, has devoted his time to study and translation of the Book of Job. He is the author of numerous scientific articles and co-author of several books on aspects of the international population problem. At present he is assistant editor of Dor Le Dor.

beliefs of the translators intrude excessively, but as is to be expected, in the two institutionally commissioned versions (NEB and NJPSV) there is some evidence of the operation of censorship. It is fair to say that the majority of translators who worked on the four examples we are considering devoted a great part of long professional lives to the task. While this must protect them from trivial or frivolous and carping criticism, it is also true that any professional worker who submits the results of his labors to the public runs the risks of hostile scrutiny. I cannot deny that that is what this article in the main contains. I propose to show, with a very limited selection of examples to support me, how all four of these enterprises have been failures.

I — NEB

The NEB was commissioned on the initiative of the Church of Scotland out of the conviction that large parts of the AV (Authorized Version of 1611) and REV (Revised English Version of 1885) were no longer comprehensible to a large part of the public. They wanted a new version in modern vernacular. Very wisely (a precaution conspieuously absent in the NJPSV), in addition to employing the most learned (or at least the best reputed) biblical scholars of their generation (in the Christian world), they asked a panel of writers to ensure that the translation would not merely be accurate, but also verbally felicitous. How, with that precaution, they arrived at the results which are on record, is something of a mystery. The salient characteristic of the NEB is its essentially anti-poetic character. Now if, which I stubbornly suppose to be the case, the aim of a translation is to approach as closely as possible to the original in its effect on the reader, both intellectually and otherwise, then it is injudicious to render poetry into tedious prose. The effect achieved is entirely different. When dealing with the Hebrew prophetic works, and the writings, one is dealing with a miraculous coordination of the (now) splintered parts of the human personality — an integration of intellect, imagination, energy and passion such as is apparently unattainable by modern writers. A faithful translation will, however, succeed in conveying that miracle and achieve a goodly measure of the effects of the original.

The anti-poetic character of the NEB lies in a mania for overspecification. One cannot write poetry and be specific at the same time. The very essence of poetry lies in the associative power of words and phrases — their ambiguities and

overtones. Compare, I suggest, the AV and the NEB versions of the great conclusion of Ecclesiastes:

> *Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth... while the sun or the light or the moon or the stars be not darkened, nor the clouds return after the rain: in the day when the keepers of the house shall tremble, and the strong men shall bow themselves, and the grinders cease because they are few, and those that look out of the windows be darkened, and the doors shall be shut in the streets, when the sound of the grinding is low, and he shall rise up at the voice of a bird, and all the daughters of musick shall be brought low; also when they shall be afraid of that which is high, and fears shall be in the way, and the almond tree shall flourish, and the grasshopper shall be a burden and desire shall fail because man goeth to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets: or ever the silver cord be loosed, or the golden bowl be broken, or the pitcher be broken at the fountain, or the wheel broken at the cistern. Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.* (AV).

> *Remember your Creator in the days of your youth... before the sun and the light of day give place to darkness, before the moon and the stars grow dim, and the clouds return with the rain — when the guardians of the house tremble, and the strong men stoop, when the women grinding the meal cease work because they are few, and those who look through the windows look no longer, when the street doors are shut, when the noise of the mill is low, when the chirping of the sparrow grows faint and the song-birds fall silent; when men are afraid of a steep place and the street is full of terrors, when the blossom whitens on the almond-tree and the locust's paunch is swollen and caperbuds have no more zest. For man goes to his everlasting home and the mourners go about the streets. Remember Him before the silver cord is snapped and the golden bowl is broken, before the pitcher is shattered at the spring and the wheel broken at the well, before the dust returns to the earth as it began and the spirit returns to God who gave it.* (NEB).

It requires no especially poetic soul to recognize the degradation of this passage in the second version, with "the grinders" (probably metaphorical for the teeth) being replaced by "the women grinding the meal," with "the voice of a

bird" (קול הצפור) giving way to "the chirping of the sparrow," "all the daughters of musick" (כל בנות השיר) emerging as "song-birds," and "that which is high" degenerating into "a steep place." While what can be said for the change (authoritatively attributed to the desire for metereological accuracy) from the tragic and ominous "Clouds return after the rain" to "with the rain" in defiance of the plain Hebrew word אחר? And what of that nagging return of "Remember Him" in the last sentence which plainly says – This is not to be read as poetry, but as a religious sermon!?

The second great defect of NEB lies in its doctrinaire disregard of Hebrew grammar, syntax and vocabulary, especially in poetry. Again a single example must stand for a host. Job 21:7–9 is not an especially difficult passage, but the "translation" of NEB is little more than a very loose paraphrase. This is not a legitimate thing to do, for it deprives the readers of all possibility of disagreeing with the interpretation of the translators. It is paternalistic transmission of the text.

The Hebrew is: מדוע רשעים יחיו עתקו גם־גברו חיל
זרעם נכון לפניהם עמם וצאצאיהם לעיניהם
בתיהם שלום מפחד ולא־שבט אלוה עליהם

NEB's "translation:" *Why do the wicked enjoy long life,*
hale in old age and great and powerful?
They live to see their children settled,
their kinsfolk and descendants flourishing;
their families are secure and safe;
the rod of God's justice does not reach them

One is surely entitled to ask what words in the Hebrew correspond to: "enjoy," "long," "great," "kinsfolk," "justice"? and also to ask for a parsing or syntactical analysis of the second line in English.

II – TS

Tur-Sinai was one of the greatest biblical scholars of his day, with a formidable knowledge of all that pertained to his craft. Unfortunately he developed and nurtured a conviction that the Book of Job had originally been written in Aramaic; that the original had been lost, and that the version which survived in the Bible was a Hebrew translation by a not very expert translator! This preposterous theory (not quite as preposterous as that of Guillaume who thought

that the original language was Arabic) colored his translation at every point, and afforded him the liberty of assuming mistakes by the translator whenever this suited his rather eccentric view of the book. In his Introduction, he lists over 270 words from the Book of Job which, he alleges, bear a different meaning elsewhere in the Bible. The freedom which he claimed to make such wholesale deductions from a dubious theory has resulted in probably the most eccentric biblical translation on record. Nor, regrettably, was this freedom combined with an unerring sense of the appropriate. It is not as though, as is usually the case with paraphrase, the end result were clear and sensible – for example one can only wonder that anyone could allow Job to describe the Underworld in these terms:

The land of 'Ephatha demons within darkness,
of gloom for which there is no exorcism –
thou stumblest in the dark (Job 10:22).

This is perilously close to gibberish.

Closer still is 20:18: *He is busy giving back and cannot swallow; his palm-tree stays half-ripe and he enjoyeth it not.* The dominant characteristic which emerges from a reading of T-S is a straining after novelty without a balancing verisimilitude. The translator lacks a sense of what is plausible. Amongst all the possible versions of אם לא נכחד קימנו, surely "Is not the babe extinguished from him?" cannot be counted. This version depends on the fantastic improbability of dividing קימנו into קי (supposedly one who vomits, and therefore a baby) and מנו, a contraction of ממנו, on analogy with the probably haplographic מני in 21:16 (= 22:18). This is further supported by the astounding identification of the expression "one that pisseth against the wall" as referring to infants "who cannot keep cleanliness," whereas on both behavioral and textual grounds it is clear that this expression refers to all males except infants "who cannot keep cleanliness."

There is an element of true personal tragedy in the T-S version of Job, for it is a version certainly informed with a deeper scholarship than any other in modern times, and contains wonderful insights and speculations. It is nonetheless unusable except as a source of ideas, ruined by a lack of literary tact and an obsession with an absurd theory of the origin of the book.

III – G

Robert Gordis likewise has devoted a life-time to the study of the Book of Job and is possessed of a compendious scholarship in all matters related to biblical study. He has published not only his translation and commentary on Job, but additionally a study of Job entitled *The Book of God and Man*. Unlike T-S, G's feet are firmly on the ground, and his version does not exhibit exotic improbabilities. The flaw in G's translation derives directly from his detailed work on quotations in the Bible, and the subject is discussed frankly and extensively in Chapter 13 of *The Book of God and Man*. In his enthusiasm for quotations, G believes that he has identified no fewer than eleven different varieties of quotation occurring in the Bible, and asserts that seven of these forms occur in the Book of Job. The characteristic of G's method is the conviction that a "quotation" need not be specifically identified as such in the text, but that it is up to the reader to identify it. I should like to make it clear that I neither contest G's eleven varieties of quotation, nor do I deny the existence in the Book of Job of quotations of one kind or another which can be identified as such by inference only. It is the indiscriminate identification of statements as quotations in G's translation which has led to a substantial falsification of the meaning of the Book in a number of crucial places. It is not the use, but the abuse of this device which I here deplore.

Consider a number of examples. In Chapter 12, vv. 7–9, Job says:

However, ask the beasts, and they will teach thee
And the fowl of the air, and they will tell thee,
Or speak to the earth, and it will teach thee,
And the fish of the sea, they will recount to thee:
Which one of all these does not know
That the hand of the Lord has wrought this.

G, because he has misunderstood the preceding verses, does not understand why Job should make this statement, nor why he should introduce it with the strong adversative ואולם – "however." He therefore solves the problem by inserting the clause "you say" before "ask the beasts" and placing the whole figure into quotation marks. There is no justification for this, if only because the friends have *not* said anything of the kind; on the contrary, Eliphaz has asserted (Chapter 5) that "this" is Job's fault for not dealing with "folly" when it first appeared, and Bildad (Chapter 8) has told Job that it is probably his "childrens'"

fault. In Chapter 12 Job sets about showing that even the faults of his people are God's work.[1] Incidentally, G's treatment of this passage displays another recurrent flaw in his interpretation. He attributes the use of the personal name of God, which is found in the Dialogue only here, to absentmindedness on the part of the author – "unconscious usage". I shall assert here that every word in the Book of Job, and probably in the whole Hebrew Bible, is the result of the exercise of deliberate craft and meticulous care. Neither here nor elsewhere are there unconscious slips.

The next three examples are all related – 21:19, 21:30, and 24:18–24, for they ostensibly deal with the fate of the wicked. In the first Job says: *God saves His strength* (= punishing power) *for his children*. G translates "You say, God saves his punishment for his children." It happens that this is precisely the opposite to what the friends have been saying which is that in addition to the inevitable downfall of their children, the wicked suffer for their sins in their own lifetimes. That is why they are discussing the fate of the wicked – because Job also is suffering in his lifetime! By refusing to wrestle with the text, and instead taking the easy way out by changing the speaker of a puzzling line, G has here failed to realize that Job is saying that God reserves His punishments for *His* children – the authentic sense in which Israel is the chosen people.

In the second, there is quite a complicated situation. Job has pointed out earlier in the chapter that "the wicked" enjoy great prosperity. He now indeed indulges in what might be ealled a hypothetical quotation, (perhaps G Type 7, or 12?) saying: "If I understand the workings of your minds and the secret thoughts with which you wrong me, then you will say, 'Where *is* the princely house? And where the canopy of the dwelling-place of the wicked?" By this he means – you will look about my ash-heap and, snidely implying that *I* am "the wicked," you will ask this sarcastic question – that is to say Job is informing the friends that he has penetrated the ugly implications of their dissertations on the fate of the wieked – all of which are directed to showing Job that what he has received from God *is* exactly that fate. Then Job asks "Have you not asked the travellers? And do you not accept their intimations that the evil man is reserved for the day of retribution. They are *escorted* to the day of wrath?" All this seems quite straightforward. Job is asserting that the doom of the wicked is postponed; while

1 D. Wolfers, *"Greek Logic in the Book of Job,* Dor Le Dor, XV, 3, 1987, p. 167.

the friends say that he receives his deserts in a timely fashion. G, however, appears to be convinced that Job could not have made such an assertion but that the friends could. He therefore renders the last two verses:

Why not ask the passers-by —
you cannot deny their evidence!
You declare, "The sinner is being saved for the day of calamity;
on the day of wrath he will be led to his doom."

Here the device of assuming quotations has been pressed into the service of an *idee fixe*.

The third passage is a very long one in which the whole of the end of Chapter 24 has been placed in quotation marks and again prefaced with "You say to me:" There is not a word in this passage which the friends have in fact said to Job, and the explanation for the sorry fate which it describes is not that Job is quoting his friends' views of the fate of the wicked, nor that he has changed his mind, nor that the verses have strayed into Chapter 24 from elsewhere, but that they do not describe the fate of the wicked, but the fate of the poor.[2] G's "virtual quotation" theory again provides a facile solution to an important textual problem, obstructing the search for the solution which is faithful to the text.

One final example, 27:7–11. Here again Job is discussing the fate of the wicked, and what he says in this portion of the speech is that the fate of the wicked is what he wishes on his worst enemy, for the wicked cannot call on God for help when his life is in danger; he cannot derive pleasure from God; God will not hear his cry when he is in trouble. That is that the godless man is deprived of the spiritual solace of belief and of an easy conscience. It is to me perfectly plausible that, despite his experiences, Job should hold these views and express them. Are we to assume that Job has ceased to believe in God? That Job actually envies the wicked? Surely in his ever-insistent cry that he is not wicked, Job is entitled to say still "Let my enemy be as the wicked and him who opposes me as the unjust." Not only is this portion of the speech by Job and expressive of his position at the time of speaking, but so is the entire remainder of the speech which G (in very good and numerous company it must be conceded) places in Zophar's mouth.[3] What Gordis does to 27:7–11 is to make it reflect what Job's

2 D. Wolfers, *Job: The Third Cycle, Dissipating a Mirage"* Part II; Dor Le Dor, Fall 1988. pp. 19–25.

3 D. Wolfers, *Ibid* Part I.

views *used* to be before his experiences. Here the introduction to the quotation runs "For I said."

There are rules for the identification of quotations which G. ignores. It is anathema to render any part of the text as a quotation unless (a) it is recognizably similar in phrasing or in sense to some other passage in the same or another book of the Bible or (b) there is some indication immediately preceding it that it is a quotation. Such indications may be slight, as for instance when 22:20 is preceded by "the innocent will laugh at them." Here it is perfectly legitimate to add, as G does, "saying." But this must be done consistently, so that 12:4b–6 which follows "I am a laughing stock to His friends etc." must also be preceded by "They say." In the Book of Job the least obtrusive introduction to a quotation is the word כי in 31:18, where the orphan boy is quoted as saying "from my youth he brought me up like a father," but G does not recognize this one, and instead has a precocious Job smugly saying: "from the period of my youth he grew up with me as with a father." There seems to be no harm in treating proverbs as though they were quotations of proverbs, but there is a certain grace as well as economy of hypothesis, in assuming that the author of the work in which they are now found originated them.

IV — NJPSV

The greatest peculiarity of this translation of the Bible is that it is apparently based on the assumption that the Hebrew language does not contain the word "and." Well, this is an exaggeration, but even in so small a compass as the Book of Job over 450 *waws* are treated as though they did not exist. Much the same treatment is meted out to other particles, conjunctions and prepositions. In the majority of cases the only effect of omitting the word "and" is to alter the tempo of a verse — to speed it up. As the biblical authors were perfectly capable of omitting "and" from many passages where it might have been included, the result of NJPSV policy is that the alternation of tempo which the authors plainly intended, between quiet and *legato* passages where the sentences are smoothly joined, and brusque, *staccato* passages where each is articulated separately, is lost, and in its place there is an almost uniform *staccato* effect which is much to the detriment of the style, music and variety of the work. This loss is, of course, more serious in poetry than in prose.

This is, however, by no means the most serious effect of this wholesale

massacre of directional words. By my count in the Book of Job alone, the omission of at least fifty-seven of these, including almost all the examples of כי, אם, חן and למען results in distortion, or obscuring the meaning of verses, or in the removal of intended, or the introduction of unintended ambiguities.

Some examples:

1. 14:5,6: NJPSV:

His days are determined;
You know the number of his months;
You have set him limits that he cannot pass.
Turn away from him that *he may be at ease*
Until like a hireling he finishes out his day.

Literally:

If *his time is determined,*
The number of his months is at Your discretion,
You have ordained his limit which he shall not pass,
(Then) look away from him, and *he will cease to be*
While he fulfills, like a servant, his contract.

Here not only is the sense subtly altered, but the tone is changed from sorrowful pleading to quite inappropriate peremptory command.

2. 20:2,3: NJPSV:

In truth my thoughts urge me to answer
(It is because of my feelings
When I hear reproof that insults me);
A spirit out of my understanding makes me reply:

Literally:

It is my agitation which makes me reply,
And *because of the urgency within me.*
I have heard my insulting rebuke
But *an inspiration from my understanding answers me:*

It is true that the above is not an important passage, but twice to separate two sentences conjoined by "and" or "but" in the Hebrew by placing one inside a bracketed parenthesis, seems to be flying in the face of the text with deliberate intention to provoke.

Perhaps even more extraordinary is the treatment of a *waw* attached to the word עמו as though it were a *waw apodosis* in 20:11 which NJPSV renders: "His

bones, still full of vigor, Lie down in the dust with him" (whatever that means). Literally: "*His* bones (= his life) will end in his youth, *and* with him *she* will lie down in the dust" (referring to the children of the wicked).

In 40:20, the whole sense of the verse depends on the introductory כי of the first line and the dependent ו of the second: "*For* the mountains provide his god, *and* all the wild beasts play there." This provides the justification for the preceding line "Let his Maker bring his sword." NJPSV simply writes: "The mountains yield him produce; All the beasts of the field play there." Here we may note not only a loss of the sense of the verse – a loss of its justification, but also a limpness of expression, a draining of emotional content.

Because, like it or not, it is impossible to write coherently in any language without the use of conjunctions and prepositions, NJPSV, after throwing away as many as they felt they could dispose of from the Hebrew text, then proceeded to introduce a fresh batch of their own into the English. From where come the "buts" in 6:17 and 9:15? The "for" in 13:19? How does "waw," usually blown away with a puff of wind, come to bear the burden of sense of "so" in 15:5 – and incidentally throw the reader right off the scent of the meaning of the passage?

If a Hebrew writer wished to express the thought "He probes to rocks in darkness" he would presumably use both prepositions ל and ב and employ the plural of צור. NJPSV has this translation for the phrase חוקר אבן אפל וצלמות. Let not the reader puzzle too hard – the phrase is as imaginary as the prepositions and the plural – made up of pieces of two sentences.

CONCLUSION

This aggressive analysis has proceeded already too far, and I am all too conscious that I have not been playing the game of scholarly criticism with the courtesy and charm which usually characterizes it. But I must conclude by addressing the question why it is that modern biblical translations produce results which are so manifestly flawed. In all four versions which I have selected above the same fundamental weakness is evident. That is the employment of devices which liberate the translators from the precise text. NEB discards when it suits it the constraints of grammar and syntax; T-S can solve any problem by substituting a foreign derivation for any word; G can change the speaker if he doesn't approve of the sentiments in the mouth that utters them; NJPSV can manipulate the vectors of thoughts by changing their direction – and in

additional ways to those described above. Each set of translators has approached their task with the additional burden of a theory of biblical writing which (shall I copy G and say "uneonsciously"?) they have attempted to validate with their work. The same applied to translators in the last century under the pernicious influence of Wellhausen, and also of Lowth. It is perhaps time we returned to a more innocent attempt to enter the minds of the authors of these great books and place ourselves in resonance with them in order to put into modern languages as much as we can extract from what they put into the ancient one, and gave up the attempt to find new ways to discipline either the language or its exponents, undisciplining ourselves in the process.

THE LOCATION OF AI

BY BEN-ZION LURIA

The question of the location of Ai is one of the most difficult problems of research into the historical topography of the Land of Israel. An American archaeologist, N. Burrows, once wrote that our problem in the search for a solution to the question of Ai is more difficult than that of Joshua, who had to conquer it.[1]

Three events recorded in the Bible are connected with Ai. These are:

1. The transfer of the camp of Abraham from the region of Shechem and Elon Moreh, of which Genesis 12:8, relates: *And he removed them from thence unto a mountain on the east of Beth-el, and pitched his tent, having Beth-el on the west and Ai on the east...*

2. The battle over Ai and its conquest by Joshua (Joshua 7–8).

3. The return of Exiles from Babylonia, among whom are mentioned: *the men of Beth-el and Ai.* Ezra 2:28, mentions: *two hundred twenty and three,* Nehemia 7:32, gives their number as *an hundred twenty and three.*

A number of distinguished explorers and archaeologists have pointed at Tel-el-Hadjer, better known as Khirbet et Tell (in short: et Tell), as the location of biblical Ai. Et-Tell is located between the villages Beitin (ancient Beth-el) and Deir Dibwan. Yet, the archaeological digs have yielded no proof whatsoever that the site was inhabited at the time of Abraham and Joshua.

The first to point at et-Tell was the Dutch explorer Van der Velde, who visited the country in 1851/2. In 1933 an expedition on behalf of Baron Edmond de Rothschild started extensive digs at the site. In the first season (September – November 1933) the excavations were led by Samuel Yevin and Judith Narquet-Krause. In the two following seasons (May – December 1934 and August – November 1935) Judith Narquet-Krause conducted the digs alone, under the supervision of Prof. William F. Albright. In 1964 (May–June) a joint expedition

1 N. Burrows – *What Mean These Stones,* New Haven 1941.

Ben Zion Luria is the editor of Beth Mikra, the Hebrew publication of the Israel Society for Biblicat Research. He is the author of numerous volumes in Hebrew on biblical history and geography.

of several American scientific institutions led by Joseph A. Callaway started digging at the location. Excavations lasted until 1976.

In the March–April issue of *Biblical Archaeology Review* Callaway poses the question: "Was my excavation worthwhile?" He gives an affirmative answer, yet admits that, in view of the results of the excavations, "we are being pressed to find a more realistic perspective from which to understand Joshua 7–8."

If et-Tell is indeed considered to be identical to the biblical Ai, it must conform to the description of the site in Genesis 12:8.

Beth-el and et-Tell are one and a half kilometres apart. The narrative in Genesis does not indicate distance; it indicates only boundaries: *Beth-el on the west and Ai on the east.* This does not fix a distance of one and a half kilometres. Would it have been possible for Abraham to set up his "tent" there? Beth-el and Ai were two fortified Canaanite townships whose inhabitants were engaged in agriculture. There would have been no place for an additional settlement of a different people between the two. The "tent" of Abraham is not the tent of an individual person or of a family. It was a camp of considerable proportions. Several years later, when residing in Hebron, Abraham could muster 318 men, even after Lot had departed from him. If we add to these 200 persons who went with Lot, it is evident that when pitching his "tent" between Beth-el and Ai, Abraham's camp consisted of several hundred warriors and, in addition, women, children and livestock. It is inconceivable that a camp of, say, 3000 people and livestock could have found space between Beth-el and et-Tell.

Let us now examine questions of topography. Beth-el is 900 m. above sea-level. East of the town begins a descent eastward. From there to Rammun, some five km. to the east of Beth-el, the land is arable. From Rammun to the Jordan Valley, a distance of eighteen kilometres, there is a sharp descent of 1,150 m. (Beth-el, + 900, Jordan Valley, – 250). This territory is intersected by wadis and canyons. There is little rainfall in the area, some 200 mm. in a year, compared to 650 mm. in the Beth-el area. This is grazing land. Until about two-three generations ago Beduin tribes let their sheep and goats graze there. This may also have been grazing land used by the people of Abraham's camp.

CONQUEST OF AI

The story of the conquest of Ai is related in the book of Joshua in greatest detail, with two chapters dedicated to it.

What was the position of Joshua before the operation at Ai? He was stationed at Gilgal, and although we are not certain of its location, it surely must have been to the east or the north of Jericho, which had already been conquered. Could he have ascended to the mountains of Beth-el after the conquest of Jericho? Was his *hinterland* secure? There were other towns in the Jericho plain. The Bible alone mentions five of them. In other words – the Jordan Valley was densely populated. It is the most fertile land in the country. Is it conceivable that Joshua was not concerned about securing these cities for his people, but contented himself with the conquest of Jericho, and then ascended a distance of 20 km. to take Ai? This would certainly not have been good strategy.

Joshua, Chapter 7:2, relates: *Joshua sent men from Jericho to Ai, which is near Beth-aven, east of Beth-el.* The identity of Beth-aven is unknown – there is an opinion that it was a place for idol worship. Anyhow, the expression "near Beth-aven" indicates that it is near, but not adjacent to Ai; "east of Beth-el" is not an indication of distance, but of direction.

According to the testimony of the spies Ai seemed a near and medium-sized city. Joshua accepted their opinion that it would be possible to take it with a small force, obviating the need for using all of his warriors. In this context we have some aid in the identification of Ai. Joshua 7:4–5 relates: *And they fled before the men of Ai; and the men of Ai killed about thirty-six men of them. and chased them before the gate as far as Shebarim, and slew them at the descent.*

The term "Shebarim" is used only once in the Bible. It appears to me that it contains some hint as to the identification of Ai.

"Shebarim" is a geographical term.[2] It depicts a locality where the mountain or plateau is broken, creating a steep rocky wall. Today we would call it in English a scarp or escarpment. In the description of the battle of Ai, Shebarim is the escarpment going down from the Judean desert to the Jericho plain. The mountain is broken and a steep escarpment of more than 125 m. is created. To this point the Israel warriors fleeing from the men of Ai could make their escape. From there, however, no further escape-route existed, and there they were slain by their pursuers.

2 The Septuaguint does not refer to Shebarim as a locality but as a verbal noun and translates that the men of Ai chased the Israelites until they were broken (*hishabram*). This correction contradicts the geographic structure of the area.

Having purified his camp from the transgression of Achan, Joshua proceeded to take Ai: *So Joshua arose and all the fighting men, to go up to Ai, and Joshua chose thirty thousand*[3] *mighty men of valor, and sent them forth by night. And he commanded them, Behold, you shall lie in ambush against the city, behind it; do not go very far from the city, but hold yourselves all in readiness.*

The same is said in Verse 12: *And he took about five thousand men, and set them in ambush between Beth-el and Ai, to the west of the city.* The number of the men in ambush is larger in the first account, and this appears to be more accurate. In the second account Beth-el is mentioned, but not in the first. However, the addition of the name of a city does not indicate distance. It again hints at the direction of Beth-el, to the west of Ai.

Joshua's tactics were suited to a territory not too distant. It would have been impractical to dispatch an ambush unit over a distance of 20 km. as it would be daylight before the unit arrived. The ascent is more than 1000 m. In addition it would have been spotted over such a distance.

The ambush unit left Gilgal and proceeded as far as Jericho. There it could stop as long as there was daylight. After nightfall it proceeded in a western direction to the escarpment, from where it descended to the nearby wadi and hid.

Joshua's main force came from Gilgal, passed by Jericho and camped at the Elisha well and from there it proceeded in a western direction. Chapter 8:2 relates: *And all the fighting men who were with him went up, and drew near before the city, and encamped on the north side of Ai, with a ravine between them and Ai.* The ravine mentioned here is the continuation of Wadi Kelt.[4] [At this place it is only six meters deep]. Its walls do not consist of upright rocks, but are of moist earth. Joshua and all his men pretended to flee eastwards from the wadi; the enemy remained in the west, behind the city. Joshua drew the king of Ai and his army to the east, *Towards the plain Arabah — and Joshua and all Israel... fled in the direction of the wilderness.*

Here are two geographical terms that we can make use of to identify the place: the *Arabah* and the *wilderness*. The biblical term "wilderness" can also be

3 "Thousand" is not to be taken as a number of men. It depicts a unit made up of a tribe or family clan.

4 The historical name has now been returned to it, and it is again called the Pratt Wadi; see Jeremiah 8:6.

applied to the territory east of Beth-el. This is the "wilderness of Beth-el," which extends to the steep descent, towards the plain of Jericho, up to the "Shebarim." The term "wilderness" can equally be applied to territories in the Jordan Valley and the Jericho Plain. There, too, the land is not cultivated and serves only for grazing. In contrast, the term "Arabah" is used exclusively for the Jordan depression. When the term "Arabah" is used in connection with the pursuit it cannot be construed that the men of Ai pursued Joshua in his pretended flight from et-Tell on the hill of Beth-el as far as the plain of Jericho, and that only there the sign was given to the ambushers to attack the city. Those waiting in ambush could discern the spear Joshua waved; the distance between them was not great.

AI AND BETH-EL

Let us consider verse 17 in Chapter 8: *There was not a man left in Ai or Beth-el who did not go out after Israel; they left the city open and pursued Israel.* The joint mentioning of Ai and Beth-el could mean that the two cities were close to each other. But why is it said: *they left the city open?* Was it one city or were there two? And there arises an additional question: If the men of Beth-el were also engaged in the battle, and all rallied around the king of Ai, and were smitten by Joshua (after he drew them away from their base), why are we told that Beth-el required a renewed conquest? And what a conquest! The city could not be taken without cunning and without the betrayal of a young man who left it. The question, therefore, is: Why did Joshua not proceed another one and a half kilometers and take Beth-el, which was quite defenceless? Joshua is known for his resolution in exploiting his victories to the fullest, in pursuing his enemies over large distances and destroying them. Why should he have hesitated in this case only, when the victory over Beth-el was secure? Some scholars have dealt with this problem and failed to find a solution. The reason is simply: the battle did not take place on the hills of Beth-el, but in the plain of Jericho. The Septuagint indeed omits mentioning Beth-el.

One other verse requires clarification. Nehemia 7:32, reporting on the return of the exiles, relates: *The men of Beth-el and Ai, a hundred and twenty and three.* In the list of the 31 kings in Joshua 12:9, mention is made of the *king of Ai which is beside Beth-el.* The two instances in which the two cities are mentioned together have to be taken into account.

A solution to this question can be obtained by a thorough observation of

the lifestyle of the population in the hills east of the watershed. The people of the hills and those of the plain are related to each other. Edward Robinson, who toured the country about one hundred and fifty years ago, had this to day: "North of Jericho, in the fields of the valley, the people of the village Tailbeh in the hills tilled the soil. Their village was in the hills, yet their fields were in the valley." We find a similar situation in the Bible.[5] Hiel of Beth-el had his fields in the valley. First he would descend to the valley, till his field, and return at the end of the season to his house in the hills. However, since the fertile soil of the valley will yield several crops if tilled two or three times, Hiel ultimately remained in the valley; brought his family, servants and property, and rebuilt Jericho.

This is an example of the biblical eonneetion between Beth-el in the hills and Ai in the valley.

CONCLUSION

In view of all that was said so far one can conclude:

(a) The extensive excavations carried out in et-Tell have not revealed settlements in the two periods related to in the Bible, that of Abraham and that of Joshua.

(b) The detailed description of the conquest of Ai by Joshua fits only a battle in the plain of Jericho, as testified to by the terms "Shebarim" and "Arabah."

(c) There is substance to the testimony of Rabbi Berakhia (fourth century), whose praise of the plain of Jericho contains the following statement: "This beautiful stretch of land, lusted after by all the kings, and lying between Ai and Jericho, measures only three miles.Each city being ruled by a king."[6]

We cannot at present identify Ai. A possible point of location is Jericho of the 4th century C.E. where a mosaic floor of a synagogue has been preserved. It lies in a plantation one kilometer north of new Jericho. One has to look for Ai 4–5 km.to the west of this point, where there is water. Without a source of water no settlement could exist in this region. Ai may well be located on the banks of Wadi Pratt (Wadi Kelt) or near the walls of Ein Duyuk or Ein Nueima; not in the hills.

5 I Kings, 16:34.

6 Shemot Rabba, Chapter 13, Verse 6.

THE NEGEV

BY ZEEV VILNAI

From a lecture given by the late Professor Zeev Vilnai in 1987 at the annual Tu B'shvat program sponsored by Dor Le Dor.

For those of us who are interested in the history of our people — in our roots and beginnings — the Negev is one of the most interesting plaees in the world.

I would like to dwell on two aspects of the Negev — the Negev as described in the Torah in the lifetimes of the patriarehs, Abraham, Isaac and Jaeob, and the same Negev at a later stage in our history as the land which was apportioned to the tribe of Simeon.

Abraham lived in the Negev, mainly in Beer-sheba, and we are all familiar with the events of his life there, including disputes over water wells and treaties with his neighbors. After the treaty with Abimelech, if we turn to Genesis 21:33, we find the sentence: ויטע אשל בבאד שבע, ויקדא שם בשם ה' אל עולם. *And Abraham planted a tamarisk in Beer-sheba, and called there on the name of the Lord the everlasting God.*

What conneetion is there between the two parts of the sentence — the planting of a tamarisk and the prayer to an everlasting God?

ויטע אשל — *And he planted a tamarisk* has a very special significance. It is not to be taken at face value, that he added one more to the tree population of Beer-sheba. Here in Beer-sheba some of the important events in the life of Abraham took place. He *called on the name of the Lord* — namely he spread the revelation of an everlasting God the Judge of the Universe; he made treaties with his neighbors; and he also began a new life. Planting a tree meant creating a tie with the soil — a change of status from wandering shepherd to permanent resident. Those familiar with the Negev know that the *eshel* is a very important tree. In the fierce heat of the Negev it provides refreshing shade, and even today the Arabic word for it *Tarfa* means a "Center of Life" for the Beduin — the place where one

Professor Vilnai, famous Israel geographer, author and lecturer, was the principal guide in walking tours over the country. He wrote over a score of books on Israel geography, and served on the Israel Government Place Names Committee.

eats and drinks and sleeps. Our Hebrew word *eshel* is given just that connotation: aleph – *achila,* eating; shin – *shtiah,* – drinking; and lamed – *lina,* sleeping.

Now we come to another place in the Negev, Gerar. The location of this spot has long been disputed. A well known archaeologist, Sir Flinders Petrie, excavated a mound which he claimed was the ancient site of Gerar. He was so thrilled with his discovery that he wrote a book called *Gerar,* but many of his colleagues disagree with his findings. We associate Gerar with our ancestor Isaac – and again, as with Abraham – we return to our theme of change of life style from herding to agriculture (Genesis 26:12): ויזרע יצחק בארץ ההיא וימצא בשנה ההיא מאה שערים ויברכהו ה׳. *And Isaac sowed in that land (i.e. Gerar) and found in the same year a hundredfold, for the Lord blessed him.* His efforts were rewarded with abundant fertility – as were his floeks and herds. Both are dependent on water, and we find that water and water wells are an oft-recurring setting for good events, or a cause for rivalry. Some of the wells of our ancestors are still in existence today; one of them in the heart of Beer-sheba is called *Beer Avraham.*

Another place name which we find in connection with water is Rehovot. Not the Rehovot we know today. In the Rehovot of the Negev, after many quarrels with his neighbors, and having being forced to move from place to place in search of water, Isaac dug a well for which no onc disputed possession. Genesis 26:22 records: *And he called its name Rehovot, and he said, For now the Lord has made room for us and we shall be fruitful in the land.*

The Negev held a very strategic position in the ancient world. It was situated between two flourishing cultures – that of Egypt in the south and that of Assyria in the north. Roads as a means of communication were therefore of prime importance, and two roads in the Negev are mentioned in the Biblc.

"דרך הים", renamed *Via Maris* by the Romans, ran along the coastal plain parallel to the Mediterranean Sea and served as a link between Egypt and Assyria. The second road, "דרך שור" led from the Negev to Egypt, and it is the route that Jacob almost certainly took when hc went down to Egypt, a road that made history again in the military operations in Sinai. For those who know the Negev thc settlements Revivim, Ashalim, Bet Eshel and T'zeilim are in the area of that road.

When the children of Israel left Egypt to go to the Promised Land they tried at

first to go along Derech Hayam or the Coast Road, but they were too weak to overcome the many fortresses whieh were along that way. They tried the second way – Derech Shur; they succeeded and proceeded until Beer-sheba; but near Arad – not far from our new town Arad of today – they had to fight with the Canaanites and were defeated, so they decided to go to the Promised Land via Transjordan, and, as we know, they entered the Holy Land via Jericho.

In the days of Joshua the land was divided among the tribes of Israel, and the Negev area was alloted to the tribe of Simeon. Like the other tribes, Simeon inherited some cities, but was less fortunate when it eame to agriculture. The land was dry and the territory was surrounded by enemies, the Edomites who were strong at that time, the Amalekites and the Philistincs. Lack of water prevented large-scale farming and the Simeonites were forced to remain shepherds. Joshua (Chap. 19) records: *And the second lot came out for Simeon, even for the tribe of the children of Simeon according to their families, and their inheritance was in the midst of the inheritance of the children of Judah.*

Why was "their inheritance in the inhcritance of Judah?" The tribe was a weak one and unable to withstand the invasion of enemies. They were compelled to ask for the protection of Judah, and this is the reason why their inheritance was in the midst of the inheritance of Judah. One finds similar arrangemcnts among Beduin tribes today, with the weaker clans seeking the protection of their stronger brethren.

Still in the Book of Joshua, (19:2) we come to an impressive list of settlements inherited by the tribe of Simeon. Regrettably most of the names remain an enigma to us, but two of them – Hatzar Sussim (Hatzar Sussa?) and Bet Merkavot do give us a clue – they were wayside stations where transport must have provided the residents with a livelihood. Generally speaking, the tribe of Simeon was poor, and this is confirmed by the rabbis who observe, "Most of the poor people came from the tribe of Simeon," and also, "They were the scribes and teachers." Rashi comments on this, "You do not find poor people like the sons of Simeon."

Now we come to another point which has puzzled many scholars; which is the identification of the biblical cities of Simeon. It is far easier to identify the cities of Judah or Ephraim, Asher or Naphtali because they were permanent cities whose names were passed on from generation to generation. The cities of Simeon could not be called permanent in the same way. In times of drought or invasion the

cities were abandoned – so there were gaps in the history of each settlement and it is difficult to pinpoint the sites of the cities of biblical times.

A further point of interest is the word *hatzer* in connection with the cities of Simeon. E.g., וכל החצרים אשר סביבות הערים האלה (Joshua 19:8) *And all the villages that were around these cities. Hatzer* is now a common word meaning the courtyard of a house, but that is not the meaning here. *Hatzer* is a special word which is particularly suited to the conditons of the Negev. It is a temporary settlement of shepherds which surrounded its cities. The conventional translation of the word is "villages" but I think "sheepfolds" would be a more aceurate description, because it is too dry in the Negev to rely only on farming, and sheep provide a very necessary supplement. Therefore the Bible mentions not only the cities of Simeon but also their *hatzerim.*

The tribe of Simeon has an unfortunate history of war, of dependence on the tribe of Judah, of lack of water and striving to enlarge its territory. In time the tribe was absorbed by the tribe of Judah.

What have our archaeologists of today been able to discover about the territory of Simeon – the area of Beer-sheba? There are many mounds – the Hebrew word is *tel* – artificial hills created as a result of the destruction of towns. Between Beer-sheba and Gaza there are many *tilim,* and undoubtedly among them are remains of towns that existed in the time of Simeon. It is unfortunate that we cannot find the connection between the mounds and the towns mentioned in the Bible. So our new settlements in the area were called by different names – Revivim, Bet Eshel, Gevulot – to name just a few. A settlement called Re'im is next to a beautiful *tel* called *Tel Jame* in Arabic, using a Hebrew version of the Arabic name. Similarly, a *tel* called Sharea was renamed Shera and a *tel* called Harera was called Haror.

The Negev has been a field of intensive exploration by scholars and archaeologists, namely all of them now Israeli scholars. We are indeed fortunate to see in our lifetime the revival of the State of Israel and the revival and rebirth of the Negev, a dry land, a *terra incognita* which has beeome, thanks to our pioneers both inside and outside Israel, such a vital and invigorating part of Israel today.

JOSIAH

THE IMPACT OF HIS LIFE AND DEATH

BY SHIMON BAKON

Rarely do both the life and the death of one individual have a major impact on the course of history, but this was the case with King Josiah, who ascended the throne of Judah in the year 639 B.C.E., when only eight years old. Politically, Judah was still a vassal of the mighty Assyrian empire, whose power had begun to decline due to the ambition of an upstart Babylonia, which, together with the Medes, eventually brought her down with the conquest of Nineveh in the year 612.[1] At the same time, Egypt, concerned with maintaining a sphere of influence in Judah-Syria, and fearing the rapid expansion of Babylonia, made common cause with her erstwhile enemy, Assyria.

At first, Josiah skilfully exploited the play for power of these three giants of antiquity, by annexing Samerina (Samaria) and Maggidu (Megiddo), two provinces that had been incorporated by Assyria.[2] But unfortunately he did not grasp the danger in which he had placed his kingdom by attempting to block Pharaoh Neco, who had rushed to the aid of Assyria. Josiah was deeisively defeated and mortally wounded. This started an almost irreversible tragic chain of events, with Judah becoming first a vassal of Egypt, and after their defeat, a satellite of the conquering Babylonians. From then on there was a constant shifting of fealty, intermingled with hopeless efforts to achieve independence, culminating in 586 in the total collapse of Judea and the destruction of the First Commonwealth. The violent death of Josiah, coupled with the dramatie events that followed it, initiated a crisis of faith that threatened the future of the Jewish people.

1 This year is approximate. There is still a debate among seholars as to the precise date in which the events dcscribed here oecurred.

2 See עיונים בספר ירמיהו Prof. A. Malamat דברי ירמיהו לפי המקרא p. 11.

Dr. Shimon Bakon is Editor of Dor Le Dor.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, when he launched a campaign to repair the Temple, Hilkiah, the high priest, supervising the work, *found the book of the Law in the house of the Lord* (II Kings 22:8).

Too much speculation has been centered on the nature of this book, although the ramifications of its discovery are of utmost importance. On reading it, the king was visibly shaken and, consulting the prophetess Hulda, initiated a major movement of reformation.

In order fully to appreciate this reformation, it is necessary to review the reign of Josiah's grandfather, King Manasseh, the longest reigning monarch of either Judah or Israel. Devoting to him a total of eighteen verses, the book of Kings finds no redeeming qualities in him.[3] He followed all the abominations held in contempt by the Bible: Molech worship, building altars for all the hosts of heaven in the courts of the Temple, and even installing a graven image of Ashera in the Temple itself. His life is summed up by the biblical narrator as follows... *and Manasseh seduced them* [the Judeans] *to do that which is evil more than did the nations.*[4] No wonder that the Torah was suppressed and forgotten, with only a few remaining faithful to the Lord. On the other hand, with Josiah, the voice of prophets was again heard in the land: Zephania, Hulda, and above all, Jeremiah, whose ministry began in the thirteenth year of Josiah's reign.

What influence, if any, Jeremiah had on Josiah, is a moot question. For reasons not understood, the Book of Kings doesn't mention Jeremiah at all. It is perhaps part of the tragedy that Jeremiah's prophetic advice to submit to Babylonia was not heeded by Josiah and by the kings who followed him, for it might have saved Jerusalem.

The reformation instituted by Josiah was shortlived, ending with his death. But the finding of the book of the Law, which preceded it, followed by the renaissance of prophecy exerted an incalculable influence on biblical Judaism. Thus Josiah's accomplishments are summarized enthusiastically in the following terms.

> *And like unto him was there no king before him, that turned to the Lord with all his heart and with all his soul and with all his might... neither after him arose there any like him...*

3 The account of his life in Chronicles deviates considerably from that in the book of Kings.

4 II Kings 21:9.

5 II Kings 23:25.

THE DEBACLE AT MEGIDDO

Our two most important sources of historical events, Kings and Chronicles, do not indicate what prompted Josiah to engage Pharaoh Neco at Megiddo. In all probability he wished to hold on to Megiddo which, lying astride the road from Egypt to the north, had great strategic significance. He also feared Egypt's plans to expand her influence to Judah and Syria. Chronicles is more specific on what occurred and even records this detail:[6] Neco sent ambassadors to Josiah, pleading with him: *God hath given command to speed me; forbear then, from meddling with God Who is with me. Nevertheless Josiah would not turn his face from him... and hearkened not unto the words of Neco from the mouth of God.*

How are we to interpret this? If, indeed, by God the god of Neco is meant, why is Josiah's death indirectly connected to his not hearkening to him? If, on the other hand, he is blamed for not hearkening to the God of Israel, the implications are that a prophet may have warned Josiah not to interfere, and if so, which prophet? It could hardly have been Hulda, who had assured Josiah: *I will gather thee to thy fathers, and thou shalt be gathered to thy grave in peace.*[7] It is therefore probable that it was Jeremiah, whose prophetic policies regarding Babylonia were well known, even to Neco.

When the brilliant career of Josiah came to a tragic end it was again Chronicles which recorded:

> *And Jeremiah lamented for Josiah, and all the singing men and singing women spoke of Josiah in their lamentations unto this day; and they made this an ordinance in Israel; and behold they are written in the lamentations.*[8]

After the king's death, political and religious controversies and rifts that had been kept under control during the reign of Josiah, swept the land.

IDOLATRY RAMPANT – CRISIS OF FAITH

Crass idolatry, which had been dormant during the too brief reign of the

6 II Chronicles 35:21–22.

7 II Kings 22:20; II Chronicles 34:28.

righteous King Josiah, surfaced as soon as he died and continued unabated till the destruction of the First Commonwealth. In defense of this phenomenon it must be said that, in the perspective of millenia past, idolatry was a religion of "eommon sense," so recognized even by our sages of old. In a fictitious argument between King Manasseh, portrayed in the Talmud as a scholar, and Rav Ashi, the latter inquired: "If, indeed, you are such a scholar, why are you an idolater?" To which Manasseh answered: "Had you lived then, you would have lifted the skirts of your garment, and run after me." אי הוה התם נקיטא בשיפולי גלימא, ורהטת אבתראי.[9] In the pereeption of the ancients, gods revealed their presence by their might and the prosperity they conferred upon their worshippers. Thus, in the exchange between Jephthah and the Ammonites, the latter having demanded the return of the territories conquered by Moses three hundred years earlier, Jephthah declared that *The Lord, the God of Israel, delivered Sihon... into the hands of Israel. So now the Lord... hath dispossessed the Ammonites... Wilt not thou possess that which Chemosh thy god giveth thee to possess?*[10] The contest between two peoples was also a contest between their gods, and the stronger one determined the outcome. This is made painfully clear by King Ahaz of Judah, of whom it is recorded that *he sacrificed unto the gods of Damascus which smote him. And he said: 'Because the gods of the kings of Aram helped them, therefore will I sacrifice to them, that they may help me*.[11] It was "common sense" which prompted Ahaz to give homage to pagan gods who had "proven" victorious over the God of Israel.

"Common sense" dietated that the Judeans, overawed by the strength of the Assyrians and Babylonians, would also adopt their deities. In addition, there was a popular belief that the gods of the foreign people could also ensure their general well being and prosperity.

This is what Jeremiah had to contend with in his hopeless attempt to wean his compatriots from idolatry. When he rebuked the Judean refugees now dwelling in Egypt, they responded, apparently pointing to the "good times" under Manasseh.

8 II Chronicles 35:25. These lamentations are lost. Perhaps Lamentations 4:20 may refer to Josiah.

9 Sanhedrin, 102b.

10 Judges 11:21–24.

11 II Chronicles 28:23.

> *We shall continue to offer unto the queen of heaven, as we have done... in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem; for we had plenty of food, and were well, and saw no evil. But since we left off to offer to the queen of heaven, we have lacked all things, and have been consumed by the sword and famine.*[12]

WHEREFORE DOTH THE WAY OF THE WICKED PROSPER

The juxtaposition of Manasseh and Josiah, with a long and relatively peaceful reign of the former and the violent death of the latter, followed by a process of political and religious deterioration, had two effects. It "confirmed" heathenism, or syncretism, and put the remaining "faithful" to the utmost test. Frost, commenting on the disillusionment in the wake of Josiah's death, suggests that "its effect was to destroy the premise on which Hebrew historiography had been built."[13] His assessment overshoots the mark. Indeed, questions were raised, as to the promises of reward and punishment, where is the God of justice, and we are confronted with the genuine outcry of Jeremiah, occassioned, perhaps, by the death of Josiah:

> *Right wouldest Thou be, O Lord. Were I to contend with Thee Yet I will reason with Thee.*
> *Wherefore doth the way of the wicked prosper?*[14]

The comparison of the lives of Manasseh and Josiah *did* indeed challenge faith in God's justice, and the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple *almost* caused the collapse of the very structure upon which biblical historiosophy was built. However, eventually the disaster was seen as proof of God's power. He Himself had instigated it, angered by the stubborn iniquity of the Jewish people, and of one individual in particular, King Manasseh. The Book of Kings, and the prophet Jeremiah are in total accord when they point an accusing finger at Manasseh. Even the righteous Josiah could not reverse the Lord's firm resolve, and the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple was sealed. *The Lord turned not from the fierceness*

12 Jeremiah 44:17–18.

13 Frost, Stanley B. The Death of Josiah, *JRL of Biblical Lit.* p. 382 (1968).

14 Jeremiah 12:1.

15 II Kings 23:26.

16 Jeremiah 15:4.

17 Jeremiah 31:28.

of His great wrath, because of the provocations wherewith Manasseh had provoked Him.[15] And Jeremiah declares: *I will cause them to be a horror among all the kingdoms of the earth, because of Manasseh...*[16]

OUR FATHERS ATE SOUR GRAPES

When Jeremiah predicted a time when they shall say no more:

The fathers have eaten sour grapes
And the children's teeth are set on edge[17]

he addressed himself to those who had remained faithful to the Lord, and yet had been assailed by the anxieties and doubts engendered by the cruel times following the death of Josiah. Despairing of hope for the future, they felt burdened by the "irreparable" sins of the fathers. Jeremiah allayed their fears by proclaiming:

But every one shall die for his own iniquity;
every man that eateth sour grapes, his teeth shall be set on edge.[18]

Israel need not fear. The covenant still stands firm. There is hope for the future. After seventy years God will remember and will cause them to return. Indeed, the covenant will be different from the one made as Sinai, since God Himself, seeing that Israel broke it, *will put (His) law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it.*[19]

This is not the place to expand on the religious revolution wrought by Jeremiah when, instilling hope in the broken remnant, he refined the principle of individual responsibility, elaborated later on by Ezekiel. We wish to emphasize that the great spiritual leaders, such as Jeremiah and Ezekiel, rose to the tremendous challenge caused by all the upheavals that befell the Judeans, as well as the corrosive influence of paganism and the doubts and despair gnawing at their souls.

THE BOOK OF THE LAW

There is a talmudic saying that God sends the cure before the illness. The Temple, despite the abuses that occurred there, also contained some measure of spirituality which unified the people. It was, however, the book of the Law, brought to the attention of King Josiah, that eventually moved into a position of

18 Jeremiah 31:29.

19 Jeremiah 31:30–32. References to a return after 70 years Jer. 25:12 and 29:10.

centrality in the lives of the Judeans. The impact it had had on the king was not easily forgotten. The Temple was destroyed, rebuilt and again destroyed; the prophetic movement faded away and came to an abrupt end; but the book of the Law, The Torah, created a dynamic of its own. With all its accretions, eventually to be known as the Written Law, it became the scaffolding upon which the "Oral Law" was created. It was around the Torah that Nehemiah drew up a covenant with the returnees: *They entered into a curse and into an oath to walk in God's law, which was given by Moses the servant of God, to observe and do all the commandments of the Lord our God...*[20] It became the "portable homeland" that sustained the Jewish people in the Diaspora, following the destruction of the Second Commonwealth.

Thus, together with the prophets, the book of the Law, discovered by King Josiah, created the inner reserves that allowed the Judeans to survive the trauma of their destroyed capital, to withstand the powerful attractions of idolatry, and to cope with the doubts that assailed them. They succeeded where no other people did, under similar circumstances.[21]

20 Nehemiah 10:30.

21 The sacking of Nineveh spelled the end of the mighty Assyrian Empire. When Cyrus, a petty Elamite chieftain rose in rebellion against Babylonia, overwhelming the forces of Besharuzur (Belshazzar), the Babylonian empire fell as rapidly as it had come into existence. The Persian Empire, supereeding it, eollapsed when the ambitious Alexander of Macedonia deseended upon it; the Carthaginians, the most dangerous rivals of Rome, collapsed with the fall of Carthage; and when Rome itself was invested by the hordes of Alaric (410 C.E.), the Roman Empire broke asunder.

RABBINIC ATTITUDES TOWARD INTERMARRIAGE

II

BY SAMUEL M. STAHL

In the first part which appeared in the last issue of Dor Le Dor (Vol. XVII –1), Rabbi Stahl addressed himself to biblical attitudes toward intermarriage.

Rabbinic Judaism adopted its hard-line positions as is evident throughout most of the halakhic and aggadic writings. This rabbinic attitude toward the intermarried is hostile and antagonistic. A Jew who intermarries is a sinner and traitor and is deserving of corporal punishment or Divine[1] displeasure.

When the rabbinic sages confront a biblical figure, they evaluate him or her in an almost black and white way. The character was either a role model, worthy of emulation, or a scoundrel, meriting nothing but denigration and defamation.[2] For a biblical character they admire, occasionally they issue a sharp word of condemnation when he or she sinned. However, such a comment would play a minor role in their overall glowing assessment. Conversely, when one they do not respect acted nobly, they express, at best, faint praise. However, in such a case, the rabbis would often ascribe sinister motives to the good deed.

1 *M.T.* Hilkhot Issure Biah 12:1; S. A. *Even Haezer,* Hilkhot Ishut 16:1ff.; *Sefer Hahinukh* 427.

2 For a full development of this concept, see Z. H. Chajes, *The Student's Guide Through the Talmud* (New York: Philip Feldheim, Ine., 19), pp. 163–164. There, Chajes observes that the rabbis had a tradition "as far as possible to praise the conduct of godly men, to demonstrate their worth and weigh it against their failings on the scales of merit, and to endeavor in every way possible to justify the doings of the good... When referring to the evil doings of the wicked, they charged them with all other possible abominable deeds deducing their charges from the context in each case."

Rabbi Samuel M. Stahl, D.H.L. is Rabbi of Temple Beth-El, San Antonio, Texas, and the Editor of the Journal of Reform Judaism, the official quarterly publication of the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

ESAU

For example, even though Jacob swindled his brother Esau out of his birthright, the rabbis attempt to "whitewash" Jacob's wrongdoing so as to present an ideal exemplar. On the other hand, they look upon Esau with disdain, so that when Scripture depicts him sympathetically, the rabbis view him harshly.

Even when Esau acted nobly, the rabbis assign ignoble motives to him. In their eyes, Esau could do little that was right. They find few redeeming features in him and consider his intermarriages blameworthy, because of the idolatrous practices of his wives.[3] They even accuse his wives of causing Isaac's blindness.[4] When his wives made sacrifices to their gods, Isaac smelled the smoke and his vision dimmed.

In addition, Esau deceived his father into thinking that Judith, one of his wives, was not a pagan.[5] Her real name was Oholibamah, a Hittite. He told his father her name was Judith to trick him. The rabbis tell us that the name of the Israelite wife Esau later took, Mahalat, was significant. It is derived from the root *MHL,* meaning "pardon." God pardoned Esau for his sins when he wed her.[6] Yet, one commentator scores Esau even here. Nahmanides charges that though Esau did not marry any more pagan wives, he was unwilling to banish those he had already wed, in spite of their unsuitability and wickedness.[7]

AHAB

The rabbis view Ahab with similar displeasure. In a few instances, they acknowledge some of his positive traits and his repenting of evil.[8] However, the rabbis also magnify the idolatrous sins connected with Ahab's intermarriage which the Bible records against him. They emphasize that his foreign wife, Jezebel, lured him into serious transgressions of idolatry. In fact, he became such

3 Gen. Rabbah 65 and Jubilees 25:1.

4 Pesikta Rabbati 12:17.

5 Rashi on Gen. 36:2–5.

6 Gen. Rabbah 66:13. In Jewish tradition, a marriage serves to absolve bride and groom of past transgressions.

7 Nahmanides on Genesis 28:8–9.

8 San. 102b and 104b, Pirke D'Rabbi Eliezer 63.

an avid apostate that every mountaintop in Palestine had an idol which he worshipped and to which he brought daily offerings. On all the doors of the city of Samaria, he had inscribed this statement: "Ahab has rejected the God of Israel." In the Torah, he substituted the names of idols for the divine name. Ahab's fate was that he was included among the three or four kings who have been denied a share in the world-to-come.[12]

SAMSON

The rabbis inform us that Samson, who married Delilah, a Philistine woman, had a fascination for Philistine women. Yet he comes out fairly well at their hands. It is true that they score him for his relations with Gentile women. They point out his powerful tendencies toward sexual immorality. They even compare him to Amnon and Zimri, who were punished for their sins.[10] Even while in prison, they believe that Samson could not resist the overtures of married Philistine women who hoped his impregnation would enable them to bear children with Samson's power and strength.[11] Samson is called *mizrak*, the name of a silver basin (Num. 7:13f). In this understanding, he was rejected (*mizrak*) by his brothers for refusing to marry within the family and for choosing a Philistine woman instead.[12] He also became a defiled Nazarite because of the Gentile woman who caused him to lose his abundant crop of hair.

Yet the predominant image of Samson in rabbinic literature is generally a more favorable one. He is compared to God. Samson's name, in their view, contains the name of God. Just as God protects and judges the people Israel, so did Samson guard and judge it.[13] So potent was Samson's supernatural strength that Jacob thought that he would be the Messiah.[14] The rabbis even praise Samson in connection with Delilah, his pagan wife. He told her he was a "Nazirite to God" and she was certain that he had revealed the true secret of his strength. She could not conceive of his linking the name of God to a lie.[15]

9 M. San. 10:2.
10 Lev. Rabbah 23:9.
11 Sot. 9a–10a.
12 Num. Rabbah 14:9.
13 Sotah 10a.
14 Gen. Rabbah 98:14.
15 Sot. 9b.

SOLOMON

The rabbis look upon Solomon's intermarriages as they do Samson's – with a mixed judgment. Solomon, according to rabbinic legend, was among those to whom God assigned names before they were born and who were considered *tzaddikim*.[16] The rabbis praise him for asking only for wisdom in his dream. Wisdom was to act as a protection against sinful thoughts. In fact, Solomon fasted for 40 days in order that God give him the spirit of wisdom.[17] The rabbis also extol Solomon's extraordinary wisdom and regard him as a prophet, in whom the Holy Spirit (*Ruah Hakodesh*) lived. This inspired quality enabled him to write the Song of Songs, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes.[19] Solomon was considered the builder of synagogues and Torah academies, where he himself studied together with many scholars and children.[19] Strong admiration for Solomon led Rabbi Jose to assert that Solomon's sole motive in marrying Pharaoh's daughter was to convert her to Judaism.[20] One rabbinic theory is that Solomon did not actually wed Pharaoh's daughter. Rather, he lived with her out of wedlock, but because he loved her so greatly, Scripture imputes it to him as though he married her.[21]

However, not all the rabbis were enamored of Solomon. Some claim that only because Solomon built the Temple he is not classified with the impious kings. His sins would have otherwise placed him among their ranks.[22] Many of the rabbis take Solomon to severe task indirectly for his behavior with non-Jewish women. They tell that when he married Pharaoh's daughter, the archangel Gabriel came down from heaven. He placed a reed in the sea. It accumulated silt and ultimately Rome, seat of Israel's enemy occupier, was built on it. Furthermore, the rabbis relate in an aggadic passage that Pharaoh's daughter brought him 1,000 instruments on their wedding night. In spite of the fact that each was dedicated to a dif-

16 Gen. Rabbah 45:11; J. Berakhot 7:11b.
17 Pesikta Rabbati 14 (ed. Friedmann, p. 59a, b), Num. Rabbah 19:3, Ecc. Rabbah 7:23, Midrash Mishle 15:29.
18 Sotah 48b, Makkot 23b, Song of Songs Rabbah 1:1, Ecc. Rabbah 1–10:17.
19 Song of Songs Rabbah 1:1, Exodus Rabbah 15:20.
20 Sifre Deut. 52, J. Avodah Zarah 1:39c, Shabbat 59b.
21 Yeb. 76a and b.
22 San. 104b; Song of Songs Rabbah 1:1 no. 5.

ferent false god, Solomon did nothing to stop her.[23] One night, she spread a tapestry, covered with diamonds and pearls, over his bed. They had the brightness of constellations in the sky which produced an illusion of stars. Thus he overslept one morning and caused grief among his people. The bag containing the keys to the Temple was kept under his pillow, and therefore the daily sacrifice could not be offered.[24]

The rabbis refuse to admit that Solomon was an idol worshiper. The biblical author maintains in I Kings 11:7–11, that the revolt and division in the kingdom were caused by Solomon's idolatry. The rabbis comment that it would have been preferable for Solomon to have cleaned sewers rather than have this scriptural verse written about him.[25] Though the rabbis criticize Solomon for failing to restrain his foreign wives from idolatry, they negate the biblical claim that they influenced Solomon to become an idolater and insist that Solomon never submitted to idols.[26]

Thus the rabbis do take Solomon to task because his marriages to hundreds of pagan women wreaked havoc on the nation. Yet, they cannot bring themselves to engage in a wholesale denunciation of him. We saw that they viewed Samson similarly. In fact, later generations also restrain themselves in looking upon their intermarriages too negatively. Maimonides points out that, for some mysterious reason, Samson and Solomon were each called *yedid Adonai* (friend of God) in spite of their exogamous marriages.[27]

JOSEPH

With regard to Joseph, the rabbis describe him as a wholly righteous person (*tzaddik gamur*).[28] They praise him for his learning in Torah, his ability to prophesy, and his support of his brothers.[29] Rabbi Phineas claims that the Holy Spirit (*Ruach Hakodesh*) resided in Joseph throughout his entire lifetime.[30] The

23 Shabbat 56b.
24 Lev. Rabbah 12:5.
25 Ex. Rabbah 6:1.
26 Shabbat 56b.
27 M. T. Hilkhot Issure Biah 13:14.
28 Gen. Rabbah 84:6, Num. Rabbah 14:16.
29 Tanchuma Vayeshev 20.
30 Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer 38.

rabbis greatly embellish the courageous resistance of Joseph to the attempted seduction by Potiphar's wife. The sages hardly admit the possibility of Joseph's intermarriage. The earlier *midrashim* indicate that Joseph's wife, Asenath, daughter of Poti-phera, the pagan priest, converted to Judaism. Her conversion is related in a dramatic tale:

> "Asenath desired also to kiss Joseph but he warded off the intimate greeting with the words: 'It is not right that a God-fearing man, who blesses the living God and eats the blessed bread of life, who drinks of the blessed cup of immortality and incorruptibility, and anoints himself with the fragrant oil of holiness, should kiss a woman of a strange people, who blesses dead and unprofitable idols, and eats the putrid bread of idolatry, which chokes the soul of man, who drinks the libations of deceit and anoints herself with the oil of destruction."[31]

The rabbis report that these words uttered by Joseph touched Asenath so deeply that she cried. Out of his compassion for her, he gave her his blessings, called upon God to pour out the divine spirit over her, made her a member of God's people and inheritance, and awarded her a portion in the life eternal.

Later teachers aver, through a fanciful tale, that Asenath had never converted but had been Jewish from birth. She was a daughter that resulted from the intercourse of Shechem and Dinah. When Dinah's brothers, who were Jacob's sons, learned about the illegitimate birth that was about to occur, they intended to kill the child to spare the family shame and disgrace. To avert such a calamity, Jacob placed a talisman, with God's name engraved on it, on the child's neck, and sent her on her way. The angel Michael came down and brought her to Poti-phera's house in Egypt. Poti-phera's wife was barren and thus raised her as if she were her own daughter. It was this child whom Joseph took for a wife.[32]

MOSES

Moses, unlike Joseph, did come under some rabbinic criticism for his intermarriage. Zimri brought Cozbi, a Midianite, to Moses and asked his permis-

31 Gen. Rabbah 85:2, 90:6, 91:5, Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia; Jewish Publication Society, 1910), Vol. II, p. 172.
32 Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer 38, Yalkut Shimoni, Vayishlach 134, Targ. Jonathan Gen. 41:45 and 46:20.

sion to marry her. When Moses refused to grant it, Zimri chided him for marrying Zipporah, who was also a Midianite woman.[33] Some rabbis claim that because of Moses' intermarriage, he became the ancestor of Jonathan, the priest of Micah's idol.[34]

Yet, the majority of sages treat Moses as they do Joseph and deny that he ever intermarried. They regard Moses as the Jewish people's greatest emancipator, lawgiver, prophet, and teacher. He was responsible for transforming a people from a confederation of tribes into a formidable nation. In their view, one so exalted in stature could not possibly have intermarried. Thus, Zipporah, daughter of Jethro, the Midianite priest, converted to Judaism and became a passionate foe of idolatry. The Tanhuma explains why her name was Zipporah, meaning, "bird." She purified her father's house from the defilement of idolatry, just as a bird purifies a leper of his uncleanliness.[35] In a charge to Joshua, his succcssor, Moses referred to Zipporah as a "poor proselytc" and asked Joshua to look aftcr her following Moses' death.[36]

Even those rabbis who admit that Moses did marry an unconverted pagan, can satisfy themselves by rationalizing. Thcy argue that the marriage took place before the Torah was revealed and thc laws against intermarriage had not yet been given. In fact, they even tacitly praise Moses for his choice of a wife, though she was a pagan, by pointing out her outstanding character.

An aggadic legend relates that Jethro paid Moses a large sum of money when he gave his daughter Zipporah to Moses as a wife. Jethro did impose the requirement that the first child of that marriage be raised in Jethro's pagan religion, while the subsequcnt children could be reared as Jews. Moses agreed to that stipulation. When his son, Gershom, was born, Moses could not circumcise him because of this pact with Jethro.[37] Moses and Zipporah then went to Egypt. On their way, Satan appeared in the form of a serpent and proceeded to swallow Moses. When the upper part of Moses' body had been ingested, the serpent stop-

33 San. 82a.

34 Judges 18:30, Baba Batra 109b.

35 Tanchuma B. 2:6.

36 Petirat Moshe 126.

37 Mekilta Yitro 1 (ed. Weiss, p. 65b). According to Jellinek, in Midrash Vayosha, the offspring of the marriage had to be divided into two equal groups, pagan and Jewish.

ped. At that moment, Zipporah realized the reason for the serpent's action: Gershom had not been circumcised. Immediately, she circumcised him and smeared some of the circumcision blood on Moses' feet. A heavenly voice then commanded the serpent to spew Moses out. Thus Zipporah is credited with saving Moses' life.[38]

Zipporah is often identified as Moses' Cushite wife. According to the biblical account, Aaron and Miriam spoke ill of Moses allegedly because of his Cushite wife.[39] Yet, the rabbis find merit in her being called a Cushite twice in that scriptural passage (Num. 12:1). They explain that the name Cushite was given to her because she was distinguished from other Ethiopians by her beauty, as Ethiopians differed from other people in their complexions. The designation "Cushite" is mentioned twice to demonstrate that her actions were as exemplary as her beauty. In fact, she conducted herself as royally in her father's house as she did when she became Moses' wife.[40]

Thus while Moses did receive a small amount of criticism for his intermarriage, the overwhelming majority of rabbis deny or rationalize it. They claim that 1) he married a convert or 2) while he did intermarry, he did so before the Sinaitic Revelation, and the pagan wife he selected, Zipporah, was of cxceptional character and beauty.

ESTHER

The rabbis employ yet another strategy to deal with the intermarriage of a biblical figure whom they admire. They propose that the marriage to a Gentile was never consummated, as in the case of Esther's relationship with the Persian king, Ahasuerus. Esther was one of the rabbis' favorites. She was a prototype of piety. Both of her names, Esther and Hadassah, pointed to her merits. The word Esther comes from the Hebrew root, S-T-R, meaning "to hide" or "to conceal." It was a fitting name for one who knew how to keep her Jewish identity a secret from Ahasuerus and the court.[41] Esther was also regarded as the hidden light

38 Ned. 31b–32a, Ex. Rabba V.

39 Ibn Ezra, in commenting upon Num. 12:1, explains that the Midianites, of whom Zipporah was a member, were dark-skinned tent dwellers, known as *Cushim*. To Ibn Ezra, therefore, *Cushim* do not refer to Ethiopians, as is commonly believed.

40 Yalkut Shimoni 1238, Moed Katan 16b, J. San. 10:28d.

41 Zohar 3:270.

that illumined Israel in its darkness. Her other name, Hadassah, means "myrtle." As the sweet scent of the myrtle fills the air where it grows, so did Esther's reputation for good deeds spread abroad widely. The myrtle also represents piety. The myrtle is always green through the years. Thus do the pious never suffer dishonor. Then, too, the myrtle possesses not only a pleasant smell but also a bitter taste. Thus, Esther was a source of joy to the Jews but a symbol of bitterness to Haman and his household.[42] While in the harem of Ahasuerus, the rabbis maintain that she remained a vegetarian to avoid breaking the dietary laws. She would eat only of her own food and refrained from dining at the king's table. She was even a Sabbath observer. Because she was cut off from contacts within the Jewish community, she feared forgetting when the Sabbath occurred. She gave each of her attendants names reminding her of the things fashioncd on each of the days of Creation. Each served her in sequence throughout thc days of the week. Thus she was certain to remember when the Sabbath day was to be observed.[43]

Esther was criticized by some rabbis for her intermarriage. Some evcn claim that the name of God was omitted from the Book of Esther because God did not want to testify at a mixed marriage.[44] But such a vicw seems too harsh. Some of the sages claim that Esther's marriage to Ahasuerus was a feigned union and suggest that God commissioned a femalc spirit in the guise of Esther to take her place with the king.[45] In actuality, they say, Esther was married to Mordecai, not to Ahasuerus. Esther's mother had died at childbirth. Hcr father perished soon thereafter, leaving Esther an orphan, and Mordecai and his wife began to raise her. In Esther 50:7, *Mordecai took her to himself like a daughter (bat).* The Rabbis read the word *(bat)* as *bayit,* meaning "home." In the rabbinic interpretation, "home," is understood to mean "wife." Thus Esther was married to Mordecai, the Jew, while living simultaneously with a Gentilc husband![46] She was scrupulously observant in her living arrangements with Ahasuerus. She also

Continued on p. 184

42 Ginzberg, *op. cit.,* Vol. IV, p. 384.

43 *Ibid.,* p. 387, Yalkut Shimoni Esther 1053.

44 Ginzberg, *op. cit.,* Vol. VI, p. 481, note 193.

45 *Ibid.,* p. 388. See notes in Ginzberg.

46 Meg. 13a.

LITERARY PATTERNS IN THE SONG OF SONGS

BY BENJAMIN J. SEGAL

This is the fourth in a series of articles by Rabbi Benjamin Segal on Song of Songs. The first three appeared in vol. XV – 2, XVI – 1 and XVI – 4.

Many are the overviews of the Song of Songs. Seen as allegory, drama, literary collection of reworked pagan material. All efforts at interpretation pale before the beauty of the text itself. While the present article approaches the Song as literature, it should be noted that an allegoric approach could be consistcnt with the view presented; but only on the basis of first achieving an integrated overview indcpendent of the allegory and only then proceeding to the allegorical interpretation. (Such was the approaeh, for example, of Ibn Ezra). The details of the Song are to be explained first; allegory afterward. Here we do not approach the latter topic.

The attribution of the Song of Songs to a single author (or single active editor, whose control and revision are evident throughout) has found an increasing number of supporters over the past two decades. Concentrating upon repeated themes,[1] word repetition,[2] literary structure[3] and the like, many find in the work the product of a single hand.

In the present essay, we accept the conclusion of unity of authorship. Given that assumption, a study of the Song should reveal literary usages which typify the author, besides the repetition of specific words and roots. It is our purpose in

1 e.g., Murphy, R. E., "The Unity of the Song of Songs," *Vetus Testamentum* XXIX, 4 (1979), pp. 436–443.

2 e.g., Rowley, H. H., "The Interpretation of the Song os Songs," in *The Servant of the Lord,* second edition (Oxford, 1965).

3 e.g., Exum, J. C., "A Literary and Structural Analysis of the Song of Songs" *Z.A.W.* LXXXV (1973), pp. 47–49.

Rabbi Benjamin Segal is director of the Ramah Program in Israel. After four years in a pulpit position, he made aliyah to Israel in 1973. He is author of the study books: Missionary at the Door and Midrash: The Search for a Contemporary Post.

this article to describe some of those tendencies, thus providing both further indications of the unity of the Song, and additional tools for understanding the Song's meaning.[4]

* * *

The author tends to compare people or situations *via* use of identical words. In those cases, the placement of the words and their application give indication of clear differences in life styles, values, and self-understanding. The verb *natan* – give – for example, is used almost exclusively in romantic contexts – 1:12; 2:13; 7:13f.; and 8:1. Subsequently, a contrast is implied through use of the same term under other circumstances. – *Were a man to give all the wealth of his house for love, he would be utterly scorned.* (8:7). The negative sentiment of the verse is reinforced by the sharply contrasting use of the verb "give."

Furthermore, this application of "give" having been established, that verb is then joined by another to imply ironic comparison in a subsequent verse, as follows. Throughout the Song, the verb – *havi* – "bring" – develops an implication of both physical pleasure and of movement towards the permanent relationship, represented by her mother's house (1:4; 2:4; 3:4; and 8:2). Subsequently, in the final use of "bring," we find an ironic comparison. In 8:11, she chooses her own vineyard over Solomon's, as described through use of the terms "bring" and "give." – One "brings in" (earns) a large sum of money for the fruits of the vineyard which Solomon has "given" the guards. This is the vineyard which she immediately rejects. Her world of "giving" and "bringing" is other. The verb use reinforces the message of the text.

A particularly striking instance of the technique under consideration is found in 3:7f., the description of the warriors who surround Solomon's bed. There, several roots and words are used which elsewhere indicate strikingly different attitudes, actions and/or reactions of the lovers. The warriors stand static "around" (*saviv*) the bed, while the previous use of that root had her moving quickly through the city (3:2). Another example is the word *ahaz* in 3:8. They are "held fast to their swords" (the implication is possibly "skilled soldiers," but

4 One of the author's outstanding techniques is to use words which can have more than one meaning in both of those senses. That subject demands lengthy treatment. See Dor Le Dor, Vol. XVI, 4.

we use the literal translation for the sake of the comparison),[5] while the lovers' reference to the root *ahz* is to "hold off" danger to their love (2:15) and to "hold fast" to one another (3:4). Similarly, "at night" (*balleilot*) the warriors stand frozen in fear, while "at night" she runs fearlessly through the city's streets, with all their dangers (3:1ff.). The warriors are "well taught in war" (again a literal translation, the sense possibly being "expert in battle"), while her use of the root *l-m-d*, "teach," 8:2, is for her mother as teacher (with a possible double meaning there, since the teaching can either be applied to her mother or to her lover). It is little wonder that shortly after these verses, the "warriors" are granted their true glory, as their armour is included as jewels in a necklace about her beautiful neck (4:4).

In another section, the desciption of the male lover (5:14–16) uses several phrases which are set against the description of Solomon's litter (3:9f.) – gold, pillars, Lebanon and the Girls of Jerusalem.

* * *

Two other patterns are particulary striking, more for their unusual quality than for their quantity. First, on three separate occasions the author uses the device of turning to outsiders to "remove" the reader from a picture which has become too intimate. Immediately after this turn to outsiders, the author totally changes the subject. In 2:7, the picture reaches a desciption of his hand carressing her body when she feels compelled to turn to the Girls of Jerusalem, adjuring them not to interfere. In 3:5 she turns to them again at the thought of bringing her lover to her mother's house.[6] In 5:1, the invitation to the friends to eat follows immediately after the poetic declaration of consummation of love.

Perhaps even more striking are the three occurrences of the phrase *mi zo't*, 3:6; 6:10; and 8:5. In all three instances, the question "who is this?" is followed by a description identifying the object of the question, which seemingly points

5 The passive might not have been felt as such, this being an active usage in a late Hebrew. The comparison still holds, however, in terms of the objects held.

6 The understanding of the mother's house as a place of great intimacy is confirmed by the subsequent details of the desired arrival there, 8:2 – *I would let you drink of the spiced wine, of my pomegranate juice.* At that point, in fact, the image is merged with that seen in the wine house. (8:3 = 2:6). See our comments below on the reinterpertation of the wine house, 2:4, in light of 8:2.

toward an answer. In all three instances, however, the text follows not with an answer, but departs to a separate subject. The answer to the question can only be extracted indirectly from the continuation of the Song. In 3:6, "who is this" seems to receive an answer of sorts in the description of one coming up from the desert, but this is followed immediately by a description of Solomon's couch, scarcely a "who"! Only further reading of the poem brings us back to the realization (indirectly) that the woman is described (possibly as a bride).[7] In 6:10, the description of a radiant woman, the expansion of the question "who is this," is cut off immediately by the introduction to the vision of the Shulamite. In 8:5 also, where the indication is clearest that the woman is described ("leaning upon her beloved"), the question is again cut short. Thus, through his poetry, the poet manages to leave us with a dangling sense of mystery about the woman.

* * *

We now mention briefly selected other examples of the literary tendencies of the author, the use of which are certainly not unique, but which nevertheless give the work a unique tone, if only by their quantity. The author has a tendency to end lists with a large all-embracing term (cf. 4:7; 4:14; 5:16; 6:10). He has a marked affinity for alliteration and word play (e.g., 1:3 – *shemanekha... shemekha;* 2:4 – *ahavah* and *hevi'ani;* 3:11 *tziyyon* and *tze'enah;* 4:2 – *shekkulam* and *shakkulah;* 4:8f. – *libbavtini* and *levanon;* 8:1f. – *'eshshakkha* and *'ashkekha;* and the refrain *ta'iru* and *te'oreru*. If the title verse of the Song is attributed to the author, certainly the same consideration holds).[8]

On a number of occasions, the best understanding of the Song is achieved through reading a word or phrase twice.[9] Among the words which might be read

7 The apparent "answer" of 3:7 that Solomon's bed aseends from the desert is belied not only by the clear reference to a person in 3:6, but also by the clearly parallel repetition of 8:5, which implies that the answer to *who is this ascending?* is the heroine of the Song. In 6:10 and 8:5, it is absolutely clear that the immediately following verses do not respond directly to the question asked.

8 The total list is much longer, of course, including more involved eehoes, such as *nofet tittofnah siftotayikh* (4:11) serial alliterations (e.g., the use of the letter *shin* in 1:6a, b) and verses including several word plays (e.g. – 4:8, with at least three such). Again, this tendency is not unique, but the consistent usage is both striking and a further indieation of unity.

9 On this device, cf. Dahood, M., "A New Metrical Pattern in Biblical Poetry," *C.B.Q.*, 29 (1967) and Watson, W.G., "The Pivot Pattern in Hebrew, Ugaritic and Akkadian Poetry," Z.A.W. LXXXVIII (1976), p. 240. Dahood, in *Psalms III* (New York: Anchor Bible, Doubleday, 1970), pp. 439–444, lists terms and phrases which he feels should be understood both with the words preceding and with those following.

twice in the Song are *'aharekha* 1:4; *dodi li* (1:13, 14 – first as a continuation, then as an independent statement); *dodim* (5:1 – love, lovers). The very difficult 6:2 is probably best understood by reading *nafshi* twice.

The author will sometimes blur the identity of the speaker of a verse, often intending to indicate identity of intention of the two possible speakers. Both 2:15 and 4:15, 16a might be said by either of the lovers. Both are probably intended. Similarly, 6:10 can reflect either the words of the male lover or the Girls of Jerusalem, and probably reflects the shared opinion of both. The speech of the crowd watching the Shulammite (7:1f.) blends without break into the words of the male lover.

The author certainly has a tendency to reveal the import of terms gradually, allowing for an initial "innocent" reading and necessitating a retroactive reinterpretation. *Kerem* – vineyard – for example, when first encountered (1:6) seems to be only part of an explanation for the woman's swarthy eolor – she was forced to be outside, guarding vineyards. The subsequent use of the term (2:15; 7:13; 8:11, 12) clarifies that it is metaphoric, possibly a symbol for love relationships *per se*. *Shoshannah* – lily – first used as an expression of her humility and his appreciation (2:1f.) becomes a dynamic means of bringing the two lovers ever closer in erotic contact. (He feeds among the lilies; her breasts are likened to fawns feeding there; his lips [!] are then so termed, subsequent to which he again is said to pick the lilies and feed among them, while her belly is finally surrounded with these lilies to which his lips were equated! – 4:5; 5:13; 6:2, 3; 7:3). *Beit hayyayin* – the wine house to which he brings her (2:4 – a seemingly teehnical description of place) takes on new meaning in light of her desire to bring him to her mother's house and there feed him spiced wine (8:2). Similar developments seem to take plaee with such terms as *'eim* – mother, *heikh* – palate – and others.

Other techniques, such as the communication of major differences via slight differences in terminology (e.g., the ehange from pursuit across the split mountains – 2:17 – to the mountains of spice – 8:14) are perhaps too universal for inclusion here. The overall impression of the study of these techniques,

however, is elear. The author has resort to specific techniques that are used throughout this short work -- comparison through parallel terms; escape from intimate descriptions through turning to outside parties; incomplete responses to the question "who is this?"; alliteration; completing lists with an all embracing term; gradual revelation of meaning; etc. We can, in noting these techniques, feel the work of a single guiding hand, and by studying his/her methods we move ever closer to understanding the Song's message.

RABBINIC ATTITUDES TOWARD INTERMARRIAGE

Continued from p. 178

questioned God for abandoning her in this situation even though she had been a pious Jew.[47]

So we see that the rabbis confront Esther's intermarriage in much the same spirit as they did Joseph's and Moses'. Because she, like them, was regarded as an exemplary figure, they negate the biblical testimony that she married a Gentile. She lived with a Gentile without consummating the marriage, since she was technically the wife of her uncle, Mordecai, the Jew.

Thus, in general, the rabbis severely score unpopular biblical figures for marrying out of the Jewish community, while negating the reality of the intermarriages of those who were more to their liking.

47 Midrash Shoher Tov 22:26.

ISAAC'S BLESSING – WHO WAS DECEIVED?

BY REUVEN P. BULKA

The biblical story of Isaac's blessing of his two children, Jacob and Esau, is well known. According to the narrative, Isaac, old and blind, called upon his elder son Esau to bring him venison, that they should eat heartily together, and that subsequent to that, in a good mood from good food, he would bestow his blessing upon Esau.

Rebecca overhears this, and urges Jacob to dress up as Esau, bring sumptuous food to his father, and receive the blessing in Esau's stead, with Isaac thinking that he is blessing Esau when in fact he really is blessing Jacob.

Jacob is hesitant, but Rebecca is insistent, and he goes ahead with the ruse. Isaac is fooled, and he blesses Jacob who he thinks is Esau. Almost immediately after Jacob leaves Isaac's tent, Esau arrives with his delicacies, only to find out that his brother has cheated him again. Isaac trembles mightily when he hears that he has been duped, but he reinforces the blessing that he had originally bestowed upon Jacob.

Even though Isaac does manage to eke out some blessing for Esau, it is a token blessing. Esau is terribly upset, devastated that his brother has pulled two fast ones on him, the other being the time when Esau sold his birthright for a pottage of lentils (Genesis, 25:29–34). Esau vows to kill his brother after his father passes away, but Jacob's parents, again at Rebecca's instigation, decide to send him away to the house of Laban to protect Jacob from Esau's wrath (Genesis, 27:1–28:7).

According to this, which is the traditional version of the story, Rebecca and Jacob were in collusion, with Jacob perhaps an unwilling partner, and Isaac was fooled by their ruse.

There are a number of problems that arise from this assumption, problems which lead to doubt about the basic premise.

Firstly, it is well known that one who is blind is better able to distinguish

Dr. Reuben Bulka, Rabbi of Congregation Machzike Hadas, Ottawa, Canada, at present Editor of the Journal of Psychology and Judaism, is the author of thirteen books. He has contributed numerous scholarly articles to journals. His specialty is Logotherapy.

voices, and has a much better sense of touch. Not being able to see, the blind person focuses on the other senses, and usually perfects them. It therefore stretches credibility to believe that Isaac would be so easily fooled by the voices. Being blind, it would have been more likely that he could detect Jacob's voice better than an ordinary individual.

Additionally, the inflections and manner of conversation of any two individuals are never the same. One can assume that Isaac, who was then estimated to have been 123 years old, could tell the difference between children that he had known for 63 years!

Jacob legitimately was concerned that his father would catch him in the conspiracy, because of the fact that he was smooth haired, whereas his brother Esau was hairy (Genesis, 27:11–12). Rebecca gets around this problem by dressing Jacob up in Esau's hairy clothing (Genesis, 27:15–16).

We are told later on that Isaac suspected that the voice was Jacob's voice, but that the hands were Esau's hands; since Jacob's hands were hairy like Esau's, the deception was pulled off (Genesis: 22–23).

This scenario, too, is fraught with difficulty. It is hard to imagine a blind individual feeling someone else's arms, and thinking that this is the individual's body hair, when in fact it is nothing more than a cloak that the individual is wearing.

Considering the fact that according to most commentaries, Isaac was already suspicious since he detected Jacob-like conversation in "Esau's" approach (Genesis, 27:21; Rashi and Nahmanides, *ad. loc.*), one cannot help but be perplexed as to why Isaac so easily dismisses the suspicions by feeling the hair on the arm, which really is nothing more than a hairy coat.

Another difficulty is the reaction of Rebecca to Jacob's legitimate question – *My father peradventure will feel me, and I shall seem to him as a mocker; and shall bring a curse upon me, and not a blessing* (Genesis, 27:12). Rebecca reacts to this by saying to Jacob: *Upon me be that curse, my son...* (Genesis, 27:13). How could Rebecca be so cavalier about this? If in fact Isaac does curse Jacob, such curse is not readily transferred. If the blessing becomes the pronouncement of a reality, then Jacob remains stuck with it. How could Rebecca dismiss this so easily?

Another question that arises is one which is raised by Nahmanides. Isaac, upon realizing that he had been fooled, begins trembling excessively (Genesis, 27:33), but instead of revoking the blessing that had been mistakenly bestowed upon Jacob, he reinforces it by saying: *Who then is he that hath taken venison, and brought it to me, and I have eaten of all before thou camest, and have blessed him, yea, and he shall be blessed* (27:33).

Nahmanides is perplexed at this reaction. If Isaac really trembles at the thought of having been consummately fooled, why does he then reinforce the blessing? This does not seem to be a logical reaction, given the emotional outburst. Nahmanides suggests that Isaac exclaimed that he could not revoke the blessing, because his having blessed Jacob was obviously a signal from God that the blessing belonged to Jacob.

But the question still remains, for Isaac could have simply trembled and said something such as, "I have already given a blessing and I cannot take it back." The more positive statement, *yea he shall be blessed,* indicates a positive reaction in the midst of a trembling emotion. This still remains incongruous.

The questions raised point to a possibility which at first glance seems unfathomable, since it runs contrary to all that we have been taught to believe about this episode. May it indeed be possible that this entire scenario was pulled off by *Isaac and Rebecca* in collusion with one another, with Isaac only *pretending* to be fooled by Jacob?

One can assume that Jacob had probably, at one point or another, told his mother about Esau's having sold his birthright. One can also assume that if Rebecca knew it, then she probably told this to her husband; if not beforehand, then certainly prior to the crucial time of the pronouncement of blessing. She would have conveyed this information as a way of proving that in fact Jacob was deserving of the first-born blessing, since Esau had disdained the birthright; it was from Esau's perspective something that had very little meaning.

The parents were faced with one great difficulty. To go directly to Esau and to tell him that he would not be getting the blessing that he probably expected, would have been devastating for Esau. He may not have been too filial with his mother, but he had an expecially close relationship with his father, as indeed rabbinic literature testifies. If the father had come to Esau and told him directly that he is not to be given the primary blessing, this would have been a crushing blow to Esau. Only God knows how he would have reaeted, what he would have done. Isaac and Rebecca may have then conceived of a ruse, whereby Isaac would ask Esau to prepare food in order to be blessed, Rebecca would send

Jacob into Isaac, who would in fact be expecting Jacob, and Isaac would go through the motions of being in doubt as to who Jacob really was, making statements about the doubt, but then giving Jacob the blessing. By so doing, he could say to Esau later on that it was his intention to give him the blessing, but that circumstances had conspired against Esau much to Isaac's surprise.

This would explain how Isaac, who was blind and therefore more sensitive to voice and to touch, could be "convinced" that Jacob was Esau. He knew all along that Jacob was not Esau; all he wanted with this play-acting was to convince Jacob that he thought he was Esau. By expressing doubt, he may have raised Jacob's tensions, but at the same time he conveyed a sense of awareness. Had he pronounced the blessing without any hesitation, Jacob may have felt that his father was not very alert, and the blessing less than authentic.

Rebecca, by saying to her son: *upon me be thy curse, my son,* was fully confident that Jacob would be blessed, since this had already been prearranged with her husband Isaac. Otherwise, as has been previously mentioned, it would have been difficult for her to be so facile about a potential curse.

The biblical verse which says: *And he discerned him not because his hands were hairy as his brother Esau's hands; so he blessed him* (27:23), is merely the reporting of how Isaac fooled Jacob into thinking that Jacob had fooled Isaac about who he really was.

Insofar as Isaac trembled when Esau, the real Esau came, one can understand that this may have been nothing more than an act, that in fact Isaac only feigned the tremble, so that Esau should really think that Isaac had been fooled.

Nahmanides' question is easily answered. Isaac reinforced the blessing even though he was trembling, because the tremble was not an authentic tremble. Isaac was perhaps subtly transmitting to Esau that all deceptions remain. Once a deception is perpetrated, it stays. The same happened now with the blessing, and there is nothing that Isaac can do to retract it.

The strategy of Isaae and Rebecca in the situation can be easily understood. Rebecca probably told Isaac that in any event Esau did not like her, but that Esau had a special relationship with his father. The brothers were anyway not getting along.

With this deception, in which it is Jacob who is deceived, Esau's feelings towards his mother remain, but so do his positive feelings for his father. Rebecca gladly takes upon herself the responsibility for being the engineer of the trick;

Isaac plays the part of the victim of ruse, and only Jacob does not really know what is actually transpiring, but as a good son goes along with his mother's wishes.

The concerns of Isaac and Rebecca prior to the blessing were not only for Jacob and the blessing that he deserved, but also for the feelings of Esau, whom they protected by letting him believe that were it not for Jacob's deception, he indeed would have been given his father's blessing.

This may be the reason why later on, the Bible states: *And Isaac sent away Jacob; and he went to Paddan-Aram, unto Laban, son of Bethuel the Aramean, the brother of Rebecca, Jacob's and Esau's mother* (28:5). Rashi admits that he does not know what this teaches us. After all, we have just read such an involved story, in which it is quite clear that Rebecca is the mother of Jacob and Esau. Why must the Bible now repeat this?

It may be, based on the suggestion contained herein, that the Bible is indicating that all of Rebecca's actions in dressing up Jacob as Esau, were a reflection of her concerns not only for Jacob and the blessing that he deserved, but also for the feelings of Esau, and the blow that it would be to him. Her actions were meant as much to protect Esau's sense of self-esteem, as to protect the family dignity and posterity. She was always the mother of Jacob *and* Esau.

The thesis proposed here admittedly runs contrary to the conventional interpretation as it is understood by every commentator who has written on it. Because of this, I hesitate to be definitive in the proposal, and instead I merely suggest this as an alternate possibility to understand an already complicated episode.

Is it not more sensible and credible to assume that Isaac and Rebecca acted in concert rather than in opposition; that Isaac's sense of touch and hearing were superior; that Isaac could differentiate his wife's cooking from his son's?

What is there within the verses themselves, to suggest that this thesis is indeed wrong?

THE BOOK OF CHRONICLES

ITS HISTORY AND PURPOSE

BY RASHI SIMON

The Book of Chronicles is arguably both the most problematic and the most neglected book of the Bible.[1] The wearying lists with which the book begins, its seemingly pointless repetitiveness (with respect especially to the books of Samuel and Kings), and its countless discrepancies in both details and generalities have tended to repel all but the most determined students of Scripture from exploring its depths (cf. Abarbanel, *Introduction to Samuel).* This article attempts to take a small step towards removing the dust of centuries of popular neglect of Chronicles by reviewing its place in biblical history in light of which we may gain an insight into the Chronicler's purpose in writing his book.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

We shall see (below, part II) that Chronicles is a pointed and profound commentary on the Babylonian Exile, the factors which brought it about, and the restoration which followed it. Accordingly, we shall begin our historical sketch with the aftermath of the destruction of the First Temple.

After the destruction of the Temple, the small group of Jews remaining in Jerusalem recognized Gedaliah ben Ahikam as their leader (II Kings 25:22). The Babylonian conqueror, his victory complete, had appointed Gedaliah as provisional governor over the small Jewish community left in the city. Within the

1 See David Kimhi, Introduction to Chronicles; cf. *Perush al Divrei ha-Yamim Meyuhas le-Ehad mi-Talmidei Rav Sa'adiah ha-Ga'on* I 7:19 (p. 25). For Christian neglect, see *Stephen Langton; Commentary on the Book of Chronicles,* ed. Avrom Saltman, pp. 11–13. The point is made by contemporary scholars as well; see e.g., Chaim Dov Rabinowits, *Da'at Sofrim al Divrei ha-Yamim,* pp.2, 3.

Rashi Simon has a Master's degree in Jewish Intellectual History from Touro College, New York City. At present he studies in a Kollel in Jerusalem.

year, however, Gedaliah was assassinated by Ishmael ben Nethaniah, a vengeful member of the Davidic line. With his demise, the last vestige of a stable Jewish settlement in the Land of Israel disappeared. The centuries old Jewish presence in the country was gone. The population void created by the Jews' mass exile was filled by the Edomites in the South and the Philistines on the coast. The Ammonites and Moabites moved in from the east, and the Samaritans increased in number and in strength in the mountainous north. With the passing of the decades, the Israelite population in the Land of Israel was nearly erased.

The center of Jewry moved to Babylon. As a people, the Jews remembered the destruction, and bore in mind always that they were a nation in exile, uprooted from its proper homeland. There were those who were inclined to despair, feeling that God had abandoned them. It was during this period that Ezekiel spread his message of faith and hope, stressing to the people that God had abandoned them only because they had abandoned Him. The Temple had been destroyed because of their sins, and it would be rebuilt, if the nation was deserving. Although no such prospect was on the immediate horizon, by and large the people retained their hope for a return to Zion.[2]

Fifty-two years after the destruction, the opportunity for that return to Zion dawned. In that year, following the death of Darius the Mede (Darius I), Cyrus the Persian (Cyrus the Great), took the throne of the Babylonian Empire and officially sanctioned the reestablishment of a Jewish community in the Land of Israel.[3] Cyrus was a tolerant ruler, who appreciated the moral messages that the prophets of Israel were spreading. Undoubtedly, he also liked the idea of having loyal subjects at the western border of his kingdom. The years that followed proved the worth of this policy: During the era of the Persian Empire, no province was more peaceful than the Land of Judea.

Once in Judea, the people immediately set about rebuilding the Holy Temple in Jerusalem. Three years later, however, the Samaritans, enemies of the Jews, convinced the Persian ruler to rescind the permission for the project that he had

2 Mordechai Breuer, *Divrei ha-Yamim le-Yisrael u-le-Umot ha-'Olam,* pp. 115–116; Max L. Margolis and Alexander Marx, *A History of the Jewish People,* pp. 115–116.

3 *Seder 'Olam Rabbah,* Ch. 30 (cited by Zecharya Fendel, *Legacy of Sinai,* p. 294); Salo W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jewish People,* vol. 1, p. 130.

earlier granted.[4] The morale of the people plummeted, and for fourteen years, without the Temple that had always unified the people, the fledgling Jewish community of Judea floundered. It was at this time that Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi emerged, and provided the leadership and inspiration that had been lacking. Darius the Persian (Darius II) ascended the throne and the following year authorized the resumption of the construction of the Second Temple.

At this time Zerubabbel, scion of the Davidic line, was the governmental head of the nation, and Joshua was the High Priest. The friction that developed between them led to Zerubabbel's return to Babylon, possibly under pressure from the Persian government, fearful of a new autonomous kingdom in Judea. This left the High Priest as the *de facto* leader of the people, and the Temple as the focal point of the Jewish Kingdom. But all was not well in Judea. Life was hard economically, and the nation lacked political order and cohesion. Many members of the economic and social aristocracy had chosen to stay in Babylon, where they had become comfortable over the years. Others simply could not afford the trip to Judea. As if to set a precedent for future exiles, the Jewish people had established comfortable communities in Babylon which not everyone was willing to leave. Although construction of the Temple was under way, Jerusalem itself was still unwalled, and signs of the destruction still existed. Spiritually, the community lacked stability. Assimilation and intermarriage with the foreign nations present in Judea posed greater threats, in fact, than they had been in Babylon.

Ezra, still living in Babylon and a minister in the Persian government, was aware of these difficulties. He petitioned the throne for active help in strengthening the Jewish community in Judea (which had proven its loyalty to the Persian Empire).[5] In response to his entreaty, Ezra was granted permission to take with him to the Land of Israel those who wanted to go, bring with him

4 See Ezra 4:4–24 et seq.; Breuer, p. 117. The Samaritans were excluded from participating in the holy work of rebuilding the Temple, so they conspired to block its construction by reporting to the Persian authorities that the Jews were planning a rebellion. Regarding the question of the identity of the Persian king who believed this report and ordered the construction halted see Fendel, p. 294. Cf. Baron, pp. 130–131.

5 Although Scripture refers to the Persian monarch at this time as ארתחשסתא (Artaxerxes), from the Talmud (R. H. 3b) it seems that this is generic name for the Persian kings (like Pharaoh for Egyptian rulers), and the ruler at the time was actually Darius (see Rashi on Ezra 7:1).

money from Babylon (including funds from the coffers of the king himself), and establish ecclesiastical, judicial and educational systems throughout the Jewish Province.

Once settled in Jerusalem, Ezra immediately set about the task of improving its religious life. He insisted upon formal conversions for members of other nations wanting to join the Jewish people, and inspired his countrymen to return to the spiritual ways of their fathers, as in the days of the First Temple. Ezra was a brilliant, devout religious leader, but it was not until Nehemiah arrived from Babylon a decade later that the Jewish province became stronger politically and militarily. Nehemiah was given permission — and a military escort — to immigrate to Judea and rebuild the walls of Jerusalem. A masterful organizer and leader, Nehemiah realized that only by strengthening the Jewish people as a national (though not necessarily sovereign) entity, could religious stability be attained as well.

THE PURPOSE OF CHRONICLES

SYNOPSIS OF CONTENTS; PLACE IN THE CANON

The Book of Chronicles can be divided thematically into three sections. The first section, I Chron. 1–9, consists mainly of various lists of names, tracing the origins of the Israelite nation (and, in abbreviated form, all of mankind), beginning with Adam. Certain tribes, notably Judah and Levi, are singled out for greater elaboration. The second section, spanning I Chron. 10 to II Chron. 9, is a detailed account of the reigns of David and Solomon. Many of the same events recorded in the books of Samuel and Kings are again related here, beginning with Saul's demise and the tranference of the kingship to David (Ch. 31 in I Samuel). II Chron. 10 until the end of the book (Ch. 36) contains a history of the Kingdom of Judea, from the division of the United Monarchy until the destruction, in the days of Jeremiah.

Although chronologically Ezra-Nehemiah[6] is the last book of *Tanakh* (compare the last three verses of Chron. with the first three verses of Ezra), the

6 Originally a single book (apparent from *B.B.* 14b and explicit in Rashi on *B:B:* 24a s.v. *le-Avotenu;* see also R. Akiva Eiger, *Gilayon ha-Shas, Suk.* 12a). The division is not found in Hebrew editions of the Bible until the sixteenth century.

Talmud (B.B. 14 b), followed by Maimonides (*Mishne Torah, Hil. Sefer Torah* 7:15), places Chronicles in that final position.[7] Hence, it seems that Chronicles was intended by the sages as the concluding summary statement of the Bible. It is left for us to attempt to discern the special message of Chronicles for its own time, and for all time.

PURPOSE AND UTILITY

In reading Chronicles one must perforce ask: Why was this book written? There is relatively little material that does not appear in other books, and much of what is repeated deviates from the earlier record [David Kimhi, (Radak), *Introduction to Chronicles;* Abarbanel, *loc. cit].* To appreciate the message of the book, we must consider the era in which it was written.

It may well be imagined that some of the people had begun to despair altogether, doubting whether God would ever restore them to their land. To dispel this doubt, writes Levi Gersonides (Ralbag), is one of the purposes for which Chronicles was written: To teach the people that their expulsion from their land was not an accident, and to assure them that a return to Judea was within their power.

In his commentary to I Chronicles 10:13, Gersonides lists sixteen specific purposes accomplished by the book of Chronicles. Number fifteen is:

> To teach the people that the whole purpose of their bitter exile was in order that they should improve their service of the Almighty. That service had deteriorated to the point of rebellion only because of the indulgent lifestyle they had come to lead.

Gersonides further points out that the lesson of שכר ועונש, Reward and Punishment, is a recurring theme in Chronicles. Purpose number two lists seven instances in which Chronicles elaborates upon the failings of earlier biblical figures, and tells of the punishments they received as a result. This is to serve "to help keep a man from inquity, lest his misdeeds cause him to be recorded as a sinner for all time." Similarly, he cites several instances in which Chronicles records in detail the rewards received by righteous men of earlier ages. It is clear that in general, for the generation immediately following the destruction, there

7 For the canonization of Chronicles, see Sid Z. Leiman, *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture; The Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence,* pp. 27–28.

was a need to underscore the prineiple of specific divine providence — השגחה פרטית.

The commentators suggest another important function of Chronicles.[8] Among the genealogies presented, the ancestry of King David is given special attention, specifically the fact of his descent from the royal tribe of Judah. Radak, in his Introduction to Chronicles, points out that the kingship of David is integral to Jewish peoplehood, and is twice prophesied in the Pentateuch (Gen. 49:10 and Deut. 33:7). Gersonides (*loc. cit.*) makes a similar point:

> The third purpose is to make known that the kingship was destined for David from birth; for his fathers were princes. Thus, Nahshon ben Aminadav was the Prince of the tribe of Judah in the days of Moses. Boaz was one of the Judges of Israel; and the fourth generation following Boaz was David (see Ruth 4:18–22).

Abarbanel, too, in his Introduction to Samuel concurs that this precisely is the preeminent purpose of Chronicles.

According to Radak, Gersonides, and Abarbanel, a major aim of Chronicles was to make it abundantly clear to the Jews of the tumultuous generations after the destruction, where the right to leadership properly lay. This does much to explain the emphasis in Chronicles upon the lives of David and Solomon, and the bias in their favor which the Chronicler often displays[9]

The Chronicler's rather unsympathetic assessment of Saul (I Ch. 10:1–12), not found in the Book of Samuel, is explained by Malbim in terms of Chronicles' *raison d'être:* To establish the divinely ordained right to the throne of the Davidic kings:

> The intent of the Chronicler throughout the book is to elevate David. He therefore writes that Saul lost the kingship because of his sins. The rule was divinely destined for David, because Saul was not deserving of it. It is

8 Although every book of the Bible is of eternal relevance (see *Meg.* 14a, *Ned.* 22b), it stands to reason that the words of Chronicles had a specific message for the people of that era (cf. Aryeh Kaplan, *Handbook of Jewish Thought* 8:56 [p. 166] and references cited there). In fact, Abarbanel (*loc. cit.*) bases his entire understanding of Chronicles on this assumption. On the books of *Tanakh* as historical accounts, see Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Zakhar: Jewish History and Jewish Memory.*

9 Malbim, too, echoes this thought. In his commentary to I Chronicles 11:1, for example, he states that, "Ezra skipped the whole account of the rule of Ish-boshet... because his purpose is only to amplify upon the greatness of David."

for this reason that he recorded this story (of Saul's death) prefatory to his account of David's coronation.

In conclusion, I would like to note a theistic message of a more general nature. One of the misdeeds attributed to Saul is his failure to *inquire of the Lord.* Interestingly enough, the expression *inquiring of God* is almost a catchword in Chronicles. Time and again the Chronicler exhorts his countrymen either directly (I 22:19): *Now set your minds and hearts on worshiping the Lord,* indirectly (II 15:2): *If you turn to Him, He will respond to you. But if you forsake Him, He will forsake you,* or by implication (II 26:5): *During the time he worshiped the Lord, God made him prosper.* The highest praise the Chronicler can lavish on a man is that he *sought the Lord with all his heart* (II 22:9). Conversely, failing to do so brings iniquity: *...And he did evil, because he did not set his heart to seek the Lord* (II 12:14). And, of course, divine pardon is assured for him who, though he has sinned, *directs his whole heart to seek God, the Lord God of his fathers* (II 30:18–19).[10]

10 Further examples abound. See, *inter alia,* I 13:3, 15:13, 21:30, II 14:3,6, 15:12, 13, 16:12, 19:4, 31:21. Cf. II 25:15, 20.

"WHAT THE BIBLE MEANS TO ME"

We would like to receive the reactions of our readers to the above question. Your replies should be short and to the point (a few sentences should suffice). Please send in your responses and we will be glad to publish those we find most interesting.

Send your responses to Dor Le Dor attention
Dr. Joshua J. Adler.

BOOK REVIEW

BY SOL LIPTZIN

ESCHATOLOGY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, by DONALD E. GOWAN, *Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1986. pp. 150.*

The book deals with the biblical concepts of a better world to be realized on earth and the impact that it had on the Western mind.

Eschatology, according to its etymology, is the study of the end. While science speculates about the temporal and spatial end of a universe that began with the Big Bang, the Bible assumes the creation of the universe by a Divine Creator and speculates about its ending not in time and space but rather in messianism, the end of sin, evil, corruption, war, human and even animal frailties. This utopian order, according to Hebraie prophets and psalmists, will replace the present one and is the direction and goal to which we move despite regressions throughout history. When this end is reached, we shall have a new heart and a new spirit. A new society will arise with the elimination of hunger and of all destructive forces. Nature will be healed of its blights and desolation.

The advance toward this messianism will be hastened by Israel's return to its Promised Land. There it will again become a light unto the nations.

Jerusalem and its holy mountain of Zion occupy a central position in biblical eschatology. The city had been the capital of the Jewish people since the glorious reigns of David and Solomon. It was supposed to be under the special protection of the God of this people and therefore invulnerable. When it was overwhelmed by the armies of Nebuchadnezzar and when its inhabitants were exiled to Babylon, the tradition of its holiness did not fade away but was replaced by the faith that it would flourish once again in days to come and in a more glorious fashion. When after the proclamation of Cyrus, the exiles were permitted to return, they found Jerusalem a desolate and strife-ridden city. The post-exilic

Sol Liptzin, Emeritus Professor of Comparative Literature at the City University of New York, is the author of eighteen volumes on world literature, including Germany's Stepchildren, The Jew in American Literature, A History of Yiddish Literature, and most recently, Biblical Themes in World Literature.

prophets then transferred the entrenched dream of an idealized Zion to the end of time.

The centrality of Zion was retained in the memory of the Jewish people even after the Second Temple was destroyed by the Romans. Though the Jewish religion postulated a universal God who could be eneountered everywhere, this did not diminish its belief that Zion was God's preferred abode. Down the centuries Jews prayed that they be returned to God's presence in Zion.

Midrashim developed in more poetic terms the concept of a celestial Jerusalem parallel to the earthly one, supplementing but not supplanting it. The almost miraculous upsurge of energy that accompanied the homecoming of Zionists to Zion throughout the past eentury stemmed from the explosion of the pent up millennial hope for the restoration of the homeless people to its ancient soil even before the coming of the messianic age. With the ingathering of the Jews in Zion, an eschatological vision could become a living reality.

The three central chapters of Gowan's cschatological study develop in greater detail the role of Zion in Jewish thought. They are entitled "Peace in Zion – The Transformation of Human Society," "The People of Zion – The Transformation of the Human Person," and "Highest of All the Hills – The Transformation of Nature." The concluding chapter deals with the influence that biblical eschatology has or eould have on present hopes for the future. Though the author is a Christian theologian, he feels that Christian emphasis on heaven and the afterlife has diverted attention from a powerful ethical component in biblical eschatology. If hopes for the future influence activities of the present, then biblical esehatology can influence present ethical conduct. Such hope can make us strive to bring nearer the time we yearn for – an era without suffering and anguish, an era when persons shall not labor in vain or bear children for calamity, an era when nations shall not lift up swords against other nations nor learn war any more.

Gowan's study stimulates thinking and is a good antidote to the pessimistic, apocalyptic views far too prevalent among us as we near the end of the second millennium of our common era.

"A DROP OF A BUCKET"

Delving into an enigmatic verse.

BY NATHAN STEIN

Behold, the nations are as a drop of a bucket.
And are counted as the small dust of the balance;
Behold, the isles are as a mote in weight.
Isaiah 40:15

Why does the prophet talk of "a drop of a buckct" instead of "a drop in the ocean?" Why should dust affect the accuracy of a scale? Any dust on the side of the scale would be counter-balanced by a similar mass on the other side.

The Hebrew for a drop is טִפָּה. Mar מר is bitter (e.g. Eccles. 7:26), but is translated here "drop." Even-Shoshan's Hebrew dictionary (page 898) questions whether מר is טפה. Nowhere else is מר used in this sense. It seems that the translators were uncertain about this word, and decided to render it "a drop" simply because of its association with bucket.

The Hebrew for dust is עפר or אבק. The noun שחק is not "dust" but "sky" (Psalm 89:7). However, there is a verb שָׁחַק – to crush or grind (Exod. 30:36). Because in the process of grinding some dust is deposited, the confused translators rendered שָׁחַק "dust."

Now, if מר is not a drop, what is the function of the bucket? Similarly, if שחק is not dust, the word "scale" becomes irrelevant. Fortunately thc terms "bucket" and "scale" have another meaning astrologically. Bucket (דלי) is the Hebrew equivalent of Aquarius, while scale (מאזנים) is known to us as Libra.

The verse ends: *The isles are as a mote in weight.* The translation is very obscure. What could the prophet know about weightlessness? How can weightless isles fit into the context of this verse? A reasonable translation would be: "He lifts up isles like a speck of dust" (cf. Is. 63:9).* The appropriateness of this rendition will be appreciated later.

During the reign of Uzziah a terrible earthquake struck the kingdom of Judea. The upheaval is mentioned in Amos 1:1 and in Zachariah 14:5, but we know very few details. The

* The New J.P.S. translates: *The very coast lands He lifts up like a mote.*
The Old J.P.S. translates: *Behold, the isles are as a mote in weight.*

historian Josephus (Antiquities, 10 § 4) writes: "At a place called Eroge half the mountain broke off from the rest on the West and rolled down four furlongs." There must have been other stories not mentioned by Josephus. Considering that the epicenter of the disturbance was in the region of the Dead Sea we might assume that a few islands emerged from the Dead Sea. This would explain why Isaiah stated that God could lift up islands as easily as a few grains of dust.

Let us return to *a drop of a bucket.* It is possible that כמר מדלי is the result of a transcription error – and that the original version was כמרם דלי – "as high as the bucket" (Aquarius).

There are several Hebrew words denoting "nation": לאום, עם, גוי and אום. Of these the term גוי (plural גוים) has an additional meaning, e.g. in Gen. 20:4 Abimelech refers to himself as a גוי. This obviously means a non-Hebrew individual. The prophets later applied the term to a pagan.

In Jeremiah 10:2 the prophet says: *Thus saith the Lord. Learn not the way of the heathen and be not dismayed at the signs of heaven; for the heathen are dismayed at them.* It is significant that in this translation the authorized version renders גוים as "heathen" while usually it equates גוים to "nations." Jeremiah saw the Zodiac cult as a form of idolatry.

Isaiah in 40:15 also addresses the pagans. However, instead of referring directly to the Zodiac, he mentions two symbols – the bucket, Aquarius, and the scale, Libra.

During the First Commonwealth the country was flooded with idol worshippers, and the prophets had to return these lost sheep to the fold. With the memory of the earthquake still fresh in the public mind, Isaiah uses the event to further his cause. We can imagine the prophet addressing a crowd of Zodiac worshippers:

Why are you so proud of the signs of heaven? There is no reason why you should consider yourselves as high as Aquarius and Libra. Yet look how powerful the Almighty is. He can lift up islands as easily as if they were grains of dust.

Verse 40:15 contains the word הן behold twice. The prophet draws our attention to two diametrically opposing ideologies: heathenism versus monotheism. The puny pagans pitted against the Master of the World.

Isaiah 40:15 could read:

Behold: the heathen consider themselves as high as Aquarius and Libra in the sky.

But behold: He lifts up isles like a speck of dust.–

ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE BIBLE

BY JOSHUA J. ADLER

Under the floor of the third to fourth century synagogue at Eshtamoa (a town south of Hebron) the Israeli archaeologist, Zev Yeivin discovered five Iron Age jugs filled with silver weighing 62 pounds, from the first Temple period. The pieces of silver were cut to various shapes and sizes mainly from jewelry. The archaeologist surmises that this was tax money collected from the local populace which was to have been passed on to the central government in Jerusalem and which for some reason or other never was forwarded.

At Dor, a town on the coast of the Mediterranean which once served as an administrative capital during Solomon's reign, an installation was discovered which produced dyes dating back almost three thousand years. The dyes, *Techelet* or *Argaman,* were used to color the garments of kings and priests, and archaeologists now feel that as a result of this discovery they better understand the process of ancient dye manufacturing.

After extensive digging in the Old City of Jerusalem, archaeologists say that the city expanded threefold during the reign of King Hezekiah (8th century BCE) from about 40 to about 130 acres.

The discovery and recent acquisition of a small ivory pomegranate shaped object by the Israel Museum in Jerusalem, became the subject of controversy when the claim was made that this "pomegranate" was used in the ancient Jewish Temple as part of the garments of a priest. This assertion has been challenged by various scholars who agree that this find does date back to the First Temple period but do not agree with the claim that the object was in any way connected with the Temple itself, since ivory was not prescribed for either Temple garments or appurtenances. Future discoveries of similar objects or of some ancient Hebrew texts where ivory is prescribed may solve this problem.

Joshua J. Adler, formerly the Rabbi of Chisuk Emuna Congregation in Harrisburg, Pa. has lived in Jerusalem since 1972, serves as the managing editor of Dor Le Dor and is the assistant to the Chairman of the World Jewish Bible Society.

עשה תורתך קבע

THE TRIENNIAL BIBLE READING CALENDAR

IS DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY OF

CHAIM ABRAMOWITZ

March-April 1989

אדר ב תשמ״ט

8		I Kings 15	א מלכים א ט״ו
9		I Kings 16	ב מלכים א ט״ז
10		Exodus 38:20-40	ג פקודי
11	W	Haftarah: Isaiah 43:21-44:21	ד הפטרה: ישעיה מ״ג, כא־מ״ד, כא
12	Th	I Kings 17	ה מלכים א י״ז
13	F	I Kings 18	ו מלכים א י״ח
14	שבת	I Kings 19	ז מלכים א י״ט
15	S	I Kings 20	ח מלכים א כ׳
16	M	I Kings 21	ט מלכים א כ״א
17	T	Leviticus 1-5	י ויקרא
18	W	Haftarah: I Samuel 15:1-34	יא הפטרה: פ׳ זכר שמואל א ט״ו, א־לד
19	Th	Esther 1-2	יב אסתר א־ב׳
20	F	Esther 3-4	יג אסתר ג־ד׳
21	שבת	Purim Esther 5-7	יד פורים אסתר ה־ז׳
22	S	Esther 8-10	טו שושן פורים אסתר ח־י׳
23	M	I Kings 22	טז מלכים א כ״ב
24	T	Leviticus 6-8	יז צו פ׳ פרה
25	W	Haftarah: Ezekiel 36:16-38	יח הפטרה: יחזקאל ל״ו, טז־לח
26	Th	I Kings 23	יט מלכים א כ״ג
27	F	I Kings 24	כ מלכים א כ״ד
28	שבת	II Kings 1	כא מלכים ב א׳
29	S	II Kings 2	כב מלכים ב ב׳
30	M	II Kings 3	כג מלכים ב־ג׳
31	T	Leviticus 9-12	כד שמיני פ׳ החדש

April

1	שבת	Haftarah: Ezekiel 45:16-46:8	כה הפטרה: יחזקאל מ״ה,טז־מ״ו,יח
2	S	II Kings 4	כו מלכים ב ד׳
3	M	II Kings 5	כז מלכים ב ה׳
4	T	II Kings 6	כח מלכים ב ו׳
5	W	II Kings 7	כט מלכים ב ז׳

April-May 1989

ניסן תשמ״ט

6	Th	II Kings 8	א מלכים ב ח׳
7	F	Leviticus: 12-13	ב תזריע
8	שבת	Haftarah: II Kings 7:3-20	ג הפטרה: מלכים ב ז׳, ג־כ
9	S	II Kings 9	ד מלכים ב ט׳
10	M	II Kings 10	ה מלכים ב י׳
11	T	II Kings 11	ו מלכים ב י״א
12	W	II Kings 12	ז מלכים ב י״ב
13	Th	II Kings 13	ח מלכים כ י״ג
14	F	Leviticus 14-15	ט מצורע
15		Haftarah: II Kings 7:3-20	י הפטרה: מלכים ב ז׳, ג־ב
16	S	Song of Songs 1	יא שיר השירים א׳
17	M	Song of Songs 2	יב שיר השירים ב׳
18	T	Song of Songs 3	יג שיר השירים ג׳
19	W	Song of Songs 4	יד שיר השירים ד׳
20	Th	Exodus 12:21-51	טו פסח שמות י״ב, כא־נא
21		Haftarah: Joshua 5:2-6:1	הפטרה: יהושע ה׳, ב־ו׳, ו
22	F	Leviticus 22:26-23:24*	טז ויקרא כ״ב, כו־כג, כד*
23		Haftarah: II Kings 23:1-25*	הפטרה: מלכים ב, כ״ג, א־כה*
24	שבת	Exodus 33:12-34:26	יז שמות ל״ג, יב־לד, בו
		Haftarah: Ezekiel 37:1-14	יחזקאל ל״ז א־יד
25	S	Song of Songs 5-6	יח שיר השירים ה׳־ו׳
	M	Song of Songs 7	יט שיר השירים ז׳
26	T	Song of Songs 8	כ שיר השירים ח׳
	W	Exodus 13:17-15:17	כא שמות י״ג, יז־טז״ו, יז
27		Haftarah: II Samuel 22	כב הפטרה: שמואל ב כ״ב
28	Th	Deuteronomy 14:22-15:17*	דברים י״ד, כב־ט״ו, יז*
29		Haftarah: 10:32-12:6*	כג הפטרה: ישעיה י׳, לב־י״ב, ו׳*
30	F	Leviticus 16-18	כד אחרי מות
	שבת	Haftarah: Malachi 3:4-24	כה הפטרה: מלאכי ג׳, ד׳־כד*
	S	II Kings 14	מלכים ב י״ד

May

1	M	II Kings 15	כו מלכים ב ט״ו
2	T	II Kings 16	כז יום השואה מלכים ב ט״ז
3	W	II Kings 17	כח מלכים ב י״ז
4	Th	II Kings 18	כט מלכים ב י״ח
5	F	Leviticus 19-20	ל קדושים

*Only in the Diaspora

*רק בחוץ לארץ

6		שבת Haftarah: Isaiah 66	א	הפטרה: ישעיהו ס"ו
7	S	II Kings 19	כ	מלכים ב י"ט
8	M	II Kings 20	ג	מלכים ב כ'
9	T	II Kings 21-22	ד	מלכים ב כ"א-כ"ג
10	W	Isaiah 10:32-11:12	ה	יום העצמאות ישעיהו י'לב-י"א, יב
11	Th	II Kings 23	ו	יום העצמאות מלכים ב' כ"ג
12	F	Leviticus 21-24	ז	אמד
13		שבת Haftarah: Ezekial 44:15-24	ח	הפטרה: יחזקאל מ"ד, טו-כד
14	S	II Kings 24	ט	מלכים ב כ"ד
15	M	II Kings 25	י	מלכים ב כ"ה
16	T	Isaiah I	יא	ישעיהו א'
17	W	Isaiah 2	יב	ישעיהו ב'
18	Th	Isaiah 3	יג	ישעיהו ג'
19	F	Leviticus 25	יד	כהר
20		שבת Haftarah: Jeremiah 32:1-27	טו	הפטרה: ירמיה, ל"ב, א-כז
21	S	Isaiah 4	טז	ישעיהו ד'
22	M	Isaiah 5	יז	ישעיהו ה'
23	T	Isaiah 6	יח	ישעיהו ו'
24	W	Isaiah 7	יט	ישעיהו ז'
25	Th	Isaiah 8	כ	ישעיהו ח'
26	F	Leviticus 26-27	כא	בחקתי
27		שבת Haftarah: Jeremiah 16:19-17:14	כב	הפטרה: ירמיהו ט"ז, יט-י"ז, יד
28	S	II Isaiah 9	כג	ישעיהו ט'
29	M	II Isaiah 10	כד	ישעיהו י'
30	T	II Isaiah 11	כה	ישעיהו י"א
31	W	II Isaiah 12	כו	ישעיהו י"ב
		June		
1	Th	II Isaiah 13	כז	יום ירושלים ישעיהו י"ג
2	F	Numbers 1-4:24	כח	במדבר
3		שבת Haftarah: I Samuel 20:18-42	כט	הפטרה: שמואל א ב', יח-מב

4	S	Isaiah 14	א	ישעיהו י"ד
5	M	Isaiah 15	ב	ישעיהו ט"ו
6	T	Ruth 1	ג	רות א'
7	W	Ruth 2	ד	רות ב'
8	Th	Ruth 3-4	ה	רות ג'-ד'
9	F	Shavuot: Exodus 19-20	ו	שבועות: שמות י"ט-כ'
10		שבת Haftarah: Ezekiel 1:		הפטרה: יחזקאל א'
		Shavuot* Deuteronomy 14:16-16:17 יז	ז	שבועות* דברים י"ד,טז ט"ז,
		Haftarah: Habakuk 2:20-3		הפטרה: חבקוק ב' כ-ג'
11	S	Isaiah 16	ח	ישעיהו ט'ז
12	M	Isaiah 17	ט	ישעיהו י"ז
13	T	Isaiah 18	י	ישעיהו י"ח
14	W	Isaiah 19	יא	ישעיהו י"ט
15	Th	Isaiah 20	יב	ישעיהו כ'
16	F	Numbers 4:21-7**	יג	נשא**
17		שבת Haftarah: Iudges 13:2-25**	יד	הפטרה: שופטים י"ג, ב-כה**
18	S	Isaiah 21	טו	ישעיהו כ"א
19	M	Isaiah 22	טז	ישעיהו כ"ב
20	T	Isaiah 23	יז	ישעיהו כ"ג
21	W	Isaiah 24	יח	ישעיהו כ"ד
22	Th	Isaiah 25	יט	ישעיהו כ"ה
23	F	Numbers 8-12**	כ	בהעלותך**
24		שבת Haftarah: Zechariah 2:14-4:7**	כא	הפטרה: זכריה ב',יד-ד',ז
25	S	Isaiah 26	כב	ישעיהו כ"ו
26	M	Isaiah 27	כג	ישעיהו כ"ז
27	T	Isaiah 28	כד	ישעיהו כ"ח
28	W	Isaiah 29	בה	ישעיהו כ"ט
29	Th	Isaiah 30	כו	ישעיהו ל'
30	F	Numbers 13-15	בז	שלח**
		July		
1		שבת Haftarah: Joshua 2:1-24	בח	הפטרה: יהושע ב', א-כד
2	S	Isaiah 31	כט	ישעיהו ל"א
3	M	Isaiah 32	ל	ישעיהו ל"ב

*Only in the Diaspora *דק בחוץ לארץ

**In Israel the Sidrah of the following week ** בישראל הסדרה של השבוע הבא.

Dor Le Dor

דור לדור

OUR BIBLICAL HERITAGE

Vol. XVII, No. 3 (Issue 67) *Spring 1989*

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES IN DOR Le DOR APPEAR IN

Internationale Zeitschriftenschau für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete Habichtweg 14, 7400 Tübingen

Old Testament Abstracts The Catholic University of America, Washington DC 20064

WORLD JEWISH BIBLE CENTER

29a Keren Hayesod St. 94188 Jerusalem 02-245751

Dor Le Dor is published in Jerusalem for the benefit of the English-speaking public and is directed to