

THE JEWISH BIBLE QUARTERLY

DOR LeDOR

OUR
20TH
YEAR



Vol. XX, No. 3 (79)

SPRING 1992

THE JEWISH BIBLE QUARTERLY

DOR LeDOR — דור לדור

Founded by Dr. Louis Katzoff, Editor 1972-1987

Published by the

עמותה יהודית להפצת ידע התנ"ך

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

Editor: SHIMON BAKON

Associate Editor: CHAIM PEARL

Assistant Editor: DAVID WOLFERS

Managing Editor: JOSHUA J. ADLER

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

PATRICIA BERLYN

REUVEN BULKA

PEGGY FROST

DAVID GEFFEN

AARON GREENBERG

RICHARD HIRSCH

RANON KATZOFF

SOL LIPTZIN

LOLA LUZANN

DAVID ROSEN

YAAKOV ROSENBERG

MAX M. ROTHSCHILD

ABRAHAM RUDERMAN

PESACH SCHINDLER

GABRIEL SIVAN

MORDECHAI SOCHEN

SHUBERT SPERO

ISSN 0792-3910

דפוס רפאל חיים הכהן בע"מ, ירושלים

מיצבו בנו משה ז"ל

Printed by Raphael Haim Hachohen Press Ltd., Jerusalem

Computer layout — Judith Fattal

EDITORIAL

The Louis Katsoff Memorial Lecture this year was given by Shalom Paul of the Hebrew University, and those who heard it heard something the like of which they will not hear again soon. For the vividness and flair which Dr. Paul brought to the re-creation of the atmosphere of the Mesopotamian "University" life of 4000 years ago were qualities which few lecturers can command.

It is, however, a sidelight which Dr. Paul threw on University life in the Jerusalem of the present day that I wish to discuss here. Dr. Paul listed for us the qualifications required to engage in biblical studies, and they amount to as comprehensive an array of scholastic accomplishments as most of us encounter in a lifetime. In languages alone an acquaintance with five Middle Eastern languages, Latin and Greek, and several modern languages are demanded, while numerous ancillary skills from psychology to history are specified. Robert Gordis, famous scholar of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, hints at a similarly demanding initiation course when he claims that "no significant work in biblical research is possible today without . . . the full utilization of extra-biblical sources from the Ancient Near East, Semitic, Hamitic, and even further afield."

The effect of these requirements, which properly understood are no less than a desire to see all who follow their profession built in their own mould, must surely be to ensure a uniformity of approach, and a similarity of tools and skills in biblical scholars of the future, which cannot tend towards the opening of new approaches, the discovery of fresh insights, or the correction of old errors.

I should like to suggest a few qualifications which, from a less academic viewpoint, I believe it would be well for Bible scholars to possess.

First they all ought to be poets. Only in this way can we ensure that no more blunders are committed like NEB rejecting "the clouds return after the rain" as being meteorologically unsound, or Gordis

rejecting "If I wash myself in snow-water" on the grounds that snow is not really a cleanser, or worst of all, that terrible subordinate clause, that "big whimper theory" with which the new Jewish Publication Society version begins the Creation *When God began to create heaven and earth — the earth being unformed and void, with darkness over the surface of the deep and a wind from God sweeping over the water — God said, "Let there be light"*. A biblical scholar must, like most lay readers of the Bible, be able to hear the trumpet blast in *בראשית ברא אלהים את השמים ואת הארץ*. We do not need a Grammarians' Bible. Your Bible scholar, then, must also have an ear for music.

He also needs a sense of humor. The Bible abounds in it, from the "Yiddish" type humor of *Is it because there were no graves in Egypt that you brought us to die in the desert?*, to the dry wit of the narrator of Jonah who gives the demography of Nineveh as *more than six score thousand persons that cannot distinguish their right hand from their left, and also much cattle*.

In another dimension there are certain types of people who should not become biblical scholars. It is most important that a scholar have no religious affiliation; he must belong to no particular denomination, be neither Jew nor Christian nor Moslem, for each seeks, consciously or unconsciously to oblige the Bible to support his theology. We all know of the Authorised Version's *A virgin shall conceive* as the reading of Isa. 7:14, but are less cognizant of our own sins in purging the Bible of its pagan residues of *בני האלהים* and such like recollections. Now there is a new version in Christendom which excludes the word *Zion* on political grounds, and a womens' lib version which ungenders God. We shall shortly be publishing an article which tells how the very chapter divisions of the Bible have been manipulated to serve the sides in an ongoing textual *jihad*.

To be more serious, new insights in scholarship always arise from unexpected directions. It is a fatal mistake to attempt to dictate who shall, and who shan't bring his mind to bear on unsolved problems in any field. The mere fact that they are unsolved

indicates that something more than has as yet been applied to them is necessary — or even sometimes something less, a mind not steeped in the errors of the past or narrowed to fit into prescribed channels of discourse and exploration. It is for this reason that the attempt by an establishment of biblical scholarship to withhold the manuscripts of the Dead Sea Scrolls from general scrutiny, on the grounds that this would interfere with the production of “definitive versions” of them, was so woefully misplaced. The study of such texts can only *begin* after they have become generally available to all with an interest in deciphering and interpreting them. Nothing is definitive until it is dead and buried.

David Wolfers
Assistant Editor

NOW AVAILABLE TO OUR READERS

THE HAIM M. I. GEVARYAHU MEMORIAL VOLUME

edited by *Joshua J. Adler* and *Ben Zion Luria*

Articles on biblical themes, many written by leading scholars in English, German, French and Hebrew. The volume also contains a bibliographical sketch of the late Professor Gevaryahu in English. Price to overseas readers: Twenty dollars (U.S.) includes shipping. To addresses in Israel the cost is 40 shekalim for subscribers to the JBQ and fifty shekalim for non-subscribers.

Send your orders and checks to:
The Jewish Bible Quarterly
P.O.B. 29002, Jerusalem, Israel

EZEKIEL: FROM DESTRUCTION TO REDEMPTION

SHIMON BAKON

Five years after he had been taken captive to Babylonia together with King Jehoiachin, on the fifth of Tammuz, 592 B.C.E., Ezekiel experienced a shattering theophany. Standing near the river Chebar, he was overwhelmed by a vision of the glory of the Lord on a chariot. *The hand of the Lord was there upon him.*¹ This was to exert an incalculable influence upon his personal life and upon subsequent Jewish thought. Unlike Moses, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, Ezekiel assumed the mantle of prophecy without questioning, and the *Maase-Merkava* (the divine Throne-Chariot) gave impetus to esoteric speculations, mysticism and the *Kabbalah*.

It seems that even prior to the theophany Ezekiel had feelings of impending disaster. The opening verse in the book of Ezekiel begins with the puzzling: *Now it came to pass in the thirtieth year*, without reference to a specific event. However its proximity to the vision of the *Merkava*, which bodes ill for the future of Jerusalem and the Temple, indicates strongly that the event seems to be the discovery of the "book of the Law" thirty years before, in the reign of King Josiah. II Kings 22:11 relates: . . . *when the king had heard the words of the book of the Law, that he rent his clothes*. Why this sign of mourning? The Book of Chronicles provides the clue for the king's strange behavior. The prophetess Huldah, who was called for consultation, exclaimed: *Behold, I will bring evil upon the place, and upon the inhabitants thereof, even all the curses that are written in the book.*² When now, in the above theophany, Ezekiel beheld the

1 1:3.

2 II Ch. 34:24.

Divine glory upon a chariot, departing from the Temple and Jerusalem (10:18-22), preceded by a vision of a mysterious man clad in linen, commanded to dash coals of fire against the city (10:2), he was certain that the destruction of Jerusalem was irrevocable.

The theophanies of Isaiah and Ezekiel, because of some similarities, invite comparison; however, here I shall stress the dissimilarities. As will be recalled, Isaiah³ saw in his vision the Lord sitting on His throne, and seraphim above Him proclaiming the threefold holiness of the Lord of Hosts, whose glory fills the whole earth. To Ezekiel, God appears in a moving chariot, in the process of self-exile. The differences in the theophanies of these two great prophets also find expression in notable differences of messianic redemption, as will be shown later on.

PHILOSOPHY OF JEWISH HISTORY

The impact of the initial theophany, followed by others confirming his presentiments of impending doom, caused Ezekiel to withdraw into silence,⁴ and to ponder the implications of God's awe-inspiring holiness. Two questions engaged his mind. Why does the Divine Presence remove itself from the Temple? What are the necessary conditions that have to prevail in order for the glory of the Lord to return to its rightful place?

Ezekiel recorded the dates of his prophecies and visions, a total of 14 in all, beginning with his first theophany in 592, and the last one in 572, wherein he describes in one mighty sweep the ideal Temple. Thus he displays an unusual paradox. He records faithfully the immediacy of his visions in profusion of color and detail, often

³ Isaiah 6.

⁴ On occasions Ezekiel was commanded to remain silent and dumb (3:26). When his wife the "desire of thine eyes" died, Ezekiel is told that an "escapee" will come from Jerusalem, only then "shall thy mouth be opened . . ." (24:26-27); this indeed occurred, as related in 33:11.

under the powerful impact of the "hand of the Lord upon him." On the other hand, he presents in his book a clearly defined process of thought. Professor Driver assesses Ezekiel's work as follows:

While most of the prophets display spontaneity, Ezekiel's book evinces reflection and study; his prophecies seem often the fruit of meditation, thought out in the retirement of his chamber. The volume of his prophecies is methodically arranged, evidently by his own hands⁵

Thus Ezekiel, though seemingly a capable orator, who drew his audiences by his words which were *unto them as a love song of one that hath a pleasant voice*,⁶ was primarily a writing prophet who arranged his book both in chronological order and by topics. The Talmud, commenting on the placement of three great prophets, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Isaiah, suggests:

Isaiah was prior to Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Then why should not Isaiah be placed first? Because the Book of Kings ends with a record of destruction and Jeremiah speaks throughout of destruction. Ezekiel commences with destruction and ends with consolation. Isaiah is full of consolation.⁷

In its inimitable brevity the Talmud sums up Ezekiel's presentation of Jewish history, beginning with sin and destruction, followed by restoration in the foreseeable future, and ending in ultimate redemption in the messianic era.

HOLINESS-SIN-REGENERATION

In Ezekiel there prevails a close, almost dialectic relationship running from the transcendental holiness of God, the sin of Israel,

5 S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, (8th ed. Edinburgh, 1913), p. 296.

6 33:30-32.

7 B. B. 14b.

to the restoration of the people and the land. It must be borne in mind that Ezekiel, a practicing priest turned prophet, was fully acquainted with the "Holiness Code" as contained in Leviticus. Indeed, most Bible scholars have pointed to the full identity of interest and point of view in Ezekiel and the Holiness Code. The refrain *and you shall be holy because I the Lord am holy*, repeated in various forms, is common to both. The transcendence of God, beyond the reach of **בן אדם** — the son of man — was confirmed when in one of the theophanies Ezekiel heard the heavenly creatures proclaim: *Blessed be the glory of the Lord from His place* — **ממקומו**.⁸ The vagueness of the term "from His place" was understood by the rabbis to mean that God's place is unknown or unknowable. God is so transcendental that Ezekiel dares not engage in dialogue with Him. Only once does he attempt, albeit unsuccessfully, to intercede on behalf of Israel,⁹ but the sin of Israel is beyond repair.

What is Israel's cardinal sin? It is the profanation of His holy name — **חלול השם** — diminishing His sanctity. The term **חלל** — profane — appears approximately 86 times in the Bible, of these 32 times in Ezekiel alone and 18 times in Leviticus. We have mentioned before the affinity between the Holiness Code and Ezekiel's concept of holiness. Leviticus sums it up:

*And ye shall keep My commandments, and do them; I am the Lord. And ye shall not profane My holy name; but I will be hallowed among the children of Israel; I am the Lord Who hallows you . . .*¹⁰

Nor is this all. Israel, according to Ezekiel, was a "rebellious house" from its inception to the present day, adding to the sin of profanation that of consistently rebelling against God. In Chapter 20 Ezekiel propounds a comprehensive history of Israel, which of necessity leads to the irrevocable destruction of the Temple, of Jerusalem, and to the dispersion.

8 3:12.

9 9:12.

10 Lev. 22:31, 32.

Profanation is the negation of God's holiness, but as we shall see shortly, it is that very transcendental holiness that will, of necessity, also lead to Israel's restoration.

THE TURNING POINT

On the eve before the carnage in Jerusalem, a man escaped and came to tell Ezekiel: . . . *the city is smitten, [Ezekiel's] mouth was opened . . . and [he] was no more dumb.*¹¹ The tragedy of the destruction of the Temple and Jerusalem, in some strange way liberated the prophet. He broke the divinely imposed silence and, confirmed as a true messenger of God, was now ready to turn a new leaf in his ministry, to instil hope for the coming restoration. In so doing, another attribute of God, compassion for the Jewish people, is manifested.¹²

*Return ye and turn yourselves from all transgression . . . and make you a new heart and a new spirit: for why will ye die, O house of Israel? For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord.*¹³

God wants Israel to live, for He is mindful of the "covenant." *Nevertheless, I will remember My covenant with thee in the days of thy youth, and I will establish unto thee an everlasting covenant.*¹⁴ God in His compassion is willing to forgive Israel for all she has done.

Years before the fall of Jerusalem, the constant attrition of its body politic, as evidenced by the fall of the Northern Kingdom, the first exile of Judeans, and the iron ring of Nebuchadnezzar tightening around Jerusalem, suggested to the people the "weakness" of the Lord. There was a growing determination to be *as the nations, as the*

11 33:22.

12 Transcendence and immanence of God in the Bible, are not incompatible attributes of God. See "The Theology of Psalm 145" by Chaim Pearl, *J.B.Q.* XX:1.

13 18:30-32.

14 16:60.

families of the countries, to serve wood and stone. God however counters: *As I live, saith the Lord God, surely with a mighty hand, and with an outstretched arm and with fury poured out, will I be king over you.*¹⁵ We thus note that, even before the final curtain has been drawn over the fate of the Temple and Jerusalem, Ezekiel presents God's forceful intervention on behalf of Israel. With the fall of Jerusalem a powerful, if not entirely new, element is brought into the eventual restoration, the vindication of God's holy name. Despairing that on its own Israel will repent, God takes an active part in the regeneration of the people and of the land. He will gather them from among the nations. He will sprinkle clean water upon them to cleanse them from all uncleanness.

In some way Ezekiel echoes Moses' plea on behalf of Israel in the episode of the spies. When God threatens: *I will smite them with the pestilence,*¹⁶ Moses responds: *Then the nations . . . will speak saying: Because the Lord was not able to bring this people into the land which He swore unto them.*¹⁷ As suggested before, Ezekiel does not engage in dialogue with God; he does not appeal. God Himself considers the dispersion of the people as a profanation and declares: *I had pity for My holy name which the house of Israel had profaned among the nations . . . I do not this for your sake . . . but for My holy name.*¹⁸

REDEMPTION

Ezekiel proceeds methodically in his delineation of Israel's restoration. It is a gradual process, beginning with the individual, followed by the rehabilitation of the people, the reunification of two kingdoms under one king and, after the defeat of Gog and Magog

¹⁵ 20:32.

¹⁶ Num. 16:12.

¹⁷ Ibid. 16. See also Ex. 32:12 and Deut. 9:28.

¹⁸ Ezekiel 36:21-22.

and the establishment of the ideal Temple, the return of God's glory to its rightful and eternal dwelling.

Though it is generally recognized that one of Ezekiel's major contributions to religious thinking was his emphasis on individual responsibility, a certain vagueness, perhaps even contradiction, is noticeable in his portrayal of God's and the individual's role in the process of redemption. On one side, he asserts that man can determine his own fate, that his past is of no account, and he is judged by his present deeds only:

*The righteousness of the righteous shall not deliver him in the day of transgression; and so for the wickedness of the wicked, he shall not stumble thereby in the day that he turneth from his wickedness.*¹⁹

In a previous chapter the individual is challenged: *make you a new heart and a new spirit.*²⁰ In a later passage it is God Himself who will accomplish it: *A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart of your flesh.*²¹ However, just as one could not make a radical distinction between God's transcendence and immanence, so also here Ezekiel does not view God's and the individual's efforts at rehabilitation of man as contradictory.

How will God bring about the gathering of the scattered remnants of Israel? First, He will punish some of the nations neighboring Judea. Ammon which had stirred up trouble. Moab because it joined Babylonia against Judea. Tyre for maliciously gloating about the fall of the Judean Kingdom. Egypt because of her historic role of deceptions, leading Judea into disastrous alliances, and then leaving her in the lurch. Special fury is directed against Edom, for her age-old hatred of Israel, her part in the destruction of Jerusalem,

19 33:12. In Chapter 18, Ezekiel discussing individual responsibility, defines the "righteous" man who exemplifies moral and ethical behavior.

20 18:31.

21 36:26.

and her ambition to rule over the devastated country.²² This accomplished, God will then gather the scattered of Israel into the *land that I gave to your fathers*, and will command the devastated land to be fruitful again, and *there will be plenty of corn and fruit*.

The fall of Jerusalem and the Temple affected the exiles in Babylonia and Ezekiel in different ways. For the former, the news spelled final doom, with all hope for the future lost. In despair they cried: *Our bones are dried up, and our hope is lost* (37:11). For Ezekiel it was a sign that the time had come for him to bring the divine message of hope to his brethren. In the midst of a valley of bones representing the whole house of Israel (37:11) he proclaims: *And I will put My spirit in you and you shall live* (37:14). The shattered house of Israel will be revived by the infusion of God's spirit.

The stage is now set for a new development, the reunion of the two kingdoms, Judah and Israel, and it will be David who will be king over them. This accomplished *I will make a covenant of peace with them — it shall be an everlasting covenant . . . and [I] will set My sanctuary in the midst of them for ever*.²³

MESSIANISM

Jewish history in the prophetic perspective is what German theologians like to call *Heilsgeschichte* — history of salvation. Surveying Ezekiel's views on this issue we discern three distinct roads leading to Israel's redemption. The first is the active involvement of the individual, freed from the bondage of his past and of his fellow-men; his own deeds are the key to his moral fate. Then there is God's covenant with His people, obliging Him, as it were, to intervene on their behalf. Finally, there is the novel concept of God's self-vindication. It is in the very nature of the Divine, that

²² The prophecies concerning these nations are contained in Chapters 25-32.

²³ 37:26.

Israel must be redeemed, for a scattered and defeated people is an affront and a profanation of His holiness.

*Thus will I magnify Myself, and sanctify Myself, and I will make Myself known in the eyes of many nations, and they shall know that I am the Lord.*²⁴

Ezekiel now adds a fourth dimension, the ultimate messianic redemption of Israel. It should be stated that the messianic aspirations as expressed by Ezekiel are not clearly delineated. One cannot be too sure whether the ultimate redemption will take place in the foreseeable future or *באחרית ימים* — the time beyond history. There are some messianic indications already in Ch. 17.²⁵

Thus saith the Lord . . . Moreover I will take . . . of the lofty tops of the cedar, and I will set it; I will crop off from the topmost of its young twigs a tender one, and I will plant it upon a high mountain . . .

The re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty²⁶ may be hinted at here as an event of the future messianic era. We are on surer footing with his Gog and Magog prophecy. There Ezekiel especially mentions the two terms: *ביום ההוא* — on that day — and *באחרית ימים* — in the end of days.²⁷ However, the final redemption as envisioned by Ezekiel is unlike that of Isaiah who foresees (probably symbolically) a radical change that will take place in nature, and is unlike Zechariah's great vision: *And the Lord shall be King over all the earth; in that day the Lord shall be One and His name One.*²⁸ For Ezekiel, two major purposes will be accomplished on *that day*. By defeating the nations who mass for a final assault under the leadership of Gog, *they shall know that I am the Lord, the Holy One in Israel.* (39:7) The final stage is now set for the return of God's Presence in the idealized Temple, which must be so constituted that it is fully dedicated to the principle of "holiness." This accomplished, Jerusalem will be renamed: *The Lord is there.*

²⁴ 38:23.

²⁵ 17:22.

²⁶ 34:23, 37:22, 24.

²⁷ 38:14 and 16 respectively.

²⁸ Zech. 14:9.

In the XVIII-3 issue of the *J.B.Q.* Marshall Portnoy wrote an article "Ahasuerus is the Villain." In the XIX-1 issue, Dr. Russel K. Edwards responded, insisting that the real villain of the Book of Esther was Mordecai. Now Prof. Hyman takes issue with Dr. Edwards in this reply.

WHO IS THE VILLAIN?

RONALD T. HYMAN

In the Fall 1990 issue of *The Jewish Bible Quarterly* Russel K. Edwards seeks to show by a "close examination" of the Book of Esther that it "is not the case" that Mordecai deserves to be cast "in a shining heroic role as the defender of his race and the architect of victory" (p. 34, lines 7-9). However, the language which Edwards uses, the omissions which are evident, and the faulty logic which he employs in his argument serve only to demonstrate that the author fails to overturn the traditional picture of Mordecai as well as the picture painted in the Book of Esther itself. Not only does he fail, but he indicts himself as one who distorts rather than interprets.

Edwards uses only negative language when describing Mordecai's actions and attributes. According to Edwards, the following sample of words and terms — from only two pages — apply to Mordecai: flagrant defiance (p. 35, line 13); intellectual arrogance (p. 35, line 23); flagrant repetitive folly (p. 35, line 27); arrogance and foolhardy pride (p. 35, line 29); abandoned all prudence and common sense as well (p. 35, line 30); political madness (p. 36, line 1); frank lunacy (p. 36, 14); and insurrection, rebellion, and obtuse refusal to obey (p. 36, line 32).

Ronald Hyman is Professor of Education at Rutgers Univ. of the State of N.J. He is the author of, among others, Strategic Questioning (1979) and School Administrator: Faculty Supervision Handbook, Prentice Hall, (1986).

Such language does not lead the reader to believe that Edwards is presenting a reasoned, close examination of the intentions and acts of Mordecai. Such shrill, emotive language indicates, on the contrary, that Edwards proposes an extreme and distorted interpretation of the Book of Esther, one that runs counter to tradition and commonly accepted scholarly commentaries. To persuade the reader to accept a new interpretation about Mordecai, Edwards needs rational language not a constant harangue which casts doubt on the author himself. When Edwards states that Mordecai exhibited "monumental political stupidity" (p. 37, line 1), he simply fails to understand how to write and structure a convincing argument against Mordecai, the man who derails Haman's plan in the end.

The picture of Mordecai painted by Edwards is contrary to the one we recognize of Mordecai from the Book of Esther itself. The image portrayed of Mordecai there is of the "wise" man who acts according to the precepts offered in what is generally described as wisdom literature. Indeed, Josephus in *The Antiquities of the Jews* describes Mordecai as a wise man.¹ By the time the king's servants question Mordecai in the beginning of Chapter 3, where according to Edwards "the real story starts" (p. 34, line 10), the Book of Esther has told us that Mordecai graciously brings up his young cousin Esther because her parents are dead; that he instructs Esther on what is proper behavior when she goes to the palace into the custody of Hegai, the keeper of the women; that he walks every day before the court of the women's house to know how Esther is doing because he is concerned for her welfare; and that he reports to Esther an assassination plot on the king's life. The explicit verbal attack by Edwards fails to besmirch Mordecai's reputation because its tone is just too dissonant and unacceptable to the reader expecting a reasoned analysis.

Edwards uses not only negative terms when referring to Mordecai but also sarcasm. For example, Edwards states that if Mordecai set

1 Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews*, Book XI, Chapter VI, Paragraph 5.

out to stir up Haman, then he succeeded. Edwards then continues, "This was all his brother Jews needed — to have a cruel enemy intent on destroying them gratuitously thrust upon their backs" (p. 36, lines 26-31). Later, Edwards refers to the incident where Mordecai rends his garments upon realizing the significance of Haman's cruel decree. Edwards says, "This ineffectual (and probably provocative) public demonstration of hopeless ineptitude Mr. Portnoy calls 'a great public relations coup.' In what?" (p. 38, lines 1-5).

Sarcasm is not a substitute for a reasoned, close examination of the text. Rather, it is an attempt to bully the reader into agreeing with the writer. Sarcasm is ineffective in the long run because the recipient of it objects to such emotional treatment. With Edwards the sarcasm is a sign of a weak case searching for acceptance it does not merit.

Edwards loses all hopes of acceptance as the several flaws in his "close examination" become apparent. He claims that the act of bowing to Haman is not to be construed as a religious one but as a political one because the intent of the king's command was for people to show respect and to honor Haman (p. 34, line 14-p. 35, line 6). Edwards makes this claim and connects it with the fact that the Book of Esther itself does not indicate explicitly why Mordecai did not bow down to Haman. (Nor does the text indicate explicitly why Mordecai did not answer the question asked of him by the king's guards. Nor does the text indicate explicitly why Mordecai told the king's guards that he was a Jew.²) Nevertheless, though he raises a good point

2 Edwards (p. 35, line 22) merely asserts that the question by the king's guards in Esther 3:3 is "perfectly fair and reasonable." While Edwards can surely make a case for the assertion that the king's guards are seeking information, it is likewise possible to make a case that this question is a critical/corrective one seeking to attack Mordecai for his disobedience. Also, Edwards does not explore the context of the question and the possible legitimate reasons for not responding to a question even if it is one of inquiry. Nor does Edwards question the possible pressures on Mordecai that led to telling the king's guards that he was a Jew.

which deserves a lengthy treatment, Edwards draws the conclusion — an invalid conclusion — that religion is not involved in the disobedience to the king's command.

First, in ancient times, and to some extent in modern times, there was a definite tie between politics and religion. Change the king, change the religion. That is, there was not a separation between what was politically correct and what was religiously correct. Second, as the Second Targum shows in the commentary on the Book of Esther, even though bowing did not originally have any religious significance, it has indeed assumed such meaning ever since the time of Benjamin, the ancestor of Mordecai. Note that the Second Targum's translation and addition to Esther 3:3 offers a response to the question asked by the king's guards. It was this section of the Second Targum which Maimonides³ used in his commentary to explain why Mordecai did not bow down to Haman: "I [Mordecai] am of the seed of Benjamin, but when Jacob bowed down to Esau, Benjamin was not yet born; and from that day onward he never bowed down to a man . . . Therefore, I will not bend or bow down before this wicked Haman, the enemy."

In short, although it is true, as Edwards states, that the king's commands to bow down to Haman did not contain any explicit mention of a religious connection, a religious connection was most likely understood by the people and the king in the very context of their society. Tradition, as far back as the Second Targum, does support the claim that bowing down has religious and national significance at least for Jews. Recall that Gideon in Judges 7:4 does use bowing as one test for those who were loyal to God. So, even if Edwards is correct about Ahasuerus's non-religious intent, the king's command meant something else to the Jews in Shushan. In modern times this might well be labeled as the "disparate impact" of the king's command on the Jews.

3 Maimonides, *Commentary on the Book of Esther*, Jerusalem, 1952. (Hebrew translated from the Arabic).

Moreover, Edwards suggests a direct logical connection between Mordecai's disobedience and the desire to destroy *all* (emphasis by Edwards) the Jews (p. 36, line 23). However, it does not follow logically that because Mordecai did not bow down, Haman had to seek the destruction of all the Jews. It might well be that Haman's anger toward Mordecai follows emotionally from Mordecai's action. But it is not the case that as a "consequence of all this" (p. 36, line 23) Haman sought to destroy *all* the Jews. Perhaps "consequence" to Edwards means not a "logical entailment" but a "result somehow connected" to an event. If so, then Edwards does not err in his reasoning. However, the tone of his article and the context of his assertions here and elsewhere in the article lead me to believe Edwards draws an invalid conclusion. See below for further comment.

Edwards is so concerned about the potential for danger and destruction brought on by Haman's plan that he creates a reality which never even occurred. At first Edwards asserts that Mordecai's behavior alerts the Jews to "what was going to happen" (p. 38, lines 6-7). Two paragraphs later, when commenting on Mordecai's sanctimonious speech and heavy-handed warning to Esther, he asserts that Mordecai's "reckless behavior had brought disaster on the Jews" (p. 38, lines 29-31). For all of Edwards' fear and complaining, the "disaster" simply never occurred. Quite the contrary. Edwards and the reader must ask how Edwards slides from potential disaster to actual disaster, all caused in his mind directly by Mordecai.

Last and most significant, Edwards three times commits his worst offense — he blames the victim for the action of the villain. While I can reluctantly forgive emotional language, sarcasm, errors in logic, and a confusion of actuality and potentiality, I cannot accept Edwards' assertions that Mordecai is the direct cause. Edwards states that Mordecai "effectively turned and pointed the weapon of revenge which was being manufactured in the palace not only against himself, *but against his brother Jews as well*"

(emphasis by Edwards) (p. 36, line 5); "I maintain that this planned destruction of the Jews was a direct result of the monumental stupidity and political madness shown by a Jewish leader, bereft of every form of political sagacity and unable to foresee the logical consequences of his egotistical behavior" (p. 37, line 29); and "If Mordecai wanted to help his people following his creation of the disaster, and his architecture of the impending genocide, why did he not seek an audience directly with the king . . . ?" (p. 38, line 13).

It is terrible that throughout the ages people have blamed the Jews and other minorities for the very cruel actions of the members of the majorities. It is even worse that Edwards, who according to the annotation describing him has developed a "great love for Jewish history and Bible studies," has fallen into the logical and social trap of blaming the victim. Edwards blames Mordecai for what Haman decides on his own. Simply put, Mordecai did not turn any weapon of revenge and did not create the disaster. He only refused to bow down. The rest of the action is Haman's, and that action does not follow deductively from Mordecai's refusal to obey the king's command.

If Edwards believes that Mordecai "turned the weapon of revenge" and was the "creator of the disaster," then he surely and singularly misreads the dynamic interaction among Mordecai, Esther, Haman, and Ahasuerus. Edwards makes a leap of logic which fails to acknowledge Haman's role in the matter. Edwards does not offer a reasoned, close examination of the Book of Esther but a distorted view about Mordecai.

BALAAM: DID GOD CHANGE HIS MIND?

JEFFREY M. COHEN

There are many problems associated with the episode of the hiring of the heathen prophet Balaam by Balak, King of Moab (Num. 22), not least of which is how to interpret the phenomenon of a speaking ass.

The problem we would address here is how it was that a heathen soothsayer and imposter, obviously devoid of any intrinsic, divinely-bestowed, spiritual gifts, could actually prevail upon God to change His mind and set aside His divine will.

This divine will was clearly revealed, following Balaam's initial commission by Balak's messengers, when God says: *Do not go with them: you must not curse that people, for they are blessed* (v. 12). Yet, when a second, more prestigious, delegation arrives, to persuade Balaam to change his mind, God readily agrees and facilitates Balaam's desire — so readily, in fact, that Balaam does not even have to express it in words of petition. Incredibly, God takes the initiative and gives Balaam the green light to accommodate to the wishes of the delegation and accompany it back to their king (v. 20).

Ironically, Balaam is convinced that God's wishes cannot be countermanded and will not be changed. Hence his clear response to the importunity of the second delegation: *If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord my God, to do any thing, small or great. Now therefore, I pray you, tarry ye here also this night, that I may know if the Lord will speak unto me more* (vv. 18-19).

Dr. Jeffrey M. Cohen is the Rabbi of Stanmore & Canons Park Synagogue, London, and lecturer at Jews' College. He has written six books, the most recent being a collection of biblical studies and contemporary issues, published in 1989 by Vallentine, Mitchell, entitled Moments of Insight.

The last phrase, in particular, makes it clear that Balaam is expecting only an extension or reiteration of the previous negative divine decision, not a revocation of it. It is likely to have been for that reason that he does not even attempt to frame a further petition to God to cancel His earlier decision. He merely asks the delegation to tarry the night so that he can demonstrate to them how seriously he is taking their request and that his refusal is a result of his hands being tied by a superior power.

So, if God was clearly under no pressure at all to concede to the petty desires of one of His misguided creatures, why then does He uncharacteristically take the initiative by encouraging Balaam to accompany the second delegation, in pursuance of a policy which at the outset had been unequivocally declared as unacceptable? What prompted God then, at this stage, to pre-empt Balaam by hastening to appear to him in order to revoke His previous decision and to volunteer His permission?

The talmudic sages, mystified by the ease with which Balaam got his own way, exclaimed with incredulity: **חוצפא אפילו כלפי שמיא** **מהני**, "impudence, even against heaven, succeeds" (San. 105a). But is the Talmud really being true to the text? Wherein lies Balaam's "impudence"? Have we not already noted that he did not, in fact, attempt by so much as a single word of petition, to persuade God to change His mind? God offered to do so!

Viewed from the talmudic perspective, this is not a problem. For there is a universally-accepted rabbinic principle which they would have applied to the Balaam situation — **בדרך שאדם רוצה לילך בה מוליכין אותו** "In the direction a man is determined to walk, Heaven lets him go" (Makkot 10b). Hence, says the Talmud, at first God prevented Balaam from going — for his own sake, as well as for Israel's — but, when he displayed a resolute and absolute determination and consuming desire to undertake that mission, God did not stand in his way. God removed the barrier and allowed Balaam's evil impulse to impel him onwards to his ultimate objective — and undoing. "In the direction a man is determined to walk"

But does this not beg the question? For where do we find any indication in the text that Balaam was being seized by an overwhelming desire to go with the delegation and choose the path of evil? We have already noted that a reading of the plain text suggests that Balaam was quite unenthusiastic and undemonstrative about the mission, to the extent that in answer to both delegations he asserts that he will have to consult God to obtain His authority (vv. 8, 19), and, when confronted by the more persuasive second delegation, he does not even attempt to petition God to change His mind, leaving it up to God to react to the request.

We suggest that a particular expression — *לְקַרְאֲךָ* — *to call thee* — used twice in this episode (vv. 5, 20), may provide the key to a solution of this problem if we invest it with the more intensive connotation that it has in several other pentateuchal passages.

God's unsolicited permission is revealed thus:

And God came unto Balaam at night, and said unto him, If the men are come to call thee, (לְקַרְאֲךָ), rise up, go with them (v. 20)

I believe that this universal rendering actually misses the full force and import of the phrase, which becomes apparent from a reading of Num. 25:1-2 and Ex. 34:15.

Ex. 34:15 solemnly warns Israel against making any alliances with the local Canaanite tribes who will readily entice them into idolatry. The verse states: *And they [those tribes] go astray after their gods, and do sacrifice unto their gods (וַיִּקְרְאוּ לָךְ וַאֲכַלְתָּ מִזִּבְחֹהוּ) and they call thee, and thou eat of their sacrifice.*

But *לְקַרְאֲךָ* must mean much more than merely calling to someone. You do not just call to a people to commit an act of apostasy. Your "call" has to be very persuasive and alluring, magnetically authoritative and overwhelming. And, we suggest, *וַיִּקְרְאוּ לָךְ* has precisely that connotation in the Balaam context. It is a call that cannot be ignored, the call of a force that has won complete mastery over the victim within its clutches.

The second exemplification of this nuance is found in Num. 25:1, which states that *Israel dwelt in Shittim, and the people began to*

commit harlotry with the daughters of Moab. The next verse states: And they called the people (ותקראן לעם) unto the sacrifices of their gods; and the people did eat, and bowed down to their gods.

The 16th-century Italian Bible commentator, Obadiah Sforzo, observes that "the Israelites" initial purpose was not to commit an act of idolatry, but simply to indulge their passion for lewdness. However, they became the hapless victims of that which the Torah had forewarned when it stated, *And they call thee (וקרא לך), and thou eat of their [idolatrous] sacrifices* (Ex. 34:15). Thus, Sforzo is implying that the key phrase קרא ל, used in both the Exodus and Numbers passages, are linked as prophecy and fulfillment.

This contextual interdependence is further underscored by other vocabulary common to both passages, namely להשתחוו (to worship other gods); זנח (to go astray); זבח לאלהיהם (to sacrifice to their gods) and אכל (to eat of the sacrifice).

Thus, the arousal of Israelite passion for the daughters of Moab facilitated their "being called" — קרא ל — or emotionally enslaved, and therefore easy prey to apostasy.

Now, applying this nuance of the verb קרא to our Balaam context, we may now render the God-initiated second communication אַם לֵקְרָא לָךְ בָּאוּ הָאֲנָשִׁים thus: "If the coming of those men *has so overwhelmed you*, then arise and go with them."

Thus, because the Almighty, who looks into our innermost thoughts (בוֹחֵן כְּלִיּוֹת וּלֵב), could fathom Balaam's passionate and all-consuming desire to accompany the second delegation and accept their dastardly commission, He was therefore in a position to initiate a reaction to it *even without Balaam having had to verbalize that desire*. God responded to Balaam's mental state, and, in consequence, decided to retract His initial refusal to allow him to pursue his heart's desire.

So the resolution of the problem we posed at the outset is that God did not, in fact, *change His mind*, in the sense we generally understand it: of pandering to the wishes and whims of another, bowing to the pressure of a superior will and a more persuasive sense of purpose.

God here retracted His original decision, which had been made solely in Balaam's best interests, in order to prevent his coming to harm and being used as an instrument of evil as a result of the machinations of his paymaster, Balak, king of Moab.

God ultimately has to surrender man up to his own desires if He is to leave man's precious freedom of will intact. In order that Balaam should be totally free to choose to succumb to the allure of wealth, fame and status, as held out by the messengers of Balak, God had to retract His initial decision.

It is, in truth, very easy for God to "change His mind." Indeed, "impudence against heaven does succeed." It succeeds, but it does not pay off! God allows us to pursue an evil enterprise. He even removes the barriers, in order to facilitate the exercise of our free will. "In the direction a man is determined to walk, Heaven lets him go."

We are all masters of our own will, and, therefore, ultimately, of our own fate. In the words of Eric Hoffer, "The basic test of freedom is less in what we are free to do than in what we are free not to do."

CHRONOLOGY OF ANCIENT HEBREW HISTORY

DAVID FAIMAN

Rabbi Ruderman's article,¹ drawing our attention to the recently renewed interest among archaeologists² in a mid-15th century B.C.E. date for the Exodus,³ raises some important questions about chronology in the Bible. The issue turns out to be far more complex than whether the archaeological ruins of Jericho present evidence for Joshua's conquest or not. What we have is a triangular puzzle having at its vertices: A self-consistent biblical chronology; the traditional Hebrew calendar; and Near Eastern history. At present any two, but not all three, may be treated as being consistent with one another. This point is best illustrated as follows.

According to biblical tradition, the Exodus occurred in the year 2446 A.M.⁴ This date is arrived at by totaling up the various lifetimes listed in Genesis and Exodus and allowing the traditional 210 years of Israelite sojourn in Egypt. But according to I Kings 6:1 Solomon began to build the Temple in the 4th year of his reign, 480 years after the Exodus from Egypt. This would fix the 4th year of Solomon's reign as the year 2926 A.M.

Now according to the Hebrew calendar 5751 A.M. = 1991 C.E. Hence, by this reckoning, the Exodus would have occurred in 1315 B.C.E. and the 4th year of Solomon's reign would have been in 835 B.C.E.⁵

1 A. Ruderman, "Did the Israelites Conquer Jericho?", *J. B. Q.*, XIX:1 (1990), p. 52.

2 J. J. Bimson & D. Livingstone, "Redating the Exodus," *Biblical Archaeology Review*, XIII:5 (1987), p. 40.

3 B. G. Wood, "Did the Israelites Conquer Jericho?", *Biblical Archaeology Review*, XVI:2 (1990), p. 44.

4 *Anno Mundi*, i.e., the year of the Creation, taking the strict traditional biblical chronology as the source.

5 Arithmetical note: There was no year zero in the secular calendar: 1 C.E. was preceded by 1 B.C.E.

Professor David Faiman was born in London and now teaches physics at Ben Gurion University of the Negev. For the last decade he has lived in Sde Boker where his principal research is in solar energy.

Consequently, an Exodus in 1315 B.C.E. implies that Joshua's conquest of Jericho took place 40 years later, i.e. in 1275 B.C.E. This is *not* the 15th century B.C.E. indicated by Rabbi Ruderman. On the contrary, by this date, according to the archaeologists, Jericho had already lain in ruins for a considerable length of time.

But Jericho is not the only problem. The Books of Kings and Chronicles contain chronologies and report historical events that are cross-referenced by the surviving histories of several surrounding nations. Consistency among those histories, according to contemporary Near Eastern scholars, would place the start of Solomon's reign at about 970 B.C.E. Thus here too there is a discrepancy — of about 130 years — compared to the biblical tradition.

Thus, intriguing as an archaeological proof of the connection between several key biblical events would be, it could well raise as many problems as it would solve.

How might these problems be resolved? It would seem that there are three logical possibilities. (1) That the Bible is inconsistent with its dates, (2) that the chronology of Near Eastern history is off by more than a century, (3) that errors have crept into the Hebrew calendar.

Possibility (1) tends to be a great favorite among scholars who ignore the logical contradictions they fall into by selectively accepting some biblical time spans but not others. Specifically, the number of "theories" that become possible is unlimited and each may be expected to raise at least as many problems as it seeks to solve.

Possibility (2) should not be dismissed out of hand but, as the years go by, new discoveries are made and any necessary revisions are effected. What remains after such revisions is a strengthened rather than a weakened view of world events, and it becomes increasingly difficult to envisage an uncertainty of 130 years in the dates of, say, the Assyrian monarch Sargon II (ruled 721-705 B.C.E.) who destroyed the northern Israelite kingdom in 721 B.C.E., or the

Chaldean emperor Nebuchadnezzar (ruled 605-562 B.C.E.) who sacked Jerusalem in 586 B.C.E.

Possibility (3), strange as it may seem, is the easiest place to look for possible errors. In the first place, when the Bible tells us that someone lived for X years, the implication is obviously not X years precisely. For example, thirty-two years and six months may have been counted as thirty-three years or thirty-two: we have no way of knowing. If such a rounding error works evenly in both directions, in the long run, then after the addition of P generations the laws of probability lead to the expectation that an accumulated error of \sqrt{P} may have crept in. Since there were 10 generations from Adam to Noah, another 10 to Abraham and six more to Moses, this implies an uncertainty of about ± 5 years in the date of the Exodus even before one tries to tie the Hebrew and secular calendars together.

A second potential source of uncertainty can arise when there is no unanimous tradition about how to interpret a biblical time span. For example, the Bible is not explicit about the number of years that Joshua ruled after the death of Moses. The tanaaitic *Seder Olam Rabba* (Ch. 14) assigns 28 years to Joshua's rule. Josephus, another source from talmudic times, puts the figure at 25 years (*Antiquities*). Ibn Ezra and Nahmanides, on the other hand, invoke a tradition of only 14 years in their respective commentaries on Exodus 33:11. This is an example of one among several critical time spans for which tradition is not unanimous and these may have led to further accumulated errors in the calendar. This kind of example should not be confused with, say, the period of the Israelite sojourn in Egypt. Although the Bible variously refers to this as 400 years (Gen. 15:13) and 430 years (Ex. 12:40), here tradition is unanimous (e.g. Mekhilta, Rashi, Ibn Ezra, etc.) in ascribing 210 years to this time span.⁶

A third kind of uncertainty arises in that we do not know what kind of year was used during the various epochs. Leaving aside the

6 This rabbinic tradition is supported by the biblical record in Exodus and the genealogical tables given in Ch. 6.

vexing question of the antediluvian life spans, there is still the problem of the lunar (354 days) versus the solar (365 days) calendar and whether the former was always "pegged" to the latter via the use of leap-years (as is the contemporary Hebrew calendar) or "free" (like the Mohammedan calendar).

With factors such as these, taken together, it should be clear that a most unreliable method of determining the date of a biblical event is by using the equation:

$$\text{B.C.E.} = 3760 - \text{AM} + 1$$

as was done above in our discussion of the dates of the Exodus and the building of Solomon's Temple.

It is the present author's opinion that before looking to archaeology for evidence of the date of the Exodus it is first necessary to have in mind an internally consistent biblical chronology of the various events. It may well be that more than one internally consistent biblical chronology is logically possible, but by ignoring even a single biblical verse one can never arrive at a consistent picture. For example, if the Bible states that King Solomon's Temple was built 480 years after the Exodus then that figure must be part of an internally consistent picture. In similar fashion, one cannot simply dismiss the hundreds of years for events chronicled in Judges in order to make room for a 14th or 13th century Exodus, as many scholars would have us do.

SIMEON THE SCAPEGOAT

BENJAMIN GOODNICK

Among the first four sons of Jacob, three have been recognized in the biblical text as leaders in various ways: Reuben, the first-born; Levi the father of the priesthood; and Judah, the foremost leader of all the brothers.

By contrast, the references to Simeon, the second son, seem censorious. He appears, at least to this writer, as the underdog, a puny fellow admiring and striving to emulate the powerful. Certainly, in the tradition he has been critically treated. It might be worthwhile to survey the biblical scene and attempt to appreciate his position and the situations in which he found himself. In so doing, we shall also obtain a better understanding of the brothers closest to him.

Our only source remains the biblical unfolding of their personal and tribal history, for the two are uniquely intertwined through nature and nurture. Moreover, because of the paucity of events and the terseness of the biblical style we must utilize the portrayal of each scene to its fullest.

The first mention of Simeon in the Bible is, of course, his birth. His mother names him so because¹ *the Lord heard* [Hebrew: *shama'*, origin of Shimon, Simeon] *that I was unloved* (Gen. 29:33). This choice may have been prophetic. As will be developed throughout this paper, the name's meaning may be considered the outstanding trait of Simeon, i.e., a proneness to listen to others.

1 All biblical translations are from *The Tanakh*, Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1986.

Benjamin Goodnick, Ph.D., a diplomate of the American Board of Professional Psychology, is a consultant to governmental agencies and private religious schools. He is engaged in private practice in the Greater Philadelphia area. His articles have appeared in Jewish and professional journals.

The first major event in which Simeon participates in the biblical text finds his brother Levi beside him (or in front of him): in the massacre at Shechem to avenge the violation of their sister, Dinah (Gen. 34:25-27). The passage further relates that the other sons of Jacob² followed and completed the carnage.³ Directly, the general blame is placed on Simeon as the elder brother.

It is evident that only an overpowering motivation can account for such a wholesale, deceptive attack on unsuspecting and fairly innocent individuals. In this case, that drive seems to stem from a profound sense of moral indignation, an extreme zealousness aroused by a feeling of defilement.⁴

Where else in the Bible do we find a similar case of overwhelming zeal? In Phineas, a direct descendant of Levi who slew Zimri ben Salu and Cozbi bat Zur (Num. 25:1-15). On this conduct, Ha'amek Davar⁵ notes "Levi and Phineas [were] . . . prompted to an extreme act by the sight of immorality. . . ." It is noteworthy that it is a Levite priest who is the avenging zealot. It would appear quite reasonable to assume that in the outrage at Shechem, Levi, in his fervor, convinced Simeon to join him in a self-proclaimed moral deed. Ostensibly, Simeon was not a mover-and-a-shaker but follower of those who perceived themselves as leaders.⁶

2 Rashi comments on this verse that they were the sons of Jacob but did not conduct themselves as his sons since they sought no advice from him.

3 Or Ha-Hayim questions how all the brothers could kill those not guilty of any crime, and he explains that the men of the city loyally defended the way to their king and prince. Therefore, they had to be attacked before the evil-doer could be directly reached and slain.

4 Note the brothers' response when rebuked by their father: *Should our sister be treated like a whore?* J. H. Hertz (*The Pentateuch and the Haftorahs*, New York, 1937) claims: "High-spirited and martial men have among all nations and throughout history often yielded to blind cruelty when dealing with an outrage of this nature" (p. 129). This may explain but not, of course, justify the savagery.

5 Quoted in N. Leibowitz, *Studies in Bereshit*, Jerusalem, 1981, p. 544.

6 The absence of Simeon in Moses' blessings is silent evidence of his low or diminished status, whereas Levi, denounced in his own father's blessings, is accorded high standing and praise.

To add further strength to this position, we note that the next biblical scene involving moral depravity and religious zeal occurs with regard to the incident of the Golden Calf. Again, the name of Levi emerges; his descendants taking upon themselves the duty of spiritual zealots, slaughter thousands (Ex. 32:16-29). In fact, their deed seemed to earn everlasting sacerdotal duties for their tribe. Yet, Simeon is nowhere named as taking part in Levi's extreme behavior.

Thus we discover a consistent pattern of zealotry within the tribe of Levi, probably the result of the blending of genetics and training. Such outstanding, if different, traits are to be found among the other clans. Moses' blessings (Deut. 33:6-25) thus illumine unique tribal features in a number of his descriptions.

Further evidence of the minor role Simeon played among his brothers was their indifference as he was being deliberately "bound before their eyes" (Gen. 42:24) by the servants of Joseph in Egypt. No word, no movement of protest was evoked to rescue him from an unknown fate.⁷ Some authorities contend that Simeon was so chosen because he was responsible for putting Joseph into the pit, though only the names of Reuben and Judah appear.⁸ Rashbam claims that Joseph was afraid that together with Levi he might conspire to act as they did at Shechem. The *Or Ha-Hayim* makes an interesting observation: He (i.e., Joseph) selected him or they (i.e., the brothers) selected him. The latter point comes closer to our view that he was made a scapegoat. The other brothers would not have selected a leader to remain incarcerated; indeed, they would probably have protested (as Judah did when Benjamin was threatened with imprisonment) at any such attempt to arrest another brother. This, in fact, may have been Joseph's purpose: to see their reaction to the

7 Hertz surmises Simeon was taken because of seniority, since he was "next to Reuben who as the oldest was to report to Jacob."

8 Rabbinic tradition claims that Simeon counseled that Joseph should be slain.

imprisonment of someone expendable, such as when they sold him into slavery.

It is true that Jacob, in his blessings to his sons (Gen. 49:5-7), expresses his feelings about Simeon and Levi, denouncing them equally for their use of weapons of violence and the fierceness of their wrath. He could not differentiate between them, since they both took part in the initial attack.

On the other hand, Simeon's relationship with his older brother Reuben is of a contrasting quality to that with Levi. Tracing the history of Reuben we observe that he was — perhaps partially due to his first-born status — preeminently, a self-satisfying, self-concerned and sensual individual.

In Reuben's first biblical exposure he brings home mandrakes found in the field (Gen 30:149).⁹ This plant has long been recognized in Eastern countries as having aphrodisiac qualities.¹⁰ In looking for them, Reuben obviously reveals a strong carnal nature. Following the above episode, Reuben is found cohabiting with Bilhah, his father's concubine and mother of two of Jacob's sons (Gen. 35:22).

Awareness of Reuben's proclivity as womanizer and his growing influence over Simeon, can lead to a better understanding of the crime of which Simeon was fully guilty: debauchery with foreign women and worshipping their pagan god at Baal Peor. It is claimed that most of the 24,000 dying in the plague (Num. 25:9) that followed were Simeonites.¹¹ This was the only tribe, it seems, wherein a chieftain flaunted his harlotry before the people's leaders, Moses and Aaron (Num. 25:6, 14).

9 Rachel must have believed in the efficacy of the mandrakes and perceived them as the source of Leah's fecundity. In fact, a few verses later we find (Gen. 30:22-23) that Rachel gives birth to Joseph.

10 See, for example, E. A. Speiser, *Genesis*, Garden City, NY, 1982, p. 231.

11 In comparing the two musterings we note a vast drop in numbers of the tribe of Simeon (Num. 1:22-23 and Num. 26:12) from being one of the larger tribes (59,300) to being the smallest (22,200).

First, we must note that this event clearly reveals that Levi's hold over and his association with Simeon had dissipated; indeed, we find Levi on the opposing side upholding the divine law and, as noted above, zealously meting out capital punishment.

How did this enormous change occur? Through the impact of a new mentor, Reuben, who, as we learned, had a sensual, self-indulgent nature. How did this new attachment develop? Again, through sharing common experiences over the years.

Let us recall that at the very start of their trek in the Sinai desert, the tribes were divided into four groups about the central shrine. Reuben, with the support of Simeon and Gad, protected the southern flank of the Tabernacle (Num. 2:10-16).¹² Such closeness inevitably brought about change, especially in a follower seeking an appropriate model.

In his newly adopted role, Simeon apparently was most eager to prove readiness to participate (i.e., in fleshy pleasures). The salacious, open behavior of one of its princes, Zimri ben Salu, is an obvious example. Simeon, however, was not a sole malefactor. The text notes that: . . . *and the people began to commit harlotry . . . and And Israel joined Baal Peor . . .* with "Israel" being repeated several times (Num. 25:1-6). It is thus clear that all the tribes were involved to some extent. Reuben, though encouraging Simeon, was, it seems, more cautious and did not commit himself so fully to this heathenish activity. Only Simeon seems to have become so absorbed as to lose awareness of the enormity of his behavior.¹³

12 The Ramban, in trying to explain why the second group was so formed, appears to claim it was for Simeon's benefit. Thus he sees ". . . Reuben as a man of repentance, repentance being a worthwhile trait, and Gad as a man of strength . . . and Simeon between them to obtain forgiveness . . ." This author does not know the origin for these views, rather finds their closeness having a negative effect on Simeon. A possible basis may be Moses' positive blessings for Reuben and Gad. In this regard, it is most interesting that in the register of the two musters of the tribes, the census of Simeon is placed between Reuben and Gad.

13 Conceivably, the Midianite leadership may have found Israel's "weak link" in the tribe of Simeon's willingness to be seduced. They were even able to seduce an Israelite chieftain.

Reuben and Gad did not prove trustworthy with respect to Simeon. In spite of long association over several decades and Simeon's willingness to accept instruction, Simeon remained at the tail end of the trio. Reuben and Gad did not take Simeon into their confidence and their future plans. This emerges when we note that these two tribes, proud of their possessions, preferred to stay together on the eastern flank of the Jordan River and not to enter the destined land with the other tribes. Again, Simeon was left behind isolated and rejected.¹⁴

Deserted, Simeon looked about to find another tribe to which he shifted his allegiance and sincerely trusted: Judah. We can recognize this new commitment in the biblical wording (Jud. 1:3): *And Judah said to Simeon his brother: 'Come up with me and I will also go with you . . . to obtain our allotted territory.'* Simeon did so courageously while knowing Judah had been chosen to be in the vanguard of the conquest. In fact, Simeon finally came to settle his people in towns within the overall boundaries of Judah and remained there securely during the Davidic dynasty (Josh. 19:1-9).

This saga of Simeon's brotherly friendships, gained and lost, is fascinating. It leaves us with the thought that positive human traits may not be appreciated when accompanied by naiveté and subservience. It also appears to point to the consistency of psychological character traits within the individual and family.

Rabbis and traditional scholars are often prone to use a teleological perspective, namely that final outcomes provide the meaning of initial actions, maintaining, for example, that later losses or failures provide proof of punishment for earlier misdeeds.

continued on p. 181

¹⁴ While the diminution of the tribe of Simeon is generally associated with the plague at Baal Peor, it is also conceivable that Simeon, originally the largest of the three tribes to the south, was given the "opportunity" to be in the forefront of defending that wing and thereby suffered losses (while Reuben and Gad protected their flocks?). As stated above, the latter two tribes were obviously making plans to which Simeon was not privy.

THE RAPE OF TAMAR

ABRAHAM FEINGLASS

In 1970 the British novelist Dan Jacobson in his book, *The Rape of Tamar* chooses Jonadab, a minor character in the Book of Samuel, to create the most 20th-century of literary forms, the psychological novel. In it he develops the motivation for Absalom's revolt as portrayed in II Sam. 9-20.

The novel deals primarily with a world from which God is absent. It is interesting to note that what attracted Jacobson to the David story was, as he says in his article in *The Listener*, "a fascination with the story of the rape itself as a series of dramatic events, from the 'sickness' of Amnon's desire for his sister to the revenge taken upon him years later by the doomed Absalom. The compression and completeness of the tale, its startling reversals of course, the truths about human nature hidden and revealed in the protagonists' terse words and violent actions: it was these which I wanted to explore and enlarge upon for their own sake."¹

Jonadab, who does not appear at all in any of the earlier treatments of the David story, is a minor character in the Samuel narrative. *But Amnon had a friend, whose name was Jonadab, the son of Shimeah David's brother: and Jonadab was a very subtil man* (II Sam. 13:2). The story of *The Rape of Tamar* is told in the form of a first-person narrative recounted by Jonadab. According to Jonadab's version it was he, himself, who, sometimes indirectly, instigated the revolt of Absalom.

As Jonadab tells his tale, it becomes clear that there were two factors motivating him. The first is an intolerable resentment of the

1 Dan Jacobson, "The King and I," *The Listener*, July 1972, p. 34.

The author received his B.A. from Ben Gurion Univ. of the Negev in Beersheva and his M.A. from the Univ. of Washington in Seattle. He is Director of Public Relations for the American ORT Federation and the author of numerous articles and short stories on Jewish themes which have appeared in magazines in Israel and the U.S.

fact that he was born the nephew of the king and so is close enough to the court to observe everything while at the same time limited in possibilities to the role of court flunky. "Clinging webs of frustration," says Jonadab, "were spun within my chest while I slept night after night." His ambition is simple, "I wanted to be king, that's all" and in his fantasies he imagines himself to be "King Jonadab! (at last!)" His thwarted ambition results in a fierce resentment towards all the major characters of the story. Feelings of his own insignificance at court lead to a cynical attitude about the court and the court life he daily witnesses.

The second factor grows out of the first. His resentment comes to be focused on David's pampered favorite daughter, Tamar. "I found her lack of curiosity about me insulting. Did she imagine that I was too low, too insignificant to be worthy of focusing those dark eyes of hers upon?" In an off-hand manner which is characteristic of his narrative, Jonadab refers to an incident that had taken place some time earlier, ". . . my intolerable father, in one of his more ambitious moods, had suggested to his equally intolerable brother [David] that I might be a suitable *parti* for the girl. The king had rejected me out of hand . . ." The incident of Jonadab's rejection is not referred to again in the novel but echoes crop up repeatedly in Jonadab's account.

Near the end of the novel, after he has successfully engineered Amnon's rape of Tamar, Jonadab unexpectedly meets Tamar in Absalom's house. "I didn't know whether I wanted to strike her or to beg her forgiveness or to ask her to marry me; perhaps all of these. But even wilder was the hope that she had sought me out for a purpose I could not guess at." And at the end of the book Jonadab waits on the road to Jerusalem to meet Tamar. When she appears, he cries, "All because of you! All of it!"

Jonadab's neurotic drive to confirm his own significance allied to his deep desire for Tamar leads him to concoct the plan that allows Amnon to possess his sister. Once the plan has been presented to Amnon, it is Jonadab who spurs on Amnon to go through with it. "I

urged Amnon to commit the crime, I encouraged him to go after Tamar." His machinations have a terrible significance because "... it was over Amnon and Tamar that Absalom was forced to present the first direct bloody challenge to the king. From that challenge all else in his short life followed."

After engineering the rape, Jonadab goes on to provoke Absalom to revenge by bringing him totally untrue reports which describe Amnon gloating over his act. Jonadab fabricates accounts that describe how, "Amnon exults over his past crimes recalling them in lascivious detail and feverishly plans further assaults upon the life and dignity of his brother [Absalom]." In Jacobson's novel it is Jonadab who then plots with Absalom the details of Amnon's murder. Thus Jonadab is directly responsible for Absalom's revolt since Amnon's murder provided "the moment for Absalom effectively to assert his power within the court and the state as a whole." The murder was "an incontrovertible assertion or assumption of power."

Jacobson is careful to establish, early in the novel, the reasons for Jonadab's resentment of the members of the House of David. Jonadab describes his father Shimeah's bitterness towards David, the king who had been his "puky little brother, the goatherd of the family." And Jonadab himself has awakened every morning of his adult life choked with phlegm. "Too many unspoken words, you could say, clogged my throat when I got out of bed every morning." Without carefully establishing the frustrations that are the roots of Jonadab's character "for the psychoanalytically minded among you," Jacobson would have risked creating in Jonadab a character akin to Coleridge's description of Iago: a "motiveless malignity."² Since, however, he does establish a believable basis for Jonadab's character both the narrative and the novel itself are convincing and effective. Like Iago, Jonadab is very aware of his ability to manipu-

2 Samuel Taylor Coleridge, "The Motiveless Villain," in *A Casebook on Othello*, ed. Leonard F. Dean, New York, 1961, p. 127.

late others for his own ends. But, as befits the main character of a psychological novel, Jonadab speculates that this ability "was achieved only at the cost of, or was the direct result of, a permanent self-impoverishment, a never-ending hemorrhage of self-identity."

It is a distinctly modern, 20th-century approach to make the hero of this novel one of the incidental characters of the scriptural account. Jonadab is a good choice for the hero as anti-hero. Jacobson created his character from the very sketchy description in II Samuel 13 of Jonadab the ". . . subtil man." He might well have followed Dryden's practice and allowed Ahithophel the role of villain.³ Besides being David's counselor, Ahithophel (the name in Hebrew means "brother of fog," of confusion or chaos) was the grandfather of Bathsheba and it is probable that he spent long years scheming for an opportunity to revenge himself on David for bringing dishonor upon the family.

It is the creation of the character of Jonadab, however, and the use of him as the central pin of a psychological novel that most strikingly illustrate Jacobson's originality of treatment of the scriptural narrative.

ABSALOM

Jacobson is surprisingly close to Dryden in his drawing of the character of Absalom. Although their aims in their respective works are very different, they both treat Absalom as essentially a tool in the hands of someone possessed of more Machiavellian statecraft. Absalom's rebellion is ascribed not to his own evil nature but rather to the evil machinations of the evil Ahithophel.

In Jacobson's novel, Absalom is portrayed as not so much evil as ambitious, and it is evil counseling that leads him astray. Jonadab describes Absalom as "ambitious, self-confident, vain and

³ Dryden, the 17th-century poet, wrote a political allegory: *Absalom and Achitophel*.

idealistic." Though Absalom is ripe for Jonadab's counseling it is only because he was the man "of all those around David who was most impressed by what David had accomplished, most in awe of David's position . . . The man, in short, who wanted to *be* David . . . and he [Absalom] would be a good king, a wise king, a reforming king, a king beloved by the people for whose benefit only he would rule."

DAVID

When Jacobson's Jonadab speaks of God (and he does so many times in the book) it is often as David's God. David seems to have a personal relationship with God which no one else in the novel approaches. In the Samuel account there is also a suggestion of this relationship. No one else in the biblical narrative calls directly upon God as David does, often in terms of direct intimacy. Upon learning, for example, that Ahithophel is among the conspirators who have driven him from Jerusalem, David's immediate reaction is to turn to "his" God. *And David said, 'O Lord, I pray thee, turn the counsel of Ahithophel into foolishness'* (II Sam. 15:31). It is interesting to note that David does not pray for a direct confounding of his enemies by the hand of God and, indeed, such divine intervention would be out of keeping with the tone of the Samuel narrative. The feeling is that if God does His part to "turn the counsel of Ahithophel into foolishness," he, David, will do the rest. And this in fact is almost what happens. Ahithophel gives Absalom wise counseling but Absalom foolishly chooses to reject it, thereby enabling David to organize his army and defeat Absalom's rebel forces. An atmosphere of what might almost be called partnership between himself and God seems to characterize David's attitude to God. Above all, David has faith and it is this faith that makes him strong. Whether or not God actually involves Himself with David's personal affairs is almost irrelevant. David believes that He does; and that gives David his strength.

God has none of the significance for the other characters in the story that He has for David. He is a mere idiomatic expression in the mouth of Jonadab's father Shimeah, "God alone knows." For Tamar, God has somewhat more significance, but not much, ". . . she had called on God, on the law, on her father, on her brothers to save her. Nothing had helped." Amnon's perception of God is on only a slightly higher level than Tamar's, "Amnon had been given more and more reason to suppose that . . . [he] . . . was nothing in the eyes of that God, of those gods in whose powers he intermittently believed." In his description of Amnon's intermittent belief, Jacobson has accurately captured the ethos of a period when the Israelites still worshiped both their own God and, to be on the safe side, the gods of the residents of the land of Canaan.⁴ David's devotion to the Lord takes on added significance when it is realized that not all Jews of the time followed suit.

Jonadab describes himself as a "pre-Kant Kantian" who believes only in what his senses of perception report. He mocks God and describes him as "God in his white beard issuing absurd injunctions."

Alone among the characters of the novel, David takes his God completely seriously and (as a result or as a cause?) takes himself completely seriously as well. Jonadab says that David perceives himself to be "a true figure or pattern of royalty, worthy to be God's chosen and anointed one, his surrogate on earth and mankind's just spokesman in the courts of heaven."

And perhaps the conviction is not so very far off the mark. Certainly David is the one character in the story who is not estranged from God. It may, ultimately, not matter whether David is supported by God or by his own faith in God. After prayer which David *feels* to have been a moment of communion with God, "His faith has been restored and refreshed. He believes that his interests

4 E. W. Heaton, *The Hebrew Kingdoms*, O. U. Press, 1968, p. 175.

have indeed become, for that lost, immeasurable moment, identical with those of the universe: nothing less."

In this sense then, Jacobson's David is not so very different from the David of the religious interpretation of Scripture. In *The Rape of Tamar* all the characters except David himself see David in terms of the account rendered in the Books of Samuel and Kings.

It is perhaps David's faith that is responsible for making him the deep, complex figure he appears. Almost all the other figures in the David story are subject to a single driving passion or psychological force (in both the scriptural narrative and in Jacobson's novel) which makes possible their definition of personality types relatively simple. But David stands apart from them. His personality is complex with many threads alternating and mingling at intervals in his life. Jonadab characterizes him as being gifted, above all else, with "credulity."

There is undeniably something about David that sets him apart from other men. Jonadab is acutely aware of it and hesitates to bring the full weight of his cynicism to bear on David. Only David of all the major characters in the novel, escapes unscathed by Jonadab's perceptive debunking of personality. The sarcastic comments that Jonadab makes about the king lack the venom of his comments on the others. In the end, despite Jonadab's cynicism, David "proves to be the one man at court Jonadab really cares for."⁵

The complex figure of David is one of the reasons that the David story has held such a great appeal to men for three thousand years. Jacobson in his attempt at an understanding of just what is involved in this strange appeal of the David story has written, "The reaches and infoldings of the king's guile, generosity and ruthlessness, ambition and humility, sagacity and self-ignorance, are always surprising, inexhaustibly so. But they are held together by some deep principle of character which is ultimately unfathomable."⁶

5 Robert Alter, "A Subtil Man," *The New York Times Book Review*, February 21, 1971, p. 30.

6 Dan Jacobson, "The King and I," *The Listener*, p. 35.

The scriptural story of David finds its most literally accurate version in its translation into the terms of a 20th-century psychological novel. In many ways Jacobson's treatment is also the most satisfying of the literary approaches. His novel, while remaining faithful to the Samuel narrative, is an effective modern treatment of the David story which has been called "a wonderfully cogent study of the psychology of the powerful."⁷

Robert Alter has seen the same "modern" element in the David story as it is treated by Jacobson in *The Rape of Tamar* that Robert B. Hinman has attributed to Cowley's *Dauides* of some three hundred years earlier. Alter has pointed out that there are "elements of the three-thousand-year-old tale that make it timeless: the nature of motive and character."⁸ And on the political level, he points out, (referring to Jacobson's novel in terms of which apply perfectly to Dryden's *Absalom and Achithophel*), "The dynamics of power and personality have not changed."⁹

7 Derwent May, "Heroic Curiosity," *Encounter*, March, 1971, p. 26.

8 Alter, p. 30.

9 *Ibid.*

SIMEON THE SCAPEGOAT

continued from p. 173

Thus, Simeon's eventual scattering and dissolution are viewed as the evidence and justified punishment for the original sins of Simeon and his offspring.

Here, a developmental method has been advocated. Through an analysis of specific relationships within the biblical text, later happenings have been shown to evolve out of earlier personal interactions as determined by the traits of the individuals involved. This sequential process, it is hoped, can lead to a better and clearer appreciation of Simeon and his tribal descendants.

THE BIBLICAL BEGINNING OF THE JEWISH CALENDAR

ALLEN S. MALLER

Christians know that the Christian calendar starts from the birth of Jesus. Moslems know that the Moslim calendar begins with the flight of Mohammed from Mecca to Medina. But most Jews would be hard pressed to explain what happened 5751 years ago, and why the Jewish calendar begins with that event. By analogy to the Christian and Moslem calendar, one might expect that the Jewish calendar would start either from the birth of Abraham (the first Hebrew) or from the Exodus out of Egypt (the birth of the Israelite people). Yet the rabbis in the second century who made up the current Jewish calendar chose Adam as their starting point.

The Hebrew word Adam means mankind — the species. The first Adam represents the beginning of civilized mankind. The exit of Adam from the Garden of Eden symbolizes the transition of mankind from a largely nomadic/neolithic stone age state of hunters and gatherers, to the more advanced chalcolithic/metal-working Bronze Age society of farmers and city-dwellers.

When did this take place? One way to figure it out is to add up all the various ages reported for people in the generations following Adam to some known date, such as the Babylonian Exile or the death of Alexander. The most famous attempt to calculate "the beginning" was that of James Usher, an Irish bishop who wrote a book on biblical chronology in the early 1650s. Usher's dates were later inserted in the margin of the authorized version of the King James Bible and these dates became widespread. He sets the date for the departure from the Garden of Eden in the year 4004 B.C.E.

Allen S. Maller is the Rabbi of Temple Akiba, Culver City, Calif. He is the author of a recent book God, Sex and Kabbalah as well as two children's books. His articles have appeared in over a dozen publications.

This is a shorter time span than that established by the third-century Christian historian Sextus Julius Africanus, who estimated that Adam came out of the Garden of Eden 5499 years before the birth of Jesus (who dated three years earlier than the calendar we use, his date for Jesus actually being correct).

The shortest estimate of the time back to Adam was made by Rabbi Yosi ben-Halafta in his second-century book, *Seder Olam Rabba*. The current Jewish calendar is based on his chronology. According to him, Adam exited the Garden of Eden and became civilized 3760 B.C.E. Actually, Rabbi Yosi underestimated the length of the Persian Empire by about 160 years, so his date is within a century of Bishop Usher's.

Another way to estimate when mankind became civilized is to use the evidence of archaeology. According to archaeologists this fundamental development in human evolution first took place in the Tigris-Euphrates valley almost six thousand years ago.

Agriculture is much more productive than hunting and gathering, and the surplus product permits investment in irrigation, food-storage facilities, metalworking and urban development. This in turn leads to record-keeping and the development of writing. The earliest writing comes from the Mesopotamian city of Uruk (Erech Gen. 10:10) and dates to about five thousand five hundred years ago, i.e., about the third century of the Jewish calendar. Of course, it is unlikely that we have found the earliest example of writing, so written records probably begin in the second or perhaps even the first century of the Jewish calendar.

By beginning the Jewish calendar with Adam, the rabbis equated human history with urban civilization and writing, i.e., a self-conscious cultural-social system. Indeed, all written references to political events in the archaeological records of the earliest human civilizations can be dated by the Jewish calendar. There are no historic events prior to Adam. Adam is not the first of mankind physically speaking but Adam is the beginning of civilized mankind. Perhaps this is why the Bible has no record of the

invention of writing. The use of clothing is placed in the Neolithic period of the Garden of Eden (Gen. 3:7, 21). Metal-working is attributed to Tubal-Cain (Gen. 4:22). Jubal is the ancestor of all who play the lyre and the pipe (Gen. 4:21). But nowhere in the Bible is writing invented. To the Jews, the people of the book, writing is a given. Thus one could say the Jewish calendar starts from the beginning of writing, and the beginning of written history. The Jewish calendar is the measure of civilization.

There is evidence of a major flood in the Tigris-Euphrates valley from four thousand nine hundred years ago, i.e., in the eighth century of the Jewish calendar. The first dynasty in Egypt arose in the 7th century of the Jewish calendar. A few centuries earlier civilization had begun in Mesopotamia. The first stone pyramid (that of Pharaoh Djoser) was built in the 10th century of the Jewish calendar and the great King Sargon of Akkad (2371-2316 B.C.E.) lived in the 14th century of the Jewish calendar. Abraham was not born until the 20th century.

While *homo sapiens* has been evolving for tens of thousands of years, civilized mankind only begins about 58 centuries ago. The Jewish calendar is the oldest in the world. The closest to it is the Mayan calendar which is only 26 years behind.

"Biblical Notes" is a new feature of the J.B.Q. Readers are invited to submit contributions to Biblical Notes on no more than 2 typewritten pages.

FOUR WHO HESITATED

BIBLICAL NOTES

The weekly reading of the Torah portion is chanted in a specific way determined by tropes — טעמים symbolizing musical notes. One of these tropes is the *shalshleth*, which occurs only three times in Genesis, and once in Leviticus. It indicates hesitation on the part of the person in question.

We encounter this rare "trope" for the first time in Gen. 19:16, when two angels urge Lot to flee Sodom, which is about to be destroyed. ויחממה *but he lingered*. His hesitation is clearly understood. Well established in his community, Lot is reluctant to become a refugee, lose all his properties, and part from his married daughters as well.

The second time it occurs in Gen. 24:12, when Abraham sends his *major domo* to find a bride for his son Isaac from amongst Abraham's family in Haran. When he arrives at a well, the man is struck by an idea on how best to select Isaac's bride: ויאמר — *And he said: . . . the damsel to whom I shall say: Let down the pitcher that I may drink, and she shall say: Drink, and I will give the camels drink also . . . she shall be the one appointed by God* (Gen. 24:12-14). Why his hesitation? The rabbis suggested that the servant, though not mentioned here by name, is Eliezer. As will be recalled, Abraham had complained: *What wilt Thou give me, seeing I go hence childless, and he that shall be possessor of my house is Eliezer* (Gen. 15:2). With the birth of Ishmael, and later Isaac, Eliezer had ceased to be Abraham's heir. They further suggest that Eliezer had a daughter whom he wished to be married to Isaac. He is again frustrated. However, loyal to his master, he overcomes his initial

hesitation. One could interpret his hesitation in another way. Though his mission was to find a suitable bride for Isaac, Abraham had not given him any instructions how to find her. It needed courage to set up a "sign" by which to test God *showing kindness unto (my) master Abraham*.

The third person who hesitated is none other than Joseph. When Potiphar's wife repeatedly importunes the handsome young man for sexual favors *וַיִּמָּאן* *he refused* (Gen. 39:8). How did Jewish sages sense Joseph's hesitation by placing a *shalshelet* on his refusal? On close reading of that remarkable passage (39:7-20) one can deduce that his refusal was only attained after a prolonged inner struggle. He "protesteth" too much (39:8-9), and how did it happen that only Joseph and Potiphar's wife were alone *and there were none of the men of the house there within* (39:11)? Was it planned? If so, who did the planning? Or was it coincidence? How does one explain that *he left his garment in her hand* (39:12)? In fact, on the biblical verse *when he (Joseph) went into the house to do his work* (39:11) Rashi, the great commentator, quotes an argument between Rab and Samuel. One of them declares that *his work* denotes to lie with her (Potiphar's wife), when there appeared to him the image of his father, giving him the inner strength to resist: though after some hesitation.

The fourth who hesitated was Moses. Lev. 8:23, portraying the inauguration of the Sanctuary, states: *וַיִּשְׁחַט* — *and it* (the ram of consecration) *was slaughtered*. The blood was then put on various parts of Aaron and his two sons. Why his hesitation? It could be explained in two ways. Aaron was blemished, having contributed to the sin of the Golden Calf. In fact Moses then had upbraided Aaron, *what did this people unto thee, that thou hast brought a great sin upon them?* (Ex. 32:21). The other possibility is that at this solemn moment, when, in addition to Aaron, his two sons are also consecrated, assuring continuity to Aaron, Moses may have had sad thoughts about his own two sons who, at best, amounted to very little and were not suitable to succeed their father.

AN UPDATE ON THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

ABRAHAM RUDERMAN

Ever since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls a group of scholars under the chairmanship of Prof. John Strugnell of Harvard University had been responsible for their publication. Because of the slow rate of publication the committee had been under fire for thirty five years and they were targets for countless barbs from fellow scholars. It was even suggested by some critics that the Scrolls contained information about early Christianity which was being suppressed. In July 1990 the Israel Archeological Council appointed an Israel Oversight Committee consisting of the following scholars: Magen Broshi, Curator of the Shrine of the Book; Jonas Greenfield and Shmaryahu Talmon, Professors at the Hebrew University; Amir Drori, Director of Israel Antiquities Authority; and Angela Sussman, Coordinator. The first task of the Oversight Committee was to encourage wider distribution of the texts for publication. For years most of these texts had been hoarded by three scholars: John Strugnell, J. T. Milik, and Emil Duech. But after thirty five years about fifty plates of texts were completely unassigned for publication. John Strugnell felt no great urgency to publish. Moreover, he gave expression to his antipathy for Judaism in an interview with Avi Katzman which appeared in the Jan.-Feb. edition of *Biblical Archeological Review*. He called Judaism a "horrible religion, a Christian heresy." He resents the fact that Judaism has survived when it should have disappeared. He feels that the answer to the Jewish problem is mass conversion. It therefore relieved a tense situation when Strugnell was replaced by Emanuel Tov of the Hebrew University.

In the meantime the situation was made more complicated with the "unofficial" publication of the unpublished photographs of the Dead Sea Scrolls by the Biblical Archeological Society. The two volume publication *Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls* under

the editorship of James Robinson contains reproductions of the original photographic archives compiled before 1967, stored in the Rockefeller Museum. The monopolistic control over the Scrolls by the authorized editors began to erode when the Biblical Archeological Society began to publish bootleg versions of the texts based on computer reconstruction of concordances compiled by the editors in the 1960's. The publishers have maintained that no harm would fall any scholar who had been working on the texts since he was always free to publish the fruits of his independent research.

Recently the Israel Antiquities Authority announced that it will give access to its unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls to outside scholars. This new policy was inspired by the announcement of the Huntington Library in California that it will allow scholars to study their microfilm copy of the scrolls. Copies of the microfilm had been deposited about ten years ago for safekeeping in three institutions, the Hebrew Union College of Cincinnati, the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center of the Huntington Library, Calif. and the Center for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies at Oxford University. Now the world will soon have access to all the material without restriction (See Editorial).

Contributions of \$5,000 and over are U.S. tax deductible when payed to P.E.F. Israel Endowment Fund, Inc., 41 East 42nd St., Suite 607, N.Y., N.Y. 10017.

IMPORTANT

Please stipulate that the recipient of your contribution is J.B.Q. — Dor Le Dor, P.O.B. 29002, Jerusalem.

JONAH'S CONFESSION

HERBERT RAND

I Jonah, son of Amittai, open my lips to tell the sons of the prophets what is in my heart. When I first returned to Bethel from my mission to Nineveh, you led me to the seat of honor as an elder prophet who had sat at the feet of our master, Elisha, of blessed memory.¹

At that time, I related what had happened to me and our scribe wrote it all on a scroll. I told you that I had been chosen by God to go to Nineveh, that great city, and to cry against it in these words: *Yet forty days and Nineveh will be overthrown* (3:4).

I wondered why God had picked me in my old age to travel three weeks by donkey to the east to a pagan city to deliver a message of doom. I tried to avoid going. As I already told you, I fled and embarked on a west-bound ship. We were caught in a violent storm; the sailors flung me into the raging sea where I was swallowed by a great fish which vomited me some time afterwards onto the shore. Once on dry land, I began to hear the same command: *Arise, go unto Nineveh . . . and make unto it the proclamation that I bid thee* (3:2). So, I went; I delivered the proclamation but the Ninevites repented and God spared them.

Now, you sons of the prophets look away when I enter into your midst. Yet you study my strange story and argue about its meaning and what lessons may be learned from it. I hear some of you calling me "stubborn; a false and unworthy prophet; a carrier pigeon who flies in the wrong direction; a silly dove" (playing on my name Jonah).²

1 Sons of the prophets. Their centers were in Bethel and in Jericho. II Kg.: 3-5, 15. H. Gevaryahu, "The School of Isaiah", *Dor Le Dor*, Vol. 18:2 (1989) pp. 62-68.

2 Hosea 7:11 — "like a silly dove."

Herbert Rand is a Doctor of Jurisprudence and a New York attorney. He is the author of published articles dealing with law, biblical archaeology, and Judaic subjects. He lives in Highland Park, N. J.

Alas, my former pride as advisor to a king has fallen for I have become a mockery for scorners.³ One thing I ask of God before I die: "Remove me far from falsehood and lies." Yes, I have done foolishly and I am ashamed.

Let me give you certain details to explain my thoughts and actions. Long ago, Elisha chose me, a novice, to deliver a message to Jehu and to anoint him king of Israel. I delivered the message but to enhance my importance I foolishly added words of my own, albeit they were all true.⁴ A prophet may not add or subtract from the words of God. The Proverbs of Solomon teach that every word of God is tried.⁵

I knew that if I were to deliver the message in its original form, and if God in his mercy were to accept the repentance of the Ninevites and Nineveh would not be destroyed, I would appear as a lying prophet.⁶ That's why I had a controversy with God.

At the outset, I implored God to begin the proclamation with the words: "Repent or —". With that addition, I would hasten to deliver the message. But no! Day and night, waking or asleep, my ears rang with the same command unchanged from the way I first heard it.

I remembered that Elijah had fared well in the land of the king of Sidon so I decided to go there from Joppa.⁷ Perhaps, the sight and sound of the sea might calm me and the God of Israel might leave me alone. But, as I walked along the harborside, I kept hearing God's command and the words of the proclamation buzzing in my ears without respite. Then I looked up and saw a two-banked Phoenician galley, a ship of Tarshish, being loaded and made ready for

3 II Kg. 14:25. He was a counselor to Jeroboam II.

4 II Kg. 9:1-13.

5 Prov. 30:5, 6.

6 A lying spirit in some of the prophets. I Kg. 22:22, 23.

7 I Kg. 17:8, 9.

sailing.⁸ It occurred to me that if I booked passage and sailed for Tarshish, a trip of some months, the ship would have to remain at Tarshish over the winter for favorable weather for the return trip. Clearly, the Nineveh assignment was urgent for the proclamation called for its imminent destruction. Therefore I felt that once I was at sea, God would look elsewhere for a prophet and leave me alone.

I paid the fare, boarded the ship, and went below. In my simplicity, I believed that if I remained hidden God might overlook me. In the hold of the ship I heard nothing but the creaking of the timbers and the slapping of the waves against the sides. At last, I was at peace — or so I thought. Soon, I heard the splash of the oars as the ship began to move out of the harbor.

Suddenly, I found myself engulfed in thick darkness which shut out the light from the grating in the deck. I wondered whether it was a *tardemah*, like the deep sleep of Adam or of Abraham but a sleep from which I would never awake. My just punishment for rebellion and for despising God's word would be my death.⁹

I don't know how long the *tardemah* continued but the next thing I remember is being shaken violently and awaking to hear the master of the ship yelling: "Wake up! We are in danger of sinking; pray to your God!"

I climbed to the upper deck. The mast, rigging, tackle and anchors had already been jettisoned but the ship was being tossed about in a violent storm and flooded by each oncoming wave.¹⁰ God was pursuing me on the open sea. I was sure that I was about to die, perhaps by a bolt of lightning; perhaps by being washed overboard, for I could not swim. The sailors pointed to me as the one who had brought bad luck to the ship; the lots told them so. I readily admitted

8 Ships of Tarshish. I Kg. 22:49; Isaiah 2:16. The British Museum has a relief from Nineveh of a two-banked Phoenician galley ca. 705-686 B.C.E.

9 A rebellious prophet was killed by a lion. I Kg. 13:11-26.

10 Most English translations have: "cast the wares that were in the ship into the sea." but *והכלים אשר באניה* refers to rigging and tackle, i.e., equipment pertaining to ships.

that I was fleeing from God. I knew that He sought to punish me alone and I was aware that under the law of the sea the master was responsible for the safety of his passengers even at the risk of the ship or its cargo.¹¹ Only I held the key to the situation. "You may throw me overboard" I said: "there will be no blood-guilt; the sin will be on my head alone." The master was hesitant even though the storm was increasing in intensity. At my suggestion, they lowered me over the side and partially immersed me. Each time they dipped me, the sea closest to the ship became calm. The captain made a declaration before witnesses that he was blameless because what he was about to do was the will of God and he ordered the crew to cast me into the sea.¹²

As I sank beneath the waves, I was prepared for death. How was I to foresee that I would be swallowed by a great fish? I had no way of knowing how long I remained in the bowels of the fish but it seemed to me like three days. In the belly of the leviathan I recited, as best I could remember, some psalms of David which seemed to reflect my peril.¹³ I vowed that if ever I escaped alive I would accept God's assignment, deliver His message to Nineveh, and return here to tell the story of what had happened to me. I was vomited out within reach of the shore. My long sheepskin coat may have been indigestible to the fish because I was still wearing it.

I set out at once on the road to Nineveh. I would speak the words put in my mouth by God, like Balaam; but no angel blocked my path. Instead, I felt that I was being prodded to keep moving ahead. I wondered whether the people of Nineveh would abuse me as the

11 The Rhodians were the earliest people to promulgate a system of maritime law in about the ninth-to-eighth century B.C.E. That law was followed by all naval powers in the Mediterranean basin and was applicable to ships at sea beyond the grasp of the god or ruler of the coastal state.

12 Under the Rhodian law of the sea, the master of the ship must transport the passenger to destination safe and sound. Death or injury to a passenger created a presumption of responsibility of the master and the owner. M. Pastoret, *Dissertation on Rhodian Sea Law*. (Paris 1784) (French) pp. 18-61.

13 Compare Jonah 2:3-10 with Ps. 18:5-7; 31:7; 120:1; 143:4.

people of Sodom used to do to strangers.¹⁴ The Ninevites were notorious for their sexual perversions. So, I planned to deliver the proclamation shortly after entering the city and then make a hasty retreat.

That's exactly what I did. Then, I found a mound just outside the city where I stationed myself to observe and learn from those passing by what would happen over the next thirty-nine days.

It was hot — hotter than I had ever experienced in the Land of Israel, and there were no trees to shade my head. I built a small shelter with some mud bricks that were lying about, apparently from the ruins of an ancient ziggurat. I was protected from the wind but not from the sun because there was no thatch for a roof.

From day to day, I heard rumors that the Ninevites were taking my proclamation to heart and were fasting and afflicting themselves and their animals. As I sat sweltering in the shelter, I doubted their sincerity and wished they would die.

On the morning of the thirty-ninth day, I awoke to discover that a leafy vine had grown overnight. It covered my shelter and shaded me from the sun all that day. But on the following morning, the vine had withered. The city was still standing and the inhabitants were going about their usual business. Nineveh had been spared.

Alas, I thought, it would have been better if I had drowned or if I had been digested by the great fish rather than to have endured these forty days of agony only to be turned into a lying prophet. In the extreme heat brought on by the east wind I felt faint, so I told God that I would welcome death. Then, He asked me a question which I didn't fully understand at the time but which has become clear to me now: *'Art thou greatly angry?'* God was asking me the same question He had asked Cain, in almost the same words.¹⁵ Cain was angry and wished his brother, Abel, dead; I was angry and wished the Ninevites dead. The desire of each of us was a sin. Cain was unable

¹⁴ Gen. 19:4, 5.

¹⁵ Gen. 4:6.

to rule over his wish; I didn't have the power to accomplish mine. So, when God asked me a further and final question, He omitted, possibly out of consideration for me, the crucial words which would have highlighted my sin.

He could have asked: "*Should I not have pity on Nineveh, that great city, wherein there are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand, and also much cattle, just to save you the humiliation of being called a lying prophet?*"

I had staked my reputation as a true prophet on the outcome of the prophecy of doom and I had lost. I had been humiliated and my career as a prophet was over. So, I hated the Ninevites because they survived and were the cause of my downfall; I had more pity for the vine than I had for them

Now, I am as one whose eyes have been opened. God could have struck me down at any time, just as He destroyed the vine, but He spared me along with the Ninevites. I bear my guilt.

Moreover, you sons of the prophets were right to call me a silly dove. I failed to grasp the true import of God's proclamation. He was not speaking to me mouth to mouth as He used to do with Moses, our teacher, but in a dark saying which I did not understand¹⁶ *In forty days, Nineveh will be overturned* may be interpreted in two ways: either that it will be overturned by destruction; or that there would be a reversal of life-style of the Ninevites from evil to repentance and righteousness.¹⁷

If only I had understood the two-edged meaning of the proclamation, then whether the Ninevites were destroyed or spared, I could have pointed to the results and said: Did I not prophesy so?¹⁸

continued on p. 198

16 Num. 12:8.

17 The hearts of the Ninevites would be turned within them. See: Hos. 11:8, **נהפך עלי לבי** *My heart is turned within Me.*

18 Example of an ambiguous (dark) oracle: Croesus, encouraged by an oracle which predicted the fall of an empire, waged war on Persia only to find that the empire referred to was his own. Herodotus, *History of the Persian War*, Bk. 1, chap. 70, p. 40 (Penguin).

ASON, A FATE WORSE THAN DEATH

JUDITH ZABARENKO ABRAMS

Death is often thought to be the worst fate a person can endure. However, the Torah has not only a concept, but a special word, that defines a fate worse than death. That word is *ason*, which occurs only five times in the entire *Tanakh*, and all of them in the Pentateuch.¹ As we shall see from examining these five biblical texts, the Torah recognizes that losses which have one, or both, of the following characteristics, can be worse than death. They are the losses which rob us of our stake in the future (i.e., our children) and for which healing does not come easily. The two losses the Torah focuses on are the abduction of a child and the loss of fertility.²

Determining the precise definition of the word *ason* is difficult. The new Jewish Publication Society translation defines the word *ason* as "disaster" in Genesis and as "damage" in Exodus. The 1917 Jewish Publication Society translation defines *ason* as "harm" in all cases. I hope to demonstrate that the words *ason* has a more subtle and complicated meaning than any of these translations imply.³ Let us examine each use of this word to discover its full meaning.

1 Three of these occurrences fall in the story of Joseph and refer to his brother Benjamin (Gen. 42:4, 42:38 and 44:29). The other two are contained in the text dealing with miscarriage (Ex. 21:22 and 21:23).

2 The Jewish tradition in later years continued to consider these two circumstances especially unfortunate. Two of the *mitzvot* for which a Sefer Torah may be sold are the redemption of a captive and in order to marry (and presumably have children) (Megillah, 27a).

3 Mekhilta seems puzzled by the word *ason*. Commenting on Exodus 21:23, it says, "There is no [meaning for the word] '*ason*' but death. And even though there is no proof [for such a definition] of the word, it is hinted at in the word[s], *If ason (harm) befall him on the way.*" (Gen. 42:38).

Rabbi Judith Z. Abrams was ordained at the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in 1985. She serves as the rabbi of Congregation Ner Shalom in Woodbridge, Virginia. She is the author of children's prayer books and a book on Tractate Berachot of the Babylonian Talmud.

Each time the word *ason* is used in the story of Joseph, it is uttered, directly or indirectly, by Jacob. Jacob has experienced the loss of his son Joseph in an extremely disturbing way: he has never seen his child's dead body; only his bloodied tunic. Jacob was not able to hold a funeral for his son and know where his son lay. He may even have treasured some small hope that his son was still alive, since he had never actually seen his corpse.

In stark contrast to his behavior when his wife Rachel died, when he apparently accepted her death,⁴ Jacob cannot be comforted for the loss of Joseph.

Jacob rent his clothes, put sackcloth on his loins, and observed mourning for his son many days. All his sons and daughters sought to comfort him; but he refused to be comforted, saying, 'No, I will go down mourning to my son in Sheol.' Thus his father bewailed him. (Gen. 37:35).

As the story continues, it becomes apparent that Jacob has still not come to terms with his son's disappearance. He hesitates to send Rachel's only other son out of his sight lest he, too, disappear suddenly.

When Jacob saw that there were food rations to be had in Egypt, he said to his sons, 'Why do you keep looking at one another? Now I hear,' he went on, 'that there are rations to be had in Egypt. Go down and procure rations for us there, that we may live and not die.' So ten of Joseph's brothers went down to get grain rations in Egypt; for Jacob did not send Joseph's brother Benjamin with his brothers, since he feared that he might meet with disaster [ason] (Gen. 42:1-4).

4 There is no explicit record of Jacob's mourning Rachel's death in Genesis: *And Rachel died, and was buried in the way to Ephrat — the same is Bethlehem. And Jacob set up a pillar upon her grave; the same is the pillar of Rachel's grave unto this day. And Israel journeyed, and spread his tent beyond Migdal-eder* (Gen. 35:19-21). Jacob may have been less traumatized by Rachel's death since he was able to bury her and, perhaps, because her death during childbirth was not as unexpected as was the sudden disappearance of his child.

What is the disaster that Jacob fears? It is Benjamin's sudden disappearance or abduction. The word *ason* in Genesis 42:38 is used in a similar way by Jacob:

But he said, 'My son must not go down with you, for his brother is dead and he alone is left. If he meets with disaster (ason) on the journey you are taking, you will send my white head down to Sheol in grief.'

Finally, in Genesis 44, while explaining to Joseph why Benjamin must return with him to Canaan, Judah relates what his father Jacob has said to him.

Your servant my father said to us, 'As you know, my wife bore me two sons. But one is gone from me, and I said: Alas, he was torn by a beast! And I have not seen him since. If you take this one from me, too, and he meets with disaster (ason) you will send my white head down to Sheol in grief' (Gen. 44:27-29).

In each of these three cases, *ason* seems to refer to something more fearful than death. It is the sudden disappearance of a child. Such a loss may be even more difficult to bear than the death of a child. When a child dies, hope is extinguished and resignation and acceptance may eventually come. The Torah seems to be saying that it may be far worse to live with hopes that can never be either realized or dashed than to live with certain grief.

The definition of *ason* as a loss that deprives one of children, and which is difficult to mourn, can describe not only the loss of child through abduction but the loss of fertility, as well. Including this conception in the definition of *ason* makes sense not only of the word itself, but of the *lex talionis*, the law of retribution, as well. First let us look at the context in which this word is used in Exodus:

When men fight, and one of them pushes a pregnant woman and a miscarriage results, but no other damage (ason) ensues, the one responsible shall be fined according as the woman's husband may exact from him, the payment to be based on reckoning. But if other damage [ason]

ensues, the penalty shall be life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, bruise for bruise (Ex. 21:22-25).

"Damage" here is often taken to mean the death of the unborn child with the loss of hope for descendants. The *lex talionis* of course was not taken as the actual law. Instead, the offender paid monetary compensation. But again, the context provides a meaning to *ason* as a loss of the future.

This, then, may be the subtle meaning of the word *ason*. The worst tragedies which we face may not be death *per se*, but the death of hope through the unjust loss of our future; often meaning, our children.

JONAH'S CONFESSION

continued from p. 194

Now, may it be Thy will, O Lord, our God and God of our fathers, to forgive my sins, to pardon my transgressions and to grant atonement for my iniquities. For the sins which I have committed in Thy sight; by acting callously, by evil thoughts, by foolish talk, by evil impulses, by lofty bearing, by scornful defiance, by sordid selfishness, by being obstinate, by groundless hatred; forgive me merciful God. For my sins, I will offer a sin-offering in Thy Temple.

The spirit of prophecy has left me never to return. May my soul be silent to those who insult me and may the lessons to be learned from my experience be for a blessing.

I have finished and will say no more.

A congregation or Bible study group may wish to honor
one of its members by sponsoring a special issue of
The Jewish Bible Quarterly.

We shall be happy to dedicate such an issue to the honoree.
Please write to the Editor, P.O.B. 29002, The Jewish Bible
Quarterly, Jerusalem, Israel, for further details.

D OES YOUR SYNAGOGUE OR PUBLIC LIBRARY
RECEIVE THE *JEWISH BIBLE QUARTERLY*?

Some of the most prestigious libraries around the world do.

Why not include yours among them?



S END A HOLIDAY GIFT SUBSCRIPTION TO A FRIEND ! ! !

Please send a gift subscription to:

Gift sent by:

Name _____

Name _____

Address _____

Address _____

City _____

City _____

State _____

State _____

Please enclose \$20 check and send to:

THE JEWISH BIBLE QUARTERLY — DOR LE DOR
P.O.B. 29002
(93801) JERUSALEM ISRAEL

**TO OUR READERS:
WE ALWAYS APPRECIATE YOUR SUPPORT**

You can be a great help to us now and in the future by:

- Giving your friends a gift subscription;
- Introducing the *Quarterly* to interested people who are not yet subscribers;
- Making a bequest to the *Jewish Bible Quarterly* in your will so that our Journal may become part of your eternal legacy to the Jewish people and its holiest book;
- Becoming a special member in one of the categories listed below.

We would then be pleased to send gift subscriptions in your name.

PLEASE DETACH

Enroll me as a:

Number of
gift subscriptions

- | | | |
|--|-------------------|----|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sustaining Member | (\$50) | 2 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Donor Member | (\$100) | 5 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Patron Member | (\$250) | 10 |

Subscription to the J.B.Q. is included in all membership categories

With your specific permission you will be listed on our honor roll in the final issue of the year. Yes No

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

List names and addresses where gift subscriptions are to be sent in your name on a separate sheet.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Sir,

I read with interest the letter to the Editor, *J.B.Q.*, Summer 1991 issue concerning the Akedah story. Both Tzvi Tur-Malka and Moshe J. Yeres fail to refer to an article on the same subject which appeared in *Dor le Dor*, Fall 1986 issue Vol. XV, No. 1. The article, I believe, presents a much deeper, more complete analysis and resolution of the whole Akedah incident.

I would like to see some comments by the above writers on my article, cited above, which explains many points of contention brought up in their treatment.

Sidney Breitbart
Maryland, USA

Sir,

In his article "The Book of Esther — Some Questions and Responses" by Joshua J. Adler (Spring 1991) the author refers to Mordecai as the uncle of Esther (p. 189), a relationship I had always assumed.

However, in reading the Book of Esther in the Bible we find the following in 2:5, 6, 7:

"There was a certain Jew in Shushan the capital, whose name was Mordecai, the son of Jair, the son of Shimei the son of Kish, a Benjamite, who had been carried away into exile from Jerusalem . . . And he had brought up Hadassah that is, *Esther, the daughter of his uncle*; for she had neither father nor mother . . . and when her father and mother were dead, Mordecai had taken her to himself as a daughter." Doesn't this make Esther either his cousin or his adopted daughter? Or were relationships differently called at one time?

Sara Shiller
New York, USA

Joshua Adler Replies:

It is wonderful to know that we have such good readers who are able to spot an error in the article I wrote on the Book of Esther. You are indeed correct. According to the text, Mordecai is Esther's cousin not uncle. The "uncle" is like the "apple" which Adam ate which I must have heard about when I was young and, in my haste to put my thoughts on paper, it came out uncle rather than cousin. However, as you also pointed out the relatives in the Bible may not always conform to what today are uncles, cousins or even brothers.

Sir,

Two years ago we corresponded about errors in the Triennial Bible Reading Calendar and here I am again. When I looked at the calendar in the back of the Fall issue (which arrived two weeks after the end of the summer calendar — with the mail service so bad, maybe you should consider a five-month calendar!), I couldn't believe what I saw:

In the first place, you've gone back to a three-month calendar when, as noted above, even four months isn't enough.

Secondly, what happened to the traditional Sidra portions? At the rate you have broken up Genesis, it will take all year just to get through the first volume of Tanakh! Are you proposing to convert the Shabbat readings to a Triennial basis also? If so, why didn't you announce this?

Third, you have omitted all the Haftarah readings. I still don't understand why you abandoned the practice of giving the name of the Sidra, but I can see absolutely no justification for omitting the Haftarah portions.

And fourth, where did you ever find Judges 22, 23, and 24 which are given as the readings for December 3, 4, and 5?

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

It seems to me that the very least you can do is to mail your readers a new, corrected calendar so that those who rely on it (fortunately, I still have the 1986 three-year version to refer to) will not be so badly misled. Perhaps if you make the new calendar long enough, you can compensate for the extra expense by omitting the calendar from the next issue.

J. J. Leavitt
Stamford, USA

Shimon Bakon replies:

Since I have taken over the responsibility for the calendar, I take the blame for some of the things you pointed out in your letter. In view of the slow mail, a minimum of four months' calendar will henceforth be included in every issue. (Unfortunately, the winter issue is already in print, therefore your suggestion can only be implemented beginning with the spring issue.)

You were absolutely correct regarding Judges 22, 23, and 24. I really can't explain how this gross error crept in.

However, our Editorial Board has felt that the traditional Sidra portion and Haftarah reading belong to the Synagogue ritual, and therefore has included the Five Books of Moses as part of the Triennial Cycle of Bible readings.

עשה תורתך קבע

THE TRIENNIAL BIBLE READING CALENDAR

DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY OF
CHAIM ABRAMOWITZ

With the completion of the triennial cycle in the summer issue of 1991, it was decided to institute two major changes:

1. We eliminated the weekly Torah and Haftarah readings for the Sabbath, since that is a function of the Synagogue, and readers do not need to be reminded by us.
2. We included the Five Books of Moses into the triennial cycle. This was not done in arbitrary fashion as according to the Jerusalem custom the Five Books of Moses were divided by "Sedarim", a total number of 154, organized to complete the reading of the Pentateuch in three years.

March 1992

1	S	I Kings 6
2	M	I Kings 7
3	T	I Kings 8
4	W	I Kings 9
5	Th	I Kings 10
6	F	Genesis 25:19-26:35
8	S	I Kings 11
9	M	I Kings 12
10	T	I Kings 13
11	W	I Kings 14
12	Th	I Kings 15
13	F	Genesis 27:1-27
15	S	I Kings 16
16	M	I Kings 17
17	T	I Kings 18
18	W	I Kings 19
19	Th	I Kings 20
20	F	Genesis 27:28-28:9
22	S	I Kings 21
23	M	I Kings 22
24	T	II Kings 1
25	W	II Kings 2
26	Th	II Kings 3
27	F	Genesis 28:10-29:
29	S	II Kings 4
30	M	II Kings 5
31	T	II Kings 6

April 1992

1	W	II Kings 7
2	Th	II Kings 8
3	F	Genesis 29:31-30:21
5	S	II Kings 9
6	M	II Kings 10
7	T	II Kings 11
8	W	II Kings 12
9	Th	II Kings 13
10	F	Genesis 30:22-31:2
12	S	II Kings 14
13	M	II Kings 15
14	T	II Kings 16
15	W	II Kings 17
16	Th	II Kings 18
17	F	Genesis 31:3-32:2
19	S	II Kings 19
20	M	II Kings 20
21	T	II Kings 21
22	W	II Kings 22
23	Th	II Kings 23
24	F	Genesis 32:3-33:17
26	S	II Kings 24
27	M	II Kings 25
28	T	Isaiah 1
29	W	Isaiah 2
30	Th	Isaiah 3

May 1992

1	F	Genesis 33:18-34:8
3	S	Isaiah 4
4	M	Isaiah 5
5	T	Isaiah 6
6	W	Isaiah 7
7	Th	Isaiah 8
8	F	Genesis 34:9-36:43
10	S	Isaiah 9
11	M	Isaiah 10
12	T	Isaiah 11
13	W	Isaiah 12
14	Th	Isaiah 13
15	F	Genesis 37:1-37:36
17	S	Isaiah 14
18	M	Isaiah 15
19	T	Isaiah 16
20	W	Isaiah 17
21	Th	Isaiah 18
22	F	Genesis 38:1-38:30
24	S	Isaiah 19
26	M	Isaiah 20
26	T	Isaiah 21
27	W	Isaiah 22
28	Th	Isaiah 23
29	F	Genesis 39:1-40:23
31	S	Isaiah 24

June 1992

1	M	Isaiah 25
2	T	Isaiah 26
3	W	Isaiah 27
4	Th	Isaiah 28
5	F	Genesis 41:1-41:37
7	S	Isaiah 29
8	M	Isaiah 30
9	T	Isaiah 31
10	W	Isaiah 32
11	Th	Isaiah 33
12	F	Genesis 41:38-42:16
14	S	Isaiah 34
15	M	Isaiah 35
16	T	Isaiah 36
17	W	Isaiah 37
18	Th	Isaiah 38
19	F	Genesis 42:17-43:13
21	S	Isaiah 39
22	M	Isaiah 40
23	T	Isaiah 41
24	W	Isaiah 42
25	Th	Isaiah 43
26	F	Genesis 43:14-44:17
28	S	Isaiah 44
29	M	Isaiah 45
30	T	Isaiah 46

THE JEWISH BIBLE QUARTERLY

DOR LeDOR — דור לדור

Vol. XX, No. 3 (79)

SPRING 1992

EDITORIAL	<i>David Wolfers</i>	141
EZEKIEL: FROM DESTRUCTION TO REDEMPTION	<i>Shimon Bakon</i>	144
WHO IS THE VILLAIN?	<i>Ronald T. Hyman</i>	153
BALAAM: DID GOD CHANGE HIS MIND?	<i>Jeffrey M. Cohen</i>	159
CHRONOLOGY OF ANCIENT HEBREW HISTORY	<i>David Faiman</i>	164
SIMEON THE SCAPEGOAT	<i>Benjamin Goodnick</i>	168
THE RAPE OF TAMAR	<i>Abraham Feinglass</i>	174
THE BIBLICAL BEGINNING OF THE JEWISH CALENDAR	<i>Allen S. Miller</i>	182
BIBLICAL NOTES — FOUR WHO HESITATED		185
AN UPDATE ON THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS	<i>Abraham Ruderman</i>	187
JONAH'S CONFESSION	<i>Herbert Rand</i>	189
ASON, A FATE WORSE THAN DEATH	<i>Judith Zabarenko Abrams</i>	195
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR		199
TRIENNIAL BIBLE CALENDAR		202

ADDRESS

THE JEWISH BIBLE QUARTERLY

MAIL

P.O.B. 29002
93801 — Jerusalem

LOCATION

Kiryat Moriah, East Talpiot
Jerusalem, Tel. 717863/16

ARTICLES IN THE J.B.Q. ARE INDEXED AND ABSTRACTED BY:

Internationale Zeitschriftenschau für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete

Old Testament Abstracts

Religious and Theological Abstracts

Index of Articles on Jewish Studies (Rambi)

The Jewish Bible Quarterly is published in Jerusalem for the benefit of the English-speaking public and is directed to all those who wish to further their understanding of the Hebrew Bible.