

THE WORLD JEWISH BIBLE SOCIETY

דור לדור

DOR^{LE}DOR

THE MYSTERY OF GENESIS 36

STUART A. WEST

THE DEVELOPMENT OF BIBLICAL PRAYER

ETAN LEVINE

SCHILLER ON MOSES

SOL LIPTZIN

MILITARY INTELLIGENCE IN THE BIBLE — III

REUBEN EFRON

WHY DID JOSEPH LET HIS FATHER MOURN FOR HIM

NORMAN ASHER

ALIENS AND ISRAELITES — I

MAX M. ROTHSCHILD

TORAH DIALOGUES — BEMIDBAR

HAROLD D. HALPERN

THIRD TRIENNIAL INDEX

דור לדור
DOR le DOR

Published by the
WORLD JEWISH BIBLE SOCIETY

In cooperation with the
Department of Education and Culture of the World Zionist Organization
and the
World Jewish Congress, Cultural Department

Chairman: DR. HAIM GEVARYAHU

Vice Chairman: DR. LOUIS KATZOFF

Treasurer: BEN ZION LURIA

Chairman, World Executive, Beth Hatenakh: CHAIM FINKELSTEIN

Chairman, World Council, Beth Hatenakh: DR. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN

Chairman, Cultural Department, World Jewish Congress: ITZHAK HARKAVI

Chairman for North America: DR. AZRIEL EISENBERG, New York City

Chairman for Europe: HERMANN WOHLMANN, Zurich

Editor: LOUIS KATZOFF

Associate Editor: SHIMON BAKON

Assistant Editor: CHAIM ABRAMOWITZ

EDITORIAL BOARD

PHILIP GOODMAN

PAUL GOULD

HAROLD D. HALPERN

JOSEPH HALPERN

RICHARD HIRSCH

WOLFE KELMAN

S. JOSHUA KOHN

LEON A. KRONITZ

S. GERSHON LEVI

SOL LIPTZIN

CHAIM H. PEARL

MAX M. ROTHSCHILD

ADRAHAM RUDERMAN

GABRIEL SIVAN

MORDECAI SOCHEN

Dor le-Dor is published by the World Jewish Bible Society for the English reading public and is directed primarily to interested Jewish laymen who wish to deepen their understanding and appreciation of their heritage through Bible study.

WORLD JEWISH BIBLE SOCIETY,

18 Abarbanel St.

Jerusalem

החברה היהודית העולמית לתנ"ך

02-662536

AN AFFILIATE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE IN THE DIASPORA OF THE
WORLD ZIONIST ORGANISATION

דפוס רפאל חיים הכהן בע"מ, ירושלים

THE MYSTERY OF GENESIS 36

BY STUART A. WEST

When a now little known Bible exegete asserted, some nine centuries ago, that a section of the Book of Genesis, relating to the Edomite kings, was interpolated during the reign of King Jehoshaphat (873–849 B.C.E.), he started a controversy that is still rife today.

Isaac Abu Ibrahim Ibn Yashush was born in Toledo, Spain, in 982 C.E., some fifty-eight years before the birth of Rashi. Writing under the pen-name of Yitzhaki, he produced a Bible commentary, the “Sefer Yitzhaki”, containing explanations which were singularly daring for the time¹. His approach to Bible exegesis was, if anything, akin to that of modern Bible criticism.

Genesis 36, the subject of a religious polemic ever since Yitzhaki made his comments thereon, contains full particulars of the line of Esau, otherwise known as Edom². After stating the names of Esau’s wives and sons, and recording their settlement in Seir³, the chapter goes on to list the male descendants of those sons⁴ and their clans⁵. There then follows a record of the Horite clans, who lived in Seir⁶, later to be known as the land of Edom, following Esau’s conquest thereof⁷. Having listed the Horites, who were dispossessed by Esau, the chapter thereafter enumerates the Edomite kings:

And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel. And Bela the son of Beor

1. See Graetz, H., *History of the Jews*, 1946, Vol. 3, p. 273; *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 1971, Vol. 8, p. 1211.

2. Gen. 36:1.

3. Gen. 36:2–8.

4. Gen. 36:9–14.

5. Gen. 36:15–19.

6. Gen. 36:20–30.

7. Deut. 2:12, 22.

Mr. Stuart A. West is a graduate of the Law Faculty of University College, London, with an LL.B. degree of London University. For several years, until he left England for Israel, he also lectured to a Bible Study group which he had helped found. He now lives in Rehovot.

reigned in Edom; and the name of his city was Dinhabah. And Bela died, and Jobab the son of Zerah of Bozrah reigned in his stead. And Jobab died, and Husham of the land of the Temanites reigned in his stead. And Husham died, and Hadad the son of Bedad, who smote Midian in the field of Moab, reigned in his stead; and the name of his city was Avith . . . And Baal-hanan the son of Achbor died, and Hadar reigned in his stead; and the name of his city was Pau; and his wife's name was Mehetabel the daughter of Matred, the daughter of Me-zahab.

Genesis 36:31–39

This was the section which Yitzhaki maintained was written in the time of King Jehoshaphat. Abraham Ibn Ezra, commenting on Genesis 36:31, quotes Yitzhaki as saying that Hadar here is one and the same person as Hadad the Edomite mentioned in I Kings:

And the Lord raised up an adversary unto Solomon, Hadad the Edomite; he was of the king's seed in Edom. For it came to pass, when David was in Edom, and Joab the captain of the host was gone up to bury the slain, and had smitten every male in Edom . . . that Hadad fled, he and certain Edomites of his father's servants with him, to go into Egypt; Hadad being yet a little child. And . . . they came to Egypt, unto Pharaoh king of Egypt . . . And Hadad found great favour in the sight of Pharaoh, so that he gave him to wife the sister of his own wife, the sister of Tahpenes the queen . . . And when Hadad heard in Egypt that David slept with his fathers, and that Joab the captain of the host was dead, Hadad said to Pharaoh: 'Let me depart, that I may go to mine own country'.

I Kings 11:14–21

Yitzhaki's link between these two passages is Mehetabel, the wife of Hadar, mentioned in Genesis 36:39 who, he claims, was the sister of Queen Tahpenes given in marriage by Pharaoh to Hadad, according to I Kings 11:19. To be skeptical of such an assertion is understandable, as it would seem to be taking exegesis too far. After all, how could Hadar and Hadad have been one and the same person? Perhaps the answer is to be found in I Chronicles 1:43–51, where

the list of Edomite kings is repeated exactly as in Genesis 36 save for a significant variation in the last two verses:

And Baal-hanan died, and Hadad reigned in his stead; and the name of his city was Pai; and his wife's name was Mehetabel, the daughter of Matred, the daughter of Me-zahab. And Hadad died.

I Chronicles 1:50-51

It is interesting to note that in the Hebrew text the name Hadad is written הַדָּד, and the name Hadar is written הַדָּר. In view of the similarity between the Hebrew letters ד and ר, it is quite possible that the two names are interchangeable, the names differing only as the result of an error by a scribe in copying the text of one of the versions. If so, could Yitzhaki have been correct in his contention? If such be the case, then the authorship of that part of Genesis 36 containing the list of Edomite kings must date back no earlier than the monarchy in Israel, after David's death. Ibn Ezra, whilst mentioning Yitzhaki's theory that the section was indeed an interpolation, is nevertheless quick to condemn the idea, regarding Yitzhaki's book as "fit to be burnt."

Apart from the fact that Yitzhaki's theory undermined the fundamental belief in Divine Revelation — משה קבל חורה מסיני — according to which the whole Torah was dictated by God to Moses on Mount Sinai⁸, and which was undoubtedly the reason for Ibn Ezra's disparaging remark, the historical content of the quoted sections from Genesis 36 and I Kings 11 demonstrate in themselves that both passages are recording facts which, timewise, are mutually exclusive.

There is no reason to believe that Genesis 36 is other than a potted history of the Edomites in Seir during the period prior to the Israelite Conquest of Canaan. Although there is no statement in the text as to when, or for how long, each of the Edomite kings mentioned in the chapter reigned, there are some helpful clues within the body of the narrative. The first point to note is that in no case is a king succeeded by his son. Secondly, there appears to have been no permanent capital or central place from which the king ruled over his subjects. Bela's city was Dinhabah, Husham was of the land of the Temanites, Hadad's city was Avith, Samlah was of Masrekah, Shaul was of Rehoboth by the River, and Hadar's city

8. See Lev. 26:46 and *Pirke Avoth* 1:1.

was Pau. Thirdly, it is to be observed that, notwithstanding the enumeration of “the chiefs of the sons of Esau”⁹, which precedes the list of kings, the chapter concludes by stating the names of the clan-chiefs¹⁰:

And these are the names of the chiefs that came of Esau, according to their families, after their places, by their names: the chief of Timna, the chief of Alvah, the chief of Jetheth; the chief of Oholibamah, the chief of Elah, the chief of Pinon; the chief of Kenaz, the chief of Teman, the chief of Mibzar; the chief of Magdiel, the chief of Iram. These are the chiefs of Edom, according to their habitations in the land of their possession. This is Esau the father of the Edomites.

Genesis 36:40–43

Further reference to “the chiefs of Edom” is to be found in the Song at the Read Sea¹¹, and the tribal nature of Edomite society is confirmed by two Egyptian historical texts. One of the texts is the Papyrus Anastasi VI, dating from the latter part of the 13th Century B.C.E., around the time of the Israelite Conquest of Canaan under Joshua:

We have finished letting the Bedouin tribes of Edom pass the Fortress of Mer-ne-Ptah . . . to the pools of Per Antum of Mer-ne-Ptah . . . to keep them alive and to keep their cattle alive . . .¹²

This extract represents a typical report of a frontier official of the time. The other text, Papyrus Harris I, was written by Pharaoh Ramses III (circa. 1195–1164 B.C.E.), probably towards the end of his reign, following the Israelite Conquest and coinciding with the time of the Philistine settlement of the coast:

I destroyed the people of Seir among the Bedouin tribes. I razed their tents: their people, their property, and their cattle as well, without number, pinioned and carried away in captivity, as the tribute of Egypt. I gave them to the Ennead of the gods, as slaves for their houses¹³.

It has been argued that these Egyptian texts are describing a nomadic society,

9. Gen. 36:15–19.

10. See Hertz, J.H., *The Pentateuch and Hafiorahs*, 2nd Ed., 1961, p. 134, on Gen. 36:40.

11. Ex. 15:15.

12. See Pritchard, J.B., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 2nd Ed., 1955, p. 259.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 262.

which had no monarchy¹⁴. According to this theory, the Edomite kings listed in Genesis 36 would have reigned during the period commencing some time after the Philistine settlement on the coast and ending during David's reign. If this is so, then this section of Genesis 36 must have been written after the death of David. Notwithstanding the logic of this argument, it is based on a false premise. The fact that neither of the Egyptian historical texts quoted makes any mention of a king is no justification for assuming the absence of a monarchy.

Bearing in mind that Edom was mountain land¹⁵ and that the first Edomites were primarily cattlemen¹⁶, it is likely that the Edomite people gradually developed from the family of Esau into a tribal society ruled by chieftains. With the destruction of their predecessors, the Horites, the Edomites were able to successfully establish themselves in their new land and mature into nationhood with a king to lead them. However, as the kingship did not devolve from father to son¹⁷, but was presumably by appointment, and since the site of the royal city varied with each king, it was probable that these Edomite kings were more like principal chieftains¹⁸. The chiefs of Edom mentioned in Genesis 36:40–43 were in all likelihood sub-chieftains ruling in different parts of the land over individual clans.

It was an Edomite king who refused Moses and the children of Israel passage through his land¹⁹:

And he said: 'Thou shalt not pass through.' And Edom came out against him with much people, and with a strong hand. Thus Edom refused to give Israel passage through his border; wherefore Israel turned away from him.

Numbers 20:20–21

Who was the Edomite king at that time? Unfortunately, Scripture does not say, but he could have been one of the kings listed in Genesis 36. Although it is

14. See *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 1971, Vol. 6, p. 372.

15. Gen. 36:8.

16. Gen. 36:6–7.

17. Likewise in the early stages of Israelite settlement under the Judges, there was no right of succession to that office. See Jud. 12:7–15.

18. A parallel example among the Israelites was "king" Abimelech, the son of Gideon (Jud. 9). See Orlinsky, H.M., *Understanding the Bible Through History and Archaeology*, 1967, pp. 96–98.

19. For the whole episode see Num. 20:14–21.

impossible to state when any of these kings ruled, we do know that the monarchy in Edom came to an end with David's conquest of that country:

And he put garrisons in Edom; throughout all Edom put he garrisons, and all the Edomites became servants to David . . .

II Samuel 8:14

It was not until the reign of Jehoram in Judah (846–843 B.C.E.), which commenced one hundred and nineteen years after the death of David, that Edom revolted and re-established its monarchy²⁰. During the interregnum, before the Edomite rebellion, Scripture confirms that Edom was subject to the suzerainty of the Judean king: *And there was no king in Edom: a deputy was king*²¹ (I Kings 22:48). Since Hadad in I Kings 11 was a refugee from David, he could not have been the Edomite king who re-established the monarchy so many years later, and, by the same token, he could not have been the king who refused Moses and the children of Israel passage through the land of Edom.

Despite the obvious weakness of Yitzhaki's premise, there are nevertheless some scholars who, for other reasons, still regard Genesis 36, or at least the section listing the Edomite kings, as a post-Mosaic interpolation written during the period of the monarchy in Israel²². They find apparent support for their thesis in the introductory verse of the section:

And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel.

Genesis 36:31

It need hardly be said that this verse has puzzled numerous Bible commentators over the centuries until today. If the Torah was written by Moses more than two hundred years before Saul, the first Israelite king, came to the throne in 1020 B.C.E., how was it possible to write of an event ostensibly in the past, but which had not yet occurred?

20. II Kings 8:20.

21. i.e., subject to the overriding authority of the king of Judah.

22. e.g., Segal, M.H., *The Pentateuch its composition and its authorship and other Biblical Studies*, 1967, pp. 34–35; Plaut, W.G., *The Torah – A Modern Commentary – Genesis*, 1974, pp. 349–350; *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 1971, Vol. 13, p. 233.

For Ibn Ezra the “king” over Israel referred to in Genesis 36:31 is Moses himself. He therefore understands the verse as alluding to the eight kings who reigned in Edom before Moses became leader of the children of Israel. Obadiah Ben Jacob Sforno interprets the verse in the same vein.

Although the interpretations of Ibn Ezra and Sforno appear to resolve the problem of the reference to an Israelite king in the context of a narrative said to have been written by Moses, it is hard to accept the idea of Moses as a king; trusted servant of the Lord²³, supreme prophet²⁴ — yes, but king — no. Nowhere in the Torah is Moses described as such. When Joshua was appointed as his successor, there was no mention of kingship being involved²⁵. Indeed, the law regarding the appointment of a king was specifically drafted for application only after the Israelite settlement in Canaan, and recourse thereto was dependent on the expressed will of the people:

When thou art come unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it, and shalt dwell therein; and shalt say: ‘I will set a king over me, like all the nations that are round about me’; thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose; one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee; thou mayest not put a foreigner over thee, who is not thy brother.

Deuteronomy 17:14–15

It is plainly evident from the phraseology of this law that the appointment of a king did not reflect the status quo of the Mosaic period; rather it envisaged the fulfilment of God’s promise to Jacob:

... ‘I am God Almighty. Be fruitful and multiply; a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee, and kings shall come out of thy loins; and the land which I gave unto Abraham and Isaac, to thee I will give it, and to thy seed after thee will I give the land.’

Genesis 35:11–12

The twofold promise — kingship and the land — is perhaps indicative that with the

23. Num. 12:7.

24. Deut. 34:10.

25. See Num. 27:15–23.

future settlement of the land, Israel would also have its own monarchy. If so, then the reference to a time when a king would reign over Israel is not out of place in the Torah, the purpose of which was to prescribe for the children of Israel their way of life in the Promised Land.

In so far as none of the Edomite kings mentioned in Genesis 36 succeeded to the throne through lineage, their mode of succession was in marked contrast to the future Israelite kings, who could trace their line back to Jacob in accordance with the Divine promise. With the introductory words of this section the Torah is therefore reassuring the children of Israel that, though they lacked a monarch whilst their cousins the Edomites had kings, the Almighty's promise to Jacob would nevertheless be realized in the fullness of time. As Benno Jacob has explained, the word "Before" in Genesis 36:31 does not necessarily indicate immediate fulfilment of the event²⁶. Furthermore, the time was to come when Isaac's prophecy that Esau would serve his brother²⁷ would also come to pass — but not until the reign of Israel's King David, when he subjugated the Edomite nation. It is hardly surprising therefore, that some scholars have interpreted the latter part of Genesis 36:31 as meaning, "before any Israelite king ruled over Edom"²⁸. Be that as it may, it should be noted that the Hebrew words, לפני ישראל, מלך-מלך לבני ישראל, literally translated, do not mean "before there reigned any king over the children of Israel", but rather "before the reigning of a king for the children of Israel". Chief Rabbi J.H. Hertz has pointedly commented that there is nothing in the original Hebrew words "expressive of past tense, or indicating that, before they were written, a king had reigned in Israel"²⁹.

Although the arguments supporting the Mosaic authorship of the section introduced by Genesis 36:31 are cogent, there are other verses in the chapter which reveal two apparent inconsistencies in the Biblical text. On the basis of these contrarities it has been postulated that Genesis 36 as a whole was a post-Mosaic interpolation³⁰.

26. Jacob, B., *The First Book of the Bible — Genesis*, 1974, p. 245.

27. Gen. 27:40. See also Nachmanides on Gen. 36:31.

28. See e.g., Jacob, B., *The First Book of the Bible — Genesis*, 1974, p. 244; *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 1971, Vol. 6, p. 372.

29. Hertz, J.H., *The Pentateuch and Haftorahs*, 2nd Ed., 1961, p. 133.

30. See Segal, M.H., *The Pentateuch its composition and its authorship and other Biblical Studies*, 1967, pp. 34–35.

The most problematic inconsistency relates to Esau's wives. The first mention of them is in Genesis 26:

And when Esau was forty years old, he took to wife Judith the daughter of Beeri the Hittite, and Basemath the daughter of Elon the Hittite. And they were a bitterness of spirit unto Isaac and to Rebekah.

Genesis 26:34–35

Aware of his parent's opposition to these marriages, Esau subsequently married his cousin:

... and Esau saw that the daughters of Canaan pleased not Isaac his father, so Esau went unto Ishmael, and took unto the wives that he had Mahalath the daughter of Ishmael Abraham's son, the sister of Nebaioth, to be his wife.

Genesis 28:8–9

Thus far there is no contradiction in the Biblical text, from which it is quite clear that Esau had three wives. However, Genesis 36, which records the generations of Esau, is without doubt at variance with these verses:

Esau took his wives of the daughters of Canaan; Adah the daughter of Elon the Hittite, and Oholibamah the daughter of Anah, the daughter of Zibeon the Hivite, and Basemath Ishmael's daughter, sister of Nebaioth.

Genesis 36:2–3

Were the first Basemath and Adah, both described as “the daughter of Elon the Hittite”, one and the same person? Likewise, were Mahalath and the second Basemath, both referred to as Ishmael's daughter and sister of Nebaioth, also one and the same person? Were their names changed, or did they have double names, as happened with others in the Patriarchal narratives³¹? On the assumption that these questions can be answered positively, there still remains the problem regarding the connection, if indeed there is one, between “Judith the daughter of Beeri the Hittite” and “Oholibamah the daughter of Anah the daughter of Zibeon

31. e.g., Abram, Abraham (Gen. 17:5); Sarai, Sarah (Gen. 17:15); Jacob, Israel (Gen. 32:39 and 35:10); Ben-oni, Benjamin (Gen. 35:18); Esau, Edom (Gen. 36:1); Joseph, Zaphenathpaneah (Gen. 41:45).

the Hivite". If there is no link, and we accept the explanation that Esau had four wives, why is there no mention of Judith in Genesis 36?

If we must recognize that Genesis 36:2–3 is at variance with Genesis 26:34–35 and 28:8–9, does this justify the assertion that Genesis 36 is an interpolation of post-Mosaic authorship? This very point was discussed by Umberto Cassuto, late Professor of Bible at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in his series of lectures on the Documentary Hypothesis³². He believed that there had been current among the Israelites two divergent traditions concerning the names of Esau's wives, and that the Torah accepted both versions without rejecting either; it therefore remains for the reader to decide which is correct or to reconcile them if he can.

The other inconsistency in Genesis 36 relates to Esau's residence. This is first mentioned in connection with Jacob's return from Paddan-aram, when he sought a reconciliation with his brother: *And Jacob sent messengers before him to Esau his brother unto the land of Seir, the field of Edom* (Genesis 32:4). After their meeting and reconciliation, each went his own way: *So Esau returned that day on his way unto Seir. And Jacob journeyed to Succoth . . .* (Genesis 33:16). If Esau was already in Seir before Jacob returned to Canaan, the purport of Genesis 36 is quite to the contrary:

And Esau took his wives, and his sons, and his daughters, and all the souls of his house, and his cattle, and all his beasts, and all his possessions, which he had gathered in the land of Canaan; and went into a land away from his brother Jacob. For their substance was too great for them to dwell together; and the land of their sojournings could not bear them because of their cattle. And Esau dwelt in the mountain-land of Seir — Esau is Edom.

Genesis 36:6–8

A possible explanation for these apparently contradictory narratives is to be found in the Torah's account of the destruction of the Horites, who were the original settlers in Seir³³:

32. See Cassuto, U., *The Documentary Hypothesis and the Composition of the Pentateuch*, 1961, pp. 67–68.

33. See Hertz, J.H., *The Pentateuch and Haftorahs*, 2nd Ed., 1961, p. 133, on Gen. 36:20.

And in Seir dwelt the Horites aforetime, but the children of Esau succeeded them; and they destroyed them from before them, and dwelt in their stead . . .

Deuteronomy 2:12

Rashi notes that the word “succeeded” is written in the Hebrew here, יִרְשׁוּם, which is the Imperfect tense of the verb, as if to say, “I have given them strength so that they might go on driving them out – continuously”³⁴. In other words, the dispossession of the Horites listed in Genesis 36:20–30 was not immediate, but rather a gradual process, probably involving prolonged warfare and danger. Such being the case, it is more than likely that, following the reconciliation with Jacob, Esau and his four hundred men³⁵ returned to Seir in order to continue their war to conquest. In the meanwhile, their families and possessions, including their herds of cattle, remained in the safety of Canaan, away from the fighting and hazards of war. Only later, when the circumstances described in Genesis 36:7 arose, did they finally settle in Seir. Viewed in this light, the narrative in Genesis 36 creates no contradiction.

The foregoing critique has examined closely the various arguments in favour of the interpolation theory regarding the origin of Genesis 36. By any criteria, such arguments are shown to be unconvincing, as the evidence from within Scripture demonstrates. In this respect, the Bible unquestionably speaks for itself.



34. See Rashi on Deut. 2:12.

35. See Gen. 33:1.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF BIBLICAL PRAYER

BY ETAN LEVINE

INTRODUCTION

Perhaps the most distinctive feature of the world's religions — Judaism, Christianity, Islam and others — is the phenomenon of prayer. In fact, it is almost inconceivable to consider a religion which is devoid of prayer experiences. Yet this was not always the case, for prayer is a Biblical innovation. Modern critical scholarship has blithely chosen to ignore this historical datum, yet as every student of comparative religion or of the ancient Near East knows, without exception the ancients mediated with the Divine by means of sacrifice and rite, and not by means of conversation! Whatever words may have been uttered, petitions voiced or peans recited were all addenda to the sacrificial act itself: the presentation of material goods to the gods. It is only in the Hebrew Bible that we discover the evolution of prayer: an evolution which continued in the post-Biblical period uninterruptedly, becoming a virtual art form embracing theology, ethics, poetics, linguistics, music and all of the creativity of the Jewish communal soul.

Astute historians of religion correctly point to the destruction of the First Temple in the sixth pre-Christian century, and the subsequent destruction of the Second Temple in the first Christian century as crucial events in the development of Jewish prayer. For the lack of a temple cult perforce lent impetus to the development of Jewish prayer. Sacrifice requires a legitimate temple and a legitimate cult and priesthood, whereas prayer is portable, universal and non-cultic. Thus, the transition to a prayer-mode of worship enabled Judaism to become truly universal and non-circumscribed by territorial imperatives.

Historical necessity notwithstanding, the Bible itself demonstrates that prayer as we know it was an integral part of Israelite religion even during the Temple periods. We can identify examples of popular and aristocratic prayer, individual

Professor Etan Levine is Chairman of the Department of Biblical Studies at the University of Haifa. Previously he taught at Yale University and Fairfield University, in the U.S.A. He has written ten books and approximately fifty articles on the Bible Versions and on Exegesis, concentrating on Semitic Philosophy.

and collective prayer, petitionary and triumphal prayer, virtually the entire gamut of worship. Not only did Daniel in Babylon pray privately thrice-daily (Dan. ch. 6), but Moses movingly and informally pleaded to God for his sister's recovery from disease: *O God, I pray thee, heal her* (Num. 12:13). The barren Hannah prays to be blessed with a child: *Only her lips moved, but her voice was not heard* (I Sam. 1: 13). There is no need to recount the more familiar examples of Biblical prayer, from Abraham pleading on behalf of the innocent of Sodom and Gomorrah through Moses begging God's pardon of Israel for the Golden Calf heresy, to Elijah praying for victory against the worshippers of Baal. As even the most casual reading of the Bible indicates, ancient Israel was a prayer-conscious community, and prayer was an essential feature of Israelite religion. And this is without parallel in the ancient world.

The purpose of this brief study is to trace the development of the prayer tradition. For from its early, spontaneous beginnings in the Biblical period, Jewish prayer constantly developed into a rich, conceptual, structured framework. The major aspects of this tradition may be catalogued and identified.

THE RECEPTIVITY OF GOD

The psalmist declared: *Every day will I bless Thee* (Ps. 145:2), and Jewish tradition affirmed that prayer is always appropriate, for "the gates of Prayer are never closed"¹. The receptivity of God is couched by the Talmud in almost anthropomorphic terms: "God longs for the prayer of the righteous"². In addition to implying that prayer is not a substitute for but a corollary of righteousness, this dictum of the Talmud describes God as yearning for spiritual contact with Man. As attributed to Josephus, "Prayer is conversation with God"³. And as Judah Halevi later explained in his *Kuzari* (Ch. V,22): "With a pure mind and a pure will, you can approach God anywhere". In truth, it could have been any Jew in any land during any century of whom the Bible spoke when it told of Daniel, i.e. that *he went into his house, his windows being open in his upper chamber toward*

1. Deuteronomy Rabbah 2:12; cf. TJ Makkot 2:6. For a popular survey see Bernard M. Casper, *Talks on Jewish Prayer*, Jerusalem 1958.

2. Talmud, *Yebamot* 64A.

3. Book of *Josippon*, Ch. 1.

Jerusalem, and he knelt upon his knees three times a day, and he prayed, and he praised God, as he had always done (Dan. 6:11).

PREPARATION FOR PRAYER

Post-Biblical Jewish texts relate to the emotional-intellectual preparedness of the worshipper. This reflects the Biblical context, in which prayer is never entered into with a state of existential neutrality or apathetic mechanism. As couched in Rabbinic terminology: "A man must purify his heart before he prays"⁴. And we know from 1st century literature that it was customary among those who took prayer seriously to prepare themselves spiritually, for "the early zealots would tarry an hour before praying, in order to attune their hearts to God"⁵. Thus would they avoid rote recitation, for, as the Mishnah puts it: "Do not let your prayer become perfunctory!" (*Abot* II,13). One sees here the interesting development of a concern for the personal, existential condition of the worshipper, rather than a formalistic analog to ancient cultism.

THE MYSTICAL REALM

The post-Biblical emphasis upon the state of the worshipper reflects the mystical dimension of awe which was deemed necessary to create the requisite atmosphere for prayer. For according to the Talmudic definition of the experience: "Prayer is the service of the heart"⁶. Whereas early Biblical worship involved the sacrifice of property, later Biblical and post-Biblical worship required the presentation of self.

In practical terms, therefore, what this means is that rote recitation is, by definition, valueless. Or, in rabbinic language: "Prayer is acceptable only if the soul is offered with it"⁷. Thus, the Talmud adjures: "When you pray, you may abbreviate (*Berakot* 3a)", and "When you address the Holy One, let your words be few (*idem*, 61a)". Again: "The prayer of the righteous is short (*Mekilta*, Ex.

4. *Exodus Rabbah* XXII,3.

5. Mishnah, *Berakot* V,1; cf. Etan Levine, *Un Judío Lee el Nuevo Testamento*, Madrid 1980.

6. Talmud, *Ta'anit* 2A.

7. Talmud, *Ta'anit* 8A.

15:25)” because “Rather a short prayer recited with slowness and devotion, than a long prayer recited hurriedly and without devotion”⁸.

During prayer, the most difficult achievement of the worshipper is not the technical dimension of ‘performance’, but the attainment of ‘concentration’, or in its Hebrew terminus technicus, ‘*Kawanah*’ – כוונה. This is a focus of attention upon the mystical experience and the presence of the divine. Consequently, the Talmud contains an adjuration which was recognized as so patently essential that for almost twenty centuries synagogues the world over posted it in front of worshippers. The statement is as terse as it is powerful: “Know before Whom you are standing!”⁹

COMMUNITY IN JEWISH PRAYER

In addition to the experience of individuality, prayer functioned as an experience of commonality. The prayer-quorum (Heb: *minyan*) institutionalized the communal dimension of prayer, as did the linguistic feature of the prayers themselves being generally couched in the plural form. Not only was the local community invoked and evoked through the prayer experience; the entire Jewish people, in its past, present and future, was involved. Thus, for example, the Talmud advises that the heart of the individual Jew be directed toward Jerusalem, so that there may be created a sort of reinforced bond of spirituality which would be collectively addressed to God. “A worshipper should turn his soul toward . . . the Holy of Holies. Thus will all Jews turn their hearts to one place”¹⁰.

The communal, or collective aspect of Jewish worship in antiquity is immediately apparent when examining the Prayer Book itself.¹¹ By far the major portion of petitionary prayers involve collective, not personal well-being. Concepts such as Redemption, Salvation and Atonement almost invariably refer to the House of Israel. The ethnicity in Jewish prayer reflects the classical Biblical

8. *Sefer Hassidim*; cf. Abraham Joshua Heschel, *God in Search of Man*, New York 1958, 17 *et seq.*

9. Talmud, *Berakot* 28B, cited in the name of Eliezer ben Hyrcanus.

10. Talmud, *Berakot* 30A.

11. E.g., both the Daily *Siddur* and the Sabbath *Siddur*, as well as the *Mahzor* for the Festivals and the High Holy Days.

motif: Israel in all its parts is ultimately one entity, and its destiny is a shared destiny forever.

CLASSICAL PRAYER AND CLASSICAL THEOLOGY

Classical Jewish prayer reflects classical Jewish theology. The Jew believed the Biblical doctrine that *Your deeds shall be rewarded*,¹² and agreed with the Psalmist: *You render to every man according to his deeds*.¹³ Therefore, despite the apparent immunity of despotic regimes, the Jew sensed that *nations sink into the pits they make*.¹⁴ In the moral economy of the universe: “Your employer is trustworthy; he will pay your wage.”¹⁵ Or, as the adage states: “God waits long, but he pays with interest!”¹⁶

The certainty of Divine Justice pervaded Jewishness. The Jew affirmed with Maimonides’ Code, “I believe with complete faith that the Creator . . . rewards those who keep His commandments and punishes those who transgress them.”¹⁷

THE CHOSEN PEOPLE

Jewish prayer, like Jewish thought, and like Jewish peoplehood itself would make absolutely no sense without the concept of Chosenness. For if the Jewish People had no Divine mandate, if it was not endowed with a legitimacy, function, mission and historic warrant, then its existence was an act of self-delusion! However, noblesse oblige: *Only you have I known* (i.e. ‘chosen’) *of all the families of the earth, therefore will I punish you for all of your iniquities* (Amos 3:2).

The status of Chosen People is asserted in the worship phrase: “Thou hast chosen us from all peoples” — *אתה בחרתנו מכל העמים*. And this continues the tradition of ethical monotheism as found in the Bible. As the prophet puts it in his adjuration: *You are my witnesses, says the Lord, and My servant whom I have chosen so that you may know and believe in Me* (Is. 43:10). And against the backdrop of all mankind: *I the Lord have called you in righteousness, and have*

12. II Chr. 15:7.

13. Psalm 62:13.

14. Psalm 9:16.

15. Mishnah, *Abot* II,16.

16. Proverb q. *Jewish Encyclopedia* X, 228b.

17. Maimonides, “Thirteen Articles of Faith,” #11.

taken hold of your hand, and kept you, and have set you for a covenant of the peoples, for a light to the nations (Is. 42:6).

The Jew affirmed this status in his prayer. He was a witness that God was underwriting human history and that the Jewish People was God's stake in human destiny.

THE WORLD-TO-COME

Although the concept of an after-life was never officially codified or dogmatized, it did pervade Jewish thought and Jewish prayer from earliest times. Thus, for example, some Talmudic rabbis felt that "the reward for Torah is only in the World-to-Come."¹⁸ Others were less sure, as, for example, Rabbi Nathan, who stated: "There is not a single precept in the Torah, however light it may be, for which there is not some reward in this world; but as to reward in the World-to-Come, I do not know."¹⁹

Some ancient sages stressed the idea of virtue being its own reward, without entering into the entire problem of reward and punishment in the afterlife. Thus, the 2nd century sage Ben Azzai wrote: "The recompense of virtue is virtue, and of sin is sin."²⁰

SUMMATION

Jewish prayer has always been a distinctive feature of Jewish culture. Although the format, content, metaphor and context evolved, the centrality of prayer in Jewish experience and expression remained constant.

Since Jewish prayer involved the entire community, it was perforce 'popular' and not 'esoteric'. A charming simplicity pervades it, throughout the centuries. As the storms swept over them, the Jews trusted that ultimately they would be delivered into a safer harbor, and that *they who sow the wind shall reap the whirlwind*.²¹ Prayer granted the Jew a sense of living in God's companionship; it

18. Talmud, *Qiddushin* 39B.

19. Talmud, *Menahot* 44A.

20. Mishnah, *Abot* IV,2.

21. Hosea 8:7.

provided sacred moments and days of awe. It recalled the meaning and purpose of Jewish existence and it reaffirmed the Biblical belief in the Divine image within man. Classical Jewish prayer equipped the Jew for a two-thousand year trek through time, for whatever else he lacked and however cruel the Diaspora might be, Jewish prayer provided the Jew with a sense of dialogue. He was on speaking terms with his God.

Modern rabbis have stated that the purpose of prayer is to leave us alone with God. Further, that true worship is not a petition to God; it is a sermon to ourselves. Much more could be added. The purpose of this brief survey was to prevent a mere overview, a passing glance at a People which prayed together and which stayed together.

LISTING OF BIBLE STORY GROUPS (continued from p. 217)

VIRGINIA

Keneseth Beth Israel
6300 Patterson Ave.
Richmond, 23226
Rabbi Edward Davis

Temple Har Zion
7360 Bayview Ave.
Thornhill, Ont. 13T 2R7
Rabbi Michael S. Stroh

COUNTRIES OUTSIDE THE U.S.A.

AUSTRALIA

University of Sydney
Dept. of Semitic Studies
NSW 2006

Dr. Alan D. Crown

Cong Beth Ora

2600 Badeaux

St. Laurent (Montreal) Quebec H4M 1M5

Rabbi Jerome B. Wolicki

ENGLAND

North Western Reform Synagogue
Alyth Gardens, London NW11 7En

Rabbi M.R. Heilbron (4 groups)

Rabbi Marmur, Rabbi Dr. Magonet

CANADA

T'nach Study Group
Toronto Jewish Congress
150 Beverley St. Toronto, Ont.

Different scholars

Dr. I. Cass, Chairman

FRANCE

Chevra

Residence St. Côme BATC

Salon-De-Provence, 13300

Mr. Gaby Chouraqui, Leader

SCHILLER ON MOSES

BY SOL LIPTZIN

For more than a century Friedrich Schiller was widely read and enthusiastically acclaimed by Jewish youth under the spell of the Enlightenment. He was, in their eyes, the supreme poet and dramatist, preaching individual freedom and national emancipation. His hymn to joy, which Beethoven incorporated into the Ninth Symphony, stirred Jewish hearts with its call for universal brotherhood embracing all children of the one God. His revolutionary dramas, from the earliest *Die Räuber* (1781) to his more mature *Wilhelm Tell* (1804), inflamed denizens of the Pale to dream of Jewish national regeneration. His influence permeated the neo-Hebrew literature of the *Maskilim* and the Yiddish literature that appealed to the less learned masses. Yet, few, if indeed any, of his Jewish readers and admirers were aware of his personal antipathy toward Jews or familiar with his prose essays dealing with the role of the Jews in world history.

When Schiller was born in 1759, the atmosphere in his native Duchy of Württemberg was still poisoned with hatred of Jews. Two decades had passed since the Württemberg financier, Jud Süß, had been hanged and his body publicly exhibited in an iron cage in order to appease the anger of the masses who blamed their ills on this Court Jew rather than on their Duke. But the memory of purported misdeeds of the hated Jew lingered on as the oppression of commoners continued unrelieved. Schiller is said to have modelled the Kosinsky episode in *Die Räuber* upon a particularly nefarious deed attributed to Jud Süß and to have conceived the robbers, Spiegelberg and Schusterle, as villainous Jews. The latter claim, however, is based on insufficient evidence.

It is unlikely that Schiller had any association with Jews during his formative years in his native townlet of Marbach or in the military academy at which he studied. The first recorded contacts were at the end of his twenties, with a Jewish moneylender in Leipzig, and, in his thirties, with a Jewish publisher. These were

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

purely business encounters and not happy ones. During his maturer Weimar years, he did meet a few Jews but never developed a significant relationship with them. Hence, his indifference toward the contemporary Jewish scene was undisturbed and his childhood prejudices remained unchallenged.

Schiller was not only poet and dramatist; he was also philosopher and historian. As philosopher, his most lasting contribution was to aesthetic theory; as historian, his most notable contributions were his studies on the Thirty Years' War and on the revolt of the Dutch against the Spanish Crown. But Schiller also made use of Biblical material for historical studies. In his lectures, published in 1790, under the long title, *Etwas über die erste Menschengesellschaft nach dem Leitfaden der Mosaischen Urkunde*, he let his fertile imagination fill in gaps in the Biblical narrative and his dramatic talent vivify myths about Biblical characters. His portrait of Moses anticipated the insights and aberrations of Sigmund Freud's work, *Moses and Monotheism* (1937–1939), and may, indeed, have influenced the father of psychoanalysis. This study, contained in *Die Sendung Moses*, 1790, illumines Schiller's attitude toward historical Judaism, for it was the historical role of the ancient people from whom Christianity sprang that interested him far more than did Jewish contemporaries with whom he had little to do and for whom he had even less sympathy.

Die Sendung Moses, originally delivered as a lecture at the University of Jena, emphasized the founding of the Jewish religious and national entity by Moses as one of the supreme achievements of mankind, one which had a lasting influence throughout the following generations. Schiller held that neither Christianity nor Islam would have come into existence if not for the innovations of Moses, primarily his popularization of monotheism. While the belief in one God had penetrated into the minds of individual wise men among the heathens, it had not seeped down to the masses who continued everywhere to worship a multiplicity of gods. It was Moses who, by the power of his charismatic personality, persuaded an entire people, the Hebrews, to be the first nation to accept monotheism. In Schiller's opinion, the Hebrews were not especially worthy to play such a role in world history. He regarded them as a depraved national group, both in ancient times and in his own days. Yet, so strange are the ways of God: this impure vessel contained precious ingredients of truth, which it dispensed to others before it was deservedly scattered and dispersed. Schiller believed that he

was being even-handed in his historical judgment when he stated that, though it would be an exaggeration to ascribe to the Hebrew people a significance which it did not deserve, it would be equally wrong to deny it its one meritorious achievement, the acceptance of the religious doctrines preached by Moses.

Schiller accepted the Biblical account that the nomadic family of Hebrews, numbering seventy souls, had come to Egypt upon the invitation of a Pharaoh and had settled in Goshen and that, in the course of four centuries, these nomads experienced a population explosion which aroused the apprehension of a later Pharaoh, who felt that these strangers in the heart of the country could constitute a danger to the realm. Schiller saw political wisdom in this ruler's attempt to make of these unreliable and unassimilable nomads a productive, sedentary group, and to reduce their numbers by ever-harsher measures of compulsory toil. The Hebrews, who had increased to about two million, were pent up in such crowded conditions in Goshen that the inevitable result was uncleanness and recurrent epidemics of contagious diseases which made them abhorrent to their Egyptian neighbors. Filthiness and scabbiness, according to Schiller, have ever thereafter characterized Jewish settlements. Leprosy, which raged among the ancient Hebrews in Egypt, was handed down by them to their progeny, generation after generation, slowly poisoning the Jewish race. Schiller named as his authoritative sources Greek and Roman writers who based themselves, to a great extent, on the no longer extant anti-Jewish diatribes of the Egyptian historian, Maneto, of the third century B.C.E.

When harsh servitude and leprosy, the Jewish disease, failed to decimate the Hebrew population, a second and severer measure, which Schiller disapproves of as inhumane, was introduced by Pharaoh. All midwives were ordered to kill the male children born to Hebrews. To make sure that they did so, hired murderers roamed through the dwellings of Goshen and killed any baby boys spared by the midwives. It was hoped that, within a few generations, the abhorred Hebrew group would be exterminated. This would, indeed, have happened, if not for Moses, the savior.

In interpreting the role of Moses, Schiller faced the same problem as did the Biblical chronicler — this savior's origin. If Moses was a child of the debased and enslaved Hebrews, where and how did he acquire his knowledge of Egyptian courtly ways so that he could negotiate with Pharaoh, or of religious mysteries so

that he could arrive at his monotheistic creed? If, on the other hand, he was an Egyptian, why should he be interested in the loathed and disease-ridden Hebrews, whom the humanitarian Schiller characterizes as the most savage, most malevolent and most depraved people on the face of the earth, an unheroic people of almost animal-like stupidity?

The providential force that guides the universe found the answer: it took a Hebrew infant, removed it from its savage people, and gave it an opportunity to partake of Egyptian wisdom. In this way, a Hebrew, educated as an Egyptian, became the instrument by which his nation was delivered from slavery. Schiller followed the Biblical description of the exposure of Moses among the bulrushes of the Nile, his discovery by Pharaoh's daughter, and his being handed over to a Hebrew wetnurse. From her, his true Hebrew mother, he learned the language and ways of the enslaved group and was imbued with sympathy for them. When the boy was returned to the princess, she adopted him as her own child, gave him the Egyptian name of Moses, and provided him with a princely upbringing. At priestly academies, he was introduced to the most advanced learning and to the mysteries of the religious establishment. This wisdom later found expression in his deeds and doctrines.

It was among the Egyptian priests that the concept of monotheism first arose. The original, fortunate discoverer of this sublime idea did not dare to give it wide currency because it would have undermined the theocratic, political structure that was based on polytheism. But he did seek out among the members of his circle talented, trusted disciples to whom he could safely transmit his precious, new insight about the one God. This insight, bequeathed for many generations from one thinker to another, finally became the mysterious property of a small coterie of priests who were able to grasp its significance and to develop it further. Moses belonged to that select group from whom no priestly secrets were withheld. The wisdom of the Torah is, therefore, Egyptian wisdom.

A century before the hieroglyphic inscriptions on Akhnaton's religious reformation were deciphered and a century and a half before Sigmund Freud's theory of an Egyptian Moses, Schiller credited the votaries of the mysteries of Memphis and of Heliopolis with the religious innovations embodied in the Torah, such as monotheism, specific priestly rituals, circumcision, belief in immortality, the ark of God, and even the name of the one supreme deity. These doctrines and

practices supposedly impressed Moses during his formative years under priestly tutelage but, like his teachers, he had to be very circumspect in espousing them. When he was forced to flee Egypt because of his impulsive killing of an Egyptian taskmaster who was mistreating a Hebrew laborer, he found the leisure in his desert-loneliness to reflect on his people's oppressed lot and on the religious mysteries to which he had been introduced. During the following years, when he was degraded to a drear existence as a herdsman in Midian, he often recalled that he had been a prince in Egypt and an initiate into profound mysteries.

Amidst the silence and solitude of his exile in the wilderness, there arose in him the desire to return to Egypt and to liberate his suffering kinsmen from their slavish existence. But, first, he had to awaken in them hope, courage, self-confidence, and enthusiasm. This could be accomplished only by imbuing them with belief in a supernatural, heavenly power that was especially interested in them. If he could only convince them that he, Moses, shepherd and prince, was the instrument and emissary of this divine power, then he could lead them out of bondage and on to freedom. Obviously, the rabble of Hebrew slaves, the scum of Egypt, was incapable of comprehending the universal, abstract deity that he himself had come to accept when he had been initiated into the mysteries that were revealed to but a few priestly sages. But even if he could get the Hebrews to grasp his grandiose vision, they would not believe that an all-encompassing deity would be interested in them more than in any other people. However, if he could identify his philosophical, invisible God with the national God of their ancestors and if he could convince them that this God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob had at long last attained to supremacy and had succeeded in annihilating all other gods, thus becoming the sole and omnipotent Ruler of the Universe, then they would become followers of this Lord of Hosts who could perform great deeds for them and could lead them on to victory against their oppressors. And, so, Moses undertook his educational mission to eradicate the superstitions that had encrusted the national God of the Hebrew slaves and to elevate this God to supreme eminence in their eyes.

To succeed in the great task which he had set for himself, Moses had to perform miracles. Schiller, the deist of the Century of Enlightenment, makes the comment: "There is no doubt that he really performed these miracles but I leave it to each person to figure out how he performed them and how they are to

be understood.” At any rate, Schiller feels that the miracles achieved their purpose. Moses did succeed in overcoming all difficulties and in leading his kinsmen out of Egypt. He did implant in them self-reliance, courage, hope and enthusiasm. Having deprived them of a country, however, he could not leave them in the desert. He had to gain for them a new homeland. This meant that he had to prepare them for the armed conquest of a territory beyond the wilderness of Sinai, a conquest that could be undertaken only by a united people that would not disintegrate into separate tribes but that would be governed by a common will, best embodied in a constitution and a code of laws that would be unanimously accepted. Such unanimous approval was possible only if all the ordinances were presented as commandments emanating from God. Therefore, Moses, the brilliant statesman, grounded them in divine sanction. He took the God of the Egyptian mysteries and unveiled his secret attributes before the Hebrews. Moses was, thus, the first person to disclose to an entire people the religious truths, including the concept of a single Supreme Being, which until then had been the property of a few wise men. He could not, of course, give the Hebrews the intelligence to grasp the new religion with their reason, since their rational faculties had not yet been sufficiently developed, but he did get them to accept this religion blindly because of their faith in his leadership and to make it the basis for the Hebraic theocratic state. And so it came about that the unworthy Hebrews became the impure vessel for the pure truth of monotheism and the Hebrew Torah the religious scroll that embodied the best of Egyptian religious wisdom.

In his 1790 essay on Moses, Schiller did not go as far as did Sigmund Freud a century and a half later, when he stripped this Prophet and Lawgiver entirely of Jewish ancestry by having him born of Egyptian parents and not merely having him reared by an Egyptian princess. Schiller did, however, anticipate Freud by tracing to Egyptian mysteries the monotheism and some of the religious commandments of the Torah bequeathed by Moses to the Jews and, through them, to Christianity and Islam. Today, of course, neither Schiller’s nor Freud’s interpretations of Moses are any longer taken seriously. □

MILITARY INTELLIGENCE IN THE BIBLE

BY REUBEN EFRON

Part III*

DISGUISE AND COVER IN INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

Proper disguise is essential for any agent sent on a secret mission in hostile territory to obtain intelligence information about the adversary, or to negotiate clandestinely with him.

A distinction is made in intelligence parlance between disguise and cover. The term disguise is used when an agent is sent into hostile environment on a one-time mission for a short period. Cover denotes a long-term stay of an intelligence agent in unfriendly surroundings, posing as a bona fide resident, living under an assumed identity and engaged in a legitimate occupation. In both cases the disguise or cover must look natural for the person or persons using it and must be above suspicion.

A comparatively recent example of the use of a successful disguise in Israel's international relations are the clandestine meetings which the late Golda Meir had with Transjordanian King Abdullah ibn Hussein, prior and after the establishment of Israel. She was disguised as an Arab woman and thus crossed the border, never arousing suspicion. An example of a skillful use of a cover for an extended period was the Soviet resident spy in the United States, Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, KGB colonel, who operated for a number of years undetected, using various aliases, as owner of an artist and photo studio in Brooklyn. Both terms, disguise and cover, however, are used intermittently.

A clever, intricate disguise operation, with some negative aspects for its

* See *Dor le Dor*, vol. V No. 4, Summer 1977, pp. 183-191 and vol. VI No. 4, Summer 1978, pp. 191-7.

Dr. Reuben Efron is a graduate of the Law Faculty of the University of Lithuania; holds an LL.B. from Atlanta Law School, Atlanta, Ga., a Master's in Comparative Law from George Washington University, Washington, D.C. and a Ph.D. from the University of Vienna, Austria. He is a member of the Georgia, District of Columbia and Israel Bars, and a Lieutenant Colonel in the USA Army, Reserve, now retired.

perpetrators, took place during Israel's conquest of the Promised Land, as related in the Book of Joshua, Chapter 9.

GIBEONITES FEAR ANNIHILATION BY ISRAELITES

The ancient city of Gibeon was located about six miles northwest of Jerusalem. It was apparently the capital of four cities inhabited by a people called Hivites, one of the seven tribes occupying the Promised Land. These cities were strategically located and controlled the access to Jerusalem and the roads to the Judean mountains.

The Gibeonites, like the other tribes and kingdoms confronting the advancing Israelites, were aware of the spectacular victories achieved by Joshua and his forces, of the conquest of the Amorites and the capture and destruction of the cities of Jericho and Ai. They knew that they were in the immediate path of the advancing Israelites and were likely to suffer the same fate of annihilation. But unlike other people of Canaan who, facing the Israelites, united to fight Joshua and his forces, the Gibeonites decided on a scheme of deception. They used an ingenious disguise in order to save themselves and to trick the Israelites into making peace with them. This is recounted in the Bible as follows:

And it came to pass, when all the kings that were beyond the Jordan . . . heard thereof . . . that they gathered themselves together to fight with Joshua and with Israel, with one accord. But when the inhabitants of Gibeon heard what Joshua had done unto Jericho and to Ai, they also did work wilily . . .

Joshua 9:1-4

GIBEONITES AWARE OF DIVINE PROMISE OF CANAAN TO ISRAEL

As the Gibeonites subsequently told Joshua (9:24), they were aware of the Divine promise of the lands of Canaan to Israel, and the command to destroy their inhabitants:

When the Lord thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and shall cast out many nations before thee, . . . greater and mightier than thou; . . . and thou shalt smite them; then thou shalt utterly

destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them; . . .

Deuteronomy 7:1–2

But the Gibeonites were evidently also cognizant of a second Divine Command pertaining to warfare and enemy lands in general:

When thou drawest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. And it shall be, if it make thee answer of peace, and open unto thee, then it shall be, that all the people that are found therein shall become tributary unto thee, and shall serve thee . . . Thus shalt thou do unto all the cities which are very far off from thee . . .

Deuteronomy 20:10–18**

Thus, it follows from the text of the two commands that a distinction was made between the lands of Israel's inheritance — the Promised Land — and far away cities and lands. Peace should be first offered to the latter, and if accepted, no one is to be harmed, and they become tributaries to Israel.

On the basis of the injunctions cited above, the Gibeonites decided to send a mission to Joshua, posing as representatives of a distant land, thus enabling them to seek a peace covenant with the Israelites.

GIBEONITES EMPLOY DISGUISE TO MISLEAD AND DECEIVE ISRAELITES

The Gibeonites were not ruled by a king, as the other city-states in Canaan, but by a council of elders. It appointed a delegation to appear before Joshua, ingeniously disguised as weary travelers who had been on the road a very long time. To make it credible, the delegation dressed in old, dilapidated garments and battered footwear, and carried decaying food. The disguise operation is described in the Bible in great detail and very vividly:

** The Bible emphasizes repeatedly that first there must be an offer of peace to an hostile people or country and that war is to be regarded as the last resort.

Moreover, according to the Jerusalem Talmud, Joshua, before entering the promised Land, sent a three-point message to the people therein, i.e.: they can leave the country, make peace or go to battle with the Israelites. (Talmud Yerushalmi, Mesichta Shvuot). Only the Gergashites left. The Gibeonites made peace, albeit by deception, and the rest fought the Israelites, were defeated and destroyed.

... the inhabitants of Gibeon ... went and made as if they had been ambassadors, and took old sacks upon their asses, and wine-skins, worn and rent and patched-up; and worn shoes and clouted upon their feet, and worn garments upon them; and all the bread of their provision was dry and was become crumbs. And they went to Joshua unto the camp at Gilgal, and said unto him and to the men of Israel: 'We are come from a far country; now therefore make ye a covenant with us.'

Joshua 9:3-6

The elders of Israel at first were distrustful of the strangers and questioned them: *... Peradventure ye dwell among us; and how shall we make a covenant with you?* Thus, they suspected them to be Canaanites with whom no covenant could be made. The visitors then addressed themselves directly to Joshua, the Commander-in-Chief, with a subservient, ingratiating statement: *We are thy servants*, meaning that they were seeking to become a Protectorate of Israel.

GIBEONITES PRESENT COVER STORY

Joshua was not impressed with the above statement and demanded that the strangers establish their bona-fide proof, their true identity. He asked them: *Who are ye and from whence come ye?* The Gibeonites then presented to Joshua their well-prepared cover story:

And they said unto him: 'From a very far country thy servants are come because of the name of the Lord thy God; for we have heard the fame of Him and all that He did in Egypt ... to the two kings of the Amorites ... And our elders and all the inhabitants of our country spoke to us, saying: Take provision in your hand for the journey, and go to meet them, and say unto them: We are your servants; and now make ye a covenant with us.'

Joshua 9:9-12

To strengthen the veracity of their disguise, the delegates exhibited their stale food and their worn-out garments and equipment which were due to their alleged long journey. For further proof they let the Israelites taste their dried-out, smelly provisions. Their story and presented proof sounded quite plausible and hence were accepted by Joshua without further investigation:

And Joshua made peace with them, and made a covenant with them, to let them live; and the princes of the congregation swore unto them.

Joshua 9:15

Thus, Joshua, as Commander-in-Chief, made an agreement with the Gibeonites allowing them to remain in their present localities without, evidently, defining their status. The elders of Israel then ratified the covenant by their solemn oath in the name of the entire community.

DISCOVERY OF DECEPTION

The distance from Joshua's headquarters at Gilgal to Gibeon by a straight line was about 20 miles. But the Israelite forces advanced leisurely, and not until the third day did they arrive in the vicinity of Gibeon and the other cities of the Hivites. And then, they realized that the Gibeonites had deceived them and that their abodes were within the confines of the Promised Land. This sequence is described as follows:

And it came to pass at the end of three days after they had made a covenant with them, that they heard that they were their neighbors, and that they dwelt among them. And the children of Israel journeyed, and came unto their cities on the third day . . .

Joshua 9:16-17

The rank and file of the Israelites were indignant about the perfidy of the Gibeonites and complained about the hasty decision of their elders. But the latter were steadfast in their determination to adhere to the covenant and their oath.

And all the congregation murmured against the princes. But all the princes said unto all the congregation: 'We have sworn unto them by the Lord, the God of Israel; now therefore we may not touch them . . . let them live; lest the wrath be upon us, because of the oath which we swore unto them.'

Joshua 9:18-20

It should be noted that in ancient as well as in recent times the people of Israel adhered to their promises and covenants with their neighbors.

PUNISHING THE GIBEONITES

Joshua and the elders were faced with the problem: What should be the fate and status of the Gibeonites, and how to punish them for their deception. It was finally decided that the Gibeonites should remain in their present places of abode but they and their offsprings should be assigned to permanent servitude, as “hewers of wood and drawers of water”, albeit not for individual Israelites, but for the congregation as a whole. They were to serve at the Tabernacle, and in a later period, transferred to such service at the Temple.

Joshua first berated the Gibeonites for their deceit; then spelled out the decision.

And Joshua called for them, and spoke unto them, saying: 'Wherefore have ye beguiled us, saying: We are very far from you, when ye dwell among us? Now therefore ye are cursed, and there shall never fail to be of you bondmen, both hewers of wood and drawers of water for the house of my God'.

Joshua 9:22–23

The Gibeonites appeared to be quite satisfied with this decision, as they expected a much harsher fate. They explained to Joshua the reason for their disguise and placed their fate in his hands.

And they answered Joshua and said: 'Because it was certainly told thy servants, how the Lord thy God commanded His servant Moses to give you all the land, and to destroy all the inhabitants of the land . . . therefore we were sore afraid for our lives . . . and have done this thing. And now, behold, we are in thy hand.

Joshua 9:24–25

The covenant with the Gibeonites was kept throughout ancient Israel's independence. In time they apparently became completely integrated within the Israelite people.

Thus ended the scheme of the Gibeonites which had all the essentials of a present-day disguise operation of a military or civil nature. □

WHY DID JOSEPH LET HIS FATHER MOURN FOR HIM?

BY NORMAN ASHER

There are three Sidrot devoted to the story of Joseph and Jacob. The story begins when Joseph was seventeen years old. He was not very mature and certainly not a diplomat. He aroused the jealousy and enmity of his brothers. He must have had great qualities of leadership which his father recognized. Unfortunately Jacob showed his preference for Joseph vis-a-vis his brothers, and openly gave him some indicia of preference, namely, a "coat of many colors." Some of the commentators say that this actually was a badge of rank.

The brothers plotted to kill him, and when the opportunity offered itself, they stripped him of his clothes and threw him into a pit in the wilderness. Somewhat later they sold him to the caravans that were passing through on their way to Egypt. Eventually he was taken to Egypt to be sold into bondage.

Then what happens? The brothers have to go home and face their father, Jacob, but they are not willing to tell him what took place. Instead, they take the coat of many colors, slaughter a goat, dip the coat in the blood, present it to Jacob and say: *Here is what we found. Is it your son's coat?* Jacob burst into tears and said: *A wild beast has devoured my son* (Genesis 37:29-36).

We now follow the story of Joseph in Egypt. A young man of seventeen, he is a bondsman to Potiphar, one of the cabinet of Pharaoh. Now he must have had great talent because he soon becomes a Major Domo of Potiphar's house and he is running the household (Genesis 39-41).

At this point the intrigue starts. Why didn't he, Joseph, a dutiful son, communicate with his father Jacob in Canaan and tell him that he was still alive? Why should he have kept silent for twenty two years, never informing his father, nor communicating with him?

Norman Asher, a lawyer in the State of Illinois, is Vice Chairman of Trustees of Spertus College of Judaica, Chicago. He studied at Hebrew Theological College, Chicago. For many years he taught Bible at Bernard Horwich Jewish Community Center and Anshe Emet Synagogue. For the past 30 years he has directed a seminar in Talmud as well.

This is our main question. It is curious to note that in rabbinical literature Joseph is referred to as יוסף הצדיק, “the righteous Joseph.” Is that righteousness? Is that the way to honor your father by not letting him know that you are still alive and to let him mourn and grieve for twenty two years?

Now of course, the rabbis called him Joseph the righteous, because he did not want to commit adultery with Potiphar’s wife, but that is only one element of his character. When they label him “the righteous,” they mean to encompass his entire behavior. However, in his relationship to his father Jacob, his actions do not appear to have been righteous.

In the final scene where the brothers return to Canaan under instructions of the Pharaoh and Joseph to tell their father, Jacob, that Joseph is alive, they do not tell him anything more.

Genesis relates that when they arrived and gave the story to their father, he expressed disbelief. In fact the text states that he fainted. He must have thought it a real sorry joke, that is, until he saw the gifts sent by Joseph which were carried in *wagons* to father Jacob. When Jacob saw these *wagons* — עגלות, then only did he believe that Joseph was still alive. And he said: *Now I will go to see my son Joseph. Now I am willing to go to Egypt* (Genesis 24:28).

Strange, isn’t it? What did he see in the wagons? What could that mean? How was he impressed by the wagons that Joseph was still alive and that the brothers were now telling him the truth?

The Midrash Rabbah has another reference to the word עגלה. It ties it in with the dedication of the Mishkan, the Tabernacle, when the princes of the tribes of Israel brought their offerings in *wagons* — עגלות (Numbers 7:3).*

In the Book of Numbers, the Torah indicates that the princes gave gifts. The twelve princes gave six wagons to the Tabernacle, which were used to load the various utensils, curtains and staves of the Tabernacle.

The Midrash adds that this was a beautiful gesture. This showed unity; each two princes acted together to give one wagon. Therefore, the Midrash states, this is what Jacob saw when he beheld the wagons of Joseph. He foresaw a time when there would be unity in Israel among the tribes. Likewise, Jacob now saw that there was friendship among the brothers, that they had made peace with Joseph

* Quoted by Menachem B. Sacks, in his volume *Menachem Zion*

and Joseph had made peace with them. And thus now he could go to visit his newly found son.

However, there is no discussion of why Joseph had not communicated earlier with his father. There is another Midrash quoted by Rashi which uses this same text, i.e., that Jacob saw the *wagons* and his spirit was revived, willing now to go to meet Joseph (Genesis 45:27).

Why? Because the reference that came to Jacob's mind at that time was the last Torah chapter that he had been studying with his son twenty two years earlier. What was the subject matter, the portion which they had been discussing? The matter referred to the "Egla Arufa" – עגלה ערופה – the beheaded heifer found in Chapter 21 of Deuteronomy (v. 1–9). The subject matter of that chapter involved a moral teaching, a ritual which prescribed that if a man was found slain outside a community in Israel, it was the duty of the judges and of the elders of the surrounding communities to investigate and to ascertain the circumstances of the death of that person.

Each nearby city must not only investigate but must measure which was the closest to the corpse. The elders of that city, the judges and the priests, were required to go through a ritual of beheading a young heifer, making the declaration that "our hands have not participated in this blood-letting, in this killing." Instead of washing their hands from responsibility the Jewish tradition implicates the nearest city in the guilt of this death.

The Midrash Rabbah, quoted by Rashi, declares that Jacob was reminded, as he saw the עגלות (the wagons), of the עגלה – heifer, having the same Hebrew root. He thus made the connection that Joseph must still be alive as he remembered their discussion twenty two years before.

Yet, does that excuse Joseph from not telling his father that he was still alive? It may excuse Jacob, but how does it excuse Joseph? Now, as a lawyer, I have been approaching this from a legal point of view and here is the solution which I suggest. Why did the Midrash use such a farfetched reference, connecting the "egla arufa" the heifer with the "agalot," the wagons, and say that this was in *Jacob's mind*? I would think the reverse is true. What the Midrash wishes to tell us is, that in sending the "wagons" – עגלות – with its Hebrew word association with the "heifer" – עגלה – there was something in *Joseph's mind*. By his act he hinted to his father the reason why he had not communicated with him all these

years. It is my position that Joseph's reminder was a gentle reproach to his father. Being aware of the requirements of a true leader, i.e., to prevent bloodshed and crime in his community, Joseph conveyed to his father that he had been remiss in not following up on needed investigation upon the disappearance of his son. He should not have been easily deflected by the sight of Joseph's blood-soaked coat of many colors and, instead, should have made every effort to investigate further. Did he go out or send somebody to look? Did he interrogate the brothers to find out what actually happened?

Nothing! Scripture is silent. All he did was to weep and mourn. He did nothing further. That is why Joseph hesitated to tell his father that he was still alive. But after his anger lessened, I think he had another good reason not to tell his father that he was still alive. And that, I think, emphasizes the true character of Joseph, the "righteous".

I am sure, that Joseph was thinking to himself: If I communicate with my father Jacob and tell him that I am still alive, what would the consequences be? He faced a real dilemma. If I notify my father that I am still alive, certainly then, the whole truth must come out. How did I get to Egypt? Did I run away voluntarily and become a slave voluntarily? That would not ring right. And since I was elevated to be viceroy of Egypt, he certainly would try to find out why I did not communicate with him and why the brothers did not let him know where I was or what might have happened to me. He had the problem that if he had told his father where he was and what had happened, then Jacob would have been in a very difficult situation.

As the leader of the tribe, he still had an obligation to enforce the law. And what would the law have been? He certainly would have been duty bound to punish his sons severely. Then what would have happened? Instead of unity he would have had family disunity.

This dilemma Joseph solved as a question of balance: it was preferable to him to let his father grieve for twenty two years than to cause the disruption of the family.

It would appear to me that, although Scripture is very terse, there are some indications that Jacob did not really believe his sons. He doubted that Joseph had been torn and killed by an animal. He not only mourned for Joseph but he was really unhappy over the lack of truth and integrity of his sons. That is really what

made him suffer; and thus he also faced a dilemma, not knowing what to do.

Between Joseph's dilemma and Jacob's doubts, they both finally decided to keep quiet and let the Lord take care of things. They certainly believed in miracles; and miracles happened. And that is how they came to the happy conclusion: Jacob and Joseph were reunited.

We are adding here a comment of a member of the Bible group led by Mr. Asher. Mr. Berg, is the "youngest" member of the group, soon to celebrate א"ח his 90th birthday.

ON "DUKHAN"

BY EDMUND BERG

"The Standard Jewish Encyclopedia" has this to say about "Dukhan": "It is a Hebrew word, meaning "Platform" in the Temple, the priests' stand; hence, as a verb, to pronounce the priestly benediction."

My Hebrew lexicon says that the word דוכן is of Talmudic origin. I am of the opinion that it is derived from the Hebrew verb דכה which means "to bow down." Therefore the word was known long *before* talmudic times. Let us not forget that at the time our Temple was in Jerusalem, and the Kohanim pronounced the priestly benediction, the people had to bow down, even to kneel. So according to my opinion, the word "Dukhan" does not refer to the "plat-

form in the Temple," but to the reaction of the people to this prescribed holy ritual by the priests.

In Psalm 10:10 we find the word with the meaning *bowing*: דכה ישח ונפל בעצומיו חלכאים – *He will bow down, he will crouch; and the unfortunate fall by his mighty men.*

This "bowing down" is observed in the ritual of ברכת כהנים. The Kohanim come to the east-wall of the synagogue (many of them have no "platform"), to pronounce the priestly blessing while the worshippers bow their heads in receiving the blessing.

So again: "Dukhan" does *not* refer to a special place in the sanctuary, but to the bowing of the congregation at a religious ritual.

ALIENS AND ISRAELITES — PART I

BY MAX M. ROTHSCHILD

Conversion of non-Jews to Judaism is again a topic of interest in Jewish life, as it has been during several periods in Jewish history. It is therefore important to study the development of this problem, not only in modern times, but beginning with the earliest stages of Jewish history. There have been different Jewish positions, not a monolithic one, vis-a-vis this question over the ages. These varying attitudes can be linked to different historical situations which, in turn, show different influences of socio-economic, political and religious factors.

In a series of articles, an attempt will be made to describe the development of these attitudes through biblical times into the period of the Talmud. The terms "Hebrew" and "Israel" are used interchangeably in this study and should not be confused with their modern political usage.

THE BIBLICAL PERIOD

Much research on the problem of the non-Israelites and their relationship to the Israelites was done by the late Yechezkel Kaufmann, both in his famous "To'dot Ha'emunah" (published in an abridged English version by Moshe Greenberg under the title "The Religion of Israel"), and in his "Golah Ve'nechar". Recently, Chayim Gevaryahu presented a Hebrew outline of Kaufmann's main thesis on the problem of non-Israelites during the biblical and the Hasmonean periods. Some of the following remarks make use of these findings.

Kaufmann, as is well known, holds the view that the Israelites were a monotheistic people from the very existence as a group. According to him, the classical prophets, along with their emphasis on social justice which the worship of the One God implies, achieved the remarkable growth of the monotheistic God-concept of the ancient Israelites, so that it embraced all people and all nations of the world — at least as an ideal. In this way, Kaufmann argues, the seeds were planted for Judaism to become a true world religion later on in history,

Dr. Rothschild, past Director of the Department of Regional Activities of the United Synagogue of America, served as the secretary of the first World Jewish Bible Society International Conference, held in Israel in the spring of 1973.

and a universal faith which enabled its daughter religions, Christianity and Islam, to convert the pagan world.

The problem was, however, that in antiquity there never was a “pure” religion, distinct from nationality or group identity. Every people had its own creed, and any individual desiring to adopt another faith changed his allegiance to the new group. People and religion were co-terminous. A change of “nationality” — although the nation-state in our modern sense of the term did not exist as yet — brought with it a change of religion.

In addition, and this is a point which in this writer’s opinion is not sufficiently stressed by Kaufmann, Israelite religion from its earliest stages entailed a system of practical commandments, both of commission and omission. It was the problem of these practical commandments or mitzvot which later was to become one of the crucial difficulties in the relationship between nascent Christianity and Judaism of the rabbinic period.

A word should be said about the universal element in Israel’s faith to which the great teacher devoted so much of his writings. Scholars today agree with his view that beginnings of this universalism can already be seen in the earliest biblical stories, such as the tale of Cain and Abel, the Flood Story, and the description of the Tower of Babel. It was one of Kaufmann’s lasting achievements to make this an important point.

The Hebrew classical prophets, beginning with Isaiah, expressed the universalistic elements of their teaching in highly poetic form: cf. the entire chapter 2 of Isaiah or the famous passage in Jeremiah 16:19–20, and many others. The postexilic Deutero-Isaiah coined a number of “universalistic” expressions which have since become the cornerstones of Judaism, such as 56:7: *for my house shall be a house of prayer for all peoples.*

It was precisely this universalistic element in pre-rabbinic Israelite religion which made it possible for aliens to join this faith in one form or another.

During the Babylonian exile we see indeed for the first time the appearance of entire groups of people, not only individuals, trying to convert to the religion of Israel. It seems that these groups increased in number at the beginning of the partial return to the land of Israel by the Babylonian exiles under Cyrus. And it is precisely during that period of the return that Deutero-Isaiah calls these groups by a new name, namely “*Nil’vim*”, those that adhere to, or seek to join.

SOME DISTINCTIONS OF BIBLICAL TERMS

When we speak of groups of people joining the faith of the Hebrews in biblical times, it is important to make certain distinctions with regard to the terminology of the Tanakh. In brief, there was the “Nokhri” – נכרי, or stranger, who stood outside of the community of Israel. He enjoyed no legal protection, and he does not figure in our present discussion. The “Ger” – גר, or non-Israelite, plays an important role in the legislation of the Torah. He was what would be called in modern terms a “resident alien”, either temporary or permanent, whose rights and duties were clearly circumscribed. Whether or not he sought to adopt the Israelite faith and followed the mitzvot out of his own free will, or whether social and economic circumstances forced him to do so, is of minor significance for our study here. The fact is that the Ger – גר – dwelt in the land of Israel, among Israelite society. At first he seems to have been poor, and the Torah puts him into the same protected category as the widow and the orphan (Deut. 24:17). Later on we see Gerim as landowners, living on a higher economic level. The “Ger Toshav” – גר תושב, or simply “Toshav” who was perhaps on an even lower socio-economic status than the Ger, certainly not owning any real estate, was forever a wage earning, lower class laborer who depended for his livelihood on Hebrew landowners.

Even Abraham calls himself Ger at an early time, in his relationship to the sons of Chet, an outsider and alien in their land (Gen. 23:4). The Ger and the Ger Toshav adopted Hebrew monotheism to a large extent. The protective Torah legislation in their favor is in itself of great significance, occupying a unique role in the world of the ancient Near East.

For the purpose of this study, however, we are concentrating on those groups of aliens who joined themselves, apparently out of their own free will, unto Hebrew monotheism, despite the fact that they did not, or not yet, live in the land of Israel itself. As we saw, these groups emerged for the first time during the Babylonian exile. Kaufmann sees in this phenomenon the great dividing line between the religion of Israel as a national or tribal creed on the one hand and its role as a world religion on the other. According to Kaufmann, the era of the Babylonian captivity is the watershed when Hebraic faith began its appearance as a true world religion, enabling non-Israelites to convert to it.

What makes for the great difficulty in understanding the problem of the early convert to the religion of Israel is, in the first place, a matter of semantics. The non-Israelite Ger of whom we spoke above, the protected alien who appears throughout the Torah, is not the same as the Ger of post-biblical and rabbinic literature. As we shall see in a subsequent article, “Ger” as a person and “Giyur” as the concept for converting a person to Judaism, standard terms in rabbinic literature, have always confused those who sought to understand the relationship of aliens to Hebrews in biblical times. Part of this confusion, to be sure, can be traced to the translation of the Septuagint. In the majority of biblical passages, the Septuagint renders “Ger” as “proselyte”, a concept which is actually of much later origin. (Post-biblical Judaism is not spoken of in the same terms as the religion of Israel in biblical times.) Conversion to post-biblical Judaism is not the same as the joining of aliens to the religion of Israel during biblical times. It is indeed interesting to note that in a few places the Septuagint does present a more precise translation of the biblical term for “Ger”, rendering it as “paroikos”, i.e. a person who dwells beside, or near, somebody else, a foreign resident in the land. This, and this only, would meet the requirements of understanding the legislation in the Torah dealing with the Ger.

THE NIL'VIM – נלרים

To return to the era of the Babylonian captivity, the term used for those who desired to adopt the religion of Israel without living in Eretz Yisrael, was “Nil'vim” – נלרים, and later on, as we shall see, also “Mit'yahadim” – מתייהדים. In modern parlance we would say that these groups were ready to adopt Israel's national faith without adopting Israel's nationality. The Hebrew term used for these groups certainly implies also that their members did not come from Jewish parents. Kaufmann thinks that Hebrew monotheism began to impress and influence the pagan world during the life of the Israelite captives in Babylonian exile.

The classical passages attesting to the new development with respect to the “Nil'vim”, pagan people seeking to adopt Hebrew monotheism, are Isaiah 51:1–8, and Isaiah 56:6–8. Kaufmann argues that the prophet Deutero-Isaiah, is the first witness to the existence of these groups of Nil'vim.

As we have seen, their main difference from the biblical Ger was that they did

not live in the land of Israel. In addition, we are still not entirely certain as to the observance of the mitzvot of the Torah by the Ger living in Eretz Yisrael, although the Torah speaks of a number of commandments which were incumbent upon him just as they were on the Israelites themselves: i.e. the laws of cleanliness, Sabbath and holiday observance which were mandatory for the Ger, as distinct from other mitzvot, such as sacrifices, which were not binding on him, but could be observed voluntarily.

The situation of the “Nil’vim” in this respect was different. Here, the religious factor is decisive, not the question whether the individual did actually dwell in Eretz Yisrael. In fact, it was the ultimate aim of the “Nil’vim” to settle in Eretz Yisrael along with the returning Israelites in order to participate fully in the Israelite cult, such as Temple sacrifices, etc. Religious motives alone must have persuaded the “Nil’vim” to identify themselves with Israel.

Whereas the term “Ger” can be found in practically all the books of the Tanakh, the term “Nil’veh” and its plural “Nil’vim”, occurs only in the later books. Isaiah 14:1 is the first text where the term appears in the distinctive sense of adopting the religion of Israel: *ונלוח הגר עליהם ונספחו על ביה יעקב*.

*... and the stranger shall join himself with thee,
and they shall cleave to the house of Israel.*

Kaufmann argues — not convincingly in this writer’s opinion — that this verse should be ascribed to Deutero-Isaiah, i.e. at least one century after Isaiah, and he thinks that the passage was included in the first Isaiah by scribal error. However, there did exist an earlier captivity of Israelites in Babylonia during the reign of king Jehojakin. Parts of the tribes of Ephraim and Samaria had been forcefully settled in Babylonia under Sennacherib during the 7th century, and under Nebukadnezzar during the 6th century, before the destruction of the first Temple. It might be expected that the Israelite deportees took with them the monotheistic traditions of their fathers and made them known to the people in whose midst they were settled.

WAS THERE CONVERSION PRIOR TO BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY

The question must also be asked whether some sort of “conversion” to the religion of Israel, other than that of the adoption of the Ger and Ger Toshav did

not already exist before the Babylonian exile. The Torah seems to exclude from the community of Israel only those nations living in the immediate vicinity of the Israelites themselves, the Ammonites and Moabites (Deut. 23:4 ff.). Even here, the very earliest commentators agree that Mosaic law speaks only about the prohibition against male Ammonites and male Moabites marrying Israelite women, whereas females of those nations were permitted to be married by male Israelites. Moses, Boaz, and several of the kings — to name but a few — married non-Israelite women. It is therefore by no means certain that we can make as sharp a distinction as Kaufmann did with regard to the acceptance of aliens into the fold of Israel's religion and community. There seems to have been much less objection to certain "conversions" even before the Babylonian exile than he assumes.

Other passages in which the term "Nil'vim" appears in this new sense are Jeremiah 50:5, Zachariah 2:15, Daniel 11:34, and Esther 9:27, all of which would fall within the last period of prophecy. The classical passages, however, remain Deutero-Isaiah and Zechariah.

*"Also the aliens that join themselves to the Lord,
To minister unto Him,
And to love the name of the Lord,
To be His servants,
Every one that keepeth the sabbath from profaning it,
And holdeth fast by My covenant:
Even them will I bring to My holy mountain,
And make them joyful in My house of prayer;
Their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices
Shall be acceptable upon Mine altar;
For My house shall be called
A house of prayer for all peoples.
Saith the Lord GOD who gathereth the dispersed of Israel:
Yet will I gather others to him,
besides those of him that are gathered.*

Isaiah 56:6-8

And many nations shall join themselves to the Lord in that day, and shall be My people, and I will dwell in the midst of thee . . .

Zechariah 2:15

We know that the Nil'vim who joined themselves to the faith and the community of Israel, prayed to the One God, observed the Sabbath, followed the ethical precepts of the Torah and adhered to their strong bond with the people of Israel even to the extent of personal martyrdom. They forsook their former idol worship with its attendant pagan customs. It was the strength of their belief in Hebrew monotheism that enabled these Nil'vim to remain loyal to the Israelites even in a land such as Babylonia, where Jewish worship had no Temple or other visible cultic centers as yet, whereas the Babylonian cult boasted of magnificent temples and cultic centers. More than ever, Israel's faith at that time consisted of a hope, namely the early return to Zion and the rebuilding of the Temple. It would appear then that under these unusual circumstances, the religion of Israel held a very strong attraction for outsiders. Because of its universalistic elements, it was possible for aliens at that time to join Israel's faith, to convert to Israel's religion and to join the Israelite nation.

TORAH DIALOGUES – Continued from page 206

4. *a. In 21:17 f. Israel sings its gratitude for fresh water. In only two other instances does the Torah refer to a poem as השירה (the song). Which are they?*
b. Which other poem in scripture (serving as a Haftarah) is also designated that way?
5. *Israel's battle with Og (21:33) differs from that with Sihon, just preceding it: (a) Sihon is sued for peace first and is engaged only after his refusal to let Israel pass through peacefully. There is no such prelude with Og. (b) In the war with Og, God reassures Moses and tells him not to be afraid. Explain these differences.*

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

A Further Note on "The Torn Robe"

by

Lawrence M. Silverman in Dor L'Dor Spring 1980 Vol. VIII No. 3

Rabbi Silverman suggests three possible readings for I Samuel 15:26–28, based on the various interpretations of the verse *When Samuel turned about to go away, he laid hold upon the shirt of his robe, and tore it*. He concludes that the best reading is that Saul tore Samuel's robe. May I suggest that the better reading is that Samuel tore Saul's robe.

Brought up as we have been with the idea that man consists of body and soul, we moderns often miss a very important point. The concept, *body and soul*, borrowed from the Greeks has become so much a part of Judaism that most translations of the Bible unfortunately reflect such a bi-partite idea of the nature of man.

The picture of man as body and soul, I believe, postdates the concept of the compilers of the Bible. To the Biblical mind, the individual consisted not only of his corporeal self, and of what we call today his psyche. In addition, such physical appurtenances as his clothing, and such non-corporeal phenomena as his shadow and his name, as well as his image, were *all part of the being*.

The Bible looked upon the individual as an "extended self". The ancient Jew believed that the self or identity of a person was not limited to his physical being. Everything associated with the self and everything that could evoke his

presence in another person's mind (i.e. a picture) was part of the self. The ancient Jew also believed that *any one* of these parts was regarded as and could be used for the whole of the individual.

For example: unlike Shakespeare's "what's in a name?" the ancient Jews believed that the name *was* the thing, equal to the person. Hence they did not use the name of God, for that would mean that one had the power that went with the name.

In our High Holy Day prayer book the ceremony is preserved in which the High Priest pronounced the Name of God on Yom Kippur: And when the priests and the people that stood in the court heard the glorious Name pronounced out of the mouth of the High Priest, in holiness and purity, they knelt and prostrated themselves, and made acknowledgement to God, falling on their faces and saying "Blessed be *He* (shem) the glory of whose kingdom is eternal." Because the name is part of the personality, and because when we recite the name we have the power that goes with the personality, they did not pronounce it.

Since clothes were part of this "extended self", they believed that whatever was done to the clothes was being done to the whole individual.

When Aaron was about to die, the word came to Moses to take Aaron and his son Eleazar up to Mt. Horeb. He was

told to strip Aaron of his clothes and put them on Eleazar, his son. "And Eleazar became priest in his father's stead" (Nu. 20:26). By placing Aaron's clothes on Eleazar, part of Aaron's personality was passed on to the new High Priest. Similarly, when Elijah (II Kings 2:13-15) departed in the chariot, he placed his mantle upon his successor, Elisha; not as a gift or a symbol but to pass on part of his personality.

When Jacob told his people to build an altar and worship God and give up the worship of idols we read: *Then Jacob said to his household and to all that were*

with him: Remove the strange gods that are in the midst of you, and purify yourselves and change your garments (Gen. 35:2).

Why do we cut "kriah" at a funeral? Pagans slashed their bodies at a time of mourning. Jews cut a garment. The rending of one's garments was in actuality the effacement of one's personality.

When Samuel tore Saul's robe, he was tearing (or cutting off) Saul from his kingship.

 Rabbi Harold M. Kamsler
 Norristown Jewish Community Center

Dear Editor

Please accept my sincere and heartfelt congratulations for providing the English reading public with an exciting vehicle for enhancing our understanding and appreciation of our religious heritage through the study of our Bible. I eagerly await the issues of *Dor le Dor*.

 Rabbi Dr. H. Joseph Simckes

Dear Editor

You really ought to be proud of the last two issues of *Dor le Dor* (Summer & Fall 1980).

They make for interesting reading. Popular — yet scholarly, and the issues include a variety of approaches to Bible study, so that each reader can pursue his own inclination in Biblical reading.

I'm delighted to say that you have raised the magazine to a very respectable level — and I'm certain that *Dor le Dor* will continue to bring pleasurable reading — and learning, I dare say, to the subscribers

 Moshe Havivi

THE FLATBUSH BIBLE SOCIETY

One of the oldest and largest local groups affiliated with the World Jewish Bible Society is the Flatbush Bible Society, located in one of the major Jewish neighborhoods in Brooklyn, New York. It was founded in Fall 1963 by Dr. Shlomo Shulsinger, long active in the movement for Hebrew in the United States and for Hebrew camping in particular.

That summer he had been a guest at a meeting of the Hug Tanakh founded by Prime Minister David Ben Gurion held in the President's home in Jerusalem, and had been very much impressed by its spirit, organization and method, which he tried to emulate.

The Flatbush group consists of about 25 members who take turns meeting at each others' homes on alternate Friday nights during the winter months. After a half-hour period of socialization there is an hour-and-a-quarter lecture in Hebrew, followed by a question and discussion period, refreshments and singing.

Our lecturer for some years now has been Dr. Meir Lubetski, Professor of Hebrew at Baruch College of the City University of New York. This year the group is studying the Megillot. In the seventeen years of its existence the group has covered almost the entire Neviim and Ketuvim.

Dr. Shulsinger and our past chairman, Mr. Mordecai Mandelbaum, recently went on aliyah. The officers of the Flatbush Bible Society this year are Professor Morris Silverman, chairman; Mr. Shlomo Telushkin, treasurer; and Rabbi Ira Spodek, secretary.

Morris Silverman, Chairman

WORLD JEWISH BIBLE SOCIETY	
MEMBERSHIP (Tax deductible in USA)	\$10
Membership Includes:	
<i>Triennial Tenakh Study Calendar</i>	
<i>One-year subscription to Dor le-Dor</i>	
For Beth Mikra, Hebrew Quarterly	Add \$10
WORLD JEWISH BIBLE SOCIETY	
18 Abarbanel St., P.O.B. 7024	
Jerusalem. Israel	
Remittance for membership is enclosed	
Name
Street
City State Zip

TORAH DIALOGUES

BY HAROLD D. HALPERN

BEMIDBAR – NUMBERS

The Book of BeMidbar (Numbers) contains both legislation and historical narrative. The period dealt with is, as the Hebrew title indicates, the 38 years of the Israelite travels in the wilderness before their arrival at the banks of the Jordan River.

QUESTIONS

HUKKAT

1. *In connection with the passage about the Red Heifer (ch. 19), the Midrash quotes Kohelet (Ecclesiastes) 7:23 – “All this I’ve attempted through wisdom (to understand); I thought I will be wise but it was far from me.” The ritual of purification after contact with the dead is called a קִרְוָה or statute for which no logical explanation is given. Many commentators have nevertheless attempted to present a rationale for this strange procedure. What logic can you offer for the Red Heifer procedure?*
2. *The complaints and rebellions against Moses appear to be endless. In Chap. 21 there is no arguing nor pleading with the people but a swift punishment through poisonous serpents. After the people express contrition, God instructs Moses to set up a brazen serpent which would have a curative effect upon those afflicted. The Talmud (R.H. 29A) explains that “it was not the brazen serpent that cured people but the fact that they lifted their eyes and thoughts heavenward. Where else in the Torah is a similar event described, involving Divine aid which in fact the Talmud associated with this occurrence and interprets the same way?*
3. *Which events described in recent verses of the Torah encourage a petty king like Arad to attack Israel (21:1)?*

continued on p. 202

Editorial Note:

Due to a printer’s error the entire Parsha of Hukkat was omitted from the series of Torah Dialogues in the last issue of Dor le Dor (Vol. IX, 3). We enter it now as a separate entity. The Parshiot should have appeared in the following order: Shelah – Korah – Hukkat – Balak.

Rabbi Harold (Chaim) Halpern is past President of the Bergen County, New Jersey, Board of Rabbis. These “Torah Dialogues” grew out of discussions between the Rabbi and his congregants in Beth Tikvah Synagogue in New Milford, New Jersey.

RESPONSES

HUKKAT

1. Here are a few theories: Rashi (see 19:22 citing Moshe HaDarshan) connects each procedure to an aspect of the sin of the golden calf (Ex. 32). Nehama Leibowitz quotes Bechor Shor who sees this as discouragement for any association with the dead. Sforno regards the cedar and hyssop in the ceremony as symbolic of pride and humility, respectively. The redness represents the sin of both extremes. He explains the ceremony as a lesson in atonement through moderation. S.R. Hirsch finds profound allegorical meaning in each detail of the procedure teaching lessons in moral freedom and sin and expiation.
2. In Exodus 17:11 where Moses lifts his hands to give encouragement to Israel while she battles Amalek (cf. Rashbam).
3. The sages note that the attack comes immediately after the death of Aaron which follows Miriam's death. The episode also comes soon after the rebellion of Korah (chap. 16), the complaint about water in chap. 20, and the refusal of Edom to allow the Israelites passage through their land. Perhaps the sight of Israel's apparent backing down in the face of Edom was interpreted by Arad to be a manifestation of cowardice and demoralization (20:21).
4. a. The song at the Sea of Reeds (Ex. 15) and the farewell song of Moses (v. Deut. 31:30).
b. The *only* other song called *השירה* in all scripture is David's song of victory and salvation (II Sam. 22 – the Haftarah for Haazinu and for the 7th day of Pesah almost identical to Psalm 18).
5. a. The reason for the first difference appears to be obvious from the text of the Torah. Og gives Israel no opportunity to enter into negotiation (cf. Nahmanides 21:33).
b. The reassurance seems to be needed because Og is a giant and his land is well fortified (see Deut. 3:4, 5, 11).
Strangely, Nahmanides later proposes that Og merely mobilized his forces in Edrie and did not actually attack (perhaps he compares 21:23 to 20:20) and since his territory lies in Transjordan Moses needed to be encouraged to attack. Hizkuni theorizes that the Bashan area is actually in Canaan (this despite Deut. 3:8. Evidently he believes that part of Transjordan should be considered the Promised Land as does Nahmanides). Therefore Moses sent no warning since he was under divine imperative to conquer Og's land. That was not the case with Sihon's territory.

INTERNATIONAL BIBLE CONTEST – SEPTEMBER 2

From a Spectator of a Bible Quiz

BY YITZHAK GLUCKSMAN

Kiryat Gat. A budding development town surrounded by the lush fields of the neighboring kibbutzim. In the second and first millenia before the common era this area was inhabited by the warlike pagan Philistines, Gat being one of its leading cities. The spirits of those Philistines would certainly be unhappy if they knew that tonight, the eve of Tu Bishvat, the present day Jewish inhabitants of Kiryat Gat were congregating in the largest local hall to witness a Bible Quiz.

This year, after a thirteen year lapse, Israel is holding an International Bible Contest for adults (Jews and non-Jews), in addition to the annual Bible Quiz for Jewish Youth to be held in Jerusalem, on September 2. Representatives from each of thirty two countries participating will vie for the honor of winning the Bible Contest. Fittingly the Contest will center on the theme of "Peace and Brotherhood" in the Bible. The entire "sporting event" will be televised and the chief dignitaries of the Israeli Government will attend.

Each country has set up its own system of national quizzes in order to determine who shall be its representative. Competition for that honor here in Israel has been particularly fierce, and the ultimate winner will have to possess great stamina along with an almost faultless knowledge of the Bible in order to succeed. The champion must first pass a nationwide written exam, succeed in one of the regional finals and emerge victorious in the national finals to be held in Tel Aviv in the beginning of June. Tonight in Kiryat Gat, as well as in Hadera, Rishon Lezion and Beit Shemesh, the regional finals are taking place.

The hall is filled to capacity with school children, parents and the elderly alike. The audience has brought along with them small pocket Bibles, the better to follow the quiz. This is a privilege that the contestants are not allowed, being expected to be able to answer all questions without the benefit of having a Bible in front of them. After a brief musical performance by a choir of local school children, the thirteen contestants march on to the stage and take the seats prepared for them.

Who are these finalists? The contestants were of all ages and all professions.

Among them is a soldier, two women, several teachers, no one who especially catches the eye. Externally there is nothing to distinguish them. They appear to be average people from all walks of life, from all kinds of backgrounds.

The quiz begins. Each of the contestants is asked to answer four questions orally. The audience is busy flicking the pages of their Bibles, attempting to keep up with the questions and answers. Though I have always prided myself on my knowledge of the Bible, I now know that this pride was totally unjustified. Even with the help of my Bible I find myself able to answer only a fraction of the questions correctly.

Only the seven contestants who answered all four questions correctly continue on to the next series comprising a set of short written questions and two more oral ones. After this series, three more competitors are eliminated.

Of the four remaining on the stage, only three will be allowed to continue on to the national finals. In front of a hushed audience, each of the four is requested to complete the following ten-part question about references to honey in the Bible:

- 1 Who was asked to take with them “a little honey”? (Joseph’s brothers, Genesis 43:11)
- 2 Who tasted “a little honey”? (Jonathan, I Samuel 14:29)
- 3 Who are the three people who offered fleeing refugees, among other things, honey? (Shobi, Machir and Barzillai to David and his men, II Sam. 17:27–9)
- 4 Who’s son will eat “butter and honey”? (Immanuel, Isaiah’s son, Is. 7:15)
- 5 Who prophesied that the remnant of Israel will “eat butter and honey”? (Isaiah 7:22)
- 6 On which city did the prophet prophecy in an allegory that “thou didst eat fine flour and honey and oil”? (Jerusalem, Ezekiel 16:13)
- 7 Which prophet compared the words of his prophecy to sweet honey? (Ezekiel 3:3)
- 8 In Proverbs, how is the consumption of honey compared to the acquisition of knowledge? *My son, eat thou honey, for it is good, and the honeycomb is sweet to thy taste / So know thou wisdom to be unto thy soul; if thou hast found it, then shall there be a future, and thy hope shall not be cut off* (Prov. 23:13–14)
- 9 Which prophet included honey as one of the export products of Judah and Israel? (Ezekiel, *Judah and the land of Israel, they were traffickers, they*

traded for thy merchandise wheat of Minnith and balsam and honey and oil and balm 23:17)

10 What reason does the Bible give for not eating too much honey? (*Hast thou found honey? eat so much as is sufficient for thee, lest thou be filled therewith and vomit it, Prov. 25:16)*

or, It is not good to eat much honey; so for men to search out their own glory is not glory, Prov. 25:27)

Silently and quickly the four write down their answers and one by one they read them aloud to the judges sitting on the stage.

Only one of the four answered all ten correctly. He is a clerk in the income tax office and wins this quiz with a score of 72 out of 75. Right behind him is a physician from Beersheba. In third place is an English teacher in one of the local high schools who managed to edge out the fourth place finisher by a single point, thus enabling him too to advance to the national finals.

Being a warlike people, the Philistines must have enjoyed rough physical sports. A Bible quiz would certainly not have been popular with them, but for the audience and contestants here in Kiryat Gat, it was both a spiritual and entertaining evening.

Yitzhak Glucksman is a graduate of JTS where he received his M.A. in Bible in 1979. Having settled in Israel, he is currently working with the World Jewish Bible Society on the Bible Contest for Jewish Youth. He also teaches Bible.



BOOK REVIEW

THE SEVEN DAYS OF THE BEGINNING

BY ELI MUNK

Feldheim Publishers, Jerusalem–New York, 5734–1974, pp. 169.

The Nineteen Letters on Judaism, commonly known as the Nineteen Letters of Ben Uzziel, although written a century and a half ago are still of value and worthy of study today. They were published in 1836, when the author, Samson Raphael Hirsch, was only 28 years old, and made a profound impression in German Jewish circles, for their brilliant intellectual presentation in classic German of Orthodox Judaism. They were written in the form of an exchange of letters between two young men, Benjamin, the spokesman for the perplexed, who expresses the doubts of a young Jewish intellectual, and Naphtali, the representative of traditional Judaism. He formulates his answers in 19 Letters, discussing questions concerning the relationship of Judaism to world culture. All the commandments in the Torah, despite their variety, reveal a spirit of unity and can be reduced to three basic principles: justice, love and the education of ourselves and others.

A follower of Hirsch, a member of a famous family in Berlin, who settled in London and was the Rabbi of the synagogue of Finchley R., known to all, even now, as “Munk’s”, came to Israel on aliya on his retirement, and here, at a ripe age, he published *The Seven Days of the Beginning*. The format, 18 Letters to a student, remind us immediately of Hirsch’s work, but there the similarity ends. The questioning student is Elisha, and the correspondent-teacher signs himself Tishbi, possibly suggesting a relationship with the two great biblical Prophets Elijah and Elisha. We are told in the foreword that the book was published at the request of students who had participated in courses of lectures on the subject matter, presumably in England.

Rabbi Dr. Munk, in the name of Tishbi, addresses his first letter to “My dear Elisha”, who asks, “How do I integrate our tradition of old into the New World in which I must live? Does it offer me guidance which takes into account and is relevant to a modern conception of the universe and society?”.

The answer is “yes” and “it all derives from the specific conception of the world and of man which is set out in the first few chapters of the Chumash”. Genesis chapter 1:1 to 2:3 are discussed in detail, with a phrase by phrase original translation at the end, “a translation” the author adds which “will not be understood without a close study of the Letters of Tishbi”. Incorporated is a Hebrew chart of the Seven Days of Creation, beginning with God and ending in man, followed by שבת on the Seventh Day, which “consolidates the laws of nature.” Finally, there is an analytical dictionary in which Hebrew words are dealt with on the assumption that most of them derive from a biconsonantal root, contained mostly in the first two letters. Over 800 words are listed in the Dictionary, with a clear and often original translation in English. Two examples: אל which “indicates a direction” and hence אלקים: “He who causes everything to exist, to develop, to continue.” To help the student there is a Guide to the Dictionary, containing all the 108 Hebrew words mentioned in the *Letters of Tishbi* and showing under which heading they can be found. For instance, the word אדם, man, is listed under אד “a thick mist” which “in combination with עפר flying substance, dust, yields the substance for man”, and under דם “Thought of, to compare”, so that אדם is “the being which is compared to its Creator, the prefix making it into a noun”. There is also a comprehensive Index, in English, and a list of sources, in Hebrew, which, besides the Tenach, includes the Mishna, Tosefta, Talmud Bavli and Yerushalmi, and selected Midrashim. The dates of authors quoted are also given. A pity that they are only in Hebrew, e.g., Abarbanel is given as ה' רס. Surely, it would have been helpful to add 1500 C.E., or David Zvi Hoffman ה' תרם (1880) or Malbim ה' תרלד (1874).

Sixteen of the Letters (II–XVII) deal with the Hebrew text of the account of the Creation, accompanied by 172 comprehensive notes in Hebrew and English, together with sources in Hebrew. The final Letter (XVIII) is headed Synopsis and in a sense summarises all that has been said in the previous Letters. It concludes, with the author’s characteristic modesty:

“In conclusion, I would remind you that all comment we made was based only on a small selection of the interpretations given by our teachers; that there are many other meanings of the Torah, and all we can hope is to have represented a true conception in our humble way.”

Certainly a book worth pondering today.

Joseph Halpern

LISTING OF BIBLE STUDY GROUPS

To a questionnaire we sent out asking about a Chug Tanakh in your community or congregation we received encouraging replies. We are pleased to list them.

The Editorial Board is certain that there are many more Bible Study groups. It is our hope they will come forward to be counted and to be tied into a fellowship of the World Jewish Bible Society.

If errors of omission or commission occurred, we apologize. Please inform us and we shall be happy to make the necessary corrections in a forthcoming issue.

CALIFORNIA

Bnai Brith DGLH4

601 N. Oakhurst Dr.

Beverly Hills, 90210

Dr. Moses Spira, Leader

Brandeis-Bardin Institute

601 N. Oakhurst Dr.

Beverly Hills, 90210

Dr. Moses Spira, Leader

Histadruth Ivrit

636 N. Harper Ave.

Los Angeles, 90048

Ben Ami Shulman, Leader

Adat Ari El Cong

5549 Laurel Canyon Blvd.

No. Hollywood, 91607

Nathan N. Volk, Leader

Beth Jacob

1550 Alameda

Redwood City, 94061

Rabbi H. David Teitelbaum

Isaac Ehrenreich Torah Study Group

254 Sutter St.

San Francisco, 94104

Different scholars

Maurice Edelstein, Chairman

Temple Beth Israel

2512 Third Avenue

San Diego, 92103

Aliza Checkoway, Leader

CONNECTICUT

Agudas Achim

1244 N. Main St.

West Hartford, 06117

Rabbi Abraham N. AvRutick

Greater Hartford Bible Group

Yad Reuven Chapter

83 LeMay St. West Hartford, 06107

Different Scholars

Henry S. Cohn, Chairman

Adath Israel Synagogue

Church and Broad Sts.

Middletown, 06457

Rabbi Nathan Levinson

FLORIDA

Chug Tanach

4200 Biscayne Blvd.

Miami, 3137

Dr. Joseph Diamond, Leader

Abraham J. Gittelson, co-ordinator

Chug L'Cheker Hatanach

4200 Biscayne Blvd.

Miami, 33137

Guest speakers

Abraham J. Gittelson, co-ordinator

Cong. B'nai Israel

30159th St. N.

St. Petersburg, 33710

Rabbi J. Ludki

Temple Adath Yeshurun

1075 N.E. Miami Gardens Dr.

North Miami Beach 33179

Rabbi Moris Kazdon

Temple Beth-El

400 Pasadena Ave. So.

St. Petersburg, 33707

Mrs. Joel Shrager, Leader

Temple Beth Solom

4244 Chase Avenue

Rabbis L. Kronisch and H. Jolt

Rose D. Fedderman, Chairman

Temple Sinai of N. Dade

18801 N.E. 22 Avenue

N. Miami Beach 33180

Rabbi Ralph P. Kingsley

Rose B. Knopf, Chairlady

ILLINOIS

Sat. A.M. Beth Emet Syn.

1224 Dempster St.

Evanston, 60202

Herbert Hubert, Leader

Leo Schubert, Chairman

North Shore Cong. Israel

1185 Sheridan Road

Glencoe, 60022

Rabbi Herbert Bronstein and

Rabbis Ira Korinow, Sonsinow

Lillian Goldblatt. Chairlady

Anshe Emet Cong.

60 N. Pine Grove Ave.

Chicago 60613

Mr. Norman Asher, Leader

Bernard Horwich Center

Touhy & Sacramento Aves.

Chicago 60645

Mr. Norman Asher, Leader

Emanuel Cong.

5959 N. Sheridan Rd.

Chicago, 60660

Rabbi Herman E. Schaalman

Congregation Bnai Emunah

9131 Niles Center Road

Skokie, 60076

Rabbi Stern (3 groups)

Am Shalom

614 Sheridan Road

Glencoe, 60022

Rabbi Harold L. Kula

Tues. Morn. Bible Class
K.I.N.S. of West Rogers Park
2800 W. North Shore, Chicago
Rabbi Moses Mescheloff
H. Rubinoff, Chairman

Mon. Morn. Class
North Suburban Syn Beth El
1175 Sheridan Rd.
Highland Park, 60035
Rabbi William LeBeau

5714 N. Christiana Ave
Chicago, IL 60659
Israel Chodosh (2 groups)

KENTUCKY
Cong. Adath Jeshurun
7401 Woodbourne Ave.
Louisville, 40205
Rabbi Simcha Kling

Knesseth Israel Cong.
2531 Taylorsville Rd.
Louisville, 40205
Rabbi Irving Glickman

MARYLAND
Temple Oheb Shalom
7310 Park Heights Ave.
Baltimore, 21208
Rabbi Stuart A. Pollack and
Rabbi Donald R. Berlin

Shaare Tefila Cong.
Silver Spring, 20901
Rabbi Martin S. Holpe

MASSACHUSETTS
Congregation Kodimoh
124 Sumner Ave.
Springfield, 01108
Rabbi Alex Weisfogel (2 groups)

Cong. Beth Jacob
P.O.Box 284
Plymouth, 02361
Rabbi Lawrence M. Silverman

MICHIGAN
Temple Beth El
7400 Telegraph Rd.
Birmingham, 48033
Different leaders
Rabbi Schwartz, Co-ordinator

MINNESOTA
Beth El Synagogue
5224 W. 26th St.
St. Louis Park, 55422
Rabbi Kassel Abelson
H. Bix, Chairman

MISSOURI
Temple Israel
10675 Ladue Road
St. Louis, 63141
Rabbi Alvan D. Rubin

NEW JERSEY
Temple B'nai Abraham
300 East Northfield Rd.
Livingston, 07039
Rabbi Barry Friedman,
Murry Brochin, Leader

Temple Beth Am
111 Avenue B
Bayonne, 07002

Rabbi Morris M. Tosk

Cong. B'nai Israel
Old Freehill Road
Toms River, 08753

Different leaders
Yetta Soloff, Co-ordinator

Temple Beth Shalom
193 E. Mr. Pleasant Ave.
Livingston, 07039

Rabbi Samuel Cohen (two groups)
R. Lowy, Chairman

Temple Shalom
215 South Hillside Ave.
Succasunna, 07876

Rabbi Joel Soffin

NEW YORK

Cong. Yeshiva Etz Chaim
1349 50 St.
Brooklyn, 11204

Rabbi Dr. Israel D. Lerner

Bayswater Jewish Center
2355 Healy Ave.
Far Rockaway, 11691

Rabbi Irving Spielman

Flatbush Bible Society
Silverman, 1271 East 9 St.
Brooklyn, 11230

Dr. Meir Lubetski
Prof. Morris Siverman, Chairman

Chug Tanach of Flatbush
928 E. 13th St.
Brooklyn, 11230

Dr. Shlomo Shulsinger

Temple Sinai
50 Alberta Drive
Amherst, 14226

Rabbi Joseph D. Herzog

Cons. Syn. Aduth Israel of Riverdale
250th St. & Henry Hudson Parkway
Riverdale, 10471

Rabbi Shlomo Balter

Park Avenue Synagogue
50 E. 87th St.
New York, 10028

Rabbi Harlan F. Wechsler and
Rabbi Neil Gillman

Larchmont Temple — Har Chayim
75 Larchmont Ave.
Larchmont, 10538

Rabbi Leonard Poller

Whitestone Hebrew Center
12-15 Clintonville Rd.
Whitestone, 11357

Molly Weinstein, Adj. Lecturer

Temple Emanu El
123 Merrick Avenue
E. Meadow, 11554

Teachers, Rabbis

Cong. B'nai Israel
91 N. Bayview Ave.
Freeport, 11520

Rabbi Reuben M. Katz

Temple Society of Concord
910 Madison St.
Syracuse, 13210

Rabbi Theodore S. Levy

Bayside Jewish Centre
203-05 32nd Ave.

Bayside, 11361

Different Teachers
Molly Weinstein, Chairman

B'nai Israel (Reform)

Bx 158

Oak Dale 11769

Rabbi Steven Moss

Brandeis University Women

Forest Hill Chapter

108-19 71st. Ave.

Forest Hilles,

Molly Weinstein, Adj. Lecturer

Free Synagogue of Flushing

41-60 Kissena Blvd.

Flushing, 11355

Dr. Charles Agin, Rabbi

OHIO

Beth Abraham Syn

1306 Salem Ave.

Dayton

Rabbi Samuel B. Press

OKLAHOMA

Temple Israel

2004 East 22nd Place

Tulsa, 74114

Rabbi C.P. Sherman

PENNSYLVANIA

Old York Road Temple – Beth Am

971 Old York Road

Abington, 19001

Change leaders

Howard D. Herman, co-ordinator

Jewish Community Center

1541 Powell St.

Morristown, 19401

Rabbi Harold M. Kamsler

Beth El Temple

2634 N. Front St.

Harrisburg, 17110

Rabbi Jeffrey Wohlberg

TEXAS

Temple Emanu-El

8500 Hillcrest

Dallas, 75116

Rabbi Jack Bemporad

VIRGINIA

Ohev Zion Congregation

801 Parkview

Martinsville, 24112

Rabbi H.A. Friedman

continued on page 178

THIRD TRIENNIAL INDEX
Fall 1978 through Summer 1981

כ"ה-ל"ז

This triennial index contains the articles published in Dor le-Dor in Volumes VII, VIII and IX. The first triennial index appears in Vol. III, No.4. The second triennial index appears in Vol. VI, No.4.

Abramowitz, Chaim				
Balaam the Magician	VIII	1	Fall 1979	31
Bible Translations and Mistranslations	VII	1	Fall 1978	44
The Hand on The Door	VII	2	Winter 1979-8	62
In the Language of Man	IX	3	Spring 1981	139
The Trials of Abraham	VIII	3	Spring 1980	127
Asher, Norman				
Jacob Mourns for His Son	IX	4	Summer 1981	191
Bakon, Shimon				
The Babylonian Captivity	VII	3	Spring 1979	108
Balaam – An Unauthentic Prophet	IX	2	Winter 1980-1	89
Elijah	IX	1	Fall 1980	22
Prophecy – A Phenomenological Approach				
Part I	VII	4	Summer 1979	160
Part II	VIII	1	Fall 1979	21
Part III	VIII	2	Winter 1979-80	76
Why Did Samuel Initially Reject Monarchy?	VIII	4	Summer 1980	171
Bartal, Arye				
The Prophet and the King	VIII	3	Winter 1980-1	111
Berg, Edmond				
Love Thy Neighbor As Thyself	IX	2	Winter 1980-1	104
Dukhan – its Meaning	IX	4	Summer 1981	195
Blumenthal, Elchanan				
Introduction to a New Kohelet Commentary	IX	1	Fall 1980	46
Bronner, Leah				
Sacrificial Cult Among Egyptian but not Babylonian Exiles – Why?	IX	2	Winter 1980-1	61 61
Chinitz, Jacob				
The Prophets – Nationalist or Universalist	VIII	4	Summer 1980	206
Efron, Reuben				
Military Intelligence in the Bible	IX	4	Summer 1981	185
Fredman, Norman				
The Divine Name El-Shaddai: He Who Created Families	IX	2	Winter 1980-1	72

Gertel, Elliot, B Adam's Rib	VII	2	Winter 1978-9	75
Gevaryahu, Haim Holy Cities in the Land of Ephraim	VII	4	Summer 1979	187
Glatt, David Hezekiah and Josiah: A Comparison	VIII	4	Summer 1980	201
Glucksman, Yitzchak Fourth International Bible Contest for Adults	IX	4	Summer 1981	208
Halpern, Harold, D. Torah Dialogues: Genesis 1:1-21:34	VII	2	Winter 1978-9	80
Genesis 22:1-40:73	VII	3	Spring 1979	140
Genesis 41:1-50:20	VII	4	Summer 1979	198
Exodus 1:1-20:26	VIII	1	Fall 1979	44
Exodus 21:1-40:38	VIII	2	Winter 1979-80	94
Leviticus 1:1-13-59	VIII	3	Spring 1980	140
Leviticus 14:1-24:23	VIII	4	Summer 1980	210
Leviticus 25:1-27:34	IX	1	Fall 1980	44
Numbers 1:1-12:16	IX	2	Winter 1980-1	100
Numbers 13:11-18:22				
22:2-25:9	IX	3	Spring 1981	150
Numbers 19:1-22:1	IX	4	Summer 1981	206
Halpern, Joseph Book Review	IX	4	Summer 1981	211
Halpern Sarah Tragedy in the Bible	IX	1	Fall 1980	3
Katzoff, Louis What's in a Name	IX	3	Spring 1981	148
Kohn, S. Joshua The Origin of the Synagogue	VIII	1	Fall 1978	27
Levine, Etan Development of Biblical Prayer	IX	4	Summer 1981	172
Evolving Symbolism of the Burning Bush	VIII	4	Summer 1980	185
Physical Characteristics of a Torah Scroll	VIII	2	Winter 1979-80	86
Levine, M. Hershel A Biblical Protest Against the Violation of Women	VIII	4	Summer 1980	194
Liptzin, Sol Abishag the Shunamite	IX	2	Winter 1980-1	78
Belshazzars Folly	VII	3	Spring 1979	119
The Biblical Tradition of Popular Democracy	VIII	4	Summer 1980	161
Lady Asenath	VII	2	Winter 1978-9	51
Literary Impact of Jonah	VII	1	Fall 1978	9
Nabal and Abigail	VIII	2	Winter 1979-80	78

Princess Hagar	VIII	3	Spring 1980	114
Rahab of Jericho	IX	3	Spring 1981	111
Schiller on Moses	IX	4	Summer 1981	179
Shulamit Unallegorized	VIII	1	Fall 1979	1
Solomon and the Queen of Sheba	VII	4	Summer 1979	72
Solomon's Humiliation	IX	1	Fall 1980	11
Luria, Ben Zion				
The Western Wall Part V	VII	1	Fall 1978	35
Part VI	VII	2	Winter 1978-9	84
Part VII	VII	3	Spring 1979	136
Part VIII	VII	4	Summer 1979	193
Minoff, Eli				
The Golden Calf in Exodus 32	VIII	4	Summer 1980	181
Porten, Bezalel				
Restoration of a Holy Nation	VII	3	Spring 1979	127
Pusin, Max				
Some Psychological Insights in the Life of Abraham	VII	2	Winter 1978-9	65
Rothschild, Max, D.				
Aliens and Israelites - I	IX	4	Summer 1981	196
Routtenberg, Hyman				
Changing Laws	IX	3	Spring 1981	120
Laws of Shabbat. Biblical Sources				
Part V	VII	1	Fall 1978	41
Prophecy and Halacha	VIII	2	Winter 1979-80	61
Radday, Yehuda, T.				
Isaiah and the Computer	VIII	1	Fall 1979	37
Shazar, Zalman				
Jonah - Transition From Seer to Prophet	VII	1	Fall 1978	1
Shrager, Miriam Y.				
Hammurabi and Biblical Law	VII	2	Winter 1978-9	89
Shalev, Yitzchak				
The Book of Jonah: A Lesson For All Generations	VII	1	Fall 1978	21
Silverman, Lawrence, M.				
The Torn Robe	VIII	3	Spring 1980	136
Was Jonathan Guilty?	VII	4	Summer 1979	153
Sivan, Gabriel				
Pharaoh Now Has Only One Option	VII	4	Summer 1979	202
Bible Misinterpretation				
Supplementary Note	VIII	1	Fall 1979	49
Soviv, Aaron				
The Confirmation of Noah's Blessing	XI	3	Spring 1981	144

West, Stuart, A.				
The Habiru and the Hebrews	VII	3	Spring 1979	101
Moses – Man of Indecision	IX	1	Fall 1980	33
Mystery of Genesis 36	IX	4	Summer 1981	161
Nuzi Tablets	VIII	1	Fall 1979	12
The Rape of Dina and the Conquest of Shechem	VIII	3	Spring 1980	144
Wise, Aaron, M.				
Darshanim Project	VIII	1	Fall 1979	52
Wolfson, Elliot, R.				
The Dialectic of Faith and Doubt in the Philosophy of Socrates and the Piety of Job	VIII	4	Summer 1980	197
Wolowelski, Joel, B.				
Testing God: A Midrash on the Akeda	VIII	2	Winter 1979–80	98
Yaron, Kalman				
Symbols of Nature in Israel and in the Near East	IX	3	Spring 1981	132

INDEX ACCORDING TO TITLE

Please Note: In the following listing the name of the article is shortened: please look under the author's name for the full title.

Activities in Bible Times				
The Golden Calf: Minoff	VIII	4	Summer 1980	181
Nuzi Tablets: West	VIII	1	Fall 1979	12
Sacrificial Cult: Bronner	IX	2	Winter 1980–1	61
What Is In A Name: Katzoff	IX	3	Spring 1981	148
Biblical Themes				
Alien and Israelite: Rothschild	IX	4	Summer 1981	196
The Babylonian Captivity: Bakon	VII	3	Spring 1979	108
Balaam – An Unauthentic Prophet: Bakon	IX	2	Winter 1980–1	89
A Biblical Protest: Levin	VIII	4	Summer 1980	194
Biblical Tradition of Popular Democracy: Liptzin	VIII	4	Summer 1980	161
Bible Mistranslations – Supplementary Note: Sivan	VIII	1	Fall 1979	49
Bible Translations and Mistranslation: Abramowitz	VII	1	Fall 1978	44
The Confirmation of Noah's Blessing: Soviv	IX	3	Spring 1981	144
Dialectic of Faith and Doubt: Wolfson	VIII	4	Summer 1980	197
The Divine Name – El Shaddai: Fredman	IX	2	Winter 1980–1	72
Elijah: Bakon	IX	1	Fall 1980	72
Hezekiah and Josiah: Glatt	VIII	4	Summer 1980	201
The Habiru and the Hebrew: West	VII	3	Spring 1979	101
Introduction to a New Kohelet Commentary: Blumenthal	IX	1	Fall 1980	46
In the Language of Man: Abramowitz	IX	3	Spring 1981	139
Jacob Mourns for His Son: Asher	IX	4	Summer 1981	191
Jonah – From Seer to Prophet: Shazar	VII	1	Fall 1978	1
Moses – Man of Indecision: West	IX	1	Fall 1980	33

Pharaoh's Only Option: Sivan	VII	4	Summer 1979	202
Prophecy – A Phenomenological Approach: Bakon				
Part I	VII	4	Summer 1979	160
Part II	VIII	1	Fall 1979	21
Part III	VIII	2	Winter 1979–80	70
The Prophets – Nationalists or Universalists: Chinitz	VIII	4	Summer 1980	206
The Prophet and the King: Bartal	VIII	3	Winter 1980	111
Restoration of a Holy Nation: Porten	VII	3	Spring 1979	127
Some Psychological Insights in the Life of Abraham:				
Pusin	VII	2	Winter 1978–9	65
Testing God: Wolowelsky	VIII	2	Winter 1979–80	98
The Trials of Abraham: Abramowitz	VIII	3	Spring 1980	127
Thou Shalt Love Thy Neighbor: Berg	IX	2	Winter 1980–1	104
Tragedy in the Bible: Halpern	IX	1	Fall 1980	3
Why Did Samuel Reject Monarchy: Bakon	VIII	4	Summer 1980	171
Book Review				
Archeology of the Bible; Book by Book:				
Gedaliah Cornfield, Reviewed by Louis Katzoff	VII	1	Fall 1978	43
Talks on Scripture: Vo.2 The Latter Prophets:				
Benjamin Zvieli, Reviewed by Joseph Halpern	VII	2	Winter 1979–80	101
The Seven Days of the Beginning: Eli Munk				
Reviewed by Joseph Halpern	IX	4	Summer 1981	203
Books of the Bible				
Genesis 1–2, Adam's Rib: Gertel	VII	2	Winter 1978–9	75
Genesis 34, Rape of Dinah: West	VIII	3	Spring 1980	144
Genesis 36, Mystery of Genesis 36: West	IX	4	Summer 1981	161
Numbers 22–24, Balaam the Magician: Abramowitz	VIII	1	Fall 1979	31
I Samuel 14, Was Jonathan Guilty: Silverman	VII	4	Summer 1979	153
I Samuel 15:26–28, The Torn Robe: Silverman	VIII	3	Spring 1980	136
Isaiah, Isaiah and the Computer: Radday	VIII	1	Fall 1979	37
Jonah, The Book of Jonah: Shalev	VII	1	Fall 1978	21
Song of Songs 5:4, The Hand on the Door:				
Abramowitz	VII	2	Winter 1978–9	62
Literature and the Bible				
Abishag the Shunamite: Liptzin	IX	2	Winter 1980–1	78
Belshazzar's Folly: Liptzin	VII	3	Spring 1979	119
Evolving Symbolism of the Burning Bush: Levine	VIII	4	Summer 1980	185
Lady Asenath: Liptzin	VII	2	Winter 1978–9	51
Literary Impact of Jonah: Liptzin	VII	1	Fall 1978	9
Nabal and Abigail: Liptzin	VIII	2	Winter 1979–80	78
Princess Hagar: Liptzin	VIII	3	Spring 1980	114
Rahab of Jericho: Liptzin	IX	3	Spring 1981	111
Schiller on Moses: Liptzin	IX	4	Summer 1981	179
Shulamit Unallegorized: Liptzin	VIII	1	Fall 1979	1
Solomon and the Queen of Sheba: Liptzin	VII	4	Summer 1979	172
Solomon's Humiliation: Liptzin	IX	1	Fall 1980	11

Source Material

Changing Laws: Routtenberg	IX	3	Spring 1980	120
Darshanim Project: Wise	VIII	1	Fall 1979	52
Development of Biblical Prayer: Levine	IX	4	Summer 1981	172
Dukhan – Its Name: Berg	IX	4	Summer 1981	195
Laws of Shabbat – Biblical Sources: Routtenberg	VII	1	Fall 1978	41
The Origin of the Synagogue: Kohn	VII	1	Fall 1978	27
Prophecy and Halacha: Routtenberg	VIII	2	Winter 1979–80	61
The Physical Characteristics of a Torah Scroll: Levin	VIII	2	Winter 1979–80	86
Torah Dialogues: Halpern	VII	2	Winter 1978–9	80
	VII	3	Spring 1979	140
	VII	4	Summer 1979	198
	VIII	1	Fall 1979	44
	VIII	2	Winter 1979–80	94
	VIII	3	Spring 1980	140
	VIII	4	Summer 1980	210
	IX	1	Fall 1980	44
	IX	2	Winter 1980–1	100
	IX	3	Spring 1981	150
	IX	4	Summer 1981	206
Zion and Israel				
Holy Cities and the Land of Ephraim Revisited: Gevaryahu	VII	4	Summer 1979	187
The Western Wall: Luria				
Part V	VII	1	Fall 1978	35
Part VI	VII	2	Winter 1978–9	84
Part VII	VII	3	Spring 1979	136
Part VIII	VII	4	Summer 1979	193
WJBS News				
World Jewish Bible Center	VII	2	Winter 1978–9	96
Fifteenth World Bible Contest	VII	1	Fall 1978	46
Sixteenth World Youth Bible Contest	VIII	1	Fall 1979	50
Seventeenth World Youth Bible Contest	IX	1	Fall 1980	53
WJB Contest and after: Contributions by winners:				
David Cedor	VIII	2	Winter 1979–80	102
Chaim Warner	VIII	2	Winter 1979–80	104
News Around the World	VII	3	Spring 1979	144
Listing of Bible Study Groups	IX	4	Summer 1981	213
4th International Bible Contest for Adults: Glucksman	IX	4	Summer 1981	208
Editorials				
Louis Katzoff: גור בארץ הזאת	VII	4	Summer 1979	151
Louis Katzoff: אמור ואמרת להזהיר גדולים על הקטנים	IX	1	Fall 1980	1
Message: Joseph Halpern	VIII	4	Summer 1980	214
Letters to the Editor	VIII	1	Fall 1979	50
	VIII	2	Winter 1979–80	99
	IX	3	Spring 1981	155
	IX	4	Summer 1981	203

עשה תורתך קבע

TRIENNIAL BIBLE READING CALENDAR

June 1981	סיון תשמ"א	July 1981	תמוז תשמ"א
W 3 Psalms 10	א	F 3 חוקח	א
Th 4 Psalms 11	ב	Sa 4 Haftarah: Judges 11:1-33	ב
F 5 נשא	ג	S 5 Psalms 30	ג
Sa 6 Haftarah:	ד	M 6 Psalms 31	ד
		T 7 Psalms 32	ה
		W 8 Psalms 33	ו
S 7 Ruth ערב שבועות	ה	Th 9 Psalms 34	ז
M 8 Ruth שבועות	ו	F 10 בלק	ח
T 9 Ruth שבועות	ז	Sa 11 Haftarah: Micah 5:6-6:8	ט
W 10 Psalms 12	ח	S 12 Psalms 35	י
Th 11 Psalms 13	ט	M 13 Psalms 36	יא
F 12 בהעלותך	י	T 14 Psalms 37	יב
Sa 13 Haftarah:	יא	W 15 Psalms 38	יג
		Th 16 Psalms 39	יד
S 14 Psalms 14	יב	F 17 פנחס	טו
M 15 Psalms 15	יג	Sa 18 Haftarah:	טז
T 16 Psalms 16	יד		
W 17 Psalms 17	טו		
Th 18 Psalms 18	טז		
F 19 שלח	יז	S 19 Psalms 40 צום י"ז תמוז	יז
Sa 20 Haftarah: Joshua 2:1-24	יח	M 20 Psalms 41	יח
S 21 Psalms 19	יט	T 21 Psalms 42	יט
M 22 Psalms 20	כ	W 22 Psalms 43	כ
T 23 Psalms 21	כא	Th 23 Psalms 44	כא
W 24 Psalms 22	כב	F 24 מטות	כב
Th 25 Psalms 23-24	כג	Sa 25 Haftarah: Jeremiah 1-2:3	כג
F 26 קרח	כד	S 26 Psalms 45	כד
Sa 27 Haftarah:	כה	M 27 Psalms 46	כה
		T 28 Psalms 47	כו
		W 29 Psalms 48	כו
S 28 Psalms 25	כו	Th 30 Psalms 49	כז
M 29 Psalms 26	כז	F 31 מסעי	כט
T 30 Psalms 27	כח		
July			
W 1 Psalms 28	כט		
Th 2 Psalms 29	ל		

August 1981 מנחם אב תשמ"א

Sa	1	Haftarah: א שבת ראש חדרש	א
		Isaiah 66	
S	2	Psalms 50	ב
M	3	Psalms 51	ג
T	4	Psalms 52	ד
W	5	Psalms 53	ה
Th	6	Lamentations ו תענית אסתר	ו
F	7	דברים ז	ז
Sa	8	Haftarah: ח שבת חזק	ח
		Isaiah 1:1-27	
S	9	Lamentations ט תשעה באב	ט
M	10	Psalms 54	י
T	11	Psalms 55	יא
W	12	Psalms 56	יב
Th	13	Psalms 57	יג
F	14	ואתחנן יד	יד
Sa	15	Haftarah: טו שבת נחמו	טו
		Isaiah 40:1-26	
S	16	Psalms 58	טז
M	17	Psalms 59	יז
T	18	Psalms 60	יח
W	19	Psalms 61	יט
Th	20	Psalms 62	כ
F	21	עקב כא	כא
Sa	22	Haftarah: כב	כב
		Isaiah 49:14-51-3	
S	23	Psalms 63	כג
M	24	Psalms 64	כד
T	25	Psalms 65	כה
W	26	Psalms 66	כו
Th	27	Psalms 67	כז
F	28	ראה כח	כח
Sa	29	Haftarah: כט	כט
		Isaiah 54:11-55:5	
S	30	Psalms 68	ל

August 1981 אלול תשמ"א

M	31	Psalms 69	א
September			
T	1	Psalms 70	ב
W	2	Psalms 71	ג
Th	3	Psalms 72	ד
F	4	שופטים ה	ה
Sa	5	Haftarah: ו	ו
		Isaiah 51:12-52:12	
S	6	Psalms 73	ז
M	7	Psalms 74	ח
T	8	Psalms 75	ט
W	9	Psalms 76	י
Th	10	Psalms 77	יא
F	11	כי חצא יב	יב
Sa	12	Haftarah: Isaiah 54:1-10 יג	יג
S	13	Psalms 78	יד
M	14	Psalms 79	טו
T	15	Psalms 80	טז
W	16	Psalms 81	יז
Th	17	Psalms 82	יח
F	18	כי חבא יט	יט
Sa	19	Haftarah: כ	כ
		Isaiah 60:40-63:9	
S	20	Psalms 83	כא
M	21	Psalms 84	כב
T	22	Psalms 85	כג
W	23	Psalms 86	כד
Th	24	Psalms 87	כה
F	25	נצבים כו	כו
Sa	26	Haftarah: כז	כז
		Isaiah 61:10-63:9	
S	27	Psalms 88	כח
M	28	כט ערב ראש השנה	כט

September 1981 תשרי תשמ"ב

T 29 Haftarah: א ראש השנה
I Samuel 1-2:10

דף יומי

We add here the daily Talmud page followed by the Jewish Community

א' בסיון ממשיכים במסכת זבחים צ"ב

ל' בסיון מתחילים במסכת מנחות ב'

דור לדור

DOR le-DOR

Vol. IX, No. 4 (ל"ט)

Summer 1981

The Mystery of Genesis 36	<i>Stuart A. West</i>	161
The Development of Biblical Prayer	<i>Etan Levine</i>	172
Schiller on Moses	<i>Sol Liptzin</i>	179
Military Intelligence in the Bible — III	<i>Reuben Efron</i>	185
Why Did Joseph Let His Father Mourn For Him	<i>Norman Asher</i>	191
On "Dukhan"	<i>Edmond Berg</i>	195
Aliens and Israelites — I	<i>Max M. Rothschild</i>	196
Letters to the Editor		203
Torah Dialogues — Bemidbar	<i>Harold D. Halpern</i>	206
International Bible Contest	<i>Yitzhak Glucksman</i>	208
Book Review —	<i>Joseph Halpern</i>	211
Listing of Bible Study Groups		213
Third Triennial Index		218
Triennial Bible Reading Calendar		224