

BOOK REVIEWS

Moses and the Original Torah, by ABBA HILLEL SILVER (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1961).

Reviewed by David S. Shapiro

The title of the volume by Abba Hillel Silver belies the range and scope of his scholarly work. Although the work purports to deal with the nature of the original Torah of Moses as the author envisages it, it is actually a spiritual history of the Jewish people during the first millenium and a half of Israel's existence. Dr. Silver has succeeded in writing a work which is scholarly, well-documented, and eminently readable. *Moses and the Original Torah* also contains passages which are moving and memorable (e.g., pp. 29-30, 37-38, 136-137). Dr. Silver is certainly no dry-as-dust scholar. He moves about freely in the world concerning which he writes so eloquently, and it is evident that the milieu of ancient Israel and its great spiritual personalities are close to his heart. But above all, he is fascinated by the figure of Moses, "the foremost religious genius of all time," the

creator of the Jewish people and the founder of its faith.

Dr. Silver, himself a great leader of world-Jewry, could not but have written a warm-hearted and fervent book about the history of his people and its great spiritual leaders. But Dr. Silver is also one of the leading Reform rabbis of America and, as such, it is to be expected that his perspective on Judaism would come to the fore in this work. While the author has joined forces with the recent, more traditional trend in critical circles and, like Albright and his school, regards Moses and not Amos or the "Second Isaiah" as the unsurpassed genius who created the religion of Israel, he nevertheless remains loyal to the "classical" Reform position, and from its vantage-point attributes to Moses the religious and ethical teachings known as *ethical monotheism*, and ascribes to later teachers those phases of the Mosaic Law which Reform declares as "ritualistic" or "ceremonial." The

author asserts that Moses promulgated a Torah which taught the unity of God and prohibited the making of images. He set up standards of behavior which would guide his people towards an ethical life, both individually and collectively. But this original Torah was in the course of time "overlaid with much heavy embroidery" (p. 6). The detailed legislation dealing with rituals, with civil and criminal law, could not have originated with Moses. Moses rejected sacrifices, sanctuaries (Temples?), and the priesthood. How can the laws of Leviticus be assigned to him? How could he have constructed a Tabernacle in the wilderness? Sacrifices, sanctuaries, and the priesthood, according to Dr. Silver, insinuated themselves into the religion of Israel only as a result of Canaanitic influence. That this appraisal of the "disciplinary commandments" (*mitzvot ha-shimiyot*, of the medievals) is identical with that of the early Christians is pointed out by Silver who is prompted by this fact to comment that "for the people as a whole, the Torah — the whole of it — had become during the Second Commonwealth an essence, a sacred reality in its own right, the supreme factor in the religious life of the people" (p. 180). There is no elaboration on the latter statement.

While Dr. Silver's interpretation of historic events is influenced by his basic religious outlook, his work must be reckoned with as one of serious scholarship. Not every proof that he proffers to buttress his point of view is novel;

some are stock-in-trade arguments, some are flimsy — but he presents his point of view skillfully and with great sincerity. Let us examine some of the grounds for Dr. Silver's thesis.

The author argues very firmly and correctly that great ideas do not necessarily appear late in the development of the human race. Consequently there is no *a priori* necessity to assume that the basic teachings of the Torah of Moses originated in later generations. Nevertheless, Silver refuses to acknowledge Moses as a lawgiver to his people. "The great religious pioneer does not as a rule propose any detailed and specific laws and ordinances. This is the work of disciples, of those who come after him" (p. 2). The example of Zaratustra, Gautama, Lao-Tse, Confucius, Jesus, and Muhammad is cited. These were teachers, religious innovators, but not lawgivers. However, analogies are not always decisive. Even if it is true that these religious pioneers were not lawgivers, it would prove nothing about Moses. Moses labored under circumstances totally different from those faced by the other teachers who lived in societies with long-established systems of jurisprudence which they did little to alter. Moses was the leader of a people that possessed no land of its own and had not elaborated a special juridical structure that it could call its own. Is it not reasonable to suppose that Moses would set before himself this task of giving his people who were about to enter the Promised Land a code

of laws that would correspond to his ethical ideals, and a mode of religious worship which would reflect the purity of his teachings?

Dr. Silver maintains that the original Torah of Moses contained nothing in it about sacrifices or regulations concerning worship. This assertion in itself is remarkable. Is it possible that, in presenting his people with a religious ideal that was so different from anything else known in the ancient world, as the author consistently affirms, Moses would not provide for some form of worship of the unseen, imageless God, such as prayer, obeisance, or offerings? A people who are loyal to God are hungry to worship Him. Would not Moses have been derelict in his duties, as the teacher of his people, had he not taught them how to pray and how to worship? It is inconceivable that he told Israel that it does not matter how one worships God. The community he led out of Egypt was after all not a congregation of sophisticated college-graduates. Even these are sometimes not averse to participating in a divine service. Before rejecting the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuchal regulations of divine worship, one would have to explicate what forms of worship Moses did sanction and instruct his people to follow. But Dr. Silver nowhere in his work clarifies what Moses did offer his people as an acceptable mode of worship.

However, our author does present what seems to be more positive

evidence for his contention that Moses was not the author of the sacrificial and Levitical regulations. Thus, he cites the prophetic invectives against the sacrifices. But it has been pointed out time and time again that the prophets were scandalized not by the sacrifices as such but by the base motives and unrepentant hearts behind the offerings. The Torah itself has declared such sacrifices to be unacceptable. (See Samson Raphael Hirsch, *Gesammelte Schriften* II, 235 ff., and his *Pentateuch* [Frankfurt am Main, 1903] to Genesis 4, 3-6 p. 82). More serious is the problem of Amos 5:25 and Jeremiah 7:21 ff. In Amos we read: "Did ye bring unto Me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?" Actually the prophet is only saying that sacrifices were not always offered throughout the entire forty years because, during the greater part of this era, circumstances, such as the lack of animals or the state of uncircumcision of the people, made the offering of sacrifices impossible.* The passage in Jeremiah which asserts that God did not speak to the children of Israel concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices *on the day He brought them out of the land of Egypt* does not offer conclusive evidence. A close study of the passages in Jeremiah will reveal that by the phrase "the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt" is meant the period from the Exodus to the theophany at Sinai (Cf. Maim., *Guide* III, 32). During this period

* See a discussion of this point in my work *Torat Mosheh Veba-Neviim*, Jerusalem, Mosad Harav Kook, 1961, pp. 30-31.

received his *devarim* at Mt. Sinai, because they never mention this mountain (except Malachi, p. 13-14). We might also, by the same logic, deny that they knew that the Egyptian king from whose yoke the children of Israel were liberated was called Pharaoh, because they never refer to him. Aaron and Miriam are mentioned only one time in all the prophetic writings (Micah, 6:4). Were the prophets unaware of their existence? On p. 130, the author forgets this theory, and states simply that Moses made the covenant with Israel at Sinai. On p. 87, Dr. Silver states that "in the Deuteronomic Code there are sundry speeches attributed to Moses, a literary device which was common among ancient writers." This reviewer is unaware to what extent this device was used in ancient times. It was practiced by the Greek historians of a much later period and their emulators (such as Josephus). Poets had from ancient times put words into the mouths of their heroes. That such a literary device would have been used in the case of so earnest and inspired a work as Deuteronomy, that a writer would have dared to put his own words into the mouth of the great man of God, is highly incredible.

There are a number of other points which need comment. For example, on p. 156, Silver asserts that Amon carried on his father's tradition for twenty-two years. The biblical text states that Amon reigned only two years (II Kings, 21:3-5). On p. 71 (See also p. IX), it is stated that the Pentateuch and

the historical books of the Bible from Joshua through Kings were recast in such a way as to extol the Davidic dynasty and the central sanctuary in Jerusalem, and they were hostile to the Northern Kingdom. While such an assertion might, correctly or incorrectly, be applied to the historical books, in what way does it apply to the Pentateuch, except for the enigmatic passage in Genesis 49:10? Where is there a glorification in the Pentateuch of the Davidic dynasty or of Jerusalem? The fact that there is no reference in the Pentateuch either to Jerusalem as the place which God has chosen, or to the Davidic dynasty, or to the division of the kingdom is in itself the greatest evidence for the antiquity of the entire Pentateuch.

On p. 122, the author maintains that according to the Book of the Covenant, only excommunication was prescribed for worshipping other gods, while the Deuteronomic Code prescribes the death penalty. However, the term *cherem* used in the Covenant Code (Ex. 22:19) means nothing other than the death penalty as can be ascertained from Lev. 27:29 which refers to such cases as that spoken of in Exodus.

On p. 139, in the formulation of the "Words" from the Holiness Code that might be attributed to Moses, the chapter on the laws of incest (Lev. 18) is omitted. One wonders why.

On p. 16, the author asserts that the *legend* associated with the birth of Moses is not unlike that which is recorded of Sargon I of Akkad and of other national he-

Book Reviews

roes of the past. Without delving too deeply into this problem, this reviewer wishes to point out that the exposure of children in antiquity was a common, everyday occurrence, and the fact that some of the exposed children were rescued and in the course of time achieved positions of importance may not in any way be statistically remarkable.

The implication on p. 41 that according to Jeremiah the sanctuary in Jerusalem was not truly a house of God is highly questionable. This assertion is belied by Jeremiah's reference to the Temple as the house *whereupon God's name is called* (7:11), a phrase which he uses in regard to his own relationship to God (15:17). Shiloh, according to him, was also the place where God caused His name to dwell at first (7:12). On p. 59, the name *Yeshurun* is said to suggest courage and victory. What evidence is there for this interpretation? See Gesenius (E. Robinson tr.), *Lexicon of the OT*, p. 449. If the Samaritans are actually Israelites as suggested on p. 53, why is it that the Samaritans never accepted the Israelite prophets? On p. 178, it is stated that in the Testament of Levi (ch. 3) opposition to the sacrifices is expressed. However, the reference is to bloodless sacrifices made in heaven, as in *Menachot* 110a and *Tossafot*, *ibid.* That the Testament of Levi was not opposed to sacrifices is evident from chapter 9 of that work. Why is Ehud regarded as the first of the Judges (p. 62) and not Othniel? Is it in the interest of the author's

theory about the tribe of Judah? On p. 134 it is stated that the prophets always use the term *Torah*, *the Torah of Moses*, *the Torah of God*. This reviewer knows of only one passage in the prophets (Malachi, end) where the expression the *Torah of Moses* is used. Likewise the statement (*ibid.*) that the author of the Deuteronomic Code frequently applies the term "the Torah of Moses" or the "Book of the Torah of Moses" to the whole of the Code which was found in the Temple during the reign of King Josiah is incorrect. Where did Dr. Silver find these these terms in the Book of Deuteronomy, unless he is referring to the Book of Joshua, which he assumes was written by the Deuteronomist, or to the Book of Kings? Why are the prophecies of Isaiah 2 and Micah 4 containing the vision of the "end of days" relegated to the post-exilic period? (p. 170).

Surprising also is Dr. Silver's failure to cite modern Hebrew biblical scholars. The monumental work of Ezekiel Kaufman is ignored, except for one reference to the English digest of his work (p. 72). Only one modern Hebrew book is cited, that of Prof. Mazar (p. 71). There is no allusion to the great books of Prof. U. Cassuto or Dr. Kaminka. In the case of a Hebraic scholar of Dr. Silver's stature this disregard is puzzling.

Dr. Silver has employed great ingenuity and skill to rear a structure of the spiritual history of our people in ancient times. However, his failure to reckon with the tried and tested tradition of our people

has weakened his edifice, so that, without a strong foundation, it totters dangerously and hopelessly. It is to be sincerely hoped that in his future writings, Dr. Silver will

build upon the bedrock of Jewish tradition, and, with his great ability and learning, will continue to be of service to our people and faith.

The Leo Jung Jubilee Volume, essays in his honor on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, edited by MENACHEM M. KASHER, NORMAN LAMM, LEONARD ROSENFELD (New York: The Jewish Center, 1962).

Reviewed by
Norman M. Bernhard

This Festschrift is a collection of uncommon significance, singularly suited to the distinguished person it honors. The Hebrew section of this volume contains a wealth of material on scriptural and talmudic subjects. Specially noteworthy is Rabbi Y. M. Ginzburg's demonstration of the innate linkage of the Written and the Oral Law. Taking one of the numerous Scriptural passages that defy simple literal interpretation, he shows how the biblical style and expressions can be understood only in the light of the halakhic *Massorah* transmitted by our Sages.

Those concerned with formulating a *modus vivendi* for the modern Torah Jew in the non-Jewish world, will find particularly interesting the piece by Rabbi Dr. Y. Z. Kahana on "Judaism and the Environment." The author indicates that the Halakhah has been very sensitive to the ways of the innumerable cultures in which Jews have found themselves. Reacting to assimilatory pressures, adoption of many local customs has been prohibited as

Chukat ha-Goy (the characteristic way of the Gentile). On the other hand, numerous Jewish practices have been modified or even suspended, either because they might incite suspicion and hostility against the Jews, or because they might elicit scorn on the part of our Gentile neighbors and result in a *Chillul ha-Shem* (desecration of the Name of God).

Too often we hear a charge of cold, unyielding legalism applied against the Halakhah. A long-needed study is Rabbi Dr. I. Jakobovits' article on "Human Pain in the Laws of Israel." The author demonstrates that the entire range of human distress, from physical pain to emotional anxiety and even embarrassment, is very much the concern of the Rabbis as it is of the Torah, "whose ways are ways of pleasantness."

Rabbi Menachem M. Kasher, famed scholar and author, contributes a lengthy dissertation thoroughly covering the subject of *Tscheilet*, the mysterious color specified by the Torah for the *Tzitzit*. He concludes that it is certainly a religious duty for all who are capable to search in the waters of

Book Reviews

Israel for the elusive sea-creature that is its source, and then for scholars to consider re-institution of its use.

The English section, apart from Herman Wouk's moving "Word of Thanks" and the customary biographical and bibliographical material, presents a bountiful crop of significant papers by such authorities as Professors Berkovits, Finkel, Katsh, Kisch, and Rabbi Eli Munk.

The late Dr. Isidore Epstein contributed a fascinating essay on Maimonides' "humanistic" approach to Jewish Law. Quoting numerous examples, he shows that, "in cases for which no provision is made in the Talmud, Maimonides, guided by dictates of reason or by moral principles, would not hesitate to dispute the decision of the Geonim or any other of his predecessors" (p. 72). That such was, indeed, the Rambam's approach to Halakhah is well-established by the author. What is questionable, however, is how distinctively unique this approach was with the Rambam. As the author indicates, Maimonides himself attributed many of his disagreements with his predecessors on such matters to variations and mistakes in the talmudic texts before them, rather than to any differences in philosophical or axiological orientation.

In examining the recently published complete text of Maimonides' Prayer Book, Jacob I. Dienstag assesses the position of this pioneering work in the history of Jewish liturgy. Of particular contemporary interest is the discus-

sion of Maimonides' concern for "the aesthetic behavior of the worshippers in the Synagogue and the decorum during the prayers." He went so far as to have the silent *Amidah* omitted altogether, thereby making it necessary for all to be decorously attentive to the Cantor's recitation aloud, during which learned and unlearned alike would fulfill their obligation. Mr. Dienstag documents Maimonides' oft-quoted aversion to *piyuttim* and their inclusion in the liturgy — although some of Maimonides' own religious poetry has been enshrined in our present prayerbook!

In his stirring prose, A. J. Heschel explores the soul-experience of the prophetic personality. Besides his objective concern with the word and demand he must transmit, the prophet is completely bound up in his encounter with the Divine Being *per se*. The key to a psychological understanding of the prophets, Heschel says, is "religious sympathy," i.e., the prophet's subjective attitude and response to what he apprehends of the *pathos* of God. "The unique feature of religious sympathy is not self-conquest but self-dedication; not the suppression of emotion but its redirection; not silent subordination, but active cooperation with God; not love which aspires to the Being of God in Himself, but harmony of the soul with the concern of God. To be a prophet means to identify one's concern with the concern of God" (p. 106).

It is worth noting that this is the attitude encouraged by Judaism for all, not only its prophets.

No doubt, this is because Judaism considered all persons to be potential candidates for prophetic communion with the Lord. Heschel himself suggests that the wider scope of this concept offers "a basic understanding of religious existence. Perhaps it is in sympathy that the ultimate meaning, worth, and dignity of religion may be found" (p. 109).

Happily, the author hastens to point out that "sympathy" is not an end in itself, nor do the prophets advocate a religion of mere sentimentality. "Not mere feeling but action will mitigate the world's misery, society's injustice, or the people's alienation from God . . . Prophetic sympathy is no delight; unlike ecstasy, it is not a goal but a sense of challenge, a commitment, a state of tension, consternation, and dismay" (p. 107).

Perhaps the keenest problem facing contemporary Jewry is that of formulating the ideal response to the challenging confrontation between authentic halakhic Judaism and Western culture. A very timely piece, therefore, is Norman Lamm's excellent essay contrasting the two versions of the Judaeo-secular "Synthesis" advocated respectively by Samson Raphael Hirsch and Rav Kook.

Rabbi Lamm summarizes the differences: "Hirsch's Synthesis is one of co-existence, hence essentially static. Kook's is one of interaction, and hence dynamic. Hirsch is an esthete who wants Torah and *Derekh Eretz* to live in a neighborly, courteous, and gentlemanly fashion. Kook is an alchemist

who wants the sacred to transmute the profane and recast it in its own image" (p. 151).

Rabbi Lamm, while giving Hirsch his due as the Father of modern Orthodoxy, clearly feels that American Orthodoxy has progressed beyond the stage where it has to prove itself, and can now move on to the more profound and creative synthesis advocated by Rav Kook. Would that this were so! I fear, though, that most of Rabbi Lamm's colleagues are painfully aware that it is still, as it was in the time of Hirsch, "important to produce a Westernized Orthodox Jew in order to refute the charge that Judaism is a collection of old superstitions" (p. 148).

Professor Samuel K. Mirsky laments the fact that talmudic methodology is a relatively uncultivated field of research. In a lengthy study of just one of the Talmud's many rules of operation, the author highlights the problems and inconsistencies caused by our oversimplifying or taking for granted the principles that guided the *Tannaim* and *Amoraim* in their formulation and discussion of the Mishnah.

In an age fraught with great halakhic controversies, Rabbi Louis Rabinowitz enters "a plea not only for tolerance and understanding . . . but for a return to and a restoration of the essential spirit of difference of interpretation" (p. 193). The author points to the thousands of differences of opinion recorded in the Talmud, and calls our attention to the little noted "time lag" — often a great many years — between the propounding of the

Book Reviews

different views and the final determination of the Halakhah in accordance with one of them. This "time lag," Rabbi Rabinowitz writes, "is of the very essence of the methodology and procedure of the Talmud... (and) continues throughout the ages in the development of Halakhah up to the present day." Therefore, he concludes, "On such questions which are being actively debated today in the various rabbinic journals and responsa... we are still in the period of 'judicial controversy and academic discussion' — but the period of 'results (which are) binding upon Jews who accept the Torah' still belongs to the future" (p. 192).

The author leaves one wondering how to discern when the period of controversy and tolerant discussion is over and the period of results, described by him as a time of cracking down on heterodoxy to establish the Halakhah firmly, begins. Is it not natural for each zealous disputant to feel impatiently that it is in *his* time?

Rabbi Leonard Rosenfeld sets out to demonstrate the relevance of the Sabbath "not only as pragmatically profitable but also as the philosophic exponent of man's quest for freedom" (p. 198). And he succeeds admirably — but not, I fear, in terms comprehensible and convincing to the average alienated American Jew who just doesn't want his style cramped, not even by God Almighty Himself.

Cecil Roth's highly readable article establishes that the Zealots of first-century Palestine "were not basically political terrorists, nor

even political activists, but members of a religious group whose dogma had political implications" (p. 209).

Particularly fascinating is Roth's theory and evidence that the members of the Qumran Sect were not in fact Essenes, but extreme Zealots, who, in keeping with their unique dogma of the sole sovereignty of God over the Jewish People, withdrew into a remote quasi-monastic community in order to avoid all possibility of recognition of Roman and even native authority in daily life.

In a difficult, but important, article, Rabbi Walter S. Wurzbarger assails the notion that, "claiming sovereignty only in the realm of practice, the Halakhah is . . . content to leave the domain of ideology entirely to the subjective whim and personal preference of the individual . . . the burden of supplying the Jew with a philosophy of life is assigned to the non-halakhic components of Judaism . . . (such) as Aggadah, philosophy, Mussar, or mysticism" (p. 212).

The author shows that "There can be no doubt that the Halakhah sets definite limits to our freedom of thought . . . and . . . commits us to a number of specific metaphysical propositions" (p. 212). Rabbi Wurzbarger then goes on to demonstrate that "there is a class of propositions to be called *meta-halakhic* propositions which contain the ontological and axiological presuppositions of the Halakhah. These meta-halakhic propositions represent the meta-physical and ethical propositions which can be

extracted from halakhic data and which, unlike general aggadic concepts, form an integral part of the halakhic system" (p. 213). The author refutes the positions of such differing thinkers as A. J. Heschel and Jacob B. Agus, who see the Halakhah as soulless, objective behaviorism, intrinsically and irremediably unconcerned with the personal world of faith, ideas, attitudes and ideological commitments. The paper ends with the suggestion that "the harnessing of the collective resources of halakhic scholars may be the only way in which the ontological and axiological foundations of halakhic Judaism can be made explicit to the modern Jew who is in search for an authentically Jewish ideology" (p. 221).

What student of Halakhah has not felt the frustration of running

up against the self-effacing statement regarding a crucial phase of his subject, "We are not acquainted any more in this matter," or "We are not expert enough to make such distinctions"? With great erudition, H. Z. Zimmels, of Jews' College in London, traces the history and probes the meaning of this self-deprecating theme in rabbinic literature and, surprisingly, in non-Jewish sources as well. One wishes still more treatment had been given to the meaning as well as the psychological and epistemological implications of this attitude.

This is truly a remarkable volume, rich in offerings to suit every interest, although addressed to a wide range of levels of understanding and prior knowledge. It is an extraordinary tribute to an extraordinary man.

B'nai Brith Great Book Series: Vol. III, *Great Jewish Thinkers of the Twentieth Century*, Vol. IV, *Contemporary Jewish Thought, A Reader*, Edited with Introductions by SIMON NOVECK (B'nai B'rith Department of Adult Education, 1963).

Reviewed by
Zalman I. Posner

Two names on the dust jacket of the first volume will catch the eye of the Orthodox reader: Abraham Isaac Kuk (*sic*) and Joseph Soloveitchik. Torah thinkers do have a place in the array of the Great. However, after reading both essays one may be reminded of the dictum that when Israel is deserving, then their work is done by others, and if not, they must

do their own work. The essay on Rabbi Soloveitchik by his pupil portrays him as well as that complex personality can be encompassed in a few pages. The one on the first Chief Rabbi of the Holy Land, sympathetic and respectful as it is, cannot be satisfactory from the viewpoint we may assume he shared. Orthodox writers have to present the lives and works of our *gedolim*; others cannot do it for us. Too, B'nai B'rith, with all due acclaim for these latest volumes in its "Great Books Series," cannot

Book Reviews

present the Torah perspective for us.

Dr. Aharon Lichtenstein pictures his teacher reverently and realistically; this "essentially lonely figure" comes to life. He undertakes the formidable task of explaining a halakhic thinker and halakhic thought to an audience presumably unfamiliar with either. His reference to the "acute dialectic of halakhic logic — so rigorous and yet so subtle; so flexible and still so firm," provides an epigrammatic description for those exposed to Talmud, but will probably be incomprehensible to the uninitiated.

His lengthier treatment of the "Concept of Halakhah" speaks concretely. The abstraction becomes real. His brief examples are illuminating and apt, drawn from familiar daily experience. His remark about the "most legalistic ritualism (being) better than no worship whatever" is a simple and effective rebuke to those who attempt to justify their slackness by denigrating the observant. Three sub-headings of Lichtenstein's are particularly recommended: Role of the Intellect, Implementation of Halakhah, and Halakhah and Jewish Identity.

Lichtenstein provides material for scholar and layman, explaining R. Soloveitchik's philosophy of Halakhah, and demonstrating its relevance in the life of the Jew. While the subjects of the other essays are represented in the companion Reader volume, unhappily R. Soloveitchik is not. Let us hope, if futilely, that we may soon be

privileged to have his vitally needed teachings available to a broader audience than his lecture room provides. Until then, we are grateful to Dr. Lichtenstein for his lucid contribution to the scanty literature on Halakhah in English.

Chief Rabbi Kook emerges from Dr. Jacob B. Agus' essay as an inspiring figure, a man of mind and heart, of religious passion and sympathetic awareness of worldly problems. But, not sharing R. Kook's attitudes to Halakhah, Agus found it impossible to present his views without subjective intrusions.

Sometimes a word, but a crucial one, betrays Agus' stand. He states that in a decision, R. Kook "suspended" the law of the Sabbatical year. A trifle like "suspended" may be the key to the Conservative view of Torah law, but may Dr. Agus attribute his views to R. Kook?

Elsewhere we are told that R. Kook "extended the meaning of holiness beyond the borders of dogma and ritual. No longer determined exclusively by the words of the Torah . . ." Does Agus mean that R. Kook's conception of holiness is attainable outside the framework of Torah and *mitzvot*? Are the "words of the Torah" somehow less vital to R. Kook? Is this the *Rav Roshi* speaking or a Conservative spokesman? The revealing choice of words in this context, "dogma and ritual," is disparaging to the concept of *emunot* and *mitzvot*.

Agus deduces from R. Kook's works that "the Messiah is no longer a person but a symbol of

the horizon of perfection." When he earlier paraphrases R. Kook and says that "every effort for the improvement of society is worship in action," we have little quarrel. But eliminating *Mashiach* on the basis of this view is unwarranted and objectionable. Is this another instance of ascribing his personal beliefs to R. Kook?

Another instance of alien views, at least implicit, interwoven in the Rav's, is a translation open to question. "Faith is exemplified by the tractate (*sic*) *Zeraim* (Plants) — man proves his faith in eternal life by planting." Is not the intention of the original quotation (Yerushalmi, cited in *Tosafot, Shabbat* 31a) that the farmer believes in God (Who lives eternally, or is the Life of all creations — *chai ha-olamim*) rather than in some undefined "eternal life"? Again we wonder about the fidelity to the Rav's intention.

But, one might argue, these are abstractions innocent of implication, though this reviewer feels they are profoundly important. However, Agus does become specific, citing a "liberal" (an attractive word, not declass   like "dogma and ritual") decision of R. Kook regarding football on Shabbat. The Rav's son, Rabbi Zvi Yehudah Kook, in response to a query by our colleague, Rabbi Philip Zimmerman, indignantly denied any such decision by his father, and sent a copy of a letter by the Rav categorically and vehemently prohibiting that activity.

The second volume of selected writings could well have offered

the closing paragraph of that letter:

But in truth, the superficiality of those who learned a little, and the illiteracy and ignorance of the masses are the causes of the stumbling-blocks in all aspects of our lives. To attain some improvement we must increase Torah study among all levels. Then they will be able to distinguish between the prohibited and permitted in general, and not be like the blind, constantly stumbling. Pupils not fully qualified must develop traits of ethics and respect, not to spring forward to issue halakhic decisions without taking counsel with their seniors . . .

The Editor's Introduction to the section "Recent Trends in American Jewish Theology," in common with the introductions to the other sections, is comprehensive and erudite. While it touches only highlights, it does so competently. Swift and flowing, it provides an enlightening insight into contemporary writing by Jews on theology. We may presume that the term "theology" in the title refers to religious thought in general, not limited to the technical definition of the term.

The areas of religious thought explored and developed by most of the Jewish thinkers (a term constantly repeated throughout the books; they are almost a new class: thinkers) here presented, are prescribed or pioneered by Christian theologians. They lay down the ground-rules, as it were, and Jewish thinkers work within the limits

Book Reviews

and terminology which others find of concern. What we have in a sense is the Jewish counterpart to the Protestant theologian. Considerable intellectual energy and ability is expended in these fields, not in itself objectionable, but *karmi sheli*, the unique and identifiable world of Jewish thought, is scarcely mentioned.

Reading these pages makes one wonder whether these theologians are not, for all their worth, an isolated group, writing for colleagues. The layman not committed to Torah may be interested in their work insofar as they may rationalize and justify his conduct and ideals, and if they don't, he will continue unperturbed. This is not the inevitable gap between philosopher and the masses, but a barrier of indifference and irrelevance. More precisely: the contemporary Jewish theologian (Kaplan, for example) prides himself on keeping his theology abreast of scientific advances. Religion is made a handmaiden of science — submissive, pliant. Has this "scientific" approach had any appreciable impact on the scientific community, say, so that physicists may describe themselves as committed and inspired Conservative or Reform Jews, convinced that this is the way for them, intellectually satisfying, indeed imperative? They might "belong," because of family obligations, but is their personal involvement more than peripheral? If theological thinking is not reflected in this group, where does it have an effect outside the professional circles? In turn how

has the Torah community performed?

The editor notes "the emergence of a new type of Orthodox Rabbi, conversant with the culture of our day." The true revolution in the Torah community is perhaps not symbolized as much by the Talmud-steeped Rabbi conversant with the secular culture, as by the scientist (the idol and symbol of the 20th century) conversant with Talmud and observant of *mitzvot*. Here we have an impressive example of effective communication between the "thinker" and the layman.

Creative religious thinkers do not necessarily "create" religious ideas, or invent novel ceremonials, or write revolutionary books. But they must "create" religious people. The startling success of men like Rabbi Aaron Kotler (not mentioned in the volume) in the field of intensive Talmud scholarship, of the Chafetz Chaim (no less an enduring figure than many subjects of the book) in the field of personal morality, and the Lubavitcher Rebbes in resuscitating an almost moribund American Jewish community — these represent Jewish religious creativeness. Nor may their work be cavalierly dismissed as "pragmatic" success, or as lacking intellectual magnitude. They may not speak of God as though they held his coat-tails, but their religious perceptions and intellectual stature is of the highest order. This new universe of Jewish learning is virtually ignored in these volumes.

Orthodox scholars and institutions may view these books as a challenge to organize and articulate

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

in English the incalculable wealth of Torah development, and to explore more deeply the areas almost untouched by the Orthodox, such

as biography and history. There is no reason why others should enjoy a monopoly.

Man's Best Hope, by ROLAND B. GITTELSOHN (New York: Random House, 1961).

Reviewed by
Leonard B. Gewirtz

In the history of Western thought two systems prevailed: Dualism and Monism. Metaphysical dualism says that the nature of the universe is dualistic: substance and essence, matter and form, body and mind. Metaphysical dualism is hospitable to a transcendental conception of God, who created a universe *ex nihilo*. Metaphysical dualism is therefore hospitable to a theonomous ethical system, and is agreeable to the theological doctrine of revelation. This metaphysics also explains psychology in dualistic terms, body and mind, and is hospitable to the doctrine of immortality.

Metaphysical monism says that the nature of the universe is monistic, matter-form continuum, or body-mind continuum. Although this seems to be a materialistic philosophy, and many dualists consider monism as a veiled form of materialism, metaphysical monism does try to reckon with and explain such manifestations as mind, spirituality, freedom, creativity, soul, etc. Metaphysical monism may be hospitable to an immanent conception of God, an autonomous conception of ethics, a monistic

psychology with a rejection of a belief in a "life-after-death," and a "theology" resting on revelation as historic process and not as event.

Process Philosophy, a contemporary school of thought, whose outstanding proponent is A. N. Whitehead, expounds monism. It rejects materialism as an oversimplified explanation of reality, and to accommodate the activities of freedom, will, creativity, intelligence, and other emergent forces regnant in nature, it suggests that reality is a vast, complex *Process*. Religious naturalism is a sub-division within the broad system of process-philosophy.

Dr. Roland B. Gittelsohn writes as a naturalist who tries to find a locus for God, Soul, prayer, ethics, and immortality in a monistic universe. These traditionally transcendental concepts coming from the Bible and its tradition, that have been interpreted in a dualistic fashion, are re-interpreted in a monistic manner, and they are divested of any other-worldly significance. Summing-up his chapter on God, he writes, "My God is not a Person. He is not supernatural. He is not a Cosmic Magician," (p. 119). Consistent with process philosophy, the author defines, "God is the Energy which has so created and

Book Reviews

infused the universe . . . God is the force which keeps the universe operating . . ." (p. 103). God is part of the process in the universe. "God is to nature what energy is to matter. He is *within* nature. He is not supernatural" (p. 113).

Basing himself on what religious naturalists, especially Edmund W. Sinnott, have written, he proposes that human values are sustained by the natural process, and that these values reside in the structure of nature. "Evolution seems to be headed in the direction of (a) order, (b) of co-operation, (c) of individualism, (d) of freedom, and (e) of spirit" (p. 51).

In a monistic universe, where everything, including God, inheres in the process, who or what is the object of worship? For Gittelsohn, prayer is reduced to an exercise in awareness — that man should be aware that he is living in a process universe without a personal God. His fourth and best reason for prayer is, "My business is to teach my aspirations to conform themselves to fact, not to try and make facts harmonize with my aspirations" (p. 169).

Dr. Gittelsohn offers to man as his best hope a process universe, without a personal God, without personal prayer, without immortality.

The limitations and flaws of this whole approach to religion are numerous. Let us take a few:

1. His uncritical acceptance of "scientific" assumptions and his complete dependence upon science as a source of knowledge and reality. From this point of view,

revelation is rejected and religious knowledge is reduced to the *consensus hominum* of the scientific community. The real expounders of religion are not the prophets, the rabbis, and philosophers and poets, but the physicists, the biologists, and the geologists. To state this position is to call attention to its absurdity.

2. His unqualified and uncritical acceptance of "science" as a basis for the validation and verification of human values. All students of axiology are prepared to admit that there can be no "scientific" validation of human values. Analytical philosophy is prepared to recognize that value judgments are enunciated axiomatically. This axiomatic origin of values does not preclude any critical analysis and evaluation. These are the functions of social philosophy, ethics, literary criticism, politics, and religion. Scientific data will be helpful in this process of evaluation. But Science cannot evaluate!

At the end of the book, the author displays an awareness of this limitation. "This does not mean that we limit ourselves to that which science can prove" (p. 187). But throughout his book, he has done so.

3. The most glaring limitation of this book is revealed in what it does not discuss, the *existential* problems of human concern: the meaning of life, the purpose of the whole human situation. For the 18th century, the cosmological-teleological answer was emotionally, psychologically, and socially significant. In our Orwellian Age

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

of Enormity, teleological proofs are almost beside the point. Man needs personal meaning for personal

commitment. This hope is not forthcoming from this book.

The Religious Factor: A Sociological Study of Religion's Impact on Politics, Economics and Family Life, by GERHARD LENSKI (New York: Anchor Books, Revised Edition, 1963).

Reviewed by
Tsvi Lieber

A month or two before every election, indignant letters appear in newspapers heatedly denying the claim that there is a Jewish or Catholic vote; rather, it is asserted that one votes "as an American," regardless of religious or ethnic affiliation. Admittedly, there may not necessarily be a Jewish or Irish vote in the sense of "voting for one's own," regardless of party or program. But after reading *The Religious Factor* it would be difficult to say that belonging to a religious group, with its distinctive way of life and world outlook, affects only one's behavior within the confines of church or synagogue but fails to influence attitudes towards work, education, and culture and voting tendencies as well.

Prof. Lenski, a sociologist at Michigan University, finds impressive statistical evidence of religion's influence in daily life by analyzing the results of a 1958 sample survey of 656 residents of metropolitan Detroit and 127 Protestant and Catholic clergymen of that city, supplemented by surveys of the Detroit Area Study of earlier years. After describing differences among Protestants, Catholics, and

Jews in regard to politics, economics, family life, education and science, the author concludes that religion furnishes the individual with a distinctive orientation toward all phases of human activity and that "differences among socio-religious groups are not declining and are not likely to decline in the foreseeable future."

To summarize briefly some of Lenski's major findings: White Protestants are strongly committed towards intellectual autonomy, with material advance and devotion to the spirit of capitalism (positive attitude to work, entrepreneurial, competitive orientation, high regard for savings, etc.) a by-product of their religious effort, which is becoming more secular and in the process of turning into a "cultural faith," according to Lenski. White Protestants tend to vote much more for Republicans than Catholics do, even when their father's party preference and the class position of both respondent and father are held constant. Catholics are described as the group least tolerant of free speech, whose ethos is also anti-capitalist. They have a higher birth rate and stronger family ties than white Protestants.

The very small number of Jewish respondents (from 27 to 94, de-

Book Reviews

pending on the number of surveys used) limits greatly the statistical significance of his findings. However, Lenski's results generally parallel other studies and are most suggestive in analyzing the Jews' place in American society.

While the Jewish group was the weakest religious community, in terms of attendance at religious services, on the other hand it was the most cohesive, in terms of friends, marriage, and other social relations. Jews are the most secular-minded — they are least likely to feel any conflict between the teachings of science and those of their religious group, and they are the most likely to believe that an atheist can be a good American. The Herberg thesis of the returning third generation, while valid statistically for Protestants and Catholics, does not hold for Jews, at least in terms of synagogue attendance. Also, in distinction to Catholic and Protestant interclass differences, more of the working class Jews attended services every Sabbath than did middle class group members.

Surveying religious attitudes, Lenski differentiated between doctrinal orthodoxy (defined as intellectual assent to prescribed church doctrines, as compared to the Orthodox Jewish definition of "conformity to prescribed patterns of action") and devotionism (a feeling of "pietistic communion with God") among Catholics and Protestants. Surprisingly, he found no correlation between the two factors. Only devotionism could be linked to a more unified humanitarian orientation while, in com-

parison, orthodoxy was associated with "a compartmentalized outlook which separates and segregates religion from daily life." Unfortunately, a similar set of questions was not asked of Jews.

The Jewish group was found to be suffering from serious religious organizational weakness while at the same time enjoying great vigor in terms of communalism and group cohesion. All 24 of the Jewish respondents in one particular sample were lifelong Jews married to lifelong Jewish spouses. 96% said that all or nearly all of their close relatives were Jewish while 77% said that all or nearly all of their close friends were Jewish. Finally, 96% of the Jews expected some type of sanction from friends or relatives if they attempted to join another group, as compared to 87% of the Catholics, 75% of the white Protestants and 28% of the Negro Protestants.

Jews were the group most likely to have received some college education and also to have completed a given unit, whether grammar school, high school or college. Three-quarters of the Jewish group were in the middle class (nearly half were in the upper middle class) and even working class Jewish respondents revealed an attachment to middle class values. In addition, nearly one-half of the Jewish family heads are self employed, as compared to 7% of the male heads of non-Jewish families.

Jews were found to be consistently liberal, in terms not only of internationalism and free speech (as are white Protestants) but also

on welfare and minority rights issues (as are Negro Protestants; Catholics are moderate, except in free speech questions where they are conservative). Jews are the least critical of drinking, divorce and doing business on Sunday, while relatively uncritical of gambling and birth control. Family size was low while familial ties were strong, symbolic rather than physical coercion was relied upon in bringing up children, and Jews were found to be the group most future-oriented, in terms of planning ahead financially and vocationally.

As revealed by the study, the image held by other groups of Jews is quite disturbing. 49% of all Gentiles believe that, compared with Protestants, Jews are less tolerant of the religious beliefs of others; 56% believe that Jews are less fair in their business dealings than Protestants, and 47% agreed with the statement that Jews have too much power in this country today. Incidentally, there are also very few contacts between Christian clergymen and rabbis.

Jews are the group most often criticized, while they themselves are least critical of others. Curiously enough, while Jews are shown to have the most tolerant views toward Negroes (for example, only 19% of the Jews as compared to 58% of the Catholics and 53% of the white Protestants said they would be disturbed by Negroes moving into their neighborhood) at the same time Negro Protestants are the group most suspicious of Jewish power and business fairness

(white Protestants are the least critical of Jews).

This unfavorable image of Jews shown by a distressingly high percentage of their fellow Americans should give pause to those who are tempted to speak glibly concerning the reduction of anti-Semitism and of the Jews' future in America.

Judging from these findings, Jewish behavior and attitudes appear to be contradictory. Among the most devoted to the capitalist ethic, Jews favor the welfare state; overwhelmingly business and professional, they vote Democratic more than any other group. Based on their high income, Jews can most afford private physicians, yet 67% were in favor of National Health Insurance (compared to 52% of middle class Catholics and 20% of white middle class Protestants). Having benefited greatly from the American economic system, nevertheless they were the most likely to prefer as a Presidential candidate "a man who gets things done by never letting governmental rules and regulations stop him," as compared to a man "who takes longer to get most things done, but generally abides by the rules and regulations."

Viewed from the perspective of Lenski's and other sociologists' findings, any analysis of the American Jewish community must begin by taking into account the central dilemma — Jews are the highest class in America, *economically*, but in terms of *social status* they are the lowest, just above the Negro. Many other studies, such as Warner's "Yankee City" survey, also

agree on the ambivalent position of the American Jews — highest on the economic scale, lowest on the social totem pole.

Insecurity, a result of failing to gain social acceptance equivalent to their economic achievements, leads to a continuing identification with minorities and an enduring concern with social welfare, which is bolstered perhaps by historical traditions. Jews therefore support the welfare state although they have benefited most from capitalism because they have realized, in Lenki's words, that

economic victories do not insure status victories. The successes of the Jews in capitalist societies have not won them comparable social recognition and acceptance. On the contrary despite remarkable success, even the wealthiest Jews frequently find themselves excluded from private clubs and organizations by their economic peers, and from high administrative posts in many corporations dominated by Gentiles. Hence, despite their success, American Jews have not developed any sense of solidarity with the American economic elite, and have in fact reacted against this elite, their political values, and the social institutions on which they depend.

An analysis of the aroused and somewhat frantic Jewish reaction to a thickly veiled threat in a Jesuit magazine, *America*, or to the American Council for Judaism charges of dual loyalty, leads this reviewer to the conclusion that the American Jewish subconscious is pervaded by a submerged and restless feeling of insecurity. The historical persecution trauma hidden behind the cheerful facade of "it

can't happen here" occasionally comes to the fore, as when a nervous Jewish community reacts against a rash of synagogue bombings in the South or a wave of anti-Semitism in Latin America.

Lenki believes that "members of the Jewish group were the most likely to be critical of the current operations of our political system." A theory of Jewish alienation from American society and its institutions, leading to strong social cohesion, might also help to explain the following results: When asked whether they would pay a fine resulting from a minor traffic violation if they would not get caught, 72% of the Negro Protestants (who as compared to the Jews are striving for acceptance and assimilation and more strongly identify themselves with the American system), 63% of the white Protestants, 61% of the Catholics but only 31% of the Jews reported they would pay the fine nevertheless!

In sum, Lenki's work, a valuable contribution to the sociology of religion, which in particular documents the importance of socio-religious group membership as a variable comparable in potency, range, and extent of influence to class, is also a beginning attempt to explain the peculiarity of American Jewry — why, independent of strictly religious factors and in terms of social relations and residence patterns, it is the least assimilated white ethnic group in the American community.

Torat Mosheh ve'Haneviim (The Prophets and the Mosaic Law), Studies in the Bible and the History of Jewish Law, by DR. DAVID S. SHAPIRO (Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1961).

Reviewed by Max Kapustin

The author has set himself the task of investigating the literary relationship between the Torah and the Prophets. "Torah" is used in the traditional sense, encompassing the totality of the Written and Oral Law. This in itself involves a thesis which is well developed in the course of the book. The author maintains that the Written Law, the Pentateuch, was well known to the Prophets and that it actually is the basis of the prophetic message.

In addition the author shows that the Oral Law (i.e., the Halakhah) was known as a whole to the Prophets, and he refers to it in order to clarify certain difficult passages in the Prophets. The methodology is similar to that of David Hoffman who, applying the last of Rabbi Ishmael's thirteen exegetical principles, employed halakhic teachings to resolve the problem of two Pentateuchical statements which seem to be contradictory.

This flies into the face of the "acknowledged results" of modern biblical criticism. Yet Rabbi Shapiro is eminently qualified to construct and defend a position which is logically tenable even if not ultimately convincing to those who would rather expend their efforts exclusively in support of their own thesis. The book wisely sets its own limitations. Instead of general condemnation, it employs the much

more productive method of carefully analyzing pertinent texts.

There is no abundance of comprehensive publications working along these lines. The sixth volume of I. Halevy's *Dorot ha-Rishonim* edited by B. M. Lewin (Mosad Harav Kook, 1939) is not mentioned in our author's Preface alongside Jawitz, A. Kaminka, Ch. Heller, and others, to whom he considers himself indebted. Forgetting about Halevy's much more passionate presentation, the substance of his work is very close to the volume under discussion. See, for instance, Halevy's general argument on the relationship between the Torah and prophetic statements based on a discussion of I Kings 18:18.

A fine example of our author's careful and learned exegesis is found in his discussion of Amos 2:4, where he makes an ingenious case for his contention that the Universal Law as expressed in the Noachide legislation must have been known to the Prophet. It goes without saying that in applying a comprehensive thesis of this kind, the danger of "over-application" is always present. It would seem to this reviewer that the term "anushim" in Amos 2:8 offers no undue difficulties and is satisfactorily explained by Rashi, Ibn Ezra (in somewhat extended form), and Radak, to whom the author himself refers. Moderns, such as Sellin, are following in their footsteps. It ap-

Book Reviews

pears not necessary and certainly not cogent to resort to the *Din* codified by Rambam in *Hilkhot Nizkei Mamon* 8:10. Of course, it is a fascinating theory.

In his two page Foreword in English, Rabbi Shapiro gives the contents of the various chapters in lieu of a Table of Contents, which is missing.

The first chapter of this work contains an analysis of the books of Amos and Micah with special emphasis on material of a halakhic character.

The Book of Isaiah and its relationship to the Mosaic Law is studied in the third and fourth chapters. The evidence also tends to a confirmation of the traditional view regarding the basic unity of the entire Book of Isaiah.

Chapter Five points out the historic and literary sources of the Messianic personality and the Messianic vision as contained in the ninth and eleventh chapters of Isaiah.

That the allegorical interpretation of the Song of Songs did not originate in the latter days of the Second Commonwealth, nor even later, but was very likely already accepted in very early times, is demonstrated in the sixth chapter by numerous parallel passages in the prophetic writings which reveal a close familiarity with the great Song of Love. The identity of Daniel who is mentioned in the Book of Ezekiel is considered in the last chapter. The theory of the Ugaritic Daniel is rejected in favor of an identification with Daniel, a son of King David, who achieved a reputation in ancient Midrashic lore, for unusual piety and wisdom.

A few additional short chapters "deal with the following topics: the relationship of the Fifteenth Psalm to Isaiah 33:14-20, the origin of the concept of Israel as a 'light

to the nations,' and the meaning of the battle of the dragons in Isaiah 27."

Another word of caution is perhaps in place regarding the "dogma" of the critical school, according to which the Torah is based on various sources or documents of much later origin than the events which they describe. Some of these sources, such as the ones called E and J, are supposedly younger than some of the books which, according to tradition, follow them chronologically.

To refute this "dogma" B. Jacob has assembled an imposing body of internal evidence to demonstrate that the Book of Genesis was known to the author of the Book of Samuel. Jacob, however, grants the theoretical possibility that the authors of the so-called E and J sources might have borrowed from the Book of Samuel rather than the other way around. Moreover, even if the chronological priority of Genesis were clearly established, we still would be left with the task of proving its Mosaic authorship. There still remains a gap of several hundred years which for us is filled through our unshakable commitment to tradition. Yet, however inconclusive some of the arguments against the critical school might be, they still serve a vital purpose inasmuch as they call into question the very foundations of the evolutionary school.

Our learned author has made another scholarly contribution towards the true understanding of our tradition. All of us are deeply indebted to him. We can only wish

that he will continue his labor and further enrich our knowledge along with our faith. This book is a must for rabbis and thinking laymen alike.

Since the book offers extremely valuable exegetical material, an index of the verses which are dis-

cussed should be of great help. Finally, we cannot help expressing the hope that the book will be made available in English. This will immeasurably increase the area of influence which it so richly deserves.

Nationalism and the Jewish Ethics — The Basic Writings of Ahad Ha'am — Edited with an Introduction by HANS KOHN (New York: Schocken Books, 1962).

Reviewed by Louis Bernstein

Professor Hans Kohn has favored us with a selection of eleven essays by Ahad Ha'am, the most important essayist in modern Hebrew literature. The essays have been translated years ago by various translators and it is a strange experience for those who read Ahad Ha'am in Hebrew to read them in translation. Too much of Asher Ginsberg's beautiful simplicity and warmth is lost in the cold English translation.

Ahad Ha'am's writings have assumed new and interesting significance since 1948. His entire approach to Zion was predicated upon the spiritual preparation of the Jewish people for the return to their homeland. The unadulterated paganism and undisguised hedonism of certain sections of Israel's population would have overwhelmed him with resentment. He would have rejected attempts to

change and alter such sacraments as marriage and divorce. His "Judaism and the Gospels" is an open attack upon liberal Judaism, perhaps as meaningful today as it was a half century ago. Despite the fact that Ginsberg was not an observant Jew, he was the product of a Torah world from which he never wanted to escape and his Jewishness dominates every line of his writing.

One might question Professor Kohn's selections. Omitted essays such as "Imitation and Assimilation" and "Half-Comfort" are indispensable to Ahad Ha'am's nationalism and his concept of the Jewish ethic. Nonetheless, the volume is a distinct contribution to the total perspective of Jewish history during the last century. He anticipated many of the problems that have arisen as a result of the establishment of the State of Israel and his proposed solutions have earned our attention.

Book Reviews

Yesodei Yeshurun, Volume 4, by RABBI GEDALIA FELDER (Toronto, 1962).

Reviewed by
Abraham Kelman

Halakhic literature falls into various categories such as: (1) Commentaries on Talmud, and the codes, (2) responsa, (3) halakhic essays on various topics. A more recent addition is the encyclopedic literature which codifies, summarizes, and arranges the material in a specific alphabetical or topical order. The *Sedei Chemed* is an outstanding example of this method. Rabbi Felder has similarly undertaken to publish a comprehensive review of problems and laws relating to the Synagogue, *Seder Hatfilot* (prayers) and the Sabbath. In this, his latest work, the largest of four fine volumes, he again displays enormous erudition, a thorough mastery of Responsa literature — particularly those of the past two centuries — and a remarkable ability to summarize complex subjects in a concise and clear manner. What makes this outstanding achievement even more noteworthy is the author's comparative youthfulness, the fact that he received most of his education on this continent, and is busily engaged in an active rabbinic and teaching career.

The present volume is a continuation of the preceding one and opens with an analysis of cooking — one of the thirty-nine major categories of work forbidden on *Shabbat*. The author is particular-

ly concerned with modern problems that are not directly discussed in the Talmud or in the codes. May we, for example, use hot water on *Shabbat*, heated in a tank? By opening the tap we cause cold water to enter and be warmed. The *Chavolim Be'Neimim* (Rabbi Graubart, Toronto) permits it on the grounds (a) that the work is unintentional, (b) that the causal effect (*grama*) is indirect. But most other recent authorities permit it only in hospitals (where it is preferable to have the tank connected to the central heating system [*Mishpetei Uziel*]) or for infants (*Chelkat Yaakov*).

Other subjects discussed are the various opinions and methods for warming baby food, the question of combing one's hair on *Shabbat*, and pouring coffee or tea into hot water.

Among other questions dealt with are the permissibility of opening food packages, folding beds or umbrellas, of applying cosmetics, or the viewing of television on the Sabbath.

These random examples are but a fraction of the hundreds of subjects included in this veritable storehouse of information and scholarship. The concluding section of the book deals with the Sabbath morning prayers and the reading of the Torah.

A brief chapter is devoted to the origin of the Sabbath sermon and the book concludes appropriately enough with the various laws

and opinions about the *Kiddush* on *Shabbat* morning. The author's primary purpose is to summarize and clarify the complex laws of the Sabbath, to shed light on the many problems that arise in connection

with its observance and to enlighten the readers on the origin and significance of the Sabbath liturgy and customs. In this he is eminently successful.

The Glory of the Torah, by SAMUEL KRAMER (London: 1962)
Rabbi Dr. Joseph Breuer Jubilee Volume, edited by JACOB and MARK BREUER (New York: Philip Feldheim, 1962)

World of Prayer, by ELIE MUNK (New York: Philip Feldheim, 1962).

Reviewed by
Chaim Feuerman

The need is often strongly felt by rabbis and educators for literature in the vernacular which will interpret Judaism authentically to students and congregants in the idiom of our time. In partial response to this need, three recent publications worthy of note have appeared, all of which flow from the pens of disciples of the Samson Raphael Hirsch school of thought.

The first of these, *The Glory of the Torah*, published last year in London by Samuel Kramer, Headmaster of Golders Green Synagogue Classes, takes the form of twenty-seven graded lessons on basic Judaism (with exercises at the conclusion of each lesson) intended for adolescent Jewish students of high school and junior college level. It is a lucid and thorough-going exposition of Judaism in question-and-answer form, addressing itself authoritatively and competently to

problems raised by intelligent and cultured young citizens of the space age. Amongst these are chapters devoted to such topics as the authenticity of the Torah, the *Chumash* in the light of recent scientific and archaeological findings, the meaning of *Shabbat*, *Yom Tov* and *mitzvot ma'asiyot*. Most rabbis and educators will find Mr. Kramer's work a highly useful handbook for the youth whose Jewish upbringing is their charge.

The second of these, the *Rabbi Dr. Breuer Jubilee Volume*, is a work much more scholarly in nature, whose contributors make a medley of stalwart German-Jewish apologetics and polemics, historical and homiletical expositions of the Hirschian *Torah im Derekh Eretz* school of thought, tributes to the life and works of Samson Raphael Hirsch, and some investigations of Halakhah. Aside from the sermonics, which may be of inspirational value to some readers, and the points of scholarly, historical, and philosophical interest covered by

Book Reviews

the contributors, the volume's real achievement lies in presenting positively a survey of the history and the teachings of Hirschian German-Jewish Orthodoxy and how it has successfully confronted the kind of intellectual and cultural challenges with which American Jewry is faced today. Though American Jews and their spiritual leaders may not find all the solutions to their dilemmas in Hirschian Orthodoxy, they will find in it much that is meaningful in terms of guidelines to a basically wholesome approach.

The last and most recent of the three publications under review in this article is intended for the mature student of Judaism who is himself a *shomer mitzvot*. It is the much-welcomed second volume of Rabbi Dr. Elie Munk's *World of Prayer* in English translation from the original German. This volume is an extensive commentary to the *Shabbat* and *Yom Tov tefillot*, com-

binning a popular approach with deep erudition. In it the author has succeeded in unlocking for the serious and intelligent layman the treasures of rational wisdom, mystic ecstasy and profound human understanding which the Sages have enshrined in our *Siddur*.

In conclusion, this reviewer cannot but lament the paucity of sound well-written literature in the vernacular whose aim is a wholesome, honest and more-than-superficial interpretation of Judaism to the secularly oriented layman whose access to the wellsprings of true Jewish wisdom is barred by a limited knowledge of Hebrew. Would that dozens of such volumes could be placed within the easy reach of the intelligent American Jewish reader every year so that the potential return to *Torah u-mitzvot* of an enlightened Jewry could be more readily realized in our generation.

REVIEWERS IN THIS ISSUE

NORMAN BERNHARD has recently relinquished a pulpit in Wichita, Kansas, to serve as the Executive Director of the newly created New York Metropolitan Council of the UOJCA.

LOUIS BERNSTEIN, rabbi of the Young Israel in Bayside, is editor of the R.C.A. Record.

CHAIM FEUERMAN is director of the Hebrew Academy of Atlanta, Ga.

LEONARD B. GEWIRTZ, rabbi of Adas Kodesh Shel Emeth Congregation in Wilmington and Counsellor at the Hillel Foundation at the University of Delaware, is the author of *The Authentic Jew and his Judaism*.

MAX KAPUSTIN is Director of the B'nai Brith Hillel Foundation at Wayne State University and a member of the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures at that University.

ABRAHAM KELMAN is rabbi of Prospect Park Jewish Center in Brooklyn.

TZVI LIEBER, a graduate of Yeshiva College, teaches political science at Brooklyn College.

ZALMAN I. POSNER, a rabbi in Nashville, Tennessee, has published a number of studies on Hasidic thought.

DAVDI S. SHAPIRO, a member of TRADITION's editorial committee, and rabbi in Milwaukee, teaches at the University of Wisconsin as well as at the Hebrew Theological College in Skokie, Illinois. His most recent book, *Torat Moshe Vehaneviim*, is reviewed in this issue.

BOOKS RECEIVED

HANAN J. AYALTI ed., *Yiddish Proverbs* (New York: Schocken, 1963).

ELIAS BICKERMAN, *From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees* (New York: Schocken, 1962).

R. H. CHARLES, *Eschatology, The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism and Christianity*, Introduction by George Wesley Buchanan (New York: Schocken, 1963).

LOUIS I. NEWMAN, *The Hasidic Anthology* (New York: Schocken, 1963).

BERNARD S. RASKAS, *Heart of Wisdom* (New York: Burning Bush Press, 1962).

LEO W. SCHWARZ, ed., *Memoirs of My People; Jewish Self Portraits* (New York: Schocken, 1963).