

Rabbi Raphael S. Weinberg received his doctorate from Bernard Revel Graduate School and is currently Assistant Professor in Jewish History and Biblical Literature at Stern College. He has contributed articles to English and Hebrew periodicals.

THE UPS AND DOWNS OF "THE RISE AND FALL"

Dr. Solomon Zeitlin has bestowed upon us the first volume of a history of the Judaeans of the Second Commonwealth.* In this volume he discusses the period from 332 B.C.E., when Judaea became a vassal of the Hellenes led by Alexander the "Macedonian," until 37 B.C.E. when the Hasmonean King Antigonus was beheaded by order of Antony in the shadow of Herod. The book is a study of the social, religious and legal institutions of those turbulent times.

Dr. Zeitlin is no neophyte in these areas. He has contributed numerous articles and monographs concerning the Second Commonwealth and he has most certainly influenced the historical evaluations and theories of many scholars. In this volume the author draws heavily from his vast accumulation of resources, weaving the salient points into the text and referring the reader to the original articles for a more detailed analysis of the pertinent issues. This in itself is of great value to the scholar and layman alike.

Articles and papers carry the curse of Babel—they are strewn, in many languages, throughout the mass of periodical literature. The layman rarely sees them, the student can hardly find them. In this respect Dr. Zeitlin has rendered a significant technical service to us all.

The author was obviously quite particular in his choice of style and rendition, for he has mastered the delicate, arduous technique of making scholarly material palatable to the average intelligent reader. The Jewish Publication Society deserves approbation for having established a noble precedent of always presenting a finished, eye-appealing product. Dr. Zeitlin's book will now reach the public and it is therefore imperative for the theories expressed therein to undergo re-evaluation and criticism.

There is a logical maxim involved in all scientific research which prohibits the analyst from manipulating facts in order to make them fit into his personal preconceived notions. From this point of view the term

* *The Rise and Fall of the Judaeian State* by Solomon Zeitlin, Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1962.

“Orthodox historian” or “Liberal historian” would be incongruous. But there is also a widespread feeling that the historian is, by definition, absolutely incapable of observing the facts which he examines. This is basically true. Therefore, historical evidence must often be interpreted and the attitude of the observer is a definite factor in the final conclusion. For this reason there arose in Jewish historiography a tendency of labeling some historians “traditionalists” and others “liberals”. Isaac Halevi and Zev Javits, for example, are considered right wing historians, while J. H. Weiss and Graetz are more liberal in their approaches. In this review I consistently take issue with the author whenever I find his statements to be based upon modernistic interpretations which could just as easily have been explained in accordance with my conservative (small ‘c’) views.

In his Introduction Zeitlin writes:¹ “The word Y² is not a transliteration of the Tetragrammaton; we do not know how the four letters were pronounced. There can be no objection, therefore, to the writing of the word Y in secular books. Furthermore, according to the *Mishnah Yadayim* 4:5, no transcription was considered sacred unless it was written in the Assyrian script; i.e., the square script, on parchment, with ink.” I humbly object to the writing of the Tetragrammaton in secular books, perhaps from an Halakhic standpoint and most certainly from the view of traditional esthetics. In the *Mishnah* which enumerates those who have “no portion in the world to come” we read:³ “Abba Saul says: also

one who pronounces *af ha-hogeh*, the Divine Name as it is spelt.” The Jews certainly attached as much importance to the written as to the spoken word: *hogeh*, therefore, may be assumed to include both forms of communication. But I must admit that we may not arrive at an Halakhic conclusion from such reasoning (also in view of the fact that the Tetragrammaton was written in a Lachish letter, a secular military report dating back to 589 B.C.E.). The reason for the prohibition is based on the principle of the sanctity of God’s Name and the subsequent care taken not to profane His Name. If this is so, the spirit of the prohibition would include transcription. And although it is true, thank God, that we don’t know how the four letters were pronounced, Dr. Zeitlin does not follow the common erroneous transliteration but he instead transcribes in a manner which he assumes, and rightly so, is closer to the correct pronunciation.

The author states:⁴ “Until the Restoration, Y had been held to be an ethnic God, the God of the Judaeans who made a Covenant with their forefathers—Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. This conception of God was entirely changed because of the influence of the Pharisees. Y ceased to be an ethnic God; now He became the God of the Universe, the Father of the entire human race. The name was no longer pronounced Y but A, the Lord of the world.” Dr. Zeitlin fully utilizes this theory of progression from an ethnic God to a universal God in order to explain why “the Pentateuch never refers to proselytism,”⁶ and

The Ups and Downs of "The Rise and Fall"

why the house of Y is eventually named *Bet ha-Mikdash*, the Holy House. Let us first examine the basic premise. It seems to me that the first indication in Jewish sources of the universality of God may be found in the primeval account, i.e., the Biblical story of creation. From the opening sentence of the Bible until chapter 2:3 the name used to identify God is *Elokim*. This name is a general term for the deity. In the Torah it is both *kodesh* referring to the God of Israel, and *chol* referring to the pagan gods (*elohim acherim*). Even when it is specifically related to Israel it still retains its general character, in contrast to Y which is the personal name of the God of Israel, i.e., *Hashem Hu Ha-elokim*. The creation account uses the noun *Elokim* exclusively to show that God in his capacity as Creator of the world is not only the Jewish God but rather the God of mankind. This is surely a universal concept. The Bible also reflects a universal moral code. Cain is punished for murder and the earth is cursed for accepting Abel's blood (Gen. 4:3). The Noahides are forbidden to murder "because man was made in the image of God" (9:6). A generation is sentenced to death by drowning because of its "violence." Sodom is annihilated for being "very wicked and sinful toward God." The narrative of the exodus discusses the miracles that were performed in Egypt leading up to the ultimate national liberation. In this story God hardens Pharaoh's heart and the hearts of his subjects in order "that you may know that the earth is God's" (Exodus 9:29) and "that

Egypt may know that I am God" (Exodus 14:14). God is also the Lord of Egypt! Pharaoh ends by recognizing God and submitting to him. In chapter 8 of 1 Kings we find the moving supplication of Solomon as he dedicates the Temple.

But will God in very truth dwell on earth? Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee; how much less this house that I have builded! Yet have Thou respect unto the prayer of Thy servant, and to his supplication, O Lord my God, to hearken unto the cry and to the prayer which Thy servant prayeth before Thee this day . . . Moreover concerning the stranger that is not of Thy people Israel, when he shall come out of a far country for Thy name's sake — for they shall hear of Thy great name, and of Thy mighty hand, and of Thine outstretched arm — when he shall come and pray toward this house . . .

Is this not an expression of hope to the universal God? Isaiah in chapter 2 of his prophecies, which Dr. Zeitlin will admit is pre-Second Commonwealth, envisions the end of idolatry: "and all nations shall flow unto it." This is surely prophetic universalism. The concept of the universal God is as old as Judaism and this concept is complemented by the notion of the chosen people—Israel's specific obligation to the universal God.

There is no need to assume that the designation "House of God" was "abandoned later because of progressive changes. It was called *Bet ha-Mikdash*, the Holy House, Naos, a sanctuary, a temple."⁸ The term *Mikdash* pre-dates the term House of God.⁹ When Solomon built his temple he meant it to be

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

a house of God. The term which he coined was subsequently used by others. When however the name of God, Y, was purposely relegated and came into disuse, the house of Y was called simply *Bet ha-Mikdash*. This would explain why the term "*Mikdash*" was preceded by the words "house of", a simple substitution for House of God.

Dr. Zeitlin writes: "The Pentateuch never refers to proselytism. This attitude was not, however, in accordance with the belief of those Judaeans who promulgated the idea of the universality of God . . . Later when the universality of God became the norm of the Judaeans, proselytes were welcomed."¹⁰ We must assume that Dr. Zeitlin deliberately ignores the references to *Gerim* in the Torah because they do not seem to undergo a formal act of conversion but rather become Israelites by settling in the land, assimilating into the Judaeans fold in the course of time. A careful inspection of the sources may, however, prove otherwise. My contention is that in the Torah itself there are to be found two distinct categories of *gerim*. One group of *gerim* is comprised of strangers who accept Judaism, who become proselytes in the true sense of the term; the other unit is the group of strangers who relinquish their pagan practices and wish to live among the Jews in the Jewish country but who do not desire to accept Judaism as their faith. I will now list the pertinent verses alluding to the two categories.

Category A—Gerim-Proselytes

Exodus 12:48—"And when a Ger

shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the Passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one that is born in the land; but no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof."

Leviticus 16:29—"And it shall be a statute forever unto you: in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, ye shall afflict your souls, and shall do no manner of work, the home-born, or the Ger that sojourneth among you."

Leviticus 17:10—"And whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the Ger that sojourns among them, that eateth any manner of blood, I will set My face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people."

Leviticus 24:16, 22—"And he that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, he shall surely be put to death; all the congregation shall certainly stone him; as well the Ger, as the home-born, when he blasphemeth the Name, shall be put to death. Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the Ger, as for the home-born; for I am the Lord your God."

Numbers 15:14-16—"And if a Ger sojourn with you, or whosoever may be among you, throughout your generations, and will offer an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord; as ye do, so he shall do. As for the congregation, there shall be one statute both for you, and for the Ger that sojourneth with you, a statute forever throughout your generations; as ye are, so shall the Ger be before the Lord. One law and one ordinance shall be both for you, and for the Ger that sojourneth with you."

The Ups and Downs of "The Rise and Fall"

Numbers 19:10—"And he that gathereth the ashes of the heifer shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the even; and it shall be unto the children of Israel, and unto the Ger that sojourneth among them, for a statute forever."

The reader must admit that *gerim* who partake of the Paschal sacrifice after having been circumcised; *gerim* who fast on *Yom ha-Kippurim*; *gerim* who offer a burnt-offering; *gerim* who are involved in the red heifer ceremony, must be members of the Jewish community, and in good standing at that.

Category B—Gerim-Sojourners

Leviticus 25:47-48—"And if a Ger who is a settler with thee be waxen rich, and thy brother be waxen poor beside him, and sell himself unto the Ger who is a settler with thee, or to the offshoot of a Ger's family, after that he is sold he may be redeemed; one of his brethren may redeem him."

Deuteronomy 14:21—"You shall not eat of any thing that dieth of itself; thou mayest give it unto the Ger that is within thy gates, that he may eat it; or thou mayest sell it unto a foreigner; for thou art a holy people unto the Lord thy God. Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk."

Here we are dealing with non-Jews. You may give them your *treife* meat; you must not allow another Jew to be overexposed to him. Can these be the same people who partake of the Paschal sacrifices? We must conclude that there were proselytes in Biblical days and that this concept was not a Second Commonwealth invention.

On page 27, the author states:

The leaders of the Judaeans, in order to nullify the high priesthood of Manasseh and remove the danger of the building of a temple on Mt. Gerizim, enacted a law that, if a Judaeans married a woman of a foreign nation, the offspring of this union would not be considered Judaeans. The male offspring of Manasseh could not be priests, not even Judaeans. Thus it came about, through the political ambitions of Sanballat, that a child's status in Jewish law follows that of its mother.

This last statement seems to be quite presumptuous. It is true that the Torah considers the father as the focal point of the family, i.e., "by their families according to their father's houses."¹¹ However, there are also indications of an ancient matriarchal category. We find that the children of Jacob are classified according to mothers (*Genesis* 46). In Biblical days, the mother had the prerogative of naming her children. Abraham defends his integrity by informing Abimelech: "And moreover she is indeed my sister, the daughter of my father, but not the daughter of my mother; and so she became my wife" (*Genesis* 20:12). In the archaic law the paternal sister was suitable for marriage while wedlock with the maternal sister would be considered incest. The *Mishnah*, being cognizant of the dual composition of the family, formulates the following regulation:¹² "Wherever there is a *kiddushin* and there is not transgression, the issue follows the status of the male . . . and whatever woman who cannot contract *kiddushin* with the particular person or with others, the issue follows her status;

this is the case with the issue of a handmaid or a gentile woman."¹³ There is no reason to assume that this law is based on a single political incident but rather on a very logical general assumption. The mother rears the child according to her mores; the child assumes her religion. To this we may add that there seldom is question as to the identity of the female progenitor while the male parentage may be subject to doubt.

We now come to a basic issue. Dr. Zeitlin remarks:

The books of Moses, we must assume, were known and regarded as sacred by the Judaeans prior to their compilation by Ezra. This explains the repetitions and contradictions that are found in the Pentateuch. For example, the law, Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk, is repeated three times. The Ten Commandments are repeated in Exodus and again in Deuteronomy. There are variants in the Ten Commandments. They even contradict one another: according to Exodus the Sabbath should be observed because Y created the world in six days and rested on the seventh, whereas Deuteronomy states that the Sabbath should be observed because Y took the Israelites out of Egypt from the land of bondage. In Exodus it is stated that the paschal lamb should be a sheep or a goat and should be eaten roasted, not cooked, while according to Deuteronomy the paschal lamb should be of the flock and the herd, and should be eaten cooked. There are other contradictions between the different books of the Pentateuch. Ezra, in compiling and editing the laws of Moses, could not remove these repetitions and contradictions, since the books were already well known among the members of the community in Judaea and were already regarded as sacred.

The author here chooses to fol-

low in the footsteps of too many scholars who delight in raising textual problems concerning the Pentateuch which have already been observed by our sages, and in offering solutions which are far less logical and profound than those suggested by the true Biblical critics. This review is not the proper platform for polemics as to the divinity and subsequent consistency of Scripture as made manifest by the equally divine Oral Law. I merely wish to echo sentiments of enlightened philosophers such as Yehuda ha-Levi giving them a slight alteration. The Bible as read is full of repetitions, contradictions, and ambiguities. God says to Moses and Aaron: "This month shall be unto you the beginning of months, it shall be the first month of the year to you" (Exodus 12:12). From this verse Moses is supposed to intercalate a calendar. What type of system is God discussing, solar, lunar, solar-lunar? The Lord tells Moses: "Speak to the children of Israel and tell them to make for themselves fringes" (Numbers 15:37). What are fringes? God commands: "You shall bind them for a sign on your hand and they shall be for frontlets between your eyes" (Deuteronomy 6:8). What are frontlets? Now, if the Torah is the word of God are we to assume that He was not able to communicate properly with man? Wouldn't it be more logical to hypothesize an Oral Tradition that explains the written text? Or should we rather say that the Torah was quilled by a scribe or scribes who were intelligent enough to produce a literature completely beyond its contemporary class and far above

The Ups and Downs of "The Rise and Fall"

anything written since, but that they lacked the vision to mend glaring discrepancies? Is it logical to assume that Ezra who changed the script of the Torah from the archaic *Ivri* to the more popular *Ashuri* characters; Ezra who made various *takkanot*; Ezra who extended the marriage prohibitions of the Jew to include all non-Jews, would not amend a "corrupt self-contradictory" text?

"Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk" is repeated three times according to our Sages to signify that the eating, cooking, or deriving any benefit whatever from a mixture of milk and meat is forbidden. A more textual interpretation would be as follows: chapters 23 and 34 of Exodus have many laws in common. We find in a Ugaritic text that one should seethe a kid in its mother's milk.^{15A} This fact indicates that the Torah was censuring a Canaanite ritual. Since Chapter 34 follows the description of the Golden Calf incident, which in effect is a mimicking of pagan rites, the interdict against the Canaanite ritual was repeated. Chapter 14 of Deuteronomy deals with prohibited foods and the eating of "abominable things". It would only be natural to repeat the seething of a kid among the other abominations. This interpretation in no way invalidates the rabbinic usage. Torah may be understood by various valid methods.

The question of the repetition of the Decalogue in Deuteronomy is quite satisfactorily explained by Nachmanides and Ibn Ezra in Exodus 20. In Deuteronomy 5 we find: "Observe the Sabbath day to keep it

holy as the Lord thy God has commanded thee." Moses is specifically reminding the people that God previously publicized the Decalogue and now he was repeating it and purposely paraphrasing God's words. In Exodus 12:9 the following command about the Paschal sacrifice is given: "Do not eat it half done or *be'shel mivshel ba-mayim*, nor sodden at all with water, but roast with fire." According to Zeitlin this contradicts Deuteronomy 16:7 "*Uvishalto*—thou shalt 'cook'¹⁵ it and eat it . . ." Isn't it obvious to all that the Torah terms the process of cooking as *be'shel mivshel ba-mayim*, sodden with *water*, the verb *be'shel* alone meaning in this place "to prepare", not to cook? There is no contradiction. The "repetitions and contradictions found in the Pentateuch" belong right where they are.

When discussing the role of Mattathias, Zeitlin states:¹⁶

The tragedy of the 1,000 men, women and children who had been burned to death in a cave because they would not profane the Sabbath aroused the most intense indignation of Mattathias and his followers. He issued a statement permitting fighting in self-defense on the Sabbath, "that we may not all die as our brothers did in the hiding places." He held that the Sabbath might be profaned to save human life.

From this we must assume that before the days of Mattathias Judaism did not sanction profaning of the Sabbath to save human life. It would be simpler, however, to assume that the cardinal principle of the sanctity of life prevailed throughout Jewish history. The case in point could be explained as follows: The 1,000 people in the cave

were refugees, with refugee mentality and spirit. When the Seleucid patrol approached they realized that they could not withstand them and decided that their obligation was to sanctify the name of God and not submit. (There was more than a transgression of Shabbat involved here. Antiochus demanded idolatry—a case where Halakhically one must sacrifice his life). Mattathias, hearing of this, realized that if the Judaeans would not organize themselves and form a resistance movement, similar occurrences would become the norm. He therefore advised guerilla warfare.

Dr. Zeitlin has endeavored to probe the mysteries of the Pharisees and Sadducees. He has presented his views in a clear, sensible manner and has succeeded at least in convincing the reader that the problem is quite involved. Dr. Zeitlin's theory in its entirety cannot be discussed in a review, and frankly should not be debated by someone who cannot arrive at what he considers a more plausible solution. There is, however, one misconception that should be mentioned. The author states: "The Sadducees demanded the rigid observance of the Pentateuchal law; the Pharisees, however, strove to amend the Pentateuchal law in order to bring religion into consonance with life . . . their aim was rather to modify Pentateuchal law to meet the vicissitudes of life. This they justified by their liberal interpretations."¹⁷ Corresponding to this view, Dr. Zeitlin continues in a later section:¹⁸ "If it was found that a defendant had been executed upon the testimony

of deliberately perjured witnesses, the witnesses were subject to the same penalty that the defendant had suffered. According to the Pentateuchal law, which in all probability was in force in the early period of the Commonwealth (Sadducee law, see pp. 176-177) if even one man testified falsely he had to suffer the same penalty which the defendant had undergone." Dr. Zeitlin, as he indicates in his notes, is alluding to the *Mishnah Makkot 5b*:

Witnesses are not to be put to death as attested *zomemim* until after the termination of the trial (*Gemar Din*). Because the Sadducees contended that *zomemim* were put to death only after the accused had actually been executed, pursuant to the scriptural text "life for life." Said the Pharisee sages to them: But does not the context read: Then shall you do unto him as he purposed to do unto his brother, which clearly implies when his brother is still alive? If so, what is the purport of "life for life" . . . *zomemim* are not to be put to death until after the termination of the trial.

According to Dr. Zeitlin the literal meaning of the Pentateuchal text is in agreement with the view of the Sadducees as opposed to the opinion of the Pharisees. It is my contention that in this case, and possibly in all cases, the Pharisees are truer to the text than their opponents.¹⁹ Let us examine the complete text.²⁰

One witness shall not rise up against a man for any iniquity, or for any sin, in any sin that he sinneth; at the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall a matter be established. If an unrighteous witness rise up against any man to bear perverted witness against him, then both the men, between

The Ups and Downs of "The Rise and Fall"

whom the controversy is, shall stand before the Lord, before the priests and the judges that shall be in those days. And the judges shall inquire diligently; and, behold, if the witness be a false witness, and hath testified falsely against his brother . . .

At this point we must insert and emphasize that these sentences are dealing with actual court procedure: the judge is cross-examining the witness²¹ and he concludes that the witness is perjuring: "then shall ye do unto him, as he had purposed to do unto his brother; so shalt thou put away the evil from the midst of thee." He only purposed to do, he however accomplished nothing—we are still in court, nothing could have happened yet. "And those that remain shall hear, and fear, and shall henceforth commit no more any such evil in the midst of thee. And thine eye shall not pity: life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot." In the final sentence the Torah adds pertinent information as to the court procedure. Liability incurred at the end of the trial, not at the beginning. The law of *zomemim* does not apply during the time when the evidence is being weighed but rather when the verdict of guilty has been pronounced. Then and only then, if in retrospect we find that the witness is false, do we brand him a *zomen*. This is an emendation of the original notion but it still leaves the whole concept within the confines of the court room. According to the Sadducee rendition, however, the last sentence contradicts the previous sentences, changing the application of the term *zomem* from an intended criminal to an accom-

plished one. In this case Dr. Zeitlin, concentrating on the term "life for life" contended that the Sadducees are more literal and the Pharisees more liberal. From the context, however, we see that the opposite is true.

The author has a very interesting chapter on the calendar. Dr. Zeitlin assumes that the Bible alludes to a solar calendar.

In a solar calendar the day begins with the dawn . . . In the Pentateuch and in other biblical books which were written before further change in the calendar, the day always is represented as preceding the night. It has been assumed, through an erroneous rendering of the first chapter of Genesis, that the biblical calendar was in fact lunar. There the day seems to begin with the evening. The text which gives the account of the creation says, Darkness was upon the face of the deep. Then God said, Let there be light and there was light. Next God divided the light from the darkness. The light He called day and the darkness He called night. Further it is stated, There was evening (that is, the sunset) and there was morning (that is, the dawn), constituting one day. The common error is to read the text as if it said, There was night-time, then day-time, and this made one full day. Rather it says when the sun set and the sun arose (again) this concluded one day. In other words, the work of creation, which precedes this statement, is understood as taking place by day. That day has its sunset, followed by the night, and then, in turn, by the dawn, and this concludes the one day and begins the next. A lunar calendar is not involved. The day is indeed from sunrise to sunrise.²²

Zeitlin has illustrious support for this explanation of Genesis 1:5 in the personage of Rashbam. Ibn Ezra, however, refutes Rashbam in his *Iggeret ha-Shabbat*. He also takes

issue with those who propound such a theory in his commentary to Exodus 16:25. Granted, however, that Zeitlin's interpretation is correct, this merely indicates that the defined period of time is a twenty-four hour period beginning at dawn. It does not in the least exclude the possibility of a festival-holiday unit of time commencing with the evening. In Exodus 12:18 we read: "In the first month on the fourteenth day of the month at *even* ye shall eat unleavened bread until the one and twentieth day at *even*." Leviticus 23:32: "It shall be unto you a Sabbath of solemn rest and ye shall afflict your souls; in the ninth day of the month at *even*, from *even* unto *even* shall you keep your Sabbath." The date given begins with dawn, the holiday with the evening. Dr. Zeitlin goes on to say that the calendar was changed from a solar calendar to a lunar-solar one.²³

It is understandable that the change of the calendar from a solar to a lunar-solar system would arouse great opposition. Although the calendar was complicated and imperfect, it had a tradition of usage for many centuries and was supported by the Pentateuch. A people who clung to tradition would naturally react violently against such a radical change. The attitude of those who opposed the innovation is expressed in the Book of Jubilees: And command thou the children of Israel that they observe the years according to this reckoning — three hundred and sixty-four days, and [these] will constitute a complete year, and they will not disturb its time from its days and from its feasts; for everything will fall out in them according to their testimony, and they will not give out any day nor disturb any feast . . . For there will be those who will assuredly make observations of the new moon

— how [it] disturbs the seasons and comes in from year to year ten days too soon. For this reason the years will come upon them when they will disturb [the order], and make an abominable [day] the day of testimony, and an unclean day a feast day, and they will confound all the days, the holy with the unclean, and the unclean day with the holy; for they will go wrong as to the months and the sabbaths and feasts and jubilees.²⁴

This outburst could just as easily have been directed against someone who may have proposed a pure lunar calendar such as the Moslems use today. It does not in any way back up Dr. Zeitlin's theory.

On page 429 the author discusses the precept of wearing *tefillin* and says:

The Pentateuch states too that the children of Israel must put a sign upon their hands and also on their foreheads. In ancient times people wore phylacteries, amulets, for protection. The Sages modified this custom and ordained that Judaeans should wear *tefillin* on the left arm and on the forehead. The *tefillin* contained four sections from the Pentateuch: Exodus 13: 2-10; 13:11-16; Deut. 6:4-9; 11:13-21. These sections were placed in the *tefillin* because they were in compliance with the words, "a sign upon thy hand" and also made reference to *totafot* which, according to the Sages, meant the *tefillin*. Similarly, a *mezuzah* was affixed on the doorpost of every home in response to the Pentateuch injunction to write them on the doorposts of thy house and upon thy gates.

Though a concept such as *Halak-hah le-Mosheh mi-Sinai*, which is the Talmudic dictum used to explain the unique nature of *tefillin*, cannot be explained satisfactorily on rational grounds, it still encompasses more

The Ups and Downs of "The Rise and Fall"

than an "amulet" theory. The intricacies of *tefillin* are not taken care of by a good luck charm idea. Aside from the fact that amulets were known and used in Tannaitic times, and still are for that matter, they did not displace or replace the strange boxes and straps worn by Jews throughout the ages.

Dr. Zeitlin's work is an important contribution to scholarship. His historical narrative is superbly written. His theories about religious institutions are obviously controversial but most stimulating. He has attempted to probe the mysteries of an obscure period and we all eagerly await his second volume.

NOTES

1. P. 19.
2. The author spells out the Anglicized form of the Tetragrammaton which will be referred to in this article by use of the letter "Y". "A" will symbolize the name Lord, as pronounced in all places where "Y" is written.
3. *Mishnah Sanhedrin* 10:1.
4. Introduction pp. 13-14.
5. See also p. 12; pp. 269-270.
6. P. 16.
7. P. 269.
8. P. 269.
9. "And let them make me a Mikdash, that I may dwell among them". Exodus 25:8. (The term 'Bet Elokim' coined by Jacob at the place of his celestial ladder does not seem to be relevant.)
10. P. 16.
11. Numbers 1:2.
12. *Kiddushin* 3:12.
13. See also *Mishnah Yevamot* 2:5.
14. Pp. 19-20.
- 15a. Cassuto U., A Commentary on the Book of Exodus, Jerusalem, 1959, p. 212.
15. The Soncino translation here reads "roast", the new J.P.S. edition has "cook" with no explanatory note. This is one example of the hidden dangers of this new translation.
16. P. 95.
17. Pp. 177-178.
18. P. 209.
19. This text has already been discussed by Dr. A. Weiss in his סדר הדיון, חורב, תשי"ח.
20. Deuteronomy 19:15-21.
21. I am not discussing the problem of עדים זוממים or עד זומם which is a מחלוקת but is not relevant to the פרושים צדוקים controversy.
22. P. 215.
23. P. 219.
24. Pp. 221-222.