

BOOK REVIEWS

Lifelong Learning Among Jews: Adult Education in Judaism from Biblical Times to the Twentieth Century, by ISRAEL M. GOLDMAN (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1975).

Reviewed by
William Greenberg

The scope of this book is larger than the title would indicate. The subtitle is almost misleading unless one understands "adult education" to include all scholarly activity, research, writing and "lernen" by anyone past adolescence.

This is a book in praise of Jewish learning and it is obviously a labor of love. It describes the exalted place Torah study has held among Jews in all times and places. It also devotes attention to the synagogue and the sermon in relation to learning, the place of the book in Jewish life including care and respect for books, lending of books and mention of several famous collections of Jewish books.

The author has collected a wealth of *maamarei hazal*, historic writings, communal records, memoirs, etc. and organized them into a survey of the Jewish attitude toward Torah study and a description

of how this attitude was expressed in practice. The bibliography and the numerous footnotes testify to the range of sources from which this work was gathered.

Some of the chapters, such as Chapter VI on the Days of the Gaonim bring to life an exciting and efficiently organized community with a wealth of detail not usually encountered. The chapters describing the steadfast devotion of Jews to the study of Torah under the most difficult conditions of persecution, deprivation and even danger are inspiring. The minutes of the various *Hevrot* from *Hevrei Shas* to *Hevrei Tehillim* drawn from communities all over Europe and even from America — though necessarily somewhat repetitious — are inspiring in the living idealism that shines through the matter-of-fact rules and regulations of the group. Among the most unusual is the Zohar Study Society in Padua, Italy under the leadership of Moses Hayyim Luzzatto (pp. 231-238).

Book Reviews

Few readers will fail to be moved by the account (p. 206) of the German intelligence officer in Warsaw during World War I who raided what he thought to be a spy ring of cab drivers only to learn that it was a study group assembled after the day's work. He wrote "It is amazing. It is unthinkable. It is inconceivable that German drivers should come every day to the University and listen to lectures on law!"

Although the book is scholarly in tone, the treatment is not as thorough nor the organization as rigorous as the scholar might desire. In chapter V the attitude of the rabbis of the Talmud to learning is examined under sixteen headings. Rabbi's counsel that one should study that part of the Torah that is his heart's desire is listed under the heading "Time and Days of Study" rather than under "What to Study: The Subject Matter of Learning."

A chronological sequence by chapter and a topical treatment within chapters generally describes the organizational design. The danger of redundancy has not been entirely avoided. Of the more noteworthy examples is the overlap of the analysis of the Talmudic attitude toward learning in Chapter V, and the nine page citation from *Menorat Hamaor* in chapter VII, and the fifteen page citation from Rambam's *Hilkhoth Talmud Torah* and from the *Shulhan Arukh* in chapter IX.

Although the scholar may find much of the book old hat and the casual reader may find the frequent repetitions annoying, the book

could be most useful as a resource for the student. The "adult education" student who is seeking to gain a Jewish understanding will be able to gain insights from this book into specific aspects of or in general attitude to Jewish learning. Perhaps since the author was an organizer and leader of the National Academy for Adult Jewish Studies (Conservative) since its inception in 1940, he may have had the adult education student in mind in writing this volume. It should prove most useful for the student.

Usually the author presents the rabbinic view correctly and with understanding. However, on page 63 he writes:

"The sages of a later age taught: 'Let the teachings of the Torah be new to thee every day so that thou shalt not consider the Torah an ancient document that is no longer regarded by men.' Rabbi Joshua ben Korha said: 'Whosoever studies the Torah and does not revise it is likened unto one who sows without reaping.' The intent of all these rabbinic teachings is to make the Jewish law, the halakhah, a living, growing tradition that both responds to and creates 'the way in which the people walk.' This concept is expressed in the talmudic aphorism: 'Read not *halikhot* but *halakhot*,' implying that what is going on among the people should be related to the development of Jewish law."

It should suffice to point out that in the original statement of Rabbi Joshua ben Korha (*Sanhedrin* 99a) the expression for "revise" is "*hoz-er aleha*" meaning to review rather than to amend. The "intent" as-

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

cribed to these passages is spurious.

In chapter XIV the distinction between *lernen* as applied to sacred Jewish studies and *shtudiren* as applied to secular subjects is cited in the name of Maurice Samuels. This basic distinction is not adhered to in this book.

After three hundred pages of traditional "lernen" from Moses through Tannaim, Amoraim, Gaonim, Rishonim, Aharonim and Hevrei Shas, Mishnayoth, Mikra and Tehillim throughout all the dispersion, the focus shifts in the last ten pages to the Modern world. The shift is so incredibly smooth that one might fail to notice the

transition from "lernen" to "shtudiren" and perhaps even to "shmoozen".

We learn the names of the many organizations in America that have sponsored programs for adult Jewish Education. We are also informed of the general titles of the programs, the names of the publications, if any, and often the date of founding. There is no discussion of the contents of the programs. Perhaps it is best to discourage the fledgling effort by contrasting it with its forbears.

Oh yes, the *Daf Yomi* is mentioned in the last paragraph of the book.

Honor Thy Father and Mother: Filial Responsibility in Jewish Law and Ethics, by GERALD BLIDSTEIN (New York: The Library of Jewish Law and Ethics, Ktav, 1975).

Reviewed by
Warren Zev Harvey

This is the first volume in The Library of Jewish Law and Ethics, a series under the editorship of Rabbi Norman Lamm, which, according to its publishers, "will prove beneficial both to scholars and to lay students of religion." The series will indeed prove beneficial if forthcoming volumes even roughly approximate the standard set by Professor Blidstein, now of the Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beersheba. His broad scholarship, precise analysis, and learned insight have, alas, been uncommon in contemporary English studies concerning "Jewish law and ethics." Would

that the present volume be taken up as a paradigm by other Jewish scholars.

Jewish law, "characteristically framed in terms of responsibility rather than right," does not speak of *patria potestas* or "parental authority," but of *kibbud av ve'aim* — not of the *rights* of parents but of the *responsibility* of their children to honor them (pp. xi-xii, cf. p. 50). Professor Blidstein opens his book with a discussion (pp. 1-36) of the significance of this filial responsibility. In effect, this is a discussion of *ta'amei ha-mitzvah*. Examining Biblical, apocryphal, Hellenistic, rabbinic, mediaeval, and modern sources, he distinguishes four "dimensions of significance:"

Book Reviews

1. metaphysical or axiological: "parental worth is derived from their sharing the work of creation with God."

2. ethical: parents deserve gratitude for their bestowal of life and sustenance.

3. social or political: respect for parents promotes respect for traditional structures of authority.

4. humanistic: filial piety is "part of the heritage of all mankind," and in fact its famous exemplars in rabbinic literature are Esau, ancestor of Rome, and Dama ben Netinah, a Gentile.

Moving from *ta'amei ha-mitzvah* to the *mitzvah* itself, Professor Blidstein discusses the scope of the responsibility of *kibbud av ve'aim* (pp. 37-59). Nimble noting Exodus 21:15, 17 and Deuteronomy 27:16, he focuses on "Honor [*kabbed*] your father and mother" (Exodus 20:12) and "You shall each revere [*tiyra'u*] his mother and father" (Leviticus 19:3). He charts historically the exposition of the seminal *baraita* in *Kiddushin* 31b, according to which filial "reverence" (*mora*) means that the son "must neither stand nor sit in his [father's] place, nor contradict his words, nor tip the scale against him," while filial "honor" (*kibbud*) means that he "must give him food and drink, clothe and cover him, and lead him in and out," in a word — service. He deftly explores the somewhat ambiguous halakhic and psychological relationships between filial responsibility (i.e., reverence and service) and love: here the two poles are fixed by Maimonides, who completely dissociates filial responsibility from filial love, and the *Zohar*,

which brackets them tightly together. Interspersed throughout these chiefly halakhic discussions are keen analyses of aggadic "anecdotes of heroic filial concern," since "much of the halakhah in the area of filial piety is in fact extrapolated by making of imitation a norm" (p. 152).

Professor Blidstein then investigates (pp. 60-74) "the single problem of filial responsibility that is discussed at length in the Talmud." Does *kibbud av ve'aim* entail financial support? The Babylonian Talmud indicates no; the Palestinian, yes. And the *rishonim* and *aharonim* are not in accord either. The problem reveals "an ongoing halakhic and ethical dialectic." On one side, there is the tendency "limiting filial piety to acts of personal service and concern and suggesting that the plight of the needy parent is similar to the plight of all society's needy," and to be meliorated by communal charity, not filial aid. On the other side, there is the insistence that "filial responsibility must . . . protect the needy parent."

From the point of view of the philosophy of halakhah, the most suggestive chapter in Professor Blidstein's book is "Responsibility and Conflict" (pp. 75-121). *Kibbud av ve'aim*, which often conflicts with "the legitimate fulfillment of different goals," is in the words of R. Simeon b. Yohai (*Tanhuma*, 'Ekev, 2), "the most difficult [*hamura*] of all *mitzvot*." Professor Blidstein analyzes the conflicts between *kibbud av ve'aim* and other *mitzvot* (e.g., marriage, *talmud torah*, *aliyah* to the Land of Israel). When does *kibbud av ve'aim* force

the son to defer another *mitzvah*? When does another *mitzvah* force him to defer *kibbud av ve'aim*?

The book ends with a discussion of the role of the parent (pp. 122-136), and comparative analysis of the honor due parents with that due teachers (pp. 137-157). In a sense, these last two themes are an integral continuation of the chapter on "Responsibility and Conflict."

In very broad outline the book may be seen as divided into three sections:

1. *ta'amei ha-mitzvah* (pp. 1-36).
2. definition of the *mitzvah* (pp. 37-74).
3. relation of the *mitzvah* to other *mitzvot* (pp. 75-157).

There is, regrettably, no general conclusion to tie together the diverse themes of the book, or to recapitulate the spirit of the *mitzvah*.

From a conceptual point of view, it would have been advantageous to begin the book with the halakhic discussion (i.e., with p. 37), and to hold the discussion of "dimensions of significance" (or *ta'amim*) for the conclusion. Only after it is clear just what the *mitzvah* is can we properly appreciate opinions concerning its "dimensions of significance." Moreover, a chapter on the significance of *kibbud av ve'aim* — bringing into focus its ethical, social, and spiritual dimensions — would have made a splendid conclusion. Why did not Professor Blidstein simply begin with the halakhic discussion and conclude with the discussion of significance? Part of the explanation may be that the book was written over a long period of time (a prefatory note indicates

that Professor Blidstein started working on the topic between 1966-9), presumably with many long interruptions, and thus different parts may have been composed with an eye neither to their coherence with other parts, nor to their place in the whole.

There is a further, more interesting explanation which concerns Professor Blidstein's theory of halakhah. According to him, the halakhah, which "proceeds through a vigorous dialectic combining modes of discourse associated with both ethics and law," is conceived as simultaneously molding and expressing "the Jewish ethos" (p. xiv). This view of the halakhah as (symbiotically?) related to "the Jewish ethos" apparently suggested prefacing the halakhic discussion with one of ethos. In fact, Professor Blidstein explicitly advises that "halakhic discussions . . . must be seen against the backdrop of the ethical and personal norms by which a society is constituted" (p. 105).

"Ethos" is a key word (cf. pp. xi-xiv, 1, 4, 8, 31, 32, 39, 46, 50, 51, 56, 67, 73, 75, 76, 78, 79, 84, 87, 92, 94, 100, 106, 110, 118, 122, 124, 130, 139, 151, 153, 157, 171, 180, 192, 218, 233). It sometimes refers to particular moral norms or values, e.g., a son does not speak in the presence of his father, a disciple is dear as a son, a son must rise before his father even if he is his father's teacher. More often it refers to specific behavioral categories, e.g., "the ethos of filial piety," "the ethos of parenthood," "the ethos of gratitude." But its most problematic use is in the recurring phrase, "the Jewish

Book Reviews

ethos" (cf. also "the Jewish ethic").

The phrase "the Jewish ethos" is problematic, in the first place, because — however "ethos" is defined — there is no one Jewish ethos shared by all Jewish communities in every age and place. Moreover, the phrase is so uninhibited in its connotations that its frequent use muddles the distinction between halakhic and non-halakhic materials. Once this important (and difficult) distinction is lost, it becomes almost impossible to analyze effectively the involute relationship between halakhah and ethics. Intrusion of "the Jewish ethos" and its kindred notions thus impairs Professor Blidstein's otherwise remarkably lucid and instructive discussions of halakhah and ethics.

While talk of "the Jewish ethos" obscures analysis of halakhic dynamics, talk about "ethos" (without the definite article) at times proves helpful. For example, the behavior of Rabbi Eliezer in mourning his father reveals "a different ethos" from that of his student Rabbi Akiba in mourning his father (p. 151). Similarly, with regard to the power of the parent to prevent a child's marriage, *Sefer Hasidim* (and certain 20th-century authorities) taught "an ethos different from that of the Maharik" (p. 92). Inquiry into the influence of personal, communal, or contemporary ethos on individual decisors is potentially fruitful just because there is no one Jewish ethos!

Any discussion concerning the relationship between ethics and halakhah must attend to the concept of *mitzvah*. Professor Blidstein raises a basic question: "What are

the bounds of a Divine command — cannot virtually any human activity be part of a *mitzvah* structure?" (p. 83). His entire book provides ample proof (if proof were needed) that virtually any human activity indeed can be part of a *mitzvah* structure, and that therefore the only bounds of a Divine command are other Divine commands. It is this exhaustive quality of the network of *mitzvot* which makes it superfluous and confusing to speak of a conflict between *mitzvot* and values, ideas, "legitimate goals," or ethos: *mitzvot* properly conflict only with *mitzvot*. When speaking about the bounds of filial responsibility, Professor Blidstein is generally careful to speak about the conflict of one *mitzvah* with another. Occasionally, however, he speaks of filial responsibility in conflict with something other than a *mitzvah* (cf. p. 76), and occasionally he speaks of a conflict between a *mitzvah* and filial responsibility — as if filial responsibility were itself not a *mitzvah* like any other (cf. pp. 82-5, 144).

But if *kibbud av ve'aim* is a *mitzvah*, then the son's obligation must be directly to the *Metzavveh*, and only indirectly to the parent. *Mutatis mutandis*, this holds for all *mitzvot beyn adam le-havero*. From the point of view of *ta'amei ha-mitzvot*, it is undoubtedly true that the "fundamental instruction" of *kibbud av ve'aim* "concerns man's responsibilities toward his parents, not toward God" (p. 5), but from a halakhic point of view that responsibility toward his parents is itself primarily a responsibility toward God. In this connection, Professor

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

Blidstein (following Danby) misleadingly translates the mishnaic "*mitzvot* [*mitzvat?*] *ha-av 'al haben*" (*Kiddushin* 1:7) as "the obligations of a son toward a father" (p. 38). Curiously, a correct translation is given on the very same page (!) by Professor Blidstein himself: "*mitzvot* concerning the parent incumbent upon the son." The *mitzvot* (or *mitzvah*) referred to in our *mishnah* are (is) Divine, not parental!

The question of the relationship of ethics to halakhah occupied mediaeval Jewish philosophers. Professor Blidstein gives fine account of their various positions on the moral significance of filial piety, but leaves the impression that, by and large, they agreed among themselves on the relationship of ethics to halakhah. They did not. Sa'adiah, who held a theory of rational ethics, considered moral *mitzvot* like *kibbud av ve'aim* to be "rational" (*mitzvot sikhliyyot*). Maimonides, who did not hold a theory of rational ethics, rejected such a description of the moral *mitzvot* as having resulted from "the illness of the theologians" (*Shemonah Pera-kim*, ch. 6). On questions such as the relationship of ethics to halakhah, Jewish philosophers always have held, and — given the nature of Judaism — always will hold widely varying views. In modern times, one extreme of the issue has been argued by Leon Roth and Emmanuel Lévinas, who see the halakhah as essentially ethical, and the other extreme by Yeshayahu Leibowitz, who sees it as distinctly non-ethical. Professor Blidstein's own position has affinities with

those of Roth and Lévinas.

One last comment about halakhah and ethos. Professor Blidstein maintains that Judaism is "quite nonpatriarchal" with regard to filial piety: "if 'father' precedes 'mother' in Exodus 20:12, the order is reversed in Leviticus 19:3" (p. xi). Nonetheless, he admits that, according to the Rabbis (cf., e.g., *Ke-ritot* 6:9), "practically speaking, the honor and reverence of the father take precedence" because "the wife is bidden to honor and revere her husband" (p. 31). Likewise (cf. *Kiddushin* 30b), marriage restricts the responsibility of a woman toward her parents since she now is "in the control" of her husband, but it does not restrict the responsibility of a man toward his parents (p. 98). The sources, however, are not unequivocal. Our contemporary ethos being what it is, the status of women with respect to *kibbud av ve'aim* requires further scrutiny.

One riddle in the book does not concern *kibbud av ve'aim*. Professor Blidstein mentions that R. Elijah Capsali was "the only author to write an entire volume on the topic of filial responsibility," and that "the volume, *Me'ah She'arim*, is still in manuscript" (p. 91). To the reader's surprise, it soon becomes apparent that Professor Blidstein has not read it. In these days of microfilm and xerox, what could have stopped him? Seeking an explanation from the notes in the back of the book, the reader is astounded to find Professor Blidstein's cryptic statement: "My request to see the ms. was refused by the Jewish Theological Seminary."

Book Reviews

How did it happen that the Jewish Theological Seminary refused to let a well-known rabbinic scholar see a rabbinic manuscript?

Technically, the book has little faults: proper names are spelled inconsistently (e.g., Rabad, Ra'abad; Rama, Ramah [!]; Perlow, Perlov; *Yoreh De'ah*, *Yore De'ah*), and so are key terms (e.g., Halakah, Halakha; *gemilut hesed*, *gemillut* [!] *hesed*); *mora* is spelled *morah*, *shelom bayit* is spelled *shalom bayit*; Palestinian Talmud is sometimes "TP" and sometimes "PT," sometimes "P" and sometimes "p"; *mishpat* is hyphenated

mis-hpat; and so on.

In all, however, *Honor Thy Father and Mother* makes an extremely good introduction to the workings of law and ethics in the Jewish tradition. It also can be a trenchant guide for rabbinic scholars in their study of texts relating to *kibbud av ve'aim*. The book (especially if published in inexpensive paperback: the present hardcover edition is priced at \$15.00!) will thus be excellent for many different kinds of university courses, adult education classes, and study seminars — and a boon to any reader interested in Jewish thought.

Yesodei S'mochos, by AARON FELDER (Revised edition, private printing, New York: 1976).

Reviewed by Victor Solomon

The past decade has witnessed a prodigious proliferation of thanatological literature. It is particularly noteworthy that death and grief, long stigmatized by our culture as vulgar, and consigned by sensitive folk to the limbo of taboo and teratological denial, has emerged, rehabilitated, as a fashionable subject fit for popular courses, public discourses and prestigious professional conferences. This denouement may be due, in part, to a growing awareness among thinking people, that man, despite impressive strides in the physical sciences and technologies, stumbles on, spiritually impoverished, toward the final toll on the road of life, while the survivors await the inevitable mourning holo-

phasm, pitifully unprepared.

"Helping professionals" marvel at this "new" turgescient field; Rabbi Felder presents a useful guidebook on an aspect of life which traditional Judaism never abandoned. *Yesodei S'mochos* is a sensitive tapestry of mourning laws and customs couched in an erudite, yet readable idiom, appealing to both scholars and laymen. Following in the footsteps of his learned father, the author documents the text with copious notes, obviously intended to stimulate the reader to research the sources.

Rabbi Felder postulates at the outset that the laws of mourning and purification were meant to help people in confrontation with the Ultimate Encounter. The Torah accepts the emotional reaction to

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

death as natural, providing strategies for dealing with bereavement. The laws of *aveilut* can harness and canalize the healthy expression of grief. "The aim," as Rabbi Felder perceives it, "is that man not only carry out the necessary precepts as prescribed by the Torah, but to emerge from the crisis greatly strengthened in his Torah convictions."

The author opts for quality, pressing between the covers of a deceptively modest volume, a concise compendium which includes an informative text, notes conveniently located after each chapter, a table

of abbreviations, a comprehensive bibliography and an index. These features commend the book, especially, to busy pulpit rabbis who may need a convenient reference for frequent inquiries on *hilkhot aveilut*, with helpful references for supplementary study in depth. The sources encompass the traditional *halakhic* literature, as well as contemporary Responsa concerned with current practical problems.

Yesodei S'mochos reflects a keen mind, a compassionate heart and an eloquent pen, which will, hopefully, continue to be productive.

Shechita, Edited by MICHAEL L. and ELI MUNK and I. M. LEVINGER (Jerusalem, New York: Feldheim Distributors, 1976).

Reviewed by
Samson Rafael Weiss

This is a monumental book. It covers over eight decades of inspiring Jewish persistency and adherence to the Torah in the defense of *shechita*. It is the record of self-sacrificing, heroic Jewish spokespersonship in the face of enmity and naked hatred. It recalls continued belief in Halakhah even under the threats of concentration camp and deportation. It is the indestructible evidence of the truly awe-inspiring sense of responsibility and historic wisdom of the Halakhic authorities, the *Gedolei Yisrael*, who, in rendering the final decision whether to reject or modify the rite of *shechita*, resisted tremendous pressures exerted by Jewish sources and from

governments.

The book contains few descriptive or evaluative portions, aside from brief introductory notes of the editors (pages 15-28) dealing with the anti-*shechita* campaigns, the initiation of scientific studies, the solicitation of expert testimonies, and the legislative developments in Germany culminating with the Nazi's prohibition of *shechita*. (This prohibition was one of Hitler's first legislative orders!) This introduction depicts German Jewry's coping with this situation and describes briefly the history of the "Reichszentrale" the Central Committee for Shechita Affairs established and led by Rabbi Ezriel (Ezra) Munk, the famed Rav of the Berlin *Adass Jisroel* Synagogue and Community. The major part of the

Book Reviews

book deals with historic documents, public statements, records of correspondence and decisions rendered in matters of *shechita* and pre-*shechita* handling of the animal.

It is precisely this detached, dry objectivity of presentation which produces the deep cumulative impact of this book. The reader must use his imagination and understanding to reconstruct the agonizing situations behind these documents. The book evokes the ever-growing respect for the man who led the world-wide fight in the defense of *shechita* for almost 40 years, Rabbi Ezriel Munk. A towering personality of Biblical dedication to God's Torah and God's people, Rav Munk was held in great awe by German, indeed all European Jewry.

The editors, Rabbi Michael L. Munk of Brooklyn, N. Y. and Rabbi Eli Munk of London - Jerusalem were both actively engaged in the conduct of the "Reichszentrale," assisting their father. Dr. Michael L. Munk occupied for many years the post of Executive Director of this vital organization.

The scientific portion of the book, entitled "The Physiological and General Medical Aspects of *Shechita*" is authored by Dr. I. M. Levinger of Bar Ilan University. This study embodies the latest scientific findings on *shechita* and on the various methods of pre-*shechita* casting, including some very significant and heretofore unpublished results of research experiments conducted by Professors Dukes and Nangeroni of Cornell University. Even the non-scientist reader will be impressed by the wide spectrum

of the research projects undertaken to establish whether *shechita* is "humane" and by the objectivity of Dr. Levinger's approach. The study is well indexed, and provides an up-to-date listing of all research studies published on this matter.

The volume contains also a number of valuable appendices. One of them lists all legislative acts, anywhere in the world protecting *shechita*. A Bibliography of works in various European languages goes back to 1876, listing Friedman's "Tam Tob" and followed by Rabinowicz' "Principes Talmudiques de Shechita et de Trepha, au Point de Vue Médical" published in Paris in 1877. The Hebrew Bibliography, of course, goes back much further. Here, one could have wished for a more detailed indication of responsa or other Halakhic sources. To quote the "Yavin Sh'muah" of Rabbi Shimon ben Zemach Duran, the "Rashbatz" for instance, or the "Bigdei S'rad" of Rabbi David Solomon Eybeschuetz without quoting at least the chapter within the section of relevance to this issue is of little use. All rabbinic authorities whose statements appear in the first volume, *Eduth Ne'emanah*, are also listed in the Appendix.

The book's scientific portion is dedicated to the late Dr. Salomon Lieben, a physician in Prague. Dr. Lieben had been deeply occupied with physiological studies of the animal, its blood pressure and brain activities during and after *shechita*, and published a whole series of excellent studies in this field. Therefore, Rabbi Ezriel Munk entrusted to Dr. Lieben the investigation of electronarcosis and chemical meth-

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

ods of stunning the animal before *shechita*. This issue agitated the Jewish communities throughout Europe as early as the 20's. Stunning was ultimately required by the Nazi Government and soon afterward in all countries controlled by the Nazis. The definitive scientific study on the effects of such stunning was made by Dr. Lieben who conducted his research at the Veterinary Institute of the Prague German University. An extraordinarily gifted and thorough scientist and a fully committed Orthodox Jew, Dr. Lieben submitted the results of

his research on electronarcosis personally to Rabbi Chaim Ozer Grodzinsky whom he visited in Poland. A confidential meeting of a small group of outstanding Halakhists was convened to hear Dr. Lieben's report.

The editors have done a great service to the Jewish community as well as to history and science by this publication. No serious discussion of *shechita*, in all its aspects, and of the struggle in its defense, will henceforth be possible without reference to this book and the sources recorded therein.

REVIEWERS IN THIS ISSUE

RABBI WILLIAM GREENBERG is spiritual leader of Congregation Ezra Besaroth in Seattle, Washington.

PROFESSOR WARREN ZEV HARVEY teaches Philosophy and Judaic Studies at McGill University in Montreal, Que., Canada.

RABBI VICTOR M. SOLOMON serves on the staff of the Counseling and Psycho-Therapy Center at Fair Lawn, N. J. and is Professor of Psychology in St. Peters College, N. J.

RABBI SAMSON RAPHAEL WEISS served for many years as Executive Vice-President of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America and is now a resident of Jerusalem, Israel, where he devotes himself to scholarly endeavors.