

*Sinai & Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible*, by JON D. LEVENSON  
(San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985).

Reviewed by  
Yaakov Elman

Jewish academics specializing in Biblical Studies shy away from "Biblical Theology."<sup>1</sup> They content themselves with the intricacies of either textual criticism, comparative Semitics and its ancillary disciplines, the study of the poetics of biblical narrative, poetic technique, and semiology—leaving both higher criticism and theology, Biblical and otherwise, to Protestant scholars. With the full acculturation and acceptance of Jews into nearly all areas of academic study, some Jews have now turned to the problem of infusing the results of a century of Biblical scholarship with theological meaning. This is the avowed aim and purpose of Prof. Jon D. Levenson's *Sinai and Zion*.

On one level, *Sinai and Zion* is a study of the theological significance (in biblical terms) of the two mountains of its title. It is also a programmatic statement of and a plea for a theological study of Judaism's holiest books that is both modern *and* in some sense Jewish; no discussion of Levenson's volume can ignore either aspect of his work. However, it must be stated at the outset that it is the modernistic aspect of his work that provides the structure and methodology of his analysis; the Jewish aspect consists mostly of an avoidance of christological references and a certain use of rabbinic literature.

Levenson's analysis of the Sinai and Zion traditions is illuminating and thought-provoking. But because of the book's pioneering nature, it is his more general programmatic intent which deserves the closest attention, and it is on

that aspect of the work that the following remarks will concentrate.

Levenson addresses two audiences in his introduction. One is that of his academic colleagues, mostly Protestant and Catholic. The other are those Jews who have rejected both traditional conceptions and the religiously dubious or indifferent results of modern biblical studies. Thus, on the one hand,

The fact is that the belief in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and kindred items of pre-modern conviction claim the allegiance today only of those Jews and Christians whose prior commitment of faith forbids them to accept anything else. As a result, among Jews at least, they have become a small minority, and most of the "people of the Book" are alienated from the Book, even at times repelled by it.<sup>2</sup>

On the other, the problem he sets before "those of a modern cast of mind who also desire to affirm the rabbinic tradition" is "how can we fit history as it is perceived and reconstructed by modern individuals into a theological (rather than humanistic) framework?"<sup>3</sup>

Levenson rejects the assumption of a monolithic Jewish tradition on matters of biblical text and authorship, but realizes that his demand for a "new model of divine revelation which takes into account the involvement of the Hebrew Bible in history and its character as imaginative literature . . . will surely diverge significantly from what has been the tradition. . . ."<sup>4</sup> Still, he believes that this new model will strengthen the study of the Hebrew Bible.

Whether this wish has much chance of success is of course bound up with

question of just why it is that study of the Hebrew Bible is hardly carried on by American Jews as a whole. It would seem that the neglect of the Bible by modern Jews is but one component of their rejection of Jewish values which conflict with those interests and goals which promote current American lifestyles. The time and effort required for the acquisition of Jewish knowledge must necessarily come from time and energy that can be given over to other, more immediately useful pursuits. Thus, the indifference to the Bible and Bible study has virtually nothing to do with the Bible as it is or as it is perceived.

On the other hand, the neglect of serious Biblical Studies in any guise by large portions of Orthodoxy is only partly based on its fear of current heresies. In the main, it is merely the latest manifestation of an age-old neglect of the Bible which has Talmudic and medieval warrant and has characterized traditional Judaism from at least medieval times.<sup>5</sup> Talmudic studies have much greater prestige, are considered more challenging, and thus attract more attention.<sup>6</sup>

Levenson's primary Jewish audience therefore consists of Jews involved in academic biblical scholarship and adherents of the Havurah movement, or those who in some measure identify with it. Levenson could hardly direct his book toward an Orthodox readership without modifying his analyses in major ways. That is a pity, for many of his ideas fall within acceptable bounds for at least some of those relatively few Orthodox Jews who maintain a serious interest in Tanakh. True, Levenson's occasional use of rabbinic sources cannot obscure the fact of his basic allegiance to the methods and conclusions of modern biblical scholarship. But because his approach is primarily theological rather than historical and to the extent that both modernists and traditionalists share the same text (and textual matters are never an issue in this book), we may yet tarry a while together.

Sinai is of course the mountain of the covenant. In seeking to uncover the specific meaning of *mattan Torah* (though, typically, the phrase does not appear), Levenson draws on a theory first proposed by George Mendenhall some thirty years ago. A comparison of the Hittite and Assyrian vassal treaties of the last half of the second millennium and the 8th-7th centuries B. C. E., respectively, with the descriptions of the covenant which appear in Exodus 19:36-8 and related texts, particularly Joshua 24, reveals a number of shared characteristics.<sup>7</sup>

So ubiquitous is this idea in the Bible that Levenson, following the trend established by Protestant scholars, locates it at the heart of biblical religion. "The literary legacy of ancient Israel is incomprehensible apart from covenantal theology."<sup>8</sup>

Levenson employs this historical parallel in constructing his theological model of God's suzerainty. What is new in Levenson's presentation is the way he relates this idea to a number of others, in particular the distinction between what he terms sovereignty and suzerainty, and the rabbinic distinction between *mitsvat* which relate to secular areas versus those which regulate man's relationship to God.

To understand Levenson's suggestion, we must quickly review some of the salient characteristics of the ancient Near Eastern vassal treaties which they share with several biblical texts, at least according to many scholars. Treaties generally begin with a statement of identity of the suzerain ("I am the Lord your God . . ."), followed by an historical prologue ("Who brought you out of the land of Egypt . . ."), followed in turn by the treaty's stipulations ("You shall have no other gods before Me . . ."). While there are other parts to the treaty for which biblical parallels may be adduced, we may stop here. The essential feature, according to Levenson, is the central importance given to *history*, the history of God's acts of gracious salvation.

"Israel began to infer and to affirm her identity by telling a story."<sup>9</sup> Levenson emphasizes the fact that while the principles of God's providence may be inferred from the stories, the stories themselves are not universal even though the principles may be. But, in contrast to Mendenhall, who traces Israel's feeling for history from the covenantal idea, Levenson suggests that it was this feeling for history which allowed the idea to take such firm root within biblical religion.

It is an orientation toward history, a "feeling" that history points to something transcendent, which prepares the ground for an image of relationship that is drawn from the historical sphere. Where the ground has not been prepared, where there is no historical identity and consciousness, the seed of covenant will die.<sup>10</sup>

This feeling for history illumines another facet of biblical religion. Levenson rejects for his reconstruction of biblical theology the distinction between apodictic (the categorical "thou shalt not" of the Bible) and casuistic law ("if . . . then" case law) which is associated with Albrecht Alt. In Levenson's formulation of Alt's position, "casuistic law is general and secular in character; apodictic law is Israelite and sacral."<sup>11</sup> As Levenson points out, ancient Near Eastern analogues can be found for both; neither is peculiar to Israelite thought. Thus, this distinction "does not have *theological* significance":

All law in Israel, whether casuistic or apodictic in form, has been embedded within the context of the covenant. . . . The artless meshing of apodictic and casuistic norms throughout the Pentateuch, a process which Alt's method seeks to reverse, is a theologically important fact which his form criticism must not be allowed to obscure. In canonical scripture, Moses mediates both types of law as if they are one. . . . Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, therefore. . . . does serve to convey a theological truth. . . . By ascribing all normative law to Moses, the canonical Pentateuch has made laws into personal commandments, and it has made the secu-

lar into a matter of the greatest sacral concern. . . . The Mosaic Torah is thus anything but a stern and impersonal taskmaster. The energy and spiritual power of the Torah flows in no small measure from its insistence on holding these two dimensions, the outer and inner, the legal and the affective, in a tight unity, refusing to sacrifice the one on the altar of the other.<sup>12</sup>

Enforcement of casuistic law is in the domain of human courts; apodictic law is in the domain of the Covenant. In general, one reflects the *halakhot bein adam la-Maqom*, the other *bein adam la-havero*, or ritual and moral law, both of which are coeval in biblical thought and in Levenson's theology. And this brings us full circle back to history, which is a record of the operation of the covenant within the context of Israel's experience. "Through covenant theology . . . Israel was able to develop a coherent correlation between experience and morals, especially public morals, the relationship between man and his neighbor."<sup>13</sup>

This sketch will suffice to illustrate the skill with which Levenson confronts and weaves together both biblical themes and modern scholarship on them. But the approach is conditioned by modern approaches and methods, and modern preoccupations. At certain points these may meet and mesh with rabbinic conceptions, but this does not serve to validate either rabbinic concepts in academic terms, or the academic approach in rabbinic terms.

We may fairly question whether the modern discussion of ancient Near Eastern concepts of treaty-making contributes anything of substance to Levenson's *theological* construction. The original importance of work on this subject was in regard to dating those portions of the Bible in which this concept is central, in particular the Book of Deuteronomy. This is not particularly relevant to Levenson's purposes. Moreover, recent work on the subject has cast doubt on whether the parallel, conceded to be inexact to begin with, is really relevant at all. D. J. McCarthy in particular has expressed doubt on this point. "Sinai

thus combines many views of the covenant, but none of them seems to reflect the genre of the treaty."<sup>14</sup>

Modern scholarship shapes Levenson's agenda and determines his methods, but in what way are they Jewish? Levenson describes his book as an "entry into the Jewish Bible." By "Jewish Bible" I take Levenson to mean more than the "Hebrew Bible." The term relates to an understanding of the Bible which is based on a rejection of christology and a use of rabbinic sources. Whether these will suffice to yield a "Jewish understanding" is the question which lurks at the heart of the matter. For the resort to the biblical text as the ultimate arbiter of a Jewish understanding of biblical theology is reminiscent of the Protestant tradition which Levenson seeks to disavow. The use of rabbinic tradition within the contexts of a discussion shaped and determined by the concerns of scholarship does not necessarily yield a Jewish approach.

The post-biblical Jewish tradition will often be brought in when it is relevant. I make no claim that Rabbinic Judaism offers the correct understanding of the Hebrew Bible. One need not subscribe to the regnant prejudice to see that Talmudic religion is different from its biblical ancestor, one of the major differences being the presence in it of a Bible. But the change seems more evolutionary than revolutionary; it lacks the "quantum leap" apparent in the Christian claim of a new Israel. . . .<sup>15</sup>

The Jewishness of Levenson's approach lies in his affirmation of the continuity of rabbinic with biblical Judaism. For example, he sees in the twice-daily repetition of the *Shema* a renewal of the Sinai covenant, and denies the scholarly consensus that such ceremonies did not survive into the rabbinic era.<sup>16</sup> It is this continuity and continued validity that may permit the appellation "Jewish" to its substance. To understand this aspect of Levenson's approach, we must examine some of the main themes of the second half of the book, which deals with "Zion."

If Sinai represents the covenant and the contingency of historical events,

Zion represents the cosmic, ahistorical re-creation of Creation. Drawing on the work of Eliade and R. J. Clifford, Levenson isolates four characteristics which the imagery surrounding Mount Zion shares with that of pagan, mythological "cosmic mountains." Zion is the center or navel of the world; the junction of heaven and earth; "the paradise in which the primal reality of creation survives intact, untarnished by the passing of time and unaffected by the threats of an aggressive chaos";<sup>17</sup> it is identified or assimilated to every sacred town or royal residence, as Jerusalem as a whole is associated with the Temple and Mount Zion. And there is a fifth characteristic of the Israelite conception of the cosmic mountain: "Not only Jerusalem and the land of Israel, but even the people Israel can be designated as Zion. . . . By virtue of Zion, Israel has become a cosmic people."<sup>18</sup> It is in this section of his work that Levenson draws most extensively on rabbinic sources to fill out this understanding of the place of Zion within the cosmos.

Levenson associates the idea of a cosmic mountain with the Davidic monarchy, whose continued authority and existence (guaranteed by God) is related not to the actions of David's descendants but to his own. Just as Zion is considered inviolate despite the sins of its worshippers, so too the Davidic monarchy was insulated from the rigors of the covenant and covenantal history in that its continuity was assured despite the actions of its representatives in any generation. This view did not go unchallenged, of course, and Jeremiah did doughty battle with the idea.

On the whole, then, though David's successors were exempt from covenantal strictures as individuals, the essential principle of the Davidic dynasty was to remain unimpaired.

Levenson insists, however, that the disassociation of Zion and covenantal ethics was only a vulgarization of the basic concept, that in fact, "the ascent of the Temple mount was considered to be

something more than simply a change of locale”:

It was, in fact, a way of entering a different kind of existence, marked by closeness to God, a life at the very center of the cosmos, the point on which the world is balanced, a true paradise.<sup>19</sup>

Zion differs from Sinai in another significant sense. The Sinaitic covenant is determinedly aniconic; no visual representation of it is presented, or possible. The people “see” the thunder and the blast of the shofar in a confusion of senses. As Levenson points out, the most extended descriptions in the Hebrew Bible are those related to the Temple and Tabernacle.

In the religious traditions that derive from the Hebrew Bible, it is the Sinaitic rather than the Zionistic mode that dominates. In Rabbinic Judaism, for example, it becomes imperative to commemorate the Temple and to hope for its reconstruction and glorification, but it is no less imperative to avoid duplicating what went on in the Temple. One is not to build a Temple outside of Mount Zion (the synagogue is a different institution), and one is not to imagine that the final redemption associated with the coming Third Temple has arrived when the world daily attests its need of redemption. The fact that rabbinic religion centers upon the study of books, that is, the written word, further undermines its appreciation of the nonverbal mode of revelation. . . . But it may be the case that through the study of the literary legacy of Zion that we have undertaken here, we can begin to acquire a sense of this lost dimension of spiritual experience.<sup>20</sup>

Nevertheless, the idea of the Temple as cosmic mountain maintained itself even in rabbinic Judaism. One striking example which Levenson adduces is contained in Maimonides’ enumeration of the images associated with the future life.<sup>21</sup> Among them are “the courts of the Lord,” “the tent of the Lord,” “the palace of the Lord,” “the Temple of the Lord.” Levenson terms this identification “inevitable.” More than this, “if the Temple is both a protological and an eschatological reality, and if the creation of the

world and the construction of the Temple are parallel events, then the completion of the eschatological Temple coincides with the eschatological Sabbath, of which the present Sabbath is a prefiguration.”<sup>22</sup>

This is not the only one, as we all know. For as Levenson hastens to add:

Like the Sabbath, the study of Torah is a taste of the ideal life, the portal to the ideal world, which is somehow available, at least in part, now. The destruction of the Temple did not close the gates of heaven to those who walk the path of Sinai up to the world of which Zion is the symbol.<sup>23</sup>

In the end Levenson does not see Sinai and Zion as antithetical. While earlier texts emphasize Sinai and later ones Zion, Sinaitic themes are sounded in regard to Zion as well. The renewal of the covenant could take place on Zion, as in Ps 50:<sup>24</sup> “In Jeremiah 7, Sinai demolishes the hubris of Zion; in Psalm 50, Zion demolishes the hubris of Sinai. The traditions correct each other. Each is fulfilled only in the presence of the other. The whole is greater than the sum of its parts.”<sup>25</sup> The two themes together indicate the Jew’s purpose in his life:

The survival of these two ancient traditions endows the Jew with the obligation to become an active partner, in the redemption not only of his people, but of the world, to live in a simultaneous and indissoluble awareness of commandment and purpose. The two poles of Sinai and Zion thus delineate an entry not only into the Jewish Bible, but also into Jewish life.<sup>26</sup>

In this discussion, Levenson finally fuses the biblical and rabbinic strands of his Judaism. While resort to later Jewish sources, especially those of certain Hasidic masters or those influenced by Hasidic thought, would have broadened and deepened his discussion, Levenson’s work must be acknowledged on all sides as a step toward a more balanced use of sources in the work of biblical exegesis. Levenson’s subtitle is “An Entry into the Jewish Bible.” One could wish that Levenson had taken us beyond the entry. Perhaps he will yet.

NOTES

1. See most recently, Jon D. Levenson, "Why Jews Are Not Interested in Biblical Theology," in J. Neusner, B. A. Levine and E. S. Frerichs (eds.), *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987, pp. 281-307.
2. *Sinai and Zion*, p. 8.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
5. See M. Breuer, "Min'u Beneikhem min ha-Higgayon," in Y. D. Gilat and E. Stern (eds.), *Mikhtam le-David: Sefer Zikhron Ha-Rav David Oks z.l.*, Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University, 1977, pp. 242-61.
6. The poignant remarks of R. Yonah ibn Janah regarding the neglect of the study of grammar in his time are a related phenomenon; see *Sefer ha-Riqmah*, ed. Wilenski, p. 11.
7. See *Sinai and Zion*, p. 26, n. 11 for bibliographic references.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 36.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 39.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 41.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 47.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 50.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 55.
14. D. J. McCarthy, "Treaty and Covenant," *AnBib* 21A, Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978, p. 276. This statement is taken from the conclusion of his chapter on the Sinai covenant, pp. 243-76.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 86.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 135.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 137.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 175.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 151.
21. *Mishneh Torah, Hilkhoh Teshuvah* 8:4.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 184.
23. *Ibid.*
24. See *ibid.*, pp. 206-9.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 209.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 217.

*Yemei Zikkaron*, by RABBI JOSEPH B. SOLOVEITCHIK, Sifriyat Eliner 5746.

Reviewed by  
Michael Gillis

*Yemei Zikkaron* is a collection of *derashot* translated from Rabbi Soloveitchik's Yiddish by Moshe Krone. The publishers tell us nothing about the dates and occasions when they were delivered. Reading the book yields up the secret that the "days of remembering" of the title refers both to the period of the

*Yamim Nora'im* and the *yahrtzeit* of the author's father.

From the outset the main themes of Rabbi Soloveitchik's thought appear. The first piece deals with man's status as a *shaliah*, or emissary, of God. Man is faced with the task of being the finite messenger of an infinite Sender. Finite

man must seek an expression of the infinite without even attempting to shrug off his own finitude. This is the great theme of *Halakhic Man*.

To read this book for the illumination and reflection of Rabbi Soloveitchik's philosophy is a valuable exercise. But to only read it so is to do it an injustice. These pieces are to be read primarily as *derashot*. Thus we should not only look for profound ideas but keep our attention upon the appropriate use of language, striking images and analogies, the novel bringing together of ideas, changes of pace and of tone. The rhetorical and aesthetic vessel is as important as what it contains, for the *derasha* must not only reflect and inform, but also move.

Each *derasha* has its own creative and imaginative devices. "Studies in Malkhuyot, Zikhronot and Shofarot" begins with a discussion of the political nature of monarchy kingship, which may be absolute or constitutional. God's kingship can be revealed both as absolute: "Put your fear upon all your works"; and as constitutional: "And they will all accept the yoke of Your kingdom." The ultimate ideal is constitutional, as expressed in the idea of covenant, but the world is such that we first seek an expression of God's absolute kingship in order to deter man from the gross evils he threatens.

The application of secular political categories to the text of the prayers and then to theology seems obvious enough after reading it. We never quite saw it that way before, however, and in an instant the Musaf of Rosh Hashana is forever changed.

Sometimes the master stroke is the transfer of categories of Halakhic and Talmudic discourse to the homiletics of the *derasha*. The distinction between *heftsa* and *gavra*, object and person, the hallmark of the Soloveitchik Talmudic method, becomes a key concept in the moral and religious sphere. Man easily becomes *heftsa*, a mere thing. He is full of inertia, subject to external forces with

no creative will of his own, guilty of bad faith. Man is capable by an act of self realization of becoming *gavra*, a person, bestowed with the ability to will, act and create. In this he comes to resemble his Creator.

There are moments, however, when it is appropriate for man to become object: to submit and be receptive. This is essential to the emotional aspect of Judaism; the longing for holiness and the ability to listen. In this passivity, too, man imitates God, Who submits to man's will by listening to his prayers and responding to his acts of penitence.

To make this point, Rabbi Soloveitchik twice quotes his childhood teacher, a Hasid of Habad. The Hasidim called the first night of Rosh Hashana "the night of coronation." Why, asked the young pupil, does God need us to crown Him? The precise answer is not recalled but it included the verse "a king held captive in the tresses" (Song of Songs 7:6). Rabbi Soloveitchik now understands that God looks to man to act so that He can respond.

It is hard not to speculate that the teacher had in mind a more radical thought about the relationship of God's will to man's. The question of principle which arises here and elsewhere in Rabbi Soloveitchik's work is: what is his precise relation to Kabbalistic and Hassidic thought?

This book is full of references to this mystical literature. The active-passive dichotomy is expressed not only in the drily Talmudic terms of *heftza* and *gavra*, but also in the sexual imagery of the Kabbala as *duchra* and *nukba* (male and female), or in terms of the *sefirot* of *yesod* and *malkhut*.

Rabbi Soloveitchik uses these terms and concepts, but always seems to neutralize their audaciousness as theological ideas. For example, one chapter contains a discussion of the doctrine of *shevirat ha-kelim* (the breaking of the vessels). This concept suggests a theodicy which gives a separate existence to evil. Here, however, it becomes merely an image for

the violent and unrestrained aspects of nature which sometimes eclipse its normal regularity and control. In fact, the reference to *shevirat ha-kelim* serves as a prelude to a discussion of Rambam's rationalist theodicy which holds evil to be the mere absence of good.

At one point Rabbi Soloveitchik makes reference to his method in making use of mystical ideas out of their mystical context.

I am not a Kabbalist and this is not the place to delve into the concealed Torah. I think, however that it was the author of the *Tanya* who said: just as the revealed Torah contains matters of the concealed Torah, so it is possible to find matters of the revealed Torah in the concealed Torah. Every idea of the Kabbala can be interpreted in a manner comprehensible to every Jew.

Above all, it seems that the tradition of the Kabbala serves as a model of *darshanut*. The poetic beauty of its images, its interweaving of the Halakhic and the homiletical, its emotional and imaginative power, draw Rabbi Soloveitchik to make use of its riches without necessarily absorbing it as a system of thought. Whatever the case, Rabbi Soloveitchik's basic approach can be expressed by a paraphrase of Pope, "Presume not God to scan; the proper study of mankind is religious man."

Reading the *derashot* is not the same as hearing them. The reader struggles to reconstruct their sound. This reader has never had the privilege of hearing Rabbi Soloveitchik speak, and yet, here and there, it is possible to discern a very particular voice. There is passion and excitement in the exposition of a complex argument or problem, and then a pause before the key concept is explained, and then all falls into place. The voice is most remarkable when it drops close to a whisper and Rabbi Soloveitchik confesses and confides: a childhood memory, a family anecdote, some personal concern or anxiety.

This quiet and personal voice is a special mark of Rabbi Soloveitchik. In one chapter there is a discussion of speech which includes:

Modern Judaism has lost the connection between the workings of the heart and the response of the mouth. The mouth does not express the heart. The mouth has become a tool of the head, the cool and calculating head; the mouth does not transmit emotions whose origin is in flaming coals.

One inevitably thinks of the modern, well-worked sermon melliflously delivered.

Rabbi Soloveitchik breaks this pattern with his passion and his poetry, but perhaps most effectively in the quiet personal passages. Some examples are in order. The transmission of tradition is associated with the pain of loss. There is an inevitable rebellion followed by a reconciliation which often comes too late. When the son succeeds his father he is most in need of him but is alone. To be heir to a great family heritage is no simple matter. It is the story not of a superhuman *gadol* but of one who remembers,

In my youth I would sometimes criticize my father in my heart and sometimes even my grandfather.

There are portraits of family members which are impressive and moving, not because of great secrets revealed or miracles wrought, but because of their evident authenticity and humanity.

The most striking of these portraits is of his grandfather. Here is part of the description of Reb Chaim:

... he was an emotional man subject to changing moods and amazement—he could be all joy and yet also be a man of melancholy and be all sadness. He could be a fighter as tough as cedar and yet sometimes be as soft as a reed. He was full of contradictions and conflicts. Reb Chaim never had a fixed timetable; he never ate or even prayed at the same time. He always had to force himself to avoid reciting the "Sh'ma" too late. Reb Chaim never dressed like a Rabbi; whenever he travelled by train no one would recognize him. He would finish "Sh'moneh Esreh" first and wait for the repetition. He would be the first to greet others and approach them to wish them "Gut Shabbes." Often one would see Reb

Chaim surrounded by a group of small children he was playing with. He would be the horse with the children pulling at the folds of his coat crying "giddyup." It was always possible to approach him freely because he was the embodiment of democracy.

Such portrayals are especially precious in an age of rabbinic hagiography. They should be collected from throughout Rabbi Soloveitchik's work, perhaps with the title "Tales of the Misnagdim—the Later Masters."

Only a few of the themes which make up the rich fabric of this book have been touched upon. The learning, deep thought and creativity which lie behind every sentence combine to make the whole many-layered and thus resistant to paraphrase or simple description. The expression of profound ideas with homiletical originality, literary and rhetorical skill in a voice which is as personal as it is authoritative makes *Yemei Zikkaron* an important addition to Rabbi Soloveitchik's works.

---

REVIEWERS IN THIS ISSUE

YAAKOV ELMAN is assistant professor of Judaic Studies at Yeshiva University.

MICHAEL GILLIS is director of Jewish Studies at Mt. Scopus Memorial College in Melbourne, Australia.

Announcing the publication of

# MESORAH מסורה

A new Hebrew-language Torah journal  
published by the Kashrut Division of the  
Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America  
emphasizing

- Contemporary Kashrut issues
- The Oral Torah of Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik

**Menachem Genack • Hershel Schachter**  
*Editors*

*Two issues per year / \$10*

UOJCA / 45 West 36th Street / New York, NY 10018