

BOOK REVIEWS

Commandments and Concerns: Jewish Religious Education in Secular Society by MICHAEL ROSENAK (Jewish Publication Society, 1987), \$27.50.

Reviewed by
Chaim Feuerman

"My first assumption," writes Michael Rosenak in his introduction, "is that Jewish religion and all Jewish education are in serious trouble."¹ Extricating Judaism and Jewish education from "serious trouble" presents a challenge of no mean proportions, and one which can undoubtedly not be met by mere mortals alone. But to help rabbis and Jewish educators in their efforts to meet this challenge, Rosenak offers *Commandments and Concerns* as a conceptual framework for formulating a useful theory of Jewish religious education.

In so doing, the author has crafted a one-of-a-kind work. For he draws upon wisdom generated by biblical and talmudic sources and their commentaries as well as all known relevant academic disciplines: sociology, psychology, theology and educational theory. Indeed, Israel S. Scheffler, Harvard Graduate School of Education, whose writings Rosenak cites, declares: "The author's broad and balanced approach seems to me quite rare in my experience; I cannot recall a book on this topic that quite compares with it."²

In entitling his book *Commandments and Concerns*, the author seems to be alluding to the double-edged concept which underlies his work:

The concept underlying this book is that two fundamental orientations to educational theory, the normative-ideational and the deliberative-inductive, are in many respects analogous to two basic religious ways of understanding. The religious orientation correlative to the normative-ideational educational theory I shall term *explicit religion*; it concerns itself with what is imposed on the learner (and the teacher) by tradition and authority.³

Presumably the author encapsulates this normative-ideational ("*explicit religion*") orientation in the title-word "Commandments," while its parallel deliberative-inductive ("*implicit religion*") orientation is encapsulated in the companion title-word, "Concerns": "The converse religious orientation I shall call *implicit religion*; this concerns itself with subjective spirituality and individual discovery."⁴

The author elaborates further in explaining the purpose of his book:

My thesis is that educational theory, at least in our age, must be both normative and deliberative and that a theology of education that does not incorporate both explicit and implicit religiosity will lead to partial—dogmatic or vacuous—understandings of religious tradition. Moreover, I suggest that the theology of education must be translated into religious educational theory and that this translation today requires the insights to be gained from social scientific understandings of "norms" and "development" lest the theory of education be simply preached at teachers and become a frill or a sham in the educational enterprise.⁵

More specifically, the author clarifies the nature of the "serious trouble" in which Jewish education finds itself and from which he offers help to extricate itself:

My claim is that modernity, in both its vulgar and its sophisticated manifestations, has overwhelmed most Jews and, conversely, that most of the Jews who refuse to be overwhelmed have not adequately confronted modernity. One finds Jewish educators speaking warmly of the integration of the Torah and general wisdom, yet much Jewish education neglects or evades Jewish knowledge or is indifferent or antagonistic to universal forms

of inquiry. Our educational practice is usually unclear, indicating that we do not know what we want; it is often dishonest, that is, we know what we want but do not believe in it, or we have decided that in present circumstances no one who knows what we know will believe it. Consequently, we lack theories of religious Jewish education (or, in the case of non-religious schools, theories of the status and significance of religious elements in the Jewish tradition). When we have theories, they are as partial as the theologies or ideologies that nourish them. And this . . . leads to educational distortions.⁶

Rosenak perceives *all* Jewish education to be in this kind of “serious trouble,” whether in Israel or in the Diaspora: Zionist, nationalist, “*dati*,” “general,” Orthodox, Conservative, Reform or Reconstructionist. Concomitantly, he sees his proposals for theory-generating deliberation as potentially useful to Jewish educational theorists and practitioners of *all* orientations.

To what extent these perceptions of the author can be substantiated in objective reality is, of course, open to investigation. At the same time, the personal perceptions of this reviewer are based upon his professional experience. This experience, though extensive, is basically limited to that of Orthodox yeshiva day school education in the United States.

Accordingly, we would wholeheartedly concur with the author that our Orthodox yeshiva day schools are in “serious trouble.” We would agree with the author that our educational practice is frequently unclear. That is, our Judaic studies classroom teachers are often not sure of *what* to teach (*how much* of *which* texts and commentaries to select, *which* skills and traits to target for mastery at *which* grade levels in *this* school *this* year) and *how* to teach *these* targeted texts, traits, subjects and skills to *these* particular children at *this* specific stage of their development in *this* individual classroom, school and community setting.

Toward the end of dispelling some of this uncertainty, some yeshiva day schools are fortunate enough to have formulated and implemented a more or less clearly written philosophy of education with an

accompanying set of specific grade by grade educational goals and objectives. This helps clarify instructional decisions to some extent for teachers in these schools and partially helps us find answers to pedagogical questions such as those of *what* and *how* to teach posed in the preceding paragraph. However, the number of yeshiva day schools which are even thus moderately fortunate is, in our experience, far from overwhelming. Yet:

The question of why religious education requires outside theories may be raised, and often is, in ultra-traditional circles. The claim is made that Judaism possesses in its own literature, all the theory necessary for educational policy making and practice. Not only does it have a view of human nature, but also the determination of worthy and legitimate goals *and* means are to be found throughout its halakhic and homiletic sources. Moreover, it is asserted, recourse to “non-Jewish theories” is dangerous, for these theories introduce the underlying belief system of a pagan or secular world into Jewish education. The readiness on the part of Jewish religious educators to use them testifies to naiveté or budding apostasy. The reason that modern religious educators think they need psychology or sociology to teach Judaism is either because they do not really understand these disciplines or because these sciences and their cultural assumptions are what they *really* believe in.

This traditionalist argument makes historic sense. After all, generations of Jews gave and received religious education that “understood what it was doing,” had policies, and predicted results—without social science.⁷

In response to this question the author posits:

If it is no longer feasible to ignore general theory, it is because Jews live in a situation of modernity; and modern Jewish thought not only *deals* with modernity but also *belongs* to the contemporary world.

Under these circumstances, we maintain, a translation of theology into the language of general theory is educationally necessary, even though the translation must be partial in order to protect the integrity of religious educational philosophy.⁸

To supplement this response by the author, we recall with some degree of both pleasure and pain many of the “*She’elot*

Book Reviews

uteshuvot (halakhic responsa)” sessions at annual yeshiva educators’ conventions. At these sessions, the savants who decide the overall religious educational policies of the yeshiva day school movement present responsa to queries posed to them by yeshiva educators. The pleasure which we recall derives from the clarification of halakhic issues in contemporary yeshiva education which is often made at those sessions. The pain which we recall arises from those vast areas of pedagogical perplexities which often remain basically unresolved after those sessions. *Hilkhhot hinukh* tell us what is obligatory and what is optional to teach, as well as what is permissible and what is prohibited in teaching. But they normally offer very little specific direction on how to go about the actual teaching process. This is left to the skill of the educator. (For example, many of us would be hard-pressed to cite the halakhic sources for such generally accepted yeshiva classroom practices as the use of worksheets, homework, testing and report cards. We won’t even begin to inquire after halakhic sources for such decisions as: how frequently we should test; whether we should use short-answer or essay-type test questions; which combinations of both; which kinds of homework should we assign at which grade levels, and so on.)

If the notion that *hilkhhot hinukh* may not offer us much direction in these areas sounds surprising to some of us, perhaps an illustrative analogy from *hilkhhot kashrut* may help reduce the element of surprise: The *Shulhan Arukh* tells us which ingredients are kosher and which are not, whether it is permissible or prohibited to cook on Shabbat and Yom Tov, and under which circumstances. However, it will not ordinarily offer recipes for cooking up kosher culinary delights. This is left to the skill of the chef.

Permit us to carry this imagery a bit further. Some yeshiva educators consider it one of our major educational challenges to make Torah learning “delectable” to the children whose spirituality we are charged with nourishing. A well-articulated Jewish

religious educational theory might very well prove useful in providing recipes for such pedagogical palatability. Hence Rosenak’s work.

At the same time, we wonder whether the author has been of direct practical assistance to us in this regard.

Firstly, no clear comprehensive theory of religious Jewish education is postulated in the book under review, although its author has ostensibly given us the intellectual instrumentality with which to construct one.

Secondly, the book is written in a somewhat ponderous, Germanic style of highly academic English, as can be seen in the several selections quoted in this review. Its language and its jargon presuppose readers’ congeniality with, and sophistication in, the intellectual foundations of graduate level university modes of abstract thinking. We wonder whether most yeshiva educators are representative of this type of readership. We are tempted to paraphrase the classic epistemological question, “If a tree falls in a forest and no one hears it, has it really fallen?” If this book is useful to yeshiva educators but linguistically inaccessible to many of them, is it to be accounted as if it had never really been written?

Lastly, we wonder whether Jewish religious educational theorists and practitioners would muster the motivation, the time and the occasion to meet together with a view toward engaging in meaningful and dispassionate academic theory-producing discourse and deliberation. And even if they were to do so, we wonder who would convene them, to which forum, and in which format? We wonder how they would ever, realistically speaking, talk to one another or listen to one another? We can only join the author in the hope which he expresses in the last paragraph of his introduction:

I make no claim to have discovered or coined the concepts, nor am I proposing new philosophies of religion. My aim is to clarify ideas that are “out there” but that sometimes are blurred. In the process I shall attempt to expand on them to put them together in a way that may make sense to teachers. If this effort

succeeds, I shall be grateful and, presumptuously, a little bit more hopeful.⁹

We are grateful to the author for his much-needed effort and for his masterful

and unique presentation. At the same time, we endorse his statement that, if his effort succeeds, we can all presumably be “a little more hopeful.”

NOTES

1. *Commandments and Concerns*, p. 8.
2. *Ibid.*, book jacket.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Ibid.*, p. 9
7. *Ibid.*, p. 197.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 198.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

The Last Analysis of Dr. Stark by JOSEPH TELUSHKIN (Bantam Books).

Reviewed by
S. Krimbone

The first requirement for a good detective story is that it be good *as* a detective story. The reader must be challenged, yet have a reasonable chance of solving the puzzle. The author thus must make the clues available and proffer a convincing solution that stands up to further examination. The reader who reviews the story should not find that he has been had. The narration must be fluent, and the dialogue spiced with the occasional turn of phrase. As a rule, it helps if the author can get the reader to like the detective.

Telushkin admirably meets this standard in his second Rabbi Winter novel, *The Last Analysis of Dr. Stark*, as well as in its predecessor, *The Unorthodox Murder of Rabbi Wahl*. His detective, Rabbi Daniel (remember that Daniel, in the Apocrypha, is considered the first detective in world literature) Winter, serves a Los Angeles pulpit and frequently turns up on the radio. His first wife, Rebecca, is conveniently dead of cancer (Rebecca Winter aha!), which makes him attractively available

(like the widow Judith of Bethulia), while exempting him from the stigma attached to the confirmed celibate. He is seeing Brenda Goldstein, who conveniently works for the police department; by the end of the book the wedding date has been set.

Telushkin's skill as a plotter is especially to be commended, as writers using the genre to teach moral lessons occasionally let themselves get sloppy with the puzzle: the later work of Chesterton and Kimmelman being cautionary examples. For like Kimmelman and Chesterton he aims not only to please but to edify, to introduce a Torah perspective and to make it a little more difficult for vice, in the real world, to proceed unchallenged.

Who killed the charismatic psychoanalyst Dr. Noah Stark is a question regarding which the benign reviewer is bound to confidentiality. About what killed Dr. Stark (and the other victims in the book) I need not keep silent: the culprit is *lashon ha-ra* (idle gossip). Telushkin's entertainment makes no pretense of replacing the

Book Reviews

Hafets Hayyim as a normative work. Nor does Rabbi Winter's milieu breed characters subtle enough to rival the snobbish refinements of Edith Wharton's *House of Mirth* gang, for example, or the sharper type of faculty politician. Yet I challenge any reader to close the volume without reflecting a bit on the Rabbinic dictum that *lashon ha-ra* kills three: the speaker, the victim and the audience. Of course, there are other worthwhile insights, dramatically and pleasingly offered, on mourning, theodicy and so forth, that will benefit both Orthodox readers and others.

At this point the frummer-than-thou's are no doubt itching to find an excuse to prohibit their children from reading this book. Well, a nubile adolescent suspect does leap into the rabbinical arms, but her father and the police are nearby so nothing can happen. But then there is the matter of Brenda Goldstein, who is not Orthodox and who expresses unhappiness with the halakhic constraints on premarital relations. Many of us would be shocked by the mere

willingness of a rabbi to contemplate a shiddukh with a woman not properly certified. But a woman who's not really committed?

And this indeed is a challenge Telushkin will have to face as he continues the series. What will become of the new rebbitzin? If she remains more in love with her husband than with his God, can a theological house divided against itself stand? If Telushkin brings her along quickly, can she remain a credible character and a credible conversational partner? Shall we look forward (shades of Dorothy Sayers, or *Stages on Life's Way* by Regine Olsen!) to tales in which Brenda takes the criminological lead, and in which Judaism is presented from her perspective?

For all this tune in, I hope, for the next installment. Meanwhile Telushkin's second success makes it clear he is no flash in the pan. There are many worse things to read during *aseret yemei teshuva*, or any other time of the year.

German Jewish Orthodoxy in an Immigrant Synagogue: Cincinnati's New Hope Congregation and the Ambiguities of Ethnic Religion by BENNY KRAUT (New York: Markus Wiener, 1988).

Reviewed by
Yehezkel Wyszowski

On July 16, 1939, a small group of Jewish immigrants from south and southwest Germany led by Dr. Leo Teitz decided to establish the New Hope congregation in Cincinnati, Ohio. This book is a thoughtfully compiled portrayal of this German communal synagogue model of the Einheitsgemeinde type, one which is an all embracing synagogue community.

Using as primary sources New Hope's liturgical *minhag*, satirical plays, congregational minutes, four constitutions, bulletins, correspondence, sisterhood and burial society reports, newspaper articles, interviews and American Jewish Archives material,

Benny Kraut skillfully examines the social dynamics of the synagogue's establishment. *German-Jewish Orthodoxy in an Immigrant Synagogue* offers a perceptive analysis of the problems of an immigrant congregation beset with internal tensions in its attempts to preserve the distinctive German ethnic-religious character of the Old World. New Hope's relationship with Reform Jews, whose hallmarks were wealth, social prestige and Jewish communal and institutional governance, and with the East European Orthodox Jews, particularly Rabbi Eliezer Silver (nationally renowned leader of Orthodoxy and preeminent rabbinic figure

in Cincinnati), were stooped in ambiguity and complexities.

In New Hope's relationship with Reform, it was ethnicity and national ties which fostered unity, whereas religion deepened the discord. On the other hand, in its interaction with East European Jews, religion fostered unity and it was ethnicity or national differences which brought friction. As the author puts it: "New Hope learned that however potent the appeal of ethnic religion to an immigrant congregation at the outset, both the factors of ethnicity and religion can be as divisive as they are unifying." By trying to appeal to as many German immigrants as possible, Teitz, its founder, attempted to recreate on American soil the spirit (if not the institutional framework) of the Einheitsgemeinde. To him, New Hope was to prove that contemporary German-Jewish immigrants, unlike their counterparts of the previous generations, need not become Reform in order to become American. Nevertheless, Kraut's findings indicate that Reformers of German background did serve as models of successful integration and Americanization. The combination of the centrifugal ethnic pull with the mostly Americanizing membership which comprised New Hope ensured that the congregation would not be immune from Reform influence.

Kraut's study on the social dynamics of an immigrant synagogue is certainly a

long overdue and valuable addition to the growing field of Jewish institutional research and places several key questions on ethnicity and religion in clearer perspective.

However, one cannot be too overreaching in the above conclusions if the membership, size and spiritual leadership of a congregation are of any consequence. After all, since 1939, when New Hope was founded, its average annual membership never exceeded one hundred. As for leadership, Kraut admits that other than learned laymen and the outside guidance of the venerable Rabbi Silver, the synagogue never had a permanent rabbi. This raises the question of how typical in fact New Hope was as an immigrant congregation and to what extent were its social dynamics a measure of a synagogue that was "drifting" aimlessly and struggling with no less than four constitutions? Moreover, this study could have been enhanced by including a chapter on the socio-economic patterns of the synagogue members, including the extent of their "intermarriage" with German Reform Jews as well as with the East European Jews.

Despite these reservations, however, *German Jewish Orthodoxy in an Immigrant Synagogue* is a masterful and thought-provoking study which future students of synagogue history will have to consult.

Hilkhot Tzava by ZEKHARIA BEN-SHELOMO, vol. 1 (Israel: Yeshivat Sha'alvim, 1986 (revised 1988); vol. 2 (Israel: Yeshivat Sha'alvim, 1989), originally published as a special edition of Yeshivat Sha'alvim's *Mi-Sagra le-Saifa*, Tamuz 5749.

Reviewed by
Michael Berger

Gershom Scholem claimed that in the history of religion, the first phase consists of an individual or group of individuals who, motivated by a shared spiritual experience,

develop certain customs, myths and behaviors expressive of their common orientation. In its second phase, when permanence and continuity replace innovation and

creativity, the institutional forms of religious life evolve: a sacred text (written or oral), standardized behaviors, and later on, a philosophical or theoretical formulation of the group's ideas. This, he said, is the natural evolution of religion, and all faiths must be studied in light of this paradigm.

This is not the place to argue the merits or faults of Scholem's view of religion in general or of Judaism in particular, but I believe the model is true of most human movements, be they political, economic, or philosophical. Often the laymen simply begin, in their common sense sort of way, to view the world according to a particular set of priorities and to act based on them. Experiments lead to successes, failures, and revisions. Ultimately, if a movement is successful (or lucky) enough, it receives the attention of the intellectual classes, and insightful minds begin to formulate a coherent philosophy of the group, articulating unspoken assumptions and fleshing out unuttered premises.

This theoretical rendering of the group's philosophy is critical from two perspectives. Internally, after initial enthusiasm as well as momentum begins to subside, a movement needs a theoretical foundation for its own self-perception, so that adherents may sense a continuing need for the existence of the movement, and that its activities are justifiable and warranted. Externally, the group must communicate an image, explaining its uniqueness to prospective followers and antagonistic opponents alike, and, at least since the printing press, reaching beyond its own borders confined by personal contact, spreading to those who may be distant but sympathetic with the movement's goals.

In recent history, a community has arisen in Israel which, inspired by the writings of Rav Kook, seeks to express a strong allegiance to the *medinah* while compromising little if anything of its religious commitment. Most clearly identified by their knitted yarmulkes, they've been dubbed the *kippah serugah* movement. Given the political environment of the Middle East, loyalty to the state is most essentially, and (socially speaking) quintes-

entially embodied in army service, and this movement has invented its own integration in this arena as well: the Yeshivat Hesder, which, over a period of five years, allows the young *dati* Israeli to learn Torah as well as serve his country, generally both admirably.

Integration, not compromise. When the Hesder Yeshiva was originally conceived, many saw it unequal to either task—half an effort in each of two realms made for inadequate performance in both. “Poor soldiers” was the derogation from the secularists, and “*krum lamdanim*” was the disparaging prediction from the religious right. But for most of Israel's short existence, Hesder students have excelled in both arenas, serving competently and valiantly in the armed forces and learning vigorously in the *beit ha-midrash*. They became and continue to be a major source of pride for religious Zionists in particular, and to *Klal Yisrael* in general.

A sign of their advancing development was the appearance in the Fall 1981 issue of *Tradition* of an article by Rabbi Aharon Lichtenstein, himself the head of Yeshivat Hesder Har Etsion, on the theory behind the institution. In “The Ideology of Hesder,” Rav Lichtenstein articulated the philosophy that Hesder is not *bi-di'avad*, a second-best, even second-rate compromise. Rather, given the current continued state of war which exists between Israel and her neighbors, Hesder remains the only *li-khathilah* option available to the religious Israeli who chooses to serve both Hashem with Torah study and homeland with army service.

While that article clarifies in an intellectual fashion the legitimate foundations of the Hesder Yeshivah, Yeshivat Sha'alvim, one of the major Yeshivot Hesder, has recently published *Hilkhos Tzava*, a two-volume work intended for practical reference for the Hesder student while he is serving in the army. Designed to fit literally in the pocket of a soldier's uniform, these paperbacks (they are published in hard cover as well, mostly for libraries, retired soldiers, and the Diaspora) are the “hesdernik's” *Kitsur Shulhan Arukh*, dealing with the daily exigencies of army life and how to

respond to them halakhically. After an introductory list of guidelines issued by the Chief Rabbinate of Israel, it goes through a detailed, in-depth treatment of the most common and indeed inevitable experiences of the hesder soldier: how to daven on an army base, what times to follow, how to keep kashrut in a camp that is officially kosher but which is staffed by unobservant Israelis as well, and how to be *shomer shabbat* under the circumstances. In this sense, the work is an expanded and particularized version of *Shemirat Shabbat ki-Hilkhatah*, a book which enjoys wide circulation and authority. The footnotes of *Hilkhot Tzava* offer sources, while the text “above the line” is clear, succinct, and not overly technical.

In several respects, however, this work goes successfully beyond *Shemirat Shabbat*, and not merely in scope. Unfortunately for the latter, which has a distinctive Ashkenazic bias, its usefulness is limited to only a particular Jewish population, and in that sense, can never become a universally accepted halakhic reference book. The *Shulhan Arukh* attained its authority for Klal Yisrael precisely due to its universal applicability. Rav Yosef Karo’s work was accepted widely only because Rav Moshe Isserles appended it with his Ashkenazic glosses. *Hilkhot Tzava* is part of that grand tradition, putting Ashkenazic and Sephardic practice and law side by side, rendering the book useful to *all* religious soldiers. This equal treatment is also a welcome corrective within Yeshivot Hesder in general, which now have an increasing Sephardic student body but whose particular traditions are usually Ashkenazic.

The volumes are also more than mere “how-to” books, limited to occasional reference. Aware of its role as a text for a unique community within Israel, it incorporates *hashkafah* as well as halakhah. It begins with a section on *bein adam le-havero*, citing Maimonides on proper behavior for adults, as well as adding a section on *derekh erez*. The second chapter is devoted to “the holiness of the army camp,” a collection of biblical verses and other sources on the importance of main-

taining the appropriate conduct of a *ben torah* even under the adverse and often harsh conditions of army life. These two chapters, inspiring in themselves, reveal an awareness that these volumes serve not as mere guidebooks, but as the embodiment of an entire worldview distinct to this community. Any work with its own “preamble” is cognizant of the special role it must play in the lives of its readers.

This idea is carried throughout the book with citations from a wide range of recent and contemporary thinkers, from the Hafetz Hayyim to Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, sprinkling relevant excerpts among the wide range of subjects. There is little blank space in these small but rich volumes. While few people could sit and go through *Shemirat Shabbat ki-Hilkhatah*, and then only through careful study, this work can be and is meant to be a reader, a companion to the Hesder student serving in the army, when in need of a *pesak* or simply a little *hizuk*.

Another advantage of this work is its clarity of presentation. Outline format is used frequently, and bold letters indicate important terms that will be used. Concepts are explained clearly and succinctly early on, thereby requiring little or no prior knowledge of the subject before consulting the book. Charts summarize more complex issues, and allow for easy subsequent reference. The work is also spared the plague of obscure *rashei teivot*, Hebrew acronyms which are the *bete noire* of the neophyte in learning. While they’re clearly explained when a term is first introduced, a glossary of *rashei teivot* appears in the back as well. These amenities not only make it easier for the young hesder student, but even renders these volumes accessible to the unobservant, but mildly interested Israeli.

Volume two is more focussed, dealing with the particular difficulties in preparing for a maneuver or attack on Shabbat, how medics should act (many Hesderniks train to be field paramedics), and communications on Shabbat. The terminology is much more technical, but not from the halakhic side; military instruments and jargon, while

Book Reviews

familiar to most Israelis, is foreign to most non-Israelis. Few Americans can name the parts of a tank, let alone tell you where they go and what they do. (The emphasis on tanks is due to the placement of a majority of Hesder students in armored units.)

The end of volume two also tries to deal with the more difficult and delicate issue that every religious Israeli, and even every religious Jew, must ultimately confront: how to relate to non-observant Jews and non-Jews. The chapter attempts to work through the legal concept of *mumar* and its parameters, with specific recommendations in terms of prayer, Shabbat, and kashrut. It is honest and open, and does its best to treat a subject that most often affects this community, which has chosen to share in the military obligation of each citizen without compromising its religious allegiances. This treatment reflects the

choice—even desire—of this religious community not to shun or ignore the non-observant, but actually to seek bridges between the secular and religious Israelis. The mood that permeates the entire discussion is set by an opening chapter on *Kiddush Hashem*.

These two volumes, then, are a welcome addition to the “sacred texts” of the Hesder community. As theoretical articulation gives way to practical application, more such works will appear. It is ample evidence of the success of this unique movement, as well as an indication of the advanced stage of its development. We can only hope that one day when peace arrives and the central institution of the movement is no longer necessary, that the ideals of participation in Israeli life at large and reaching out to other Jews will remain the characteristic features of this special community.

REVIEWERS IN THIS ISSUE

CHAIM FEUERMAN is adjunct professor of Jewish Education at the Touro College Graduate School of Jewish Studies and Headmaster of the Westchester Day School, Mamaroneck, N.Y.

S. KRIMBONE is a teacher in New York.

YEHEZKEL WYSZKOWSKI is Chairman of the Department of Jewish History at the Yeshivah of Flatbush.

MICHAEL BERGER is a doctoral student in the Department of Religion at Columbia University.