

DOR Le DOR

בית התנ"ך העולמי בירושלים

Our Tenth Year

Vol. X, No. 3 (ט"ז)

SPRING 1982



THE WORLD JEWISH BIBLE SOCIETY

דור לדור

DOR le DOR

OUR BIBLICAL HERITAGE

A Quarterly Published by the

WORLD JEWISH BIBLE SOCIETY

Founded by David Ben Gurion and Zalman Shazar

An affiliate of the Department of Education and Culture in the Diaspora of the
World Zionist Organization

Chairman: Professor HAIM GEVARYAHU

Vice Chairman: Dr. LOUIS KATZOFF

Treasurer: BEN ZION LURIA

President, Bible Readers' Union, England: The Hon. GREVILLE JANNER, MP

Chairman, World Executive, Beth Hatenakh: CHAIM FINKELSTEIN

Vice Chairman, World Council, Beth Hatenakh: S.J. KREUTNER

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor: LOUIS KATZOFF

Associate Editor: SHIMON BAKON

Assistant Editor: CHAIM ABRAMOWITZ

PHILIP GOODMAN

RICHARD HIRSCH

CHAIM H. PEARL

PAUL GOULD

WOLFE KELMAN

MAX M. ROTHSCHILD

HAROLD D. HALPERN

S. JOSHUA KOHN

ABRAHAM RUDERMAN

JOSEPH HALPERN

S. GERSHON LEVI

GABRIEL SIVAN

YAACOV HALPERN

SOL LIPTZIN

MORDECAI SOCHEN

PUBLICATIONS

Dor le Dor — Our Biblical Heritage, English Quarterly

Beth Mikra — Hebrew Quarterly

Decir — Spanish Quarterly

Triennial Calendar for Daily Bible Readings. Numerous volumes of Biblical Studies

PROGRAMS

- World Bible Contest for Jewish Youth on Yom Ha-atzmaut
- Quadriennial World Bible Contest for Adults
- Regional and National Conferences
- Prime Minister's Bible Study Group
- Bible Study Groups in Israel and in Diaspora
- Beth Hatenakh in Jerusalem — World Jewish Bible Center

*Tribute
to
Ben Zion Luria*



His desk is always orderly, spic and span; each office item in its place, papers filed away properly and pending matters neatly stacked in their appropriate bins. Behind the desk sits a quiet, unostentatious, methodical individual, pleasant in demeanor, firm in his decisions on office management, reliable in everything he undertakes.

Thus, the editor of the Hebrew periodical of the World Jewish Bible Society, Beth Mikra, and treasurer of the Society and of the Beth Hatenakh, carries on his daily office routine. A prolific writer and author, he manages to fill in his mornings with administrative duties and his evenings, often late into the night, with scholarly research in Bible, Israel geography and history of the Second Temple period. And with all this, a constant humility characterizes his personality.

Ben Zion Luria, born in Bialystok, came to Israel (then Palestine) in 1925, at the age of 20. He enrolled in the Hebrew University, where he received his Master's Degree in Israel geography. Together with a well known geographer, David Benvenisti, he explored near and distant places, getting to know every nook and cranny of Eretz Yisrael, and much of Lebanon and Syria. Their joint work *אטלס תנכ"י וערים במקרא*, published in 1966, is a standard reference source for students and scholars to this day. In 1927, he was among the organizers of the Ramblers Association, whose aim was to get to know the land and its antiquities through walking hikes.

His expertise in this area readied him for his appointment to the Committee on the

Naming of Streets in Jerusalem; also to the National Geographic Committee where he serves as the chairman of its subcommittee on the naming of new settlements. As educator-geographer, he prepared a series of maps for the schools in present-day Israel and of its neighbouring countries as well as ancient Israel of the Biblical and Second Temple periods. His geographic atlas includes 120 maps. He is also a member of the Israel Exploration Society and of the World Union of Jewish Studies, participating actively in its quadrennial academic conferences.

Founder and editor of the Hebrew quarterly *Beth Mikra*, Mr. Luria has advanced the scholarly output on Biblical studies of the Society. The *Beth Mikra*, now in its 26th year, is published in cooperation with the Department of Education and Culture in the Diaspora of the World Zionist Organization. It is the medium of scholars and learned laymen for their research and findings in Biblical lore and literature. *Beth Mikra*, the Hebrew publication, *Dor-le-Dor*, the English quarterly and *Decir*, the Spanish journal, comprise the on-going endeavor of the Society to spread Biblical knowledge among our people throughout the world.

In addition to the *Beth Mikra*, Mr. Luria has edited many special volumes and Festschriften under the imprimatur of the Society. Outstanding among these are the Proceedings of Biblical Seminars at the home of the late President of Israel Zalman Shazar. His closeness to Shazar was instrumental in his appointment as Director of the קרן לעדוד מלומדים וסופרים ע"ש זלמן שזר — קרן עמ"ס, a foundation to promote scholarly publications, administered through the Office of the President of the State of Israel.

Mr. Luria is the father of two daughters and a son. The oldest daughter, Arnona, a university graduate with a degree in Bible and geography, is engaged in educational programming for the Ministry of Education. Arnona's husband, Colonel Micah Peikus, fell in the Battle for Jerusalem in the Six Day War in 1967. A street was named in his memory, called the "Commander Street". It is located in Abu Tor, near the Railroad Station and opposite what is hopefully to become the Beth Hatenakh. A double sacrifice was borne by Arnona when her eldest son (eldest grandson of B.Z. Luria) fell in the Yom Kippur War.

The younger daughter, Talmona, with a degree in nature science, teaches high school and guides teachers of nature study in the Education Department of the Hebrew University. His son, Menachem, has a doctorate in Photochemistry and teaches Ecology at the Hebrew University.

Mr. Luria's first wife, Judith (nee Ginzburg), who passed away in 1972, was active in the Labor Party. For twelve years she served in the Jerusalem Municipality. A street in the Giloh section of Jerusalem was named after her.

His present wife, an emigré from Russia, is active in the absorption of Russian immigrants and in publication of works on the Shoah in Russia.

Below is the list of Mr. Luria's publications:

גלילות במולדת (תש"ז ותשכ"ז) — מסות ומחקרים בהיסטוריה ובטופוגרפיה של אזורים שונים בארצנו;
 ערי ישראל (תשכ"ו) — מדריך למפת הארץ בתקופת התנ"ך;
 היהודים בסוריה בתקופת בית שני, המשנה והתלמוד (תשי"ז);
 מגילת תענית (תשכ"ד) — חגים שמרביחם לזכר נצחונות המכבים;
 ספר עובדיה (תשל"ב) — פירוש גיאוגרפי-היסטורי לנבואות הזעם כלפי אדום;
 מגילת הנחושת (תשכ"ד) ממדבר יהודה, מספרת על גניות כלי בית המקדש מימי ברכוכבא;
 מינאי עד הורדוס (תשל"ד) — גדולתה וירידתה של מלכות בית חשמונאי ושעבודה לרומי;
 קדמות העברית (תשל"ז) — פרקים בתולדות ארץ ישראל ועם ישראל בימי האבות;
 פרקי ירושלים (תש"מ) — אחרים ומאורעות בירושלים בימי גדולתה;
 בימי שיבת ציון (ברפוס) - על תקומתה של מדינת יהודה לאור המקורות הקדומים שלנו.

נוסף לזה פרסם מאמרים ומחקרים בידיעת הארץ, בתולדות הישוב ובמקרא באכסניות מדעיות רבות.

From the Jewish Chronicle, Sept. 11, 1981

Sir, — Ten years ago the first number of "Dor-le-Dor" was issued, together with the first triennial Bible Reading Calendar, in Israel, and the Bible Readers' Union is happy to congratulate the World Jewish Bible Society, "Dor-le-Dor," and its editor, Dr. Louis Katzoff, on this auspicious occasion.

Our president, Mr. Greville Janner, MP, has also sent greetings to "Dor-le-Dor." In his message, he writes "I am proud to be president of the Bible Readers' Union in succession to my wife's late and revered uncle, Chief Rabbi Sir Israel Brodie. He passed much of his last months in a room in London's St. Thomas's Hospital, looking across the river at the House of Commons. One evening, he said to me: 'I take great comfort from the Palace of Westminster. It reminds me of the Bible. Whenever you look at it, you find something new'."

This year we commence the nineteenth cycle of daily Bible readings as a Union. Any of your readers who are interested in our activities should contact our treasurer, Tuvya Shahr, Education officer of the London Board of Jewish Religious Education, at 9 Durley Road, London N16 5JW.

(The Rev) JOSEPH HALPERN
 Chairman, Bible Readers' Union
 Ramat-Gan, Israel.

THE HEBREW WORD SHEM – (שם)

A new interpretation of several Biblical passages

BY I. RAPAPORT

The word *shem* (שם) is found very frequently in the Hebrew Bible, both in its earlier and later books. Generally, it is one of the easiest terms to translate, and the most common value attributed to it is the English word “name.” By the normal processes of semantic evolution, the term has also come to stand for “fame,” “glory” and “memorial.” Similarly, *shem* occurs in both the narrative and poetic portions of the Sacred Scriptures, where “name” is its primary value, with “fame” and “glory” being among its derivative values. This interpretation of *shem* has long been universally accepted among Biblical scholars.

Yet, upon a more detailed examination of many Biblical passages in which *shem* is found, it appears that the conventional meanings by which the term is rendered do not always yield a satisfactory sense for those passages. Space here is obviously too restricted for a full presentation of the problem. Accordingly, the reader is asked to bear with us if we select only a few such passages to illustrate the difficulty.

For instance, when we read in Genesis 3:20 the following verse: *And the man called his wife's name Eve*, the English term “name” serving as the lexical equivalent of the Hebrew *shem*, we readily accept the translation because it makes good sense. But when we find in the Book of Ruth 4:11 a phrase as this: *And call thou a name in Bethlehem*, we feel that the text is quite unintelligible.

The reader will recall that Ruth 4:11 refers to the occasion when Boaz had announced that he would marry Ruth. The people who were around Boaz in Bethlehem at the time promptly expressed their felicitations to him, saying inter alia: *Do thou valiantly in Ephratha, and call thou a name in Bethlehem*. Whereas we can perhaps interpret the first part of the phrase, quite correctly, as

Rabbi Dr. I. Rapaport, O.B.E., Emeritus Chief Minister of the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation and Chairman of the Melbourne Beth-Din, has written extensively on Biblical and Judaic subjects. The present article is a non-technical abridgment of his book “The Hebrew word SHEM and its original meaning,” published in Melbourne, 1976. Dr. Rapaport now lives in Givatayim, Israel.

hoping that Boaz would be successful in his intended marriage with Ruth, it is not easy to fathom the full significance of the second part of that phrase. What exactly was in the minds of the people when they said to Boaz on the occasion: *And call thou a name in Bethlehem*. What do those words really mean?

It seems likely that this interpretational difficulty was felt by the various translators of the Hebrew Scriptures over the ages, and not knowing what to make of this enigmatic phrase, they decided to render it by "and be thou famous in Bethlehem." Such a sentiment is itself very laudable; it is pleasing to be famous. But does the sentiment really represent the true meaning of the Hebrew phrase under consideration?¹

Or, to take another illustration.

At the time of the oppression of the Hebrews in ancient Egypt, we read in Exodus chapter 2, the daughter of Pharaoh went down to bathe in the river and she found a baby in a box floating on the water; she saved the baby and had it attended to. In due course she adopted him as her son (Ex. 2:10), *and she called his name Moses and said: 'Because I drew him out of the water'*. Once again we agree that the English rendering "his name" is the correct equivalent of the Hebrew *shem* which appears in the scriptural text. Moreover, according to the Egyptian princess's maternal appreciation of the circumstances in which she found the baby, she chose a most suitable name for the foundling: she called him Moses because, according to her knowledge of Hebrew etymology, the term Moses indicated that the baby had been drawn out of the water.

So far so good. But how are we to understand a similar case of giving a name to a baby who happened to be born under special circumstances? We refer to the case of Hannah and the birth of Samuel as narrated in I Samuel 1:1-20. As the childless wife of Elkanah, Hannah stood and prayed at the Sanctuary in Shiloh, vowing to God that if He granted her the privilege of the "seed of men," she would dedicate him to God's service for ever. She was then blessed by Eli the High Priest who prayed that her wish might be fulfilled to her satisfaction by the God of Israel.

I Samuel 1:20 tells us: *Hannah conceived and gave birth to a son, and she cal-*

1. Recently a distinguished Biblical scholar in England openly admitted that "the Hebrew wording in Ruth 4:11 is unusual, and many propose alterations to the text. The exact meaning must remain uncertain." (See Leon Morris, *Ruth*, London 1969, p. 311).

led his name Shemuel because (she said) *'from the Lord I have asked him'*. At the human level the narrative is profoundly gratifying, and at the religious level the reader cannot but become filled with new hope and faith even amidst the most unpromising conditions. But when we come to analyse the etymological motivation behind the name which Hannah selected for her newly-born son, we are more than baffled.

The name Shemuel is composed of two Hebrew words: *shem* and *el*. It follows, then, that if we accept that the meaning of *shem* is "name," the future prophet of Israel seems to have been called by his mother, "The name of God." Of course, a mother is entitled to choose any appellative and turn it into a personal name for her offspring. But by the same token the reader is entitled to expect that the selected name would make sense to the ordinary observer. Looked at from this point of view, we ask, what sense is there in choosing a composite word like Shemuel, meaning "The name of God"? What sort of reasonable identification is associated with a newly-born child by calling it "The name of God"?

To be sure, I Samuel 1:20 tells us that Hannah called the baby by the name Shemuel because (she said) "from the Lord I have asked him," the two operative words being שמואל and שאלתי. The juxtaposition of these two terms is taken by many scholars to indicate that we have here a play on words, or that we have here a case of assonance, or that the phrase "I have asked him from the Lord" is actually the basis or the explanation of the name chosen for the baby, namely, "The name of God." But all these scholarly suggestions have remained largely unacceptable, as if to prove the ancient maxim that where there are too many explanations for the same phenomenon, it is most likely that none of them is the true explanation. One way or another, as a personal name, purely and simply, "The name of God" given to a child makes no sense whatsoever.

The two illustrations which have just been cited are typical of numerous other instances in the Hebrew Scriptures in which the rendering of *shem* by "name" is quite inadequate or even beyond comprehension.

Thus, in Genesis 6:10 we find that the first son of Noah bears the name of *Shem*. However, what meaning does this name have? And if it merely means

“Name” — what is the logical sense in calling one’s son by the appellative “Name”?

Moreover, in the Book of Isaiah 56:5, the prophet speaks of strangers and eunuchs who will perhaps one day wish to join themselves to the service of God. But those people are disheartened because they are lonesome and without children. Yet, by way of a reply, the prophet tries to remove their unhappiness by assuring them that their despondence has no justification because the Lord will give them in His house and walls *a hand and a name* — (יד ושם) — *better than sons and daughters, an eternal name (שם) will I give them which will never be cut off.*

Now, what is the meaning of the phrase “a hand and a name,” or, as some translators have it, “a place and a name”? How can “a hand and a name” be better than “sons and daughters”? What is the point of comparison between the former and the latter? And one more question in this case: how can one be given an eternal name “which will never be cut off”?

There is also another illustration which calls for some urgent up-dating. In Genesis 12:2 we read of God making an emphatic promise to Abraham in the following quatrain:

*And I will make of thee a great nation,
And I will bless thee,
And I will make thy name great,
And thou shalt be a blessing.*

At first sight, these four lines read very easily and smoothly. As a divine promise, they are a fountain of continuous inspiration. Indeed, generation upon generation of Abraham’s descendants have long found infinite consolation in the Biblical message contained in Genesis 12:2. But while we can readily understand the first, second and fourth clauses of the quatrain, we cannot say the same about the third clause of the message: “And I will make thy name great.” What is a “great name”? Is it a famous name? Did the founder of the people of Israel ever aspire to a famous name? Indeed, what are the criteria for a famous name? Is it wisdom, or material wealth or military power?

In fact, as we look back today upon the millennial history of the nation that

was founded by Abraham, we find there have been in the ranks of Israel names of people who seem to have been much greater in fame or glory than Israel's first patriarch: Moses, for instance, or King David. If anything, a great name is extremely ephemeral, and a truly great man will hardly yearn for it to the extent that God will promise him a fulfilment of his shortlived yearning. What, then, is the significance of the phrase, "and I will make thy name great"?

The final example of the difficulty which is encountered if we simply render the term *shem* by "name" is connected with the section of the Biblical law of the levirate. Thus, in Deuteronomy 25:5-9, we read that if a man dies without leaving any offspring, one of his remaining brothers — referred to as the levir — should marry the childless widow. Then, the first-born son of the new marital union should *stand upon the name (shem) of the dead brother, and his name should not be blotted out of Israel*. Now, exegetically, there is little doubt about the provision contained in this particular passage (verse 6). It means that the first-born child of the new marriage is to be regarded as the legal heir of the deceased husband and that as such he is to prevent the extirpation of the latter's family line.

Linguistically, however, since the word *shem* meaning "name" is mentioned twice in this verse, we find it difficult to understand why the Biblical lawgiver failed to express the law directly. Why did he not say it in so many words that under such and such circumstances the new child should be considered to all intents and purposes as the son and heir of the dead man? After all, we are dealing here with a legal provision, which should at all times be as explicit as possible; why, then, did the lawgiver make use of the term *shem* twice in the same verse, leaving it to the judge to say that *shem* in this case should be interpreted as *child*, and not as *name*, which is the normal interpretation in all other cases?

Indeed, the same difficulty is also seen in verse 7 where we are told of what is to happen if the levir refuses to marry the childless widow. In such circumstances, the widow is invited to appear before the elders of the city in order to accuse the levir of refusing *to raise up a name (shem) for his brother in Israel*. Once again, we know that "to raise up a name" is exegetically the same as "to produce a child." But why did the lawgiver use a turn of speech which implies a certain in-

interpretation rather than be explicit about it and require the widow to state plainly that the levir "refuses to produce a child for his brother in Israel"?²

My view is that inasmuch as Hebrew is closely related to Akkadian, both languages being branches of the Semitic stock of languages, it is a matter of certitude that at least some words in one language will have the same meaning as those same words are known to have in the other language. There is no doubt that the Hebrew *shem* is related in its lexical counterpart to the Akkadian *shumu*.

Now, in Akkadian (or Assyro-Babylonian), the term *shumu* means "name" but originally, almost before the Semitic stock of languages expanded into various linguistic branches, like Aramaic, Hebrew and Arabic, this term had the meaning of "child," "offspring," "progeny," "descendant," "posterity," and the like, the common denominator among them being that they all indicate one form or another of biological issue. Further, my own belief is that such biological issue can express itself either in the form of an individual person, like "child" or "son," or in the form of a group of people, like "clan" or "nation." It is only in the course of time, embracing probably very many centuries, that *shumu* also assumed the value of "name," because it was recognised that a child perpetuated the name of the family of which it was a member from the biological point of view.

It is my opinion that the Hebrew *shem* went through the same semantic development: At first the term had the value of biological issue, like "child" or "offspring" or "posterity," and it was only after going through a process of semantic evolution that it also acquired the idea of "name" or, as a derivative, "fame" and "reputation."³

Without any lexical hesitation, we can use the Hebrew *shem* in the sense of

2. I have dealt with the present inquiry at much greater length in the book entitled "The Hebrew word SHEM and its original meaning," published in 1976. While that book is largely of an academic nature, with many linguistic technicalities, the solution which I propose in its pages is based on a re-discovery, as it were, of the original meaning of the Hebrew word *shem*.

3. It would take me too far away from my present discussion if I were to reproduce here even part of the extensive lexical evidence which I adduced in my book concerning the validity of my theory of the philological equivalence between Hebrew and Akkadian. Nor is it necessary to

"child," and similar notions of biological issue whenever such a notion will be required by the context of one or another passage in the Sacred Scriptures. Many Biblical verses which have hitherto appeared as obscure or lacking in precise interpretation now begin to emerge in a new and much improved meaning.

Thus, we can now feel justified in claiming that we understand why, in Genesis 6:10, the eldest of Noah's offspring was called *Shem*. This word is no longer taken to have the value of "name," which would not make any sense as a personal name for Noah's offspring; the word means "son" or "child," and Noah seems to have selected one or the other of these appellatives to serve as a personal name for his newly-born baby. Indeed, even in our time we find that a parent will choose a common noun and turn it into a personal name for his offspring. It is more than likely, therefore, that Noah's first baby would be called *Son* or *Child*, in the same way as in later Biblical times people called their offspring by such names as *Lass* (נערה) in I Chronicles 4:5-6 or *Son* (בן) in I Chronicles 15:18).

Similarly, the felicitation in Ruth 4:11 will now lend itself to a sensible interpretation. By congratulating Boaz on his impending marriage with Ruth, the neighbours no longer said to the bridegroom "and call thou a name in Bethlehem" in the sense of "become thou famous in Bethlehem." The occasion did not call for a blessing of becoming famous, but for one of establishing a family, and hence the neighbours would have said to Boaz, "and produce thou offspring (*shem*) in Bethlehem." And the felicitation was not only meaningful but also very timely.

In this connection we recall that in the events leading up to the marriage of Boaz and Ruth a most essential part was played by the consideration of assigning offspring to Ruth's deceased husband, Mahlon, whereby the latter's inheritance would be retained within the family. This aspect of the case is specifically stated by Boaz in Ruth 4:10 where the word *shem* is repeated twice; apparently in ancient Israel there was a publicly acknowledged institution whereby,

emphasize here that the earliest chapters of the Hebraic history were spent in ancient Mesopotamia, the cradle of all the Semitic languages and their common cultures. And a characteristic feature of those remote times is that *shumu* (and its equivalent *shem*) can be traced back to the very oldest cultural levels when the written sign for the Akkadian word was still represented pictographically, and the particular sign indicated that it represented biological issue.

in the absence of biological issue by a deceased husband, the law of the country stepped in and provided legal issue for such a husband. And in the light of our re-interpretation of *shem* as "child," or "progeny" and the like, the reader will find Ruth 4:10 incomparably more intelligible, inasmuch as Boaz speaks here of the need to prevent the excision of the offspring of the dead man *from among his brethren and from the gate of his people*.

At this stage it will be pertinent to return to our earlier discussion of the Biblical law of the levirate as contained in Deuteronomy 25:5-9. Again we will now make use of the value "child" or "offspring" for the Hebrew term *shem* and with this notion in mind we obtain a different and much better rendering of verse 6. In the absence of natural children by the deceased husband, the widow is to be taken to wife by the latter's brother, and then, in accordance with verse 6, the firstborn child of the new union will be regarded as the offspring of the dead brother, so that his offspring will not be blotted out from Israel. Thus, we no longer have the enigmatic phrase here, saying that "the firstborn son shall stand upon the name of the dead brother;" it is not the "name" of the dead brother, but the "offspring" of the dead brother.

In fact, the entire law of the levirate in this Biblical section seems to be an officially legalised practice of the levirate case which is recorded in Genesis 38:8. The episode there concerns the instruction which Judah gives to his son Onan to go and perform the duty of a levir towards Tamar whose husband Er had passed away. The purpose of this duty was, as Judah expressed it, saying, take her to wife, and *raise up seed to thy brother*. Here, then, we have a phrase which is the exact equivalent of the wording in Deuteronomy, except that the notion of "child" or "offspring" is designated in Genesis by the term *zera* whereas in Deuteronomy it is referred to as *shem*. Otherwise, as is well-known, the terms *shem* and *zera* are lexical synonyms, which is also the case in Akkadian where the terms *shumu* and *zeru* are invariably used in the sense of "progeny."

Similarly, Deut. 25:7 can now be given a much improved interpretation. In this verse, the childless widow stands before the elders of the city and declares, saying, *my husband's brother refuseth to raise up offspring for his brother in Israel*.

The Hebrew term for "offspring" in this verse is *shem*, as in verse 6. But, as in verse 6, the widow does not use the term *shem* in the sense of "name," either in its literal or figurative sense; she uses the term in its original — almost primordial — sense, which is "offspring."⁴

Earlier in this article we raised certain queries in connection with the name *Shemuel* which Hannah gave to her newborn baby. Having stated that the traditional and long-accepted rendering of *Samuel* as "The name of God" makes no sense if it is used as a personal name, we are now in a position to give the name a completely new meaning and to understand the reason behind Hannah's choice to bestow it upon her baby.

We recall the special circumstances in which the birth took place: the baby was born in response to a deeply heartfelt prayer by a childless wife who was otherwise filled with sadness and anxiety and with an inexpressible desire to become a mother. Under such conditions — when the baby eventually came into the world — what better and more suitable way was there for the joyful mother than to acknowledge the event by naming the baby as "The *child* of God"?

Hannah seems to have been a profoundly pious woman, with the soul of a poet, as is evidenced in the hymn which she composed in honour of her son's birth (see I Samuel 1–10). She was also permeated with a spirituality befitting a mother who, in advance of the child's birth, vows to dedicate him to the eternal service of God — this being the highest form of human service upon earth. With such an attitude to life, how is one to express this conviction at moments of truly historic significance? To Hannah, the answer was at hand — and she did not hesitate to give it when the opportunity of supreme importance came her way. When the baby for which she had so tenderly and trustfully entreated was born, she saw in it an act of divine involvement in the affairs of man, and consequently she called her baby "The child of God."

We now come to the final few passages which, we believe, will emerge in a more meaningful garb within their Biblical context, once the term *shem* which is

4. The reader will find a fuller discussion on the social and legal aspects of the Deuteronomic law of the levirate in my book "The Hebrew word *SHEM* and its original meaning."

contained in them is rendered “child” or “offspring,” as we have suggested in accordance with our re-discovered original value of *shem*.

Earlier in this article we referred to Isaiah 56:5 where a rather emphatic reference is made to two groups of people, of whom it is said that they desired to join themselves to the people of the Lord, but to whom the process of achieving their desire was painfully denied. Those two groups consisted of such men who were described as foreigners and as eunuchs. The first group complained that the Lord had separated them from His people, while the second group lamented, saying, *behold, I am a dry tree*.

Unfortunately, there is nothing in Is. 56:5 — or in the passages preceding or following this very verse — to enable us to gauge the political or historical conditions in which the prophet spoke to those people and re-assured them of a warm welcome into the ranks of Israel. The prophet almost conducts a polemic with those two groups who are apparently afraid of some kind of a stigma of inferiority, be it social or national. On the contrary, the prophet pleads with them, and turning first to the foreigner, he almost orders him against saying *the Lord has indeed separated me from His people*, nor is the eunuch to claim, *behold, I am a dry tree*. And the prophet seems to have put an unusually strong emphasis on these re-assuring sentiments.

All we know is that a divine re-assurance is given to those two groups of deeply disaffected people. And the re-assurance — if the conventional “name” is accepted as the legitimate rendering for the term *shem* which occurs in verse 5 — is expressed in the name of God, saying, *and I will give them a hand and a name (yad va'shem) better than sons and daughters. An eternal name will I give them which will never be cut off*.

Some scholars have long been aware that the phrase “a hand and a name” is a very inadequate translation of the Hebrew expression *yad va'shem*, and so they have extended it to mean “a place and a name.” But since this rendering is rather colourless, conveying very little consolation to the complainants, Biblical scholars of most recent date have translated *yad va'shem* “monument and a name,” giving it the sense of a memorial stele which the foreigners and eunuchs will be allowed to erect in the precincts of the Sanctuary — a sort of plaque in-

scribed with their names. This memorial is to serve them as something "better than sons and daughters," and something which will never be cut off.

But all these interpretational attempts, which in any case introduce new notions into the Biblical text, hardly assuage our objections as we referred to them.

The two groups of people mentioned by the prophet feel either alienated or utterly excluded from the nation of Israel. They look upon themselves as foreigners who have no access to Israel's sanctities, and as eunuchs who have no hope in the future story of the nation. Of what comfort, therefore, can "a memorial stele" be to such people who are embittered by the lack of any joyful prospects in their lives? Can an inscribed plaque take the place of living issue? How can any monument be a substitute for such emotional outlets as are normally provided by the possession of members of one's family?

It is against the background of some such questions that it is imperative to re-interpret the Hebrew phrase *yad va'shem*. In this connection we feel that the second element of this phrase should be taken to mean "offspring" or "posterity." Thus, the prophet holds out towards the two groups of foreigners and eunuchs the prospects of posterity which will be "better than sons and daughters." What form is to be given to this posterity — a national or spiritual integration into the ranks of Israel — will probably remain a mystery in view of the absence of more helpful details in the Biblical text under discussion.

And insofar as the first element of the phrase *yad va'shem* is concerned, it is our opinion that also the term *yad* needs lexical re-interpretation, and this time I would connect it either with the related term *yadid*, with the meaning "friend," or with its lexical equivalent *yd* in Ugaritic, with the meaning "affection." With this re-interpretation in mind, I believe that Isaiah 56:5 would read most meaningfully, as follows:

*And I will give them in My house and within My walls
Affection and posterity better than sons and daughters,
An everlasting posterity I will give them
That will never be cut off.*

Having the significance of "affection and posterity," the expression *yad*

va'shem in the verse would truly have been of the deepest consolation to the people to whom the prophet addressed his words at the time.

We here shall deal with one more illustration — already referred to above — namely, Genesis 12:2. The reader will recall that the traditional rendering of the third part of this verse is: *And I will make thy name (שם) great*. However, this rendering is in our view quite unsatisfactory, and in accordance with our claim we propose to translate the phrase in question as: “And I will make thy posterity great.”

From the Biblical context we know that Abraham was about to set out on a journey into the unknown. He was on the point of breaking his ties with his native land and his father's house in order to embark upon the Road of Faith. What items is one to take along such a journey? Accompanied by his barren wife, being at the time without any children of their own, what thoughts could have risen to the forefront of his mind when Abraham was about to leave for strange and hostile lands? We believe that from the contents of the message given to him by God, we can decipher the nature of Abraham's secret hopes and prayers at the time. And so we read in Genesis 12:2 —

*And I will make of thee a great nation,
And I will bless thee,
And I will make thy posterity great,
And thou shalt be a blessing.*

In the hour of his darkest loneliness the first Patriarch of Israel could hardly have aspired to “fame” or “a great name” if we accept as correct the traditional rendering of *shem* and apply it, as former scholars have done, to the third part of the divine promise contained in this verse. A solitary person nurtures fear and anxiety in his heart, regardless of the depth of faith by which he may be inspired to reach out towards lofty deeds. What such a person needs most urgently and primarily is an assurance of sheer survival, and such an assurance is indeed vouchsafed to Abraham; he would be made into a great nation, and his posterity

too would be great — “great” in the sense of being indestructible, and certainly viable in spite of all hardships and inimical vicissitudes.

At the time of his departure from his native land, Abraham had no need for a high reputation, which is one of the derivative values of *shem*. The heathens of ancient times, no more than their modern counterparts, had no particular regard for a high reputation. Abraham’s most essential requirement was the undoubted strength to achieve the purpose of his spiritual revolution — an enterprise which would take innumerable generations to accomplish. But how would such strength come his way? How would the spiritual revolution stand up to the hostile forces which reigned supreme in the world at the time, and seemingly still continue to do with no end in sight?

The answer to his fears, as he stood on the threshold of his break with the past and the dawn of his future, was revealed to Abraham in the divine assurance concerning the greatness of his biological existence. God said to him:

*And I will make of thee a great nation,
And I will bless thee.*

And if I am right in using here the re-discovered original meaning of *shem* as “posterity,” God went on to say to him:

*And I will make thy posterity great,
And thou shalt be a blessing.*

Neither Abraham nor his descendants ever experienced much of the bliss of “a great name,” if there is any such in it. Their dream was but to follow the word and the will of the Divine Creator. That is what the nation of Israel always understood as the concept of its greatness. Indeed, that is what the greatness of Abraham’s posterity still stands for in this world. The blessing given to our first Patriarch is continuing, and is eternally being fulfilled even as the Divine Creator is eternal.



THE PLAGUE IN I SAMUEL 5 AND 6

BY MYRON EICHLER

Dedicated to the memory of my brother Prof. Jacob Eichler

The object of this paper is to analyze the nature of the disease described in I Samuel chapters five and six. There are certain terms in this paper which are rather obscure. The Hebrew term for the textual word translated as hemorrhoids or piles is Apholim — עפולים. This term is not read aloud in the synagogue and, instead, Techorim — טחורים is substituted for it. These two words which in the singular form are Ophel — עופל and Tachor — טחור, their meaning, etymology and the reason for the substitution, constitute a significant part of the inquiry of this essay. Also, we shall examine critically opinions expressed on the nature of this disease. It is recommended that chapters five and six of I Samuel be carefully read. For some background material on the sources quoted, the reader should consult the appendix.

ETYMOLOGY OF TECHORIM — טחורים

Techorim comes from the verb techor — טחור, meaning to strain the rectum or the end of the large intestine as used in this form in the Talmud, Sabbath 82b. Others translate it as hemorrhoids, claiming that this is the usage among physicians.¹ An old source² analyzes this term as being composed of two parts, rendering it as either ta-achor — תא אחור — meaning that which blocks the posterior opening (the anus) or tach-chor — טח חור — meaning that which is fastened to the anus.

If we consider the sister tongues of Hebrew, Syriac and Arabic, we arrive at

1. Ben Yehudah Eliezer, *A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew* New York, International News Co., Vol. IV. Jastrow Marcus, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature*, New York and Berlin Verlag Choneb 1926.
2. Shoresch Yesha, 1833, based on the Meir Natib, the first Hebrew Concordance written by Isaac Nathan in 1447.

יהי זכרו ברוך

To our sorrow, Dr. Eichler passed away as his article was being processed through the press. We present this posthumously in his memory.

Dr. Myron Eichler, formerly Assistant Professor of Psychiatry at the University of Maryland Psychiatric Institute in Baltimore moved in 1973 with his family to Jerusalem. He served as a Mental Health Career Investigator and later as Director of the South Jerusalem Mental Health Center.

other meanings for this term. Payne Smith in his *Thesaurus Syriacus*, as quoted by Driver³, regards techor as *tenesmo laboravit*, which is used in the same sense as in the Talmud Sabbath. However, he translates it as dysentery, and since according to Driver, it also should be a concrete object that could be molded, he renders this disease as dysenteric tumors (swellings). In Arabic, the related term Al Tzechira means a painful anal discharge with blood. Mandelkern⁴ maintains that techorim is the same as the Arabic ophel. Hiskuni's^{4a} translation "fic" is a French word denoting a disease marked by the progressive development of a fleshy fig-like body, narrow in the stalk and gradually more swollen.⁵ This condition suggests piles.

Techorim is also described in an old lexicon⁶ as a disease of the perineal region (the area including the genitals and anal opening) which, from disintegration of tissue, fever and moisture produces parasites afflicting the anal region.

ETYMOLOGY OF APHOLIM – עפולים

The etymology of Apholim – is far more relevant to our discussion. It derives from the verb aphol – עפל – meaning to swell.

In the Bible we find three different usages of ophel עופל.

- a. Ophel is the name of a hill in the city of Jerusalem. (See the Appendix).
- b. In the verb form Va'yapilu – ויעפילו – (Numbers 14:44), it has the meaning of expanding one's courage as in preparation for battle.
- c. In Habakkuk (2:4) it occurs in the form of Uplah – עפלה – suggesting an arrogant person whose soul is swelled up in him.

Mandelkern⁷ suggests that the singular Ophel עופל is a Tumulus (mound) or Clivus (a hill) while the plural Apholim – עפולים means *tumores ani* (anal swell-

3. Driver, S.R., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons 1895.

4. Mandelkern, Solomon, *Veteritis Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae*. Berlin, F. Margolin 1925.

4a. Hiskuni – Hiskiah ben Menoah – Bible Commentary on Deuteronomy 28:27.

5. Hartzfeld and Darmstetter *Dictionnaire General de la Langue Francaise*, Paris Librairie Ch. Delagrave.

6. See footnote 2.

7. Viz footnote no. 4.

ling) and *mariscae hemorrhoides* (piles). It may also indicate painful boils. It is interesting to note that some commentators⁸ do not consider עופל a disease but a place. Since עופל refers to high places, they suggest that by the process of inversion it points to a lower, namely, the perineal region. That עפולים may point to the site of perineal region may be confirmed by the fact that in Arabic the word ophel is said to mean hemorrhoidal swelling while according to Dunash Ibn Tanim,⁹ ophel is like an Arabic word, denoting a disease afflicting female sexual organs.

A factor contributing to the meaning of "site, place" rather than to a disease is the similarity of עופל and אופל, the latter meaning "dark". This opinion is based on II Kings 5:24, referring to the stealthy deal Gehazi the servant of Elisha made with Naaman, a Syrian general: ויבוא אל העופל "and he came to the hill" which the Targum Yerushalmi renders as a "dark, hidden place" rather than "hill". Similarly, in reference to ויעפילו (Numbers 14:44), the Targum Yerushalmi, which reflects homiletical concepts, again translates, "they prepared in the dark before dawn." While the rendering of עופל as a "dark place" seems untenable, Kimchi,¹⁰ in his commentary on Samuel where the terms טחורים and עפולים occur, claims that the first is the name of the disease and the latter the site of the disease.

Yet, from the biblical sources quoted above, we may safely assume that the basic meaning of apholim, stemming from the verb עפל, to swell, simply indicates some type of swelling. Rashi, in his commentary on the relevant section in Samuel, maintains that both "techorim" and "apholim" are two names of diseases of the private parts and the anus.

However, the fact that עפולים signifies "swellings" tells nothing more about the nature of this plague. Perhaps it is the swellings caused by the bubonic plague, or perhaps swellings of the buttocks as suggested in Luther's translation where he renders the "golden apholim" as "arses of gold". Techorim on the other hand,

8. Radak *Sefer Hashorashim*.

9. Reider, J., *Deuteronomy with Commentary* Phila.: The Jewish Publication Society of America 1937, p. 259.

10. Radak, *Commentary ad loco*.

seem clearly to denote hemorrhoids or ailments resulting from excessive straining of the rectum or the anal region, from trying to defecate.

WHY THE SUBSTITUTION

Apholim, apparently a disease afflicting the anus and rectum, so widespread in the literature consulted, I feel, is responsible for the substitution of טחורים for עפולים. This substitution antedates the Septuagint, and was in use from the time of Ezra, 450 BCE. The Talmud¹¹ discusses this substitution and maintains that this is done because apholim refers to an unspeakable vulgar thing. In other words, Techorim is used as a euphemism. The pressure to use this euphemism is so strong that in the text of I Samuel 6:12 and 18 טחורים is used as a regular part of the text and not as a substitution:

וישימו את ארון ה' אל העגלה ואת הארגו ואת עכברי הזהב ואת צלמי טחורים (6:12)
ואלה טחורי הזהב (6:18)

All we know, at this stage, is that Techorim, obviously hemorrhoids, a euphemism for Apholim, occurs in the same region of the body as the latter. Thus their relationship is such that both occur in the same region. The euphemism was then carried over into the Greek and Aramaic translations. Later commentaries, influenced by the euphemistic translations, fell into the same error and rendered Apholim as hemorrhoids. The Midrashic interpretations served primarily as homiletical material to indicate the severity of the plagues visited on the Philistines. They were not designed to clarify the actual nature of Apholim.

BUBONIC PLAGUE

In the light of all this information, it is now interesting to see how the version, i.e., bubonic plague, arose. Neustätter¹² has done very thorough research on this question. He traces the idea back, prior to the discovery of the connection between rodents and plague, in 1894. It is in a book called *Physica Sacra* by Scheuchzer of the Zürich Lyceum, published in 1724. In this book the author entered into a discussion of apholim. First he mentioned syphilitic figwarts or

11. Megillot 25a.

12. Neustätter, Otto, a. *Where did the Identification of the Philistine Plague (I Samuel 5 & 6) as Bubonic Plague Originate?* Bull. Hist. Med. XI, 1, 1942. b. *A Forgotten Monograph on Apholim, Tainted with Suspicion of Plagiarism.* Bull. Hist. Med. XIII, 3, 1943.

swellings but concluded that these may be endured for a long time without consequence. The apholim of the Philistines was very deadly so that still another disease had to be considered, one which is combined with a swelling. "This must have been bubonic plague," is the conclusion. He suggested that those who did not succumb to the plague may have developed very large swellings in contrast to those who died from it, which agrees with the relevant passages in Samuel (I Samuel 5:12). It is very interesting that the idea of apholim being bubonic plague arose even before the discovery of the rat vector or carrier of the disease.

It is the hypothesis of bubonic plague which must be tested in the relation to evidence available to us.

Epidemiologically we have evidence from Ephesus that there was a particularly fatal disease prevailing in Libya, Egypt and Syria about the 3rd century before the Common Era. This disease was characterized by high fever, delirium, pain and an eruption of large hard buboes,¹³ or swellings. So it is possible that the same disease existed around the time of the plague referred to in Samuel, 1040 BCE.

There are three types of plague: bubonic (swellings), septicemic (blood infection), and pneumonic (lung infection). The incubation period after the bite of the rat flea carrier is usually not less than three days nor more than ten days. In the prodromal stage or onset, vomiting and hematemesis (vomiting of blood) may occur. In the febrile stage the skin is hot, the face bloated; there is extreme weakness and prostration, and nausea and vomiting are frequent. Constipation or diarrhea may occur. Very serious complications are hematemesis and enterorrhagia (intestinal bleeding). Localization of the disease in the skin produces a carbuncle type lesion (pus filled swelling). In the gastrointestinal form of the disease, serious intestinal hemorrhage or bleeding occur. Death occurs in three to five days and the disease in all lasts six to eight days though convalescence may be prolonged. Septicemic plague is the most virulent and rapidly fatal type and intestinal manifestations are characteristic of this type. In this paragraph I have tried to touch on only those clinical features of the disease which may be related

13. Carrion, A.L. (in *Nelson Loose Leaf of Medicine*) ed. W.W. Palmer New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons 1946.

to views covered in this paper. Many other clinical features are not presented here.

Now let us consider the points in the text of Samuel which must be satisfied in any explanation of the disease.

1. The plague spread with the transporting of the Ark.
2. The plague attacked all classes and ages of people.
3. The plague was connected with the hidden parts.
4. The plague was deadly.
5. The lesion of the plague appears to be a concrete thing which can be given a definite shape.
6. The plague caused great social upheaval and confusion.
7. Those who did not die were smitten with "apholim."
8. There was currently a plague of field mice which were destroying the crops.
9. The return of the Ark to the Israelites set up a plague among them.
10. The word apholim is included among a list of skin diseases in Deuteronomy (28:27).

The spread of the disease with the Ark explains the spread of infected rats and of people spreading the infection. Bubonic plague, as in many diseases, does not distinguish between classes, and ages. Thus it satisfies the second point. Bubonic plague attacks the hidden parts as inguinal (crotch area) buboes and is very deadly. Judging from Defoe's description of the plague in London¹⁴ we could judge it to cause great confusion and social upheaval. The development of buboes in the survivors and not in those that die rapidly is very probable, especially in septicemic plague where death precedes the development of the buboes. A plague of field mice concurs with a description of bubonic plague. The Hebrew word for mice עכבר may be rendered as rats as it is a general term. Perhaps this plague of rats came from the dead bodies on the battlefield nearby, from the battle in which the Ark was captured. The spread of the plague to Bet Shemesh with the return of the Ark is possible as their carriers may have transported the infected fleas. Apholim is most prominent as a skin disease in that it gives rise to buboes and so inclusion of it with a list of skin diseases, fits well.

All this amounts to is that the possibility of bubonic plague is not disprovable

14. Defoe, Daniel, *A Journal of the Plague Year*, New York: Modern Library Edition 1948.

from this evidence, but neither can it be definitely proven. What of the ideas cited earlier in the paper which do not agree with this diagnosis? They fall into the following categories.

1. A disease of the anus or rectum. — this was covered in the discussion of the switch of words from apholim to techorim earlier in the paper.
2. Dysentery.
3. Animal parasitism, or infestation with small animals.
4. A disease of the inguinal region.
5. A multiple condition.

DYSENTERIC DISEASES

The possibility of a dysenteric type of disease originates with Josephus¹⁵ and his descriptions. The nature of this disease is not clear. In one case he describes the symptoms as vomiting their innards and in the other he describes them defecating their innards. Also the translations do not all agree on how to render the Greek. The concept of dysentery is well supported by the Arabic and Syriac words related to techorim. I suggest that Josephus had techorim in mind in his description. The possibility is this: Dysentery is a symptom of a disease of epidemic nature, causing great damage to the gastrointestinal tract (stomach, small and large bowels), and which may involve straining of the rectum to defecate. The idea of this straining giving rise to hemorrhoids as a result of the disease is possible, especially since it was those who did not die who developed hemorrhoids. The possibility of modeling hemorrhoids as votive offerings seems remote. However, another contradicting fact is that the apholim seemed to be a primary disease. Although this is possibly what Josephus had in mind, we find it incomplete as an explanation of the disease which occurred.

OTHER POSSIBILITIES

The possibility of animal parasitism in the rectal region stem from late sources and reflect the influence of concepts of spontaneous generation. According to this theory, the putrified tissue gives rise to parasites which further the destruction in

15. Waxman, Meyer, *A History of Jewish Literature*, New York: Bloch Publishing Co., Vol. I and II, 1938.

this area. There is no known situation deriving from parasitism which is so fatal and of such nature as to correspond with this description.

The concept of a disease similar to bubonic plague is brought by Dunash Ibn Tanim when he says that apholim is like an Arabic word referring to an ailment in the female sexual organs, probably hernia. This is the region of buboes that is femoral (crotch) or inguinal hernia. The other commentary which says the Arabic word ophel refers to hemorrhoidal swellings of the anus, may refer to a later meaning of the term. Radak too refers the disease to the whole perineal region, not just the anus.

Neustätter's concept of a multiple condition is an interesting analysis of the problem. It is too artificial however and certainly does not deal with the passage in Samuel which says: "and those that did not die were smitten with apholim." The causal relationships then of a plague of apholim and a fatal disease are not explained in this concept.

There are two other possibilities which should be mentioned and which are related to each other. Perhaps it was a disease which does not exist today — a swiftly fatal disease which brings out swellings in the anus much like hemorrhoids in appearance. The extinction of a disease is possible. Perhaps from a "religious" point of view it might be said that this disease was a supernatural affliction, specific for that situation, such as the ten plagues of Egypt and the plague of fiery serpents in the desert. These plagues are very difficult to understand and have therefore been called miracles. Maimonides in his *Guide to the Perplexed*¹⁶ stated that miracles should be considered natural phenomena, miraculous only in their time of occurrence and relationship to events; this does not deny their divine nature. Therefore even those who prefer a religious viewpoint can look for a natural disease as the cause of this plague.

Despite the evidence of many sources which localizes the condition to the anus with symptoms similar to hemorrhoids, my conclusion is that the hypothesis of bubonic plague is the most tenable explanation of the disease which occurred among the Philistines as described in the Book of Samuel.

16. Maimonides, *Moreh Nevuchim*, Section Three, Chapter 32, pp. 46-47, New York: OM Publishing Co., 1946.

APPENDIX

References to Apholim in the Bible

Ophel עופל

Isaiah 32:14

Micah 4:8

I Kings 5:24

Nehemiah 3:26, 27

Nehemiah 11:21

II Chronicles 33:14

Apholim עפולים

I Samuel 5:6, 9, 12

I Samuel 6:4, 5

Deuteronomy 28:27

Va-yapilu — ויעפילו

Numbers 14:44

Uplah — עפלה

Habakkuk 2:4

References to Techorim טחורים in the Bible

Deuteronomy 28:27

I Samuel 5:6, 9, 12

I Samuel 6:4, 5, 11, 17



ANNOUNCING

All 36 Issues of Dor-le Dor

1972 — 1981

NOW AVAILABLE IN THREE BOUND VOLUMES

- | | |
|--------------|------------------|
| 1. 1972-1975 | 1-12 (Vol. 1-3) |
| 2. 1975-1978 | 13-24 (Vol. 4-6) |
| 3. 1978-1981 | 25-36 (Vol. 7-9) |

Each Bound Volume \$20.00

CORRECTION

In the Summer issue of Dor-le-Dor, Vol. IX, No. 4, p. 125

the name of the Rabbi of Shaare Refila Cong.,

Silver Spring, Md., was regrettably misspelled.

His correct name is: Rabbi Martin S. Halpern

TORAH DIALOGUES

BY HAROLD D. HALPERN

DEVARIM – DEUTERONOMY

In chapter 11 Moses' exhortations and admonitions are concluded for the time being. The next fifteen chapters present laws, many for the first time (מצוות מחדשות), to regulate Israelite life in the new land. Many of the questions on these chapters will highlight comparisons with previous laws stated in the Torah (מצוות מבוארות). Some of the following material is inspired by lectures and writings of Prof. Neḥama Leibowitz of the Hebrew University.

QUESTIONS

RE'EH

1. *When the Lord enlarges your territory, as He promised you, and you say, "I want to eat meat," for you have the urge to eat meat, you may eat meat whenever you wish. If the place where the Lord has chosen to establish His name is too far from you, you may slaughter any of the cattle or sheep that the Lord gives you, as I have instructed you; and you may eat to your heart's content in your settlements.*

Deut. 12:20–22

- a. *What is the general intent of these verses?*
 - b. *How does the instruction here differ from previous food regulations, such as those in Genesis 1:29 f., 9:1 ff. and Leviticus 17:1–5?*
2. *In 13:2–6 the Torah warns Israel not to follow a prophet simply because he has performed a wonder. His message, not a "sign," is the essential element to be considered. If he counsels us to violate the Torah then he is false. (Maimonides, based on the Talmud, teaches that in special instances or emergencies a true prophet may counsel temporary violation of a Biblical commandment. For him the individual's personal qualities and general message are the crucial indicators – see: Iggeret Teman and Yesodé HaTorah 8.6 f., Yeb 90B and Dor le-Dor no. 30 page 66.1. How is it that the Torah speaks of a false prophet being able to perform a sign or wonder"?)*
 3. *The regulations for tithes (מעשר) in 14:22–29 and for the year of release (שמיטה) in 15:1–6 clearly have ethical aims; to benefit the poor and un-*

Rabbi Harold (Chaim) Halpern is past President of the Bergen Country, New Jersey, Board of Rabbis. These "Torah Dialogues" grew out of discussions between the Rabbi and his congregants in Beth Tikvah Synagogue in New Milford, New Jersey.

RESPONSES

RE'EH

1. a. The entire chapter emphasizes the importance of a central sanctuary. But these particular verses grant permission to slaughter animals for food anywhere.
b. For the earliest humans apparently the eating of meat was not permitted. After the great deluge permission was specifically granted (cf. Gen. 1:29 f. and 9:1-4). In the wilderness Israel could only eat meat slaughtered at the Tabernacle (Dev. 17:1-5 v. Ibn Ezra and Nachmanides). Rav Abraham Isaac Kook views these passages as concessions to human cravings for meat. He believes that ideally the Torah views humans as not eating meat. The regulations regarding blood and ritual slaughter of kosher animals, are meant to lead to greater reverence for life.
2. Many of the medieval commentators feel that false prophets could possess powers of sorcery and trickery since there are examples of such in the Bible (e.g. Pharaoh's magicians in Exodus 7). The Torah here seems to say that God has granted the false prophet such power in order to test Israel's loyalty (v. 4) or to train them in detecting deception (as נסֶה in I Samuel 17:39).
3. a. The consuming of the maaser sheni by the owner could have many edifying purposes: he performed this mitzvah in Jerusalem, the holy inspiring, and study-filled city (Sefer HaHinuch, Haamek Davar and Rashbam). This mitzvah also trains us in discipline and leads to giving of charity (vv. 28 f. Abravanel and Arama). All the sources cited are quoted by Prof. Leibowitz.
b. The foreigner envisaged here is a merchant who borrows for business purposes. Possibly the distinction is made because the foreigner is not bound to agricultural laws of Shemittah (Lev. 25) so that he has earnings while the Israelite doesn't (Bechor shor). Hillel's "prozbul" which mitigates the law in 15:2 was enacted to protect Israelite commerce. Also exempted by the Talmud were wages, mortgages, pledge loans and others (Mishna Sheviith 10:1 ff.) The law was meant to benefit the poor (cf. Ibn Ezra on 15:4).
4. The Midrash states that this third review of the festivals is for the benefit of the Zibbur or congregation. The meaning of this is unclear but some, including Rashi, see here an emphasis on the festival falling in the appropriate season of the year. Implied, therefore, is the intercalation of the calendar in order to adjust to the solar year. In fact, some texts read עִבּוּר (intercalation) instead of צִבּוּר.
5. a. Verses 11 and 14-15 simply indicate that when we do rejoice our celebration should include the deprived of the community and that it be at the central sanctuary. The word אֶךָ in verse 15 may mean "only" to imply that no mourning may take place (v. Sforno and Targums. cf. Ibn Ezra). Rashi views the verse as a promise, not a commandment.

QUESTIONS

RE'EH (continued)

derprivileged of society. Yet, the following questions arise:

- a. *What purpose does the maaser sheni (14:22-27) serve if the owner consumes his own produce?*
- b. *Why was a distinction made in lending for the foreigner (גכרי) in 15:3?*
4. *In chapter 16, the Torah presents a review of the festivals for the third time. The Midrash Sifré explains that the purpose in Leviticus is the teaching of their proper order and in Numbers the listing of their respective sacrifices. What new element is presented here?*
5. *In 16:11 and 16:14 f. the Israelite is commanded to rejoice on the festivals.*
 - a. *What is the purpose of legislating a natural reaction?*
 - b. *Why is there no similar expression with regard to Pesach?*

SHOFTIM

1. *Shoftim presents many new laws concerning the political and legal administration of a nation. There is an emphasis upon rules of justice and of warfare. What is distinctive or unusual about the Torah's treatment of the following matters:*
 - a. *The King (17:14 ff)*
 - b. *Religious guides (chapter 18)*
 - c. *Manslaughter (19:1-13)*
 - d. *Laws of warfare (chapter 20)*
2. *Which modern legal terms parallel the following terminology used by the Torah in 17:8:*
 - a. *Between blood and blood*
 - b. *Between plea and plea*
 - c. *Between stroke and stroke*
3. *Many people believe that the more ancient the sage and his legal opinion the more authentic and authoritative is his ruling. There is little basis for that attitude in Rabbinic literature. Rashi, Maimonides and other leading legal authorities teach that the latest opinions of sages are peremptory and binding. Where in chapter 17 of our parashah, is the basis for the latter attitude?*
4. *What rationale are you able to offer for the ritual of the עגלה ערופה (heifer whose neck is broken, 21:1-9) in the case of an unsolved murder?*

RESPONSES

b. The Midrash explains that the command to rejoice is omitted for Pesach since at that time the results of the harvest are unknown (cf. Bechor Shor). Also, for the same reason the Hallel is abbreviated during Pesach; "Do not rejoice when your enemy falls" (Proverbs 24:17), referring to the suffering of the Egyptians. Pesach preparations and regulations also make it difficult for some Jews to rejoice on that festival.

SHOFTIM

1. a. The King was to copy and study these laws of the Torah. He was under divine law limited in his actions in many respects.
 b. Other peoples had priests but Israel was to have prophets too. Prophecy was established at Mount Sinai and precluded turning to the magicians and diviners popular among pagans.
 c. One who killed another accidentally was provided with places of refuge where he could escape vengeance by a close relative of the victim.
 d. Many exemptions were provided from military service. The Israelite army was also not to devastate trees indiscriminately. Further laws of warfare are found in the next parashah (21:10-10, 23:10-15).
2. a. Homicide b. Civil suit c. Assault
 (Based on Ibn Ezra as opposed to Rashi)
3. From the fact that the Torah includes in 17:9 the seemingly superfluous words, "that shall be in those days," our sages deduce that a contemporary judge's ruling overrides earlier legal opinions.
4. The communal nature of the ceremony is evidently symbolic of corporate responsibility. Maimonides explains that such a ritual would gain wide publicity and might lead to witnesses coming forward. Abravanel and others emphasize the shock value of such an elaborate ceremony. (thus emphasizing the heinous nature of capital crime). The Talmud (Sotah 47a) sadly notes that "when the murderers increased, the (ritual of) breaking of the heifer's neck was abolished."

JUSTICE IN SOLOMON'S COURT

ANONYMOUS V. ANONYMOUS

BY HERBERT RAND

Although the regular Haftarah for Parashat Miketz is heard infrequently and will not be recited during Shabbat morning services until the year 1996, — on all other years the Haftarah of Hanukkah is read — its subject is probably the best known of all the stories which illustrate the wisdom of Solomon.¹

THE STRUCTURE OF THE STORY

The basic narrative, dramatic in plan and structure, is a concise record of a courtroom scene, presented without background or descriptive detail. The mounting tension of the action and its climax result from abrupt changes in the rhythmic patterns of speech of Solomon and of the litigants, the element of surprise and the emotional impact inherent in the problem presented for solution.

The most remarkable features of the account is its brevity: the complainant (plaintiff) presented her direct case in 69 words to which the respondent (defendant) answered with six words. The record attributes to King Solomon a soliloquy of 15 words, an interlocutory order of the same length and, after a brief exchange between the parties, a final decision in just ten words. Indeed, the events of the several days preceding the trial together with the entire action taken at the trial were skillfully reduced by the scribe to a narrative time of a few minutes, with no loss of dramatic effect.

Sandwiched between prologue and epilogue, the trial record is prefaced with the quiet statement that Solomon awoke from a dream. It is taken for granted that the reader is familiar with the subject of the dream.² The trial does not involve important litigants and therefore records no historical event. The purpose

1. I Kings 3:15-4:1. Note that Miketz: Gen. 44:4-17 also tells of a trial held by Joseph wherein his brothers are charged with larceny.

2. I Kings 3:5-15; II Chron. 1:7-12.

Herbert Rand is a Doctor of Jurisprudence and a practicing New York attorney. He is the author of published articles dealing with Law, Biblical Archaeology and matters of Jewish interest. He lives in Highland Park, New Jersey.

for its inclusion in I Kings was to show that Solomon had indeed acquired an understanding heart in judgment — the boon he had requested in his dream. The epilogue consists of a statement to the effect that Solomon's decision in this case established his reputation as a wise and understanding judge.

THE NATURE OF THE PROCEEDING

Using contemporary terms of reference from English or American jurisprudence, the action can be described as a habeas corpus proceeding to determine which of the parties is the mother of the male infant then in the custody of the respondent. She was being accused of having surreptitiously exchanged her own dead infant for complainant's live child — a charge of kidnapping.

The text does not disclose whether the parties had previously presented their case to the elders at the city gate or whether the case was being heard by the King in the first instance. However, there was an urgent need for a prompt decision awarding the live child to one of the women; the loser would be responsible for burial of the dead child.

The two women stood before the King.³ Since the procedure of that time made no provision for a King's counsel or prosecutor, or for private advocates, the litigants presented the case and defense in person. Neither party brought any witness. Moreover, as complainant explained, there had been no witnesses to any of the happenings relevant to the case. Ordinarily, proof of a fact required the testimony of at least two competent (male) witnesses.⁴ All testimony was subject to diligent inquiry (cross-examination by the Judge).

From a preliminary comment, we learn that both women were harlots. Their names and lineage are not revealed so that their parents might not be shamed.⁵ It appears, therefore, that Solomon's Hall of Justice was open to all litigants — even if the disputants were prostitutes.

THE COMPLAINANT TESTIFIES

In a few well chosen and seemingly well-rehearsed words, the complainant

3. Deut. 19:17; Numbers 27:1–4. For examples of direct petition to the King see II Sam. 12:1–6; II Kings 6:26–30.

4. Deut. 17:6; 19:15–17.

5. Deut. 23:18; Lev. 19:29.

stated her case; it can be summarized as follows:

"While I slept, the respondent, who lives with me, exchanged her baby boy, which had died, for my living son who was three days older than hers. In the morning light, I could see that the child I was holding was not mine. No other person was in our house at or after the time we two gave birth."

SOLOMON WEIGHS HER TESTIMONY

This young woman speaks with deliberation about an act which she could not have observed because she was asleep. An ewe will recognize her own lamb among the others in the flock. So a mother should know which of two infants is hers, even though there be an age difference between them of only three days. Yet, she makes no attempt to describe the features or marks of either baby which might differentiate one from the other.

Is she imposing a story created in her imagination? Perhaps she was unable to accept the fact that her own child had died and therefore she came to believe that the babies had been exchanged.

Why are there no witnesses who might recognize the live child and identify his mother? It seems strange that no mid-wife or friend attended either woman during childbirth or visited them afterwards. She may indeed be the mother of the live child — and then again perhaps not.

I will hear the other woman.

THE RESPONDENT ANSWERS

לֹא כִּי בְּנִי הַחַי וּבְנֶךְ הַמֵּת

"No! For the live one is my son and your son is the dead one."

Complainant responded immediately, hurling the words back in reversed (chiastic) order which emphasized her rejection of the dead child.

לֹא כִּי בְּנֶךְ הַמֵּת וּבְנִי הַחַי

"No! For the dead one is your son and my son is the live one."

SOLOMON CONSIDERS THE DILEMMA

The respondent did not expressly deny or even comment on any of the facts alleged by the other woman. Is she laconic by nature or is she wary of speaking freely? Perhaps the terseness of her reply may be caused only by exhaustion

from carrying the child some distance so soon after giving birth. Yet, her answer is enough to raise the issue of which one is the mother.

Is she capable of having stolen the living child to replace the dead infant? For some time after child-birth, a woman requires a child to suck her milk. Therefore, she might have been impelled to make the exchange when she discovered that her child had died. But, the other woman may be claiming the live child to satisfy the same need.

Neither of the harlots is worthy of belief. Both have the fluttering eyelids; but which one has the lying tongue?⁶ Each one contradicts the other but one of them must be telling the truth. The child will never know his father but one of these women is surely his mother.

The search for the truth in this matter can lead nowhere. Let us try to discover which one is fit to fill the role of mother. I will put them to a test, subject them to an ordeal to see how they will react to a cruel death which I will propose for the child. I must fashion a decision as irrational as an act of King Saul in his least lucid moment.

"Fetch me a sword," he said.

Then, turning to his scribe, he dictated his decision:

גִּזְרוּ אֶת-הַיֶּלֶד הַזֶּה לְשֵׁנַיִם וְחֲנוּ
אֶת-הַחֲצִי לְאַחַת וְאֶת-הַחֲצִי לְאַחַת:

"Slice the child in two and give half to one and half to the other."

An armed guard positioned his sword above the child, awaiting a signal from the King to proceed.⁷

THE OPEN OPTIONS

Solomon weighed the several options which the situation presented to the parties:

(1) What if both women remain silent and acquiesce in the killing? Then, neither one is a fit mother. No Israelite, whether King or subject has the right to

6. Proverbs 6:25; 6:17.

7. To punish Pytheus, King Xerxes of Persia ordered Pytheus' oldest son to be cut in two, one half to be placed on each side of the road for the army to pass between, Herodotus, Book 7 (40).

sacrifice a child — not even to God. If Abraham argued with God to save lives in Sodom and Gomorrah, the women should argue with me to save the boy. If neither will ask for mercy, I shall rescind my order and, perhaps, have the child reared in my harem.

(2) What if both women implore me to spare the child? Then I shall have to recall my order and think of another solution.

(3) What if only one shall implore me and the other remains silent? Then, I shall award the child to the suppliant.

AN UNEXPECTED REACTION

Just then it appeared that the complainant was about to speak.

בִּי אֲדֹנָי הַנּוֹלֵד אֶת-הַיָּלִיד הַחַי וְהַמֵּת אֶל-תְּמִיתָהּ

"If you please, Sir, give her the live child and don't kill him."

In any court of law, her statement would have been taken to constitute a withdrawal of her complaint. Since the only determinable issue was the question of which one was entitled to custody, the respondent would thereupon have won the case if only she had remained silent.

But this turn of events only highlighted the enigma. A tender-hearted women such as the complainant would not wish to be the indirect cause of death of *any* child, whether it be hers or her neighbor's.⁸

RESPONDENT RENOUNCES HER CLAIM TO THE LIVING CHILD

It is fair to assume that during the trial, respondent gave some thought to the many problems she would have in caring for an infant while practicing her profession. What better way to shed that burden than by acquiescing in the King's decree? The child must die! So with a tone of finality, she brusquely rejected complainant's offer.

בְּמִלִּי גַם-לִי גַם-לָךְ לֹא יִהְיֶה קֶזֶר:

"He will not be mine nor yours. Cut him up!"

By her callous response, she had in effect abandoned the child, renounced her

8. The text at line 26 contains a comment, apparently a parenthetical explanation, in which the complainant is referred to as the mother of the live child. Nothing in the record up to that point unequivocally supports that comment although it has validity as a post-trial insertion based upon the final adjudication.

right to custody and shown herself to be unfit as a mother, whether or not she was the natural mother of the child.

THE BASIS OF THE FINAL DECREE

The respondent, a woman with a heart of iron, must have appeared to Solomon as the antithesis of Shifra or Puah, the midwives who saved Hebrew boys from death, in defiance of direct orders from Pharaoh.⁹ Unlike those midwives, she did not fear God. The child's best interests required that he be awarded to complainant. And so, Solomon awarded custody to her.

But, since the question of parentage was still open, he established a legal relationship by his final words. "She is the mother."

Although his final decree was wise and just, it was not based on any proof that complainant was in fact the biological mother. In fairness to Solomon, we must accept the possibility that he might have guessed, intuitively (and correctly) which one was the natural mother. After all, a judge who reputedly could understand the language of the birds might have no problems in discerning the truth from the demeanor of the parties.

ANOTHER CHILD CUSTODY CASE

More than 27 centuries after Solomon, in a habeas corpus proceeding in the New York courts, a natural mother and a foster mother were contending for custody of an infant. The highest court of that State said that the case "gives rise to questions which are always distressing and usually perplexing as well." It held that "callous disregard" of the natural mother for the child reflected "a settled purpose to be rid of all parental obligations and to forego all parental rights", which amount to abandonment, showing her to be unfit to rear the child because her conduct is contrary to accepted principles and mores.¹⁰

The principle of law, common both to the New York case and to the case tried before Solomon is: Where a party in a child custody case has been guilty of abandonment or other conduct which renders her an unfit mother, the other

9. Ex. 1:15-21, Contrast: Canaanite practice of sacrificing their children to Moloch, Lev. 20:1-5.

10. *People of the State of New York ex rel Anonymous v. Anonymous* (1961), 10 N.Y. 2d. 332; 222 N.Y.S. 2d 945.

litigant will be granted custody without regard to whether she is the natural parent or the foster parent.

As King Solomon said: "there is nothing new under the sun."¹¹

11. Eccl. 1:9.



Judgment of Solomon, G. Doré

THE JUDGMENT OF SOLOMON

BY SOL LIPTZIN

When Solomon ascended the throne of his father David, he was young and inexperienced. To strengthen his hold on the throne, he had been advised by his aged predecessor to take cruel measures. He began his reign with the murder of Adoniyahu, his older brother, and of Joab, the former commander-in-chief of the army, and the banishment of Abiathar, the sole survivor of the priests of Nob. Yearning for peace with his neighbors and for tranquillity among his subjects, he had to maneuver constantly between the powers encircling his kingdom and to settle disputes between contending groups within his kingdom. The problems he faced during the day continued to trouble him at night during his restless sleep. Then, one night, he had a dream in which the Lord appeared to him and asked him what he desired most. Solomon replied that what he wanted most was an understanding heart so that he could judge between right and wrong and discern between good and evil. It pleased the Lord that Solomon preferred wisdom to riches, honor, or longevity, and the Lord granted the king's wish.

How wisely Solomon judged difficult cases that were brought before him was illustrated by the biblical chronicler in the dispute between the two harlots described in *Kings I*, 3:16–28. Both prostitutes lived in the same house and each gave birth to a child at about the same time, only three days apart. One of the children died at midnight and its mother exchanged it for the living child. When the other mother awoke and found the dead child beside her, she insisted that it was not hers. Each mother claimed the living child as her own. The dispute came before the king. He ordered a sword to be brought and the living child to be cut in two, with half to be given to each mother. While one mother, spurred on by envy or spite, agreed to the division, the other mother, whose love was enkindled toward her offspring, implored that the child be spared and be given to her rival. Then the king pronounced his final judgment: the living child belonged to the

Sol Liptzin, formerly Professor of Comparative Literature at the City University of New York, is the author of eighteen volumes on world literature, including *Germany's Stepchildren*, *The Jew in American Literature*, and most recently, *A History of Yiddish Literature*.

compassionate woman whose maternal affection had triumphed over all other feelings. Her love had revealed her as the true mother. All Israel then acknowledged the wisdom of the young monarch.

According to the Talmud, Solomon was so absolutely certain of the correctness of his decision, because a *Bat Kol* — a Voice from Heaven — came forth and confirmed it.

The repercussions of Solomon's judgment have given rise to important works of art and literature. Paintings on this subject include those of Giorgioni, Rubens, Poussin, and Tiepolo, but the most famous is that of Raphael, in the Vatican. It shows Solomon seated on the throne. He has just pronounced his preliminary judgment and his servant is about to carry it out. The latter has seized the living child in his left hand and holds a drawn sword in his right. But at this moment, as the child is about to be cut in half, the true mother rushes forward to save it. Her face is turned toward the king, begging him to spare it. The false mother, on the other hand, kneels in the foreground near her own dead child and apparently does not object to Solomon's decision being carried out.

THE INDIAN CHALK CIRCLE TEST

In literature, the closest parallel to the sword test of Solomon is the chalk circle test. The theme itself, before the chalk circle was added, has been traced back to ancient India, from where it migrated to Tibet and to China. It tells of two mothers, wives of the same man, who appeared after his death before a king who was an incarnation of Buddha. Both claimed the same son. The king suggested that each mother take hold of a hand of the child and pull. The false mother was without pity and tore it to herself. She was primarily interested in obtaining the inheritance of the deceased husband through her child, since a childless widow could not inherit the family's fortune. The true mother did not want to hurt the child and did not pull. The king then awarded her the child.

This version, current in India, was recorded at a much later date than the Solomonic one and yet prominent biblical scholars, such as Hermann Gunkel, Hugo Gressmann, and Martin Noth, maintain that the former must have arisen first, probably as a fairy tale spread from mouth to mouth. Gressmann, who calls attention to twenty-two parallel themes in various parts of the world, does not claim a common source for all of them. However, the similarities between the

Indian and the biblical narrative are so profound that he and other scholars maintain it is most unlikely that the two arose spontaneously in such complexity. They must be somehow interrelated. These scholars give priority to the Indian tale, primarily because it is better motivated. The Indian litigants are wives of the same deceased husband. They are not only jealous of each other but they also wish to be recognized as head of the household, since according to custom in India, only the mother of the child can have this status. The harlot of the biblical narrative, on the other hand, had no reason to burden herself with a child not her own and to fight for its possession. Besides, if the Solomonic tale is an adaptation of an original Indian source, then the transformation of the two wives into two harlots can be viewed as more compatible with biblical morality. The biblical narrator did not want such immoral behavior and litigation to arise in a respectable Hebraic family.

By the middle of the fifth century, this Indian tale, whether pre-Solomonic or post-Solomonic in its origin, had reached China. In the fourteenth century, the Chinese version was dramatized by Li Hsing-tao, who added the chalk test. This Chinese play had its greatest vogue in the twentieth century European adaptations by Klabund and by Bertold Brecht. The most recent narrative of the dispute between two mothers over the possession of the one child eschewed all tests. It was based on tragic reality of the Holocaust years. Though its author, Yehuda Yaari, entitled it *The Judgment of Solomon*, he left it up to the reader to render final judgment.

A CHINESE VERSION

The Chinese play, Huilan-ki by Li Hsing-tao, has the child placed on a chalked line, not a circle. The judge then calls upon each of the two mothers to take hold of a hand and to pull it toward herself. The true mother should have the greater strength. However, the true mother lets the child's hand go. Though the test is repeated, the compassionate mother still refuses to pull hard upon her beloved, tender offspring. The wise judge then recognizes her as the rightful mother.

This play did not reach Europe until the nineteenth century. It was translated into French by Stanislas Julien in 1832 and from the French into German by Wollheim da Fonesca in 1876. It became the basis for Klabund's play *Der chinesische Kreidekreis*, which he wrote for the actress Elizabeth Bergner and

which was staged in Berlin by Max Reinhardt in 1925. Thereafter it enjoyed wide popularity on many stages and in print until the Second World War. It inspired Brecht to compose in 1944 and 1945 his more original drama *Der kaukasische Kreidekreis*, the last great work of his American exile.

DER KAUKASISCHE KREIDEKREIS

Brecht had earlier used this theme in his short story *Der Augsburger Kreidekreis*, which he wrote at the beginning of the Second World War and whose action he transferred from China to Germany of the Thirty Years' War. His more important dramatic version has the prologue take place in Soviet Georgia while the main action is transposed to an earlier era of feudal Georgia.

There, long ago, the despotic Governor of a provincial capital is killed in the course of a revolt and his wife is forced to flee precipitously. She manages to save her wardrobe but not her little child. Her maid Grusche is left with the baby. As sole heir to the Governor's estate, it is in great danger as the rebels seek to lay hands on it. Grusche, overcome with pity for the helpless, abandoned infant, escapes with it over the icy mountain pass. Her affection for the child increases as she experiences hardships for its sake. In order to care for it better, she passes it off as her own child. When the rebellion is crushed and the former regime is finally restored, the Governor's wife returns to town and wants to reclaim the child. But Grusche refuses to give it up. When the case is brought before the former vagabond and newly reappointed judge Azdak, he draws with chalk a circle on the ground and places the child in it. He then tells each woman to pull it out. Since the child is the sole heir to the family's wealth, the greedy biological mother pulls at it with all her might, while the loving foster-mother lets go. Though the judge has become aware that Grusche did not give birth to the child, he nevertheless awards it to her as the true mother.

The judge upholds the author's view that biology should not be the determining factor but rather humaneness. The humble maid who loved and preserved the child in perilous years behaved with greater maternal affection and will undoubtedly be a better mother to it in coming years than the egoistic, aristocratic lady whose only claim is the claim of blood-relationship.

By switching the ending and making the welfare of the child a more important consideration than the accident of birth, Brecht is reaffirming his own adherence

to the humanitarian philosophy he always espoused and his belief in the doctrine that truth is socially conditioned.

THE JUDGMENT OF SOLOMON

The Hebrew novelist Yehuda Yaari, in his story *The Judgment of Solomon*, presents the struggle of two mothers over the custody of their one son as basically insoluble from the human point of view, even if it can be resolved legally. The author presents both sides of the case fairly but he himself suggests no answer.

The story is told by a mother who survived the Nazi terror. As the wife of a Berlin Jewish doctor, she had lived a tranquil, prosperous life with her husband and child until the Crystal Night of November 1938, when the Nazis ushered in their more intensified terror against Jews. Before then the family had opportunities to leave Germany but did not do so. Husband and wife felt that they were needed as doctors to treat Jewish patients since non-Jewish doctors were forbidden to do so. However, after 1938, life became unbearable also for them, but by then avenues of emigration were closed to them as to most German Jews. Perhaps their five-year-old son could still be saved. A family the doctors knew had received a certificate of immigration into Palestine. The permit included the family's three children, but only two were still in Germany. The boy's name could be added to the passport as the third child. The mother was hesitant to part from him but finally agreed. The boy arrived safely and was entrusted to a generous woman in Jerusalem, a well-to-do widow without children of her own. She became a new, loving mother to him.

One day the Berlin Gestapo called for the father and later told his wife to call for his ashes. When the war broke out, all correspondence with Jerusalem ceased. Consumed with longing for her son, the desperate German widow risked escaping across the sealed border and through other occupied territories. After many hardships, she succeeded in reaching Jerusalem. Three years had passed since the boy had left Berlin and his German-Jewish parents. He was now eight years old when the visitor from abroad arrived. He immediately recognized her as his German mother and said so to his Jerusalem mother. And now the dilemma arose. Both mothers wanted him and needed him. Both were lonely and longing for his affection. When the immigrant mother, who had been thought

dead for a long time, asked for the return of her son, the foster-mother suggested that the boy be consulted as to whether he wished to leave his present home where he was now so happy. Upon such a test the boy's physical mother did not dare to enter, since she was not certain of the outcome. Nor did she want to consider taking him against his will, by resorting to court, since the experience would scar him and might destroy any affection he had for her. What should she do? And how would Solomon have decided the case of these two lonely widows, one his biological mother and the other his spiritual mother, both in need of the child's love?

VARIATIONS OF THE THEME

Variations of the problem that Solomon was called upon to solve have persisted for three thousand years. The dilemma of the child between two mothers, both of whom claimed it, became especially acute since the Holocaust. Many a Jewish mother threatened with deportation to an extermination camp entrusted her beloved child to a kind Christian neighbor who undertook to care for it and who faced dangers in doing so. Such a child, for its own safety, was generally raised in the faith of its foster-mother and escaped more easily the horrors and the death that would otherwise have been its lot.

When the Second World War ended, these children were sought out by surviving relatives, even when the mother perished, or by Jewish emissaries who were most anxious to bring back to the Jewish fold the orphans who had not died along with a million less fortunate children. It frequently happened that the foster-mothers had become emotionally attached to their wards and that the children themselves did not want to give up their safe existence and their Christian faith. They were reluctant to return to unknown kinsmen who were residing in strange lands and to the faith of the emaciated Jewish refugees who emerged from concentration camps. The wisdom of Solomon was needed to unravel the complexities of individual cases and often even such wisdom did not suffice. Solutions had to be found for insoluble cases and these solutions were at times heartbreaking. To this day the judgments of contemporary Solomons have left conscious or subconscious scars on mature personalities who have long since outgrown childhood fears of the Nazi period.

AMOS – PROPHET AND WORDLY MAN

BY BEN ZION LURIA

There seems to be an accepted notion among Bible scholars that the prophet Amos did not foresee the menace of Assyria. Indeed, he prophesied the banishment of Israel from its land, but he did not point to Assyria directly as the rod of God's anger nor the land to which Israel would be exiled. Apparently, this notion is based on the statement of Amos: *I will cause you to go into captivity beyond Damascus* (5:27). This was the limit of Amos' political wisdom.

This viewpoint is clearly expressed by Yehezkel Kaufmann: "Amos does not mention Assyria. He speaks about a 'nation' who would attack Israel and about a northern exile beyond Damascus. The prophecy of Amos was enunciated in the period before Tiglat-Pileser (745 BCE), at a time when Assyria was yet weak and its might was not yet felt in Western Asia. The 'nation' was seen as a vision, similar to the pestilence, the earthquake, the locust, etc. Amos had no inkling of the Assyrian threat. His reference was to some far-away northern barbaric people. His vision was the product of his religio-ethical idealism rather than a realistic historical political insight."¹

Thus Kaufmann idealizes the message of the prophet, but in the process loses sight of Amos' awareness of political reality. This notion goes counter to the understanding of the text.

It is a mistake to take Amos' statement to Amaziah, the priest of Beth El too literally. Indeed, Amos declared: *I was no prophet, nor a prophet's son; but I was a herdsman and a dresser of sycamore trees* (7:14). It is merely a manner of speech, a form of humility when describing oneself or his family. *And God took me from herding the flock* (7:15), but we should not assume that his grasp of the world around him was contained within his experience as a herdsman in the Judean wilderness of Tekoa and that with this alone he went forth to preach the faith of Israel. He knew the neighbouring peoples round about, he knew their machinations amongst themselves and against Israel.

Amos knew about Edom, Moab and Ammon. He knew the history of the

1. Kaufmann, *חולדות האמונה הישראלית*, vol. VI, p. 87.

Philistines as he knew that the Arameans stemmed from the hills of Armenia. He knew the valley and the plains of Damascus. He also knew about the distant country Beth Eden in Asia Minor and about the Land of Kir somewhere in the mountains of Armenia.

We do not have information about Amos' life-style. But we can compare him to the prophets who preceded him, like Elijah and Elisha. We know that they did not lead a sedentary life, nor did they stay in one place. The stormy spirit of Elijah moved him to distant places. We find him in solitude on Mount Sinai, seeking in the lonely desert answers to his search for meaning. We find him again in the far north, in the territory of the Phoenicians, in Zarephat at Sidon though he limited his spiritual ministrations to Ahab and his household within the area of Samaria, Jezreel and the Carmel. It is just as likely that Amos also moved about, and not just between Tekoah (10 miles southeast of Jerusalem) and Beth El (10 miles north of Jerusalem). We shall try to prove that Amos had a wide political horizon and that he warned day and night about the Assyrian threat, but because of his use of unfamiliar terminology, his utterings are not sufficiently understood.

*Hear this word, ye kine of Bashan
That are in the mountain of Samaria
That oppress the poor, that crush the needy,
That say unto their lords: 'Bring that we may feast.'
The Lord God hath sworn by His holiness
Lo, surely the days shall come upon you,
That you shall be taken away with hooks (בצנח),
And the very last of you with fish hooks (בסירות דוגה),
Out you will go, each by the nearest breach in the wall,
To be driven all the way to Harmon (והשלכחנה ההרמונה)*

Amos 4:1-3

The word *ההרמונה* appears only once in Scriptures, and has been translated and interpreted in a variety of ways, mostly as a name of a place or region.² Emendations have been made which, to my mind, are unnecessary.

The meaning of the word *הרמונה* is "harem." One need not search long to learn

2. *Biblischer Commentar*, herausgegeben von Carl Friedr. Keil und Franz Delitsch, 1866.

E. Kautzsch: *Die Heilige Schrift*, 1896, Beilagen S. 63.

D. Karl Marti: *Kurzer Hand-Kommentar zum Alten Testament*, Tübingen, 1904.

about the fate of young women who were taken captive, as practiced in antiquity. Already in the Song of Deborah, we find the reference: *Are they not gathering, are they not sharing the spoil; a damsel, two damsels for each man of war* (Judges 5:30). Jeremiah declares to Zedekiah: *All the women left in the palace of the king of Judah shall be led off to the officers of the king of Babylon* (Jeremiah 38:22). Amos' message to the fat women of Bashan spelled out their eventual fate in being taken into enemy concubinage, implicit in the words וחשלכנה והרמונה. In Arabic, the equivalent word would be "Harim" (harem). Thus there is no need for emendation.

חֲסִידוֹת דָּוִיד . . . בַּסִּירוֹת דָּוִיד – HOOKS AND FISH HOOKS (4:2)

The JPS translation hardly fits the frame of reference of the prophet in his denunciation of the wealthy women of Bashan. What connection can ordinary hooks or fish hooks have with the women of exile of spoiled aristocracy of the prosperous Bashan? Other interpretations – spears, shields, rings, thorns, hunting hooks, special fishing hooks – similarly seem to be farfetched.

The medieval commentator Jonah ibn Janah, in my view, comes closest to the true meaning of the prophet's admonition. He translated the word צִנּוֹת: basket. Starting with the notion of "basket", we can proceed further to explain the setting.

The Aramaic word צִנָּה or צִינָּה has the meaning of palm trees or baskets made of palm leaves. Indeed, there is a wild palm tree whose branches are smaller than the ordinary palm tree. This tree can be seen on the slopes of Mount Moab, near the Dead Sea, in the salty river bed of the Zerek Creek. It is mentioned in the Mishna – צִנֵּי הָר הַבְּרוּל – stone palm tree (Succah 3:1).

This species of palm tree is very prevalent in the land of the Tigris and

חֲסִידוֹת דָּוִיד, הפירוש המדעי בעריכת אברהם כהנא: שמואל קרויס

W. Nowack: *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament*, Göttingen, 1903.

Hitzig.

William Rainey Harper, I.C.C. 1905.

Hugo Gressmann: *Die Schriften des Alten Testament*, Göttingen, 1921.

דביר חשי"א, תנ"ך מהדורה ספרותית: מ.צ. סגל

Artur Weiser: *Das Alte Testament* (Deutsch), Göttingen, 1959.

ע' הרמן: אנציקלופדיה מקראית

Euphrates. A reference in the Talmud (Berachot 31a) – צניחא דבבל – gives the impression of a very old species stemming all the way back to the first man in history.

Baskets were made from the branches of these stone-palms. To this day Iraq markets its dates in baskets woven from these branches. This basket is called צנה, from the tree whence it comes.

Since the lands of the Tigris and Euphrates were poor in hard-wood producing trees, the inhabitants of Assyria would fashion their boats, round in form, from these palm branches, coated with a layer of pitch. There is room for two or three persons and it moves lightly and easily on the rivers of Iraq. The peasants residing near the river would transport their produce in these palm-leaved boats down the river stream to the markets of the large city. They would abandon or sell their baskets after the disposition of their produce, since it would be too difficult to navigate their boats up the river stream. This type of boat was prevalent only in the land of the Tigris and Euphrates, namely Assyria.

This then was the message of Amos to the women of Bashan. They would be banished from their home in Israel to the distant land of Assyria, symbolized by its distinctive product, the ubiquitous round boat of palm branches.

With this interpretation in mind, it behooves us to update the world outlook of the prophet. He was not a primitive shepherd, limited to his immediate home at the edge of his Judean hills and wilderness. Amos kept abreast with what was happening in the wider world. He could see the ominous signs emanating from the rising empire from the northeast.



Round Boats made from Palm Branches

THE STORY OF CREATION

Part II — *Genesis Chapter 2*

BY CHAIM ABRAMOWITZ

As we have seen, the Biblical account of creation in chapter one of Genesis does not conflict with either the accepted age of the earth, or the theory of evolution, though it does not necessarily teach or endorse them.* The only conflict is with the atheist who does not know how it all began, or how life originated, but is convinced that there is no God who is the prime cause of existence. The account in Genesis chapter two presents a different problem. It does not disagree with scientific or believable data, but it does seem to conflict with the previous account. The answer of the documentary theory, that they were two separate stories, E and J, current at the time, casts doubt on the veracity of both accounts. It also does not explain how a gifted redactor could place the two stories next to each other without realizing that one negates the other.

The traditional commentators found a different answer, one which can be summarized in the Talmudic passage quoted by Rashi: כלל ופרט אין אתה דן אלא כעין הפרט. One of the principles in studying the Torah is that if a general statement is followed by a detailed example, we judge according to the example. As an extension of this principle: if a general narration is followed by a detailed account, then we know that the latter is intended to detail what was omitted in the former. Chapters two and three fill in the details omitted in chapter one.

Since the Bible is not a storybook, its stories do not necessarily follow the ordinary procedure of logical continuity. אין מוקדם ומאוחר בתורה. There is no chronological order in the Torah because its message, and not the story per se, is of paramount importance. Let us look at the story of the Revelation on Mount Sinai as an example. It is continuous if we read the story in the following order: Exodus 19:9–25, 24:1–18, 20:1–21, 20:19. Keeping in mind the purpose of the

* See article in the Fall issue of Dor le-Dor (Vol. X, No. 1) for an elaboration of the first chapter of Genesis.

Chaim Abramowitz served as Educational Director of Temple Hillel in Valley Stream, New York. He came on Aliya in 1973. He is Assistant Editor of Dor le-Dor.

Revelation and the desired effect of the retelling, it is obvious that the Ten Commandments should be listed as soon as possible. A closer look at the contents of the intervening chapters, emphasizing moral laws as well as divine service, will help us understand the gravity of the sin of the golden calf. In the same way Genesis chapter one conveys in short bold terms the relation of man to the rest of creation. It only hints at what is coming with the phrases, "let us make a man" and "they shall rule" and "male and female He created them". The next two chapters fill in the details.

GENESIS CHAPTER TWO**

This is the story of heaven and earth when they were created.¹ At the time² when the Lord God made earth and heaven, no shrubs of the field was yet on the earth and no grains had yet sprouted. *Though grass, the first aspect of life, covered the earth, it could not sprout and grow* because the Lord God had not yet sent rain upon the earth, and there was no man to till the soil, *for grains do need special care and cultivation.* A mist³ rose from the *hot* grounds *which were still in their formative stage* and watered the whole surface of the earth, *Later* the Lord God formed man from the dust, and He blew into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living thing.

The Lord God had planted a garden in Eden in advance,⁴ and placed there the man whom He had formed. And every tree *which* the Lord God caused to grow

** The passages in italics are interpolations clarifying the running account of the text of chapter 2.

1. J.P.S. new version, following Rashi, places the first half of the verse at the end of the preceding paragraph. אלה תולדות, as Cassuto points out, always precedes a narrative. Here it refers to the garden and man coming from the earth. בהבראם should be translated *when* as in the A.V. and not *as* they were created.

2. ביום "in the day" indicates the beginning of an action, i.e. "at the time" (Sforno).

3. This describes the condition of the earth before it was ready for man. Ibn Ezra quotes Saadiah Gaon saying that the negative of the previous verse should extend to this. "There was no man and a mist did *not* rise."

4. Everyone translates מקדם -- "to the east", influenced no doubt, by v. 3:25. Onkelos translates it מלקדמין -- "in advance," based on Breshit Rabba: "Not before the creation of the world, but before the creation of Man". Compare Psalm 74:12 מלכי מקדם -- my king of old.

from the ground was pleasant to the sight and good for food.⁵ He also planted the tree of life in the middle of the garden and the tree of knowledge of good and bad.⁶ The Lord God took the man⁷ and placed him in the Garden of Eden to till it and to tend it. And the Lord God commanded the man saying: "of every tree in the garden you are free to eat, but as for the tree of knowledge of good and bad you must not eat of it⁸ for as soon as you will eat of it *you will lose the eternal life intended for you*, and you will be doomed to die.

And the Lord God said⁹: It is not good for man to be alone. I will make a fitting helper for him. And the Lord God formed out of the earth¹⁰ all the wild beasts and all the birds of the sky and brought them to the man to see what he would call them; and whatever the man called each living creature, that would be its name.¹¹ And the man gave names to all the cattle,¹² and to the birds of the sky, and to all the wild beasts; but for Adam no fitting helper was found.¹³

And the Lord God cast a deep sleep upon the man, and he slept and *he dreamed that* He took one of his ribs and closed up the flesh on that spot, and that the Lord God fashioned into a woman the rib that he had taken from the man. *When he awoke the man became aware that the creature he saw was not just another animal, but human like himself and realized that it was the fitting*

5. The rephrasing of the translation is to emphasize the idea that every tree in the garden was beautiful and bore good fruit, and not that every one of the innumerable kinds of fruit trees in the world was in the garden.

6. Vs. 10–14 are omitted here because they have no bearing on our retelling of the story.

7. "Man" is used as a collective term for the forerunner of mankind. Like all other living beings man was male and female, in two separate human beings — and not some sort of a siamese twin as the Midrash and most commentators imagined him to be. Male and female He created them . . . and He called their name Adam (Gen. 5:2).

8. The tree of life was not included in the taboo since he was granted eternal life anyway. The meaning of the trees will be dealt with in the discussion of chapter 3.

9. "Had said" — was part of God's plan before He created man.

10. Since all the animals were "formed out of earth" this and man's formation from dust need not be taken literally. All living beings are made up of the same elements as the rest of the earth, but since they are a later development, they are "formed out of the earth".

11. See note on "names" at the end of the article.

12. Cattle was not included in the previous list. It was only after he gave them names and established his control over them that some of the wild beasts became domesticated, i.e. cattle.

13. עֹר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ — fitting, i.e. equal to him in ability and comprehension.

*helpmate he had been seeking. Then the man said, This is the time I have found my helpmate because she is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh. It shall be called woman because from man she was taken.*¹⁴

Hence a man leaves his father and mother and clings to his woman, so they become as one.¹⁵

NAMES

A name was much more than mere identification. Giving a name to a thing or a person meant impressing and expressing its effect on oneself and on others. "In the Egyptian language a name could never be a product of chance. Concerning personal nomenclature, the Egyptians believed that their names were a reflection of their souls, and is equated with their characters and destiny" (Dictionary of Symbols — J.E. Cerlot). In Biblical literature a name represented a destiny, e.g., חוה; or an event, e.g. פלג (10:25); or an indication of character, e.g. פרץ (38:29); or a hope that the name will influence the future, e.g. נח (5:38); or יוסף, etc.

In the story of creation there are five entities to which God gave names: light, darkness, expanse, dry land, and the "gathering of waters." All these came into existence before the appearance of man and were therefore imbued with character by God. Since it was man's destiny to utilize (rule over) all the rest of creation (1:26, 28) it was up to him to decide on how to utilize (give names to) all other living creatures. In Hullin 63a the Rabbis mention a number of animals whose characters are reflected in their names. Abigail summarized it beautifully when, in referring to her husband, said כשמו כן הוא "He is like his name" (I Samuel 25:25).

14. The story, if taken literally, presents a problem, Was Adam created asymmetrical with a superfluous rib on one side? The Midrashic solution that she was already created but attached to his back as a siamese twin, takes away the force of man's exclamation about "bone of my bones, etc". Also, how did Adam know that the woman he saw was the missing rib?

The story acquires force and credibility if we take it as a divine message given in a dream as in the case of Abraham (Genesis 15).

15. In Hebrew the addition of ה makes the word feminine. In the case of איש the middle letter י is omitted when the ה is added. Translating אשתו literally as "his woman" instead of "his wife" highlights the idea that both man and woman together are the acme of creation. This is implied in the blessing to both of them (1:28) and in the closing phrase, "become one flesh." The Midrash comments on this fact: The two letters both have in common are ש א = fire. The two additional letters are ה י = God. The consuming force of ש א becomes productive when the divine ה י becomes part of it. Yalkut Shimoni 1:24.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Mr. Norman Asher
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

I presume you are the author of the article on Joseph in Dor le-Dor (Vol. IX #4, 1981).

The question you raise is an excellent one. I would like, however, to offer an alternate possible answer.

In brief, I suggest that the most opportune time for Joseph to contact his father was when he was viceroy. He deliberately did not do so, I think, because by then he realized that his childhood dreams were divinely inspired; this as a result of his going from prison to viceroy because of

dreams. He reveals his acceptance of the sale to the Ishmaelites by his brothers when he says (Genesis XLV-5) "...for G-d did send me before you for the preservation of life." He thus did not wish to alter the Divine plan even though he and Jacob were to undergo years of anguish.

I hope this brief comment is of interest.

Sincerely

Saul Wischnitzer

Ph.D Biology

10-61 136 St

Flushing N.Y. 11367

Dear Dr. Wischnitzer

Thank you very much for your letter of September 18, 1981 about my article in Dor le-Dor in Summer 1981 about Joseph, the Righteous and His Father, Jacob.

This answer was also touched on vaguely by Nachmanides, the Ramban. Among other things he said: "But it was because Joseph saw that the bowing down of his brothers, as well of his father and all his family, could not possibly be accomplished in their homeland, and he was hoping that it would be effected in Egypt when he saw his great success there. This was all the more so after he heard the Pharaoh's dream, from which it became clear to him that all of them were destined to come there and all his dreams would be fulfilled."

(Nachmanides, Commentary on Genesis XLII, page 513, "Ramban" translated and annotated by Charles B. Chavel, Shilo, N.Y., 1971).)

The above appeared in my original article with some other citations, but the Editor deemed them superfluous.

My original paper had the following conclusion about the Ramban's conclusion: "Now I say that is a very tenuous approach. Surely a miracle happened. But I think Joseph acted out of concern that he did not want to disrupt the family." The Editor, also, deleted my said statements.

Sincerely,

Norman Asher

NA: dn

The article by Chaim Abramowitz, "The Story of Creation" which appeared in the Fall, 1981 issue of *Dor le-Dor*, stimulated some responses. The Editorial Board is pleased to submit two.

Dear Mr. Abramowitz

I have long felt it possible to interpret the Creation chapter in modern scientific terms. Yours is an excellent attempt at doing just that. There is even evidence of this approach in Hullin 27b where the Rabbis offer the proof for evolution in discussing the laws of Shehitah.

One must be careful with this approach, however, not to assume that our present level of scientific knowledge is absolutely correct and therefore the ultimate truth of Torah. It is at best a reasonable hypothesis for our times. I consider that to be the case also with the Hukkim. A quick glance will show that all of them deal with physical situations which ordinarily we would explain scientifically. I believe that the Torah offers no explanation for them because the level of scientific knowledge varies from one generation to the next. What would have been considered

sophisticated a century ago is today considered naive. Hence the Torah offers no explanation, but we are free to suggest one in keeping with our own level of scientific knowledge.

There is, however, one point in your article which I seriously question. Your suggestion that Rashi's opening comment to Genesis can only be accepted if we assume that Rashi did not complete his commentary until less than eight years before his death. The First Crusade began in 1096, and Rashi died in 1104. It seems a little far-fetched to assume that Rashi intended his comment as a Jewish reaction to the Crusades.

In any event, I found the article interesting and well written. I do enjoy reading *Dor le Dor* whenever I receive a copy and look forward to other articles of yours that may appear in print.

Sincerely yours,

Rabbi Milton H. Polin

Dear Editor:

Several new concepts in physics are proposed here to reconcile the Biblical account of Creation with present-day knowledge of modern science. The first concept is that of time, which, as it

develops into a physical reality, invests the world with new properties.¹ The second is that of the American theoretical physicist Dr. Charles Muses, who proposes that time in itself is a source of energy.

1. Kozyrev, "Possibility of experimental study of the properties of time", JPRS 45238, May 2, 1968, US Department of Commerce, Joint Publication Service.

2. See Itzhak Bentov, *Stalking the Wild Pendulum*, Bantam Press, New York, 1977, for an exceptionally lucid explanation.

Another concept is that of the "Big-Bang" origin of the universe.² Keeping these concepts in mind, let us begin to analyse the verses in the text.

בראשית – "in the beginning". The general consensus among traditional commentators is that *time* itself was created. Thus: Maimonides' *Guide for the Perplexed* chapters 13 and 30: "Time was created simultaneously with the world"; in Gersonides *Milchamot Hashem*, 10–12: "Time was created as well as motion"; the Vilna Gaon, *Aderet Eliyahu*: "Time itself was created"; Rabbi Yonatan Eibeschutz, *Yaarot Dvash*: "God created the beginning of time"; *Bachya* Ibn Pakuda on Exodus 20:11: "Time was created"; the *Meharsha* on Talmud Hagigah 12a, Asarah Devarim Neemru: "Time was created".

יהי אור – "Let there be Light!". Light, the first act of God's Creation, precedes the creation of the sun. This has long puzzled traditional Biblical scholars. In view of the "time as energy" idea, it now becomes plausible. Thus this primordial energy is equated with "light".

ברא – "created". The word **ברא** has interpretation. Since the etymological root

posed great difficulties in biblical of **ברא** is to 'cut out and form',^{3,4} this presupposes the use of material. That is to say, something is formed from a previously existing substance. Traditional biblical commentators and medieval Jewish philosophers were at a loss in explaining this paradox of reconciling their understanding of **ברא** with the accepted theory of 'creatio ex nihilo' or creating something from nothing (**יש מאין**) and had to offer forced interpretations.^{5,6,7} Interestingly enough, another etymological stem infers: to feed, to eat, to grow fat and healthy (as in **בריא**) all implying an expanding state. Similarly, S.R. Hirsch has explained **ברא** and its kindred roots of **ברח** (to flee), **ברה** (to taste or to eat), **פרח** (to blossom), **פרא** (grow wild), and **פרע** (something protruding, wild, or rioting), with the meaning of striving to get out or getting out of a state of being constrained or bound.

I therefore propose the following interpretation: "From a state of existence in which time and energy were created, the Lord suddenly *expanded heaven and earth* (universe)."

Joshua Backon
Jerusalem

3. W. Gesenius, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, (E. Robinson, Ed.), Crocker and Brewster, Boston, 1844.
4. David Zvi Hoffman on Genesis 1:1, and Rashi on Ezekiel 23:47.
5. Ibn Ezra on Genesis 1:1.
6. Ramban on Genesis 1:1.
7. Maimonides, *Guide for the Perplexed*, II:30; II:17.

ואלה עמדו על הברכה

We take pleasure in presenting the following list of Patrons of the World Jewish Bible Society for the year 5742.

Rabbi Gordon Papert
Kings Park, NY

Rabbi Dr. Walter Jacob
Rodeph Shalom Congregation
Pittsburgh, Pa

Kal Zeff
Englewood, Colo

Rabbi Max B. Wall
Ohavé Zedek Synagogue
Burlington, Vermont

Rabbi Fredrick Schwartz
Temple Shalom
Chicago, Ill

Rabbi H. Simckes
Hollis Hills Jewish Center
Flushing, NY

Maurice Edelstein
San Francisco, Cal.

Prof. Leoni Kasseff
Rio-de Janeiro
Brazil

Gershon Markin
Tel Aviv, Israel

Rabbi Jordan Pearlson
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5M 3B1

Pastor Klaus Jürgen Stock
Köln, West Germany



עשה חורתך קבע

TRIENNIAL BIBLE READING CALENDAR

March 1982	ניסן תשמ"ב	April 1982	אייר תשמ"ב
Th 25 Job 27	א	Sa 24 Haftarah: Isaiah 46	א
F 26 ויקרא	ב	S 25 Job 41	ב
Sa 27 Haftarah:	ג	M 26 Job 42	ג
Isaiah 43:21-44:23		T 27 Daniel 1	ד
S 28 Job 28	ד	W 28	ה יום העצמאות
M 29 Job 29	ה	Isaiah 10:32-33:11	
T 30 Job 30	ו	Th 29 Daniel 2	ו
W 31 Job 31	ז	F 30 אחרי מות קדשים	ז
April		May	
Th 1 Job 32	ח	Sa 1 Haftarah: Amos 9:7-15	ח
F 2 צו	ט	S 2 Daniel 3	ט
Sa 3 Haftarah:	י שבת הגדול	M 3 Daniel 4	י
Malachi 3:4-24		T 4 Daniel 5	יא
S 4 Job 33	יא	W 5 Daniel 6	יב
M 5 Job 34	יב	Th 6 Daniel 7	יג
T 6 Job 35	יג	F 7 אמור	יד
W 7	יד ערב פסח	Sa 8 Haftarah: Ezekiel 54:16-31	טו
Th 8 Song of Songs	טו פסח	S 9 Daniel 8	טז
F 9	טז פסח	M 10 Daniel 9	יז
Sa 10 Haftarah:	יז שבת חול המועד	T 11 Daniel 10	יח
Ezekiel 37:1-14		W 12 Daniel 11	יט
S 11 Song of Songs	יח חול המועד	Th 13 Daniel 12	כ
M 12 Song of Songs	יט חול המועד	F 14 בהר-בחקתי	כא
T 13 Song of Songs	כ חול המועד	Sa 15 Haftarah:	כב
W 14 Song of Songs	כא פסח	Jeremiah 16:19-17:14	
Th 15 Song of Songs	כב פסח	S 16 Ezra 1	כג
F 16 שמיני	כג	M 17 Ezra 2	כד
Sa 17 Haftarah:	כד	T 18 Ezra 3	כה
II Samuel 6:1-7:17		W 19 Ezra 4	כו
S 18 Job 36	כה	Th 20 Ezra 5	כז
M 19 Job 37	כו	F 21 במדבר	כח יום ירושלים
T 20 Job 38	כז יום השואה	Sa 22 Haftarah: Hosea 2:1-22	כט
W 21 Job 39	כח		
Th 22 Job 40	כט		
F 23 תזריע-מצורע	ל		

א' בניסן ממשיכים מסכ' בכורות י"ח
שבת ט"ו באייר מתחילים מסכ' ערבין
י"ט בסיון מתחילים מסכ' תמורה

TRIENNIAL BIBLE READING CALENDAR

May 1982			סיון חשמ"ב	June 1982			תמוז חשמ"ב
S	23	Ezra 6	א	T	22	I Chronicles 3	א
M	24	Ezra 7	ב	W	23	I Chronicles 4	ב
T	25	Ezra 8	ג	Th	24	I Chronicles 5	ג
W	26	Ruth	ד	F	25	קרח **	ד
Th	27	Ruth	ה	Sa	26	Haftarah:	ה
F	28	שבועות *	ו			I Samuel 11:14-12:22	
Sa	29	Haftarah:	ז	S	27	I Chronicles 6	ו
		Ezekiel 1		M	28	I Chronicles 7	ז
S	30	Ezra 9	ח	T	29	I Chronicles 8	ח
M	31	Ezra 10	ט	W	30	I Chronicles 9	ט
June				July			
T	1	Nehemiah 1	י	Th	1	I Chronicles 10	י
W	2	Nehemiah 2	יא	F	2	חקת בלק ***	יא
Th	3	Nehemiah 3	יב	Sa	3	Haftarah: Micah 5:6-6:8	יב
F	4	נשא *	יג	S	4	I Chronicles 11	יג
Sa	5	Haftarah: Judges 13:2-25	יד	M	5	I Chronicles 12	יד
S	6	Nehemiah 4	טו	T	6	I Chronicles 13	טו
M	7	Nehemiah 5	טז	W	7	I Chronicles 14	טז
T	8	Nehemiah 6	יז	Th	8	I Chronicles 15 תמוז י"ז	יז
W	9	Nehemiah 7	יח	F	9	פנחס	יח
Th	10	Nehemiah 8	יט	Sa	10	I Kings 18:46-19:25	יט
F	11	בהעלותך *	כ	S	11	I Chronicles 16	כ
Sa	12	Haftarah:	כא	M	12	I Chronicles 17	כא
		Zechariah 2:14-4:7		T	13	I Chronicles 18	כב
S	13	Nehemiah 9	כב	W	14	I Chronicles 19	כג
M	14	Nehemiah 10	כג	Th	15	I Chronicles 20	כד
T	15	Nehemiah 11	כד	F	16	מטות ומסעי	כה
W	16	Nehemiah 12	כה	Sa	17	Haftarah:	כו
Th	17	Nehemiah 13	כו			Jeremiah 1-2:3	
F	18	שלח *	כז	S	18	I Chronicles 21	כז
Sa	19	Haftarah: Joshua 2:1-24	כח	M	19	I Chronicles 22	כח
S	20	I Chronicles 1	כט	T	20	I Chronicles 23	כט
M	21	I Chronicles 2	ל				

* In Israel read the listing of the following week

** In Israel read only the first (חקת) of the following week's listing

*** In Israel read only בלק

TORAH FOR THE FAMILY

by Philip L. Lips

and Louis Katzoff

Published by the World Jewish Bible Society

**An easy and attractive do-it-yourself guide to
get to know the Five Books of Moses as you
read or study the Bible with your children**

Price \$8.95

**25% discount (price \$6.70) to members of the
World Jewish Bible Society**

WORLD JEWISH BIBLE SOCIETY

MEMBERSHIP (Tax deductible in USA) \$10

MEMBERSHIP INCLUDES SUBSCRIPTION TO Dor le Dor

WORLD JEWISH BIBLE SOCIETY

29 A Keren Hayesod St.

94188 Jerusalem, Israel

Remittance for membership is enclosed

Name

Street

City State Zip

DOR le DOR

דור לדור

OUR BIBLICAL HERITAGE

Vol. X, No. 3 (ל"ט)

Spring 1982

TRIBUTE TO B.Z. LURIA		141
THE HEBREW WORD SHEM (שֵׁם)	<i>I. Rapaport</i>	144
THE PLAGUE IN I SAMUEL 5 and 6	<i>Myron Eichler</i>	157
TORAH DIALOGUES — DEVARIM	<i>Harold Halpern</i>	165
JUSTICE IN SOLOMON'S COURT	<i>Herbert Rand</i>	170
THE JUDGMENT OF SOLOMON	<i>Sol Liptzin</i>	177
AMOS — PROPHET AND WORDLY MAN	<i>B.Z. Luria</i>	183
THE STORY OF CREATION — PART II	<i>Chaim Abramowitz</i>	187
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR		191
LIST OF PATRONS		194
TRIENNIAL BIBLE READING CALENDAR		195

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES IN DOR le DOR APPEAR IN:

1. *Religious and Theological Abstracts* 121 S. College Street, P.O.Box 215 Myerstown, PA 17067
2. *Internationale Zeitschriftensschau Für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete* Habichtweg 14, 7400 Tübingen

WORLD JEWISH BIBLE SOCIETY,
29A Keren Hayesod St. 94188 Jerusalem

החברה היהודית העולמית לחג"ך
02-245751

Dor le Dor is published in Jerusalem for the benefit of the English speaking public and is directed to knowledgeable Jews who wish to further their understanding of Jewish Scripture.