JUDAH HA-NASI

Head of Palestinian Jewry and codifier of the MISHNAH; b. probably in Galilee, *c.* 135; d. Galilee, *c.* 220. Judah was the son of Simeon II ben Gamaliel II, who was the grandson of GAMALIEL (mentioned in Acts 5.34; 22.3), who was in turn the grandson of Hillel. As the patriarch or head of Palestinian Jewry, Judah received as a permanent epithet the title ha-Nasi (the Prince), originally given to the president of the Great Sanhedrin in Jerusalem. In the Mishnah he is referred to simply as Rabbi (the teacher par excellence), and in the GEMARAH he is often called Rabbenu (our teacher) or Rabbenu ha-kadosh (our saintly teacher). He was instructed in the HALAKAH of the Oral Law by the most famous rabbis of his time, but he summed up his experience as a student, and later as a teacher, in the words: ''Much of the Law have I learned from my teachers, more from my colleagues, but most of all from my students'' (*Mak.* 10a).

According to his contemporaries, humility and fear of sin were his dominant traits. Although he was very rich, he led a simple and unassuming life because he was convinced that ''he who accepts the pleasures of this world is deprived of the pleasures of the world to come'' [*Avot de-Rabbi Natan* 28, ed. S. Schechter (New York 1945) 85]. When he succeeded his father as leader of the Jews in Palestine, he established the seat of the patriarchate and the academy, first at Bet Shearim and later at Sephoris. (Both of these places are within a ten mile radius of Nazareth.) He conducted the patriarchate with royal dignity, and his authority was recognized by the Romans as well as by the Jews. His tomb was discovered in one of the catacombs of Bet Shearim during the excavations made there in 1953 [*Israel Exploration Journal* 4 (1956) 88–107].

Rabbi Judah's greatest and lasting contribution to JUDAISM was his compilation and codification of the Oral Law in the collection of legal sayings called the Mishnah. Other collected teachings of earlier rabbis had been attempted before his time, but his collection soon eclipsed these and became the sole authoritative expression of the Halakah. Until his time, the traditional interpretation of the Mosaic Law was handed down orally, and hence was known as the Oral Law as distinctive from the written Law of Moses. Judah's revolutionary procedure consisted of recording the Oral Law in writing (in Mishnaic Hebrew). The earlier transmitters of the Oral Law, the Tannaim (repeaters), belonged to different schools that held variant opinions. This resulted in uncertainty as to what was really binding, and the divergent opinions ascribed to the ancient sages could be accepted or rejected at will. Judah's main contribution lay in the judicious selections he made from the copious material at his disposal. Since the publication of his Mishnah at the end of the second or beginning of the third century, the primary pursuit of Jewish sages has been commenting on its contents.

See Also: TALMUD.

Bibliography: W. BACHER, *The Jewish Encyclopedia*. ed. J. SINGER (New York 1901–06) 7:333–33. D. J. BORNSTEIN, *Encyclopaedia Judaica: Das Judentum in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. (Berlin 1928–34) 8:1023–35. L. LAZARUS, *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York 1939–44) 6: 229–230. K. SCHUBERT, *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, ed. J. HOFER and K. RAHNER (Freiberg 1957–65) 5:889. A. GUTTMANN, ''The Patriarch Judah I: His Birth and Death,'' *Hebrew Union College Annual* 25 (1954) 239–261.

[M. J. STIASSNY]

JUDAISM

The term Judaism admits of various meanings. Rarely, it denotes the identity of an individual Jew (as, ''He is aware of his Judaism'') or an indeterminate bond among all Jews; occasionally, the whole of Jewry; more often, the manifold expression of Jewish history or culture; and commonly, the sum total of commandments, rites, traditions, and beliefs that make up the Jewish religion. Even in its religious signification, the term is not univocal. Taken broadly, it encompasses the life, worship, and faith of the Jewish people of all times, beginning with the Patriarchs and Prophets. More precisely, it refers to the Jewish religion as it developed after the Babylonian Exile. The latter meaning is the topic of this article. (On the older Israelite religion, *see* ISRAEL, 3.)

As Israel's postexilic way, Judaism has known diverse religious experiences, gone through several phases, and expressed itself through a number of currents. There is something unique about it. Fitting none of the usual categories, Judaism is a people religion: a religion limited to one people, and a people so tied to that religion as to exist for and through it. [The word people must not be taken here in a narrow sense. In post-Biblical no less than in Biblical times, Gentiles have sought refuge under the wings of the God of Israel (Ru 2.12). Not only individuals but also a whole people, such as the KHAZARS, have become part of Judaism.] True, not all Jews live by their traditions; still, religion is so woven into the texture of their history that they are tied together by a spiritual bond and not merely by blood.

Birth. Judaism, in the strict sense of the word, was born when, under the leadership of EZRA, the Israelites bound themselves to walk in the ways of God's Torah (Neh 10.29). Probably toward the end of the 5th century B.C. a caravan had brought Ezra from Babylon to Jerusalem. There this priest and scribe began to teach the statutes and ordinances of Torah to those returned from

captivity (Ezr 7.10). Thus the industrious scribe—student, knower, and expounder of the Law—took the place of the stormy prophet. As the rabbis have it, with the death of the last Prophets, the Holy Spirit departed from Israel; divine inspiration withdrew, but the men in Israel could still hear ‘‘a small voice [coming from above]’’ (*bat qôl*, literally ‘‘daughter of sound,’’ i.e., echo; e.g., *Soṭ.* 48b). For fear that the Israelites would not remain constant in the service of the Lord, Ezra ordered them to expel their ‘‘foreign,’’ i.e., pagan, wives. The presence of such women threatened faith in and worship of the one God. Ezra was convinced that, as God's ‘‘special possession’’ (Ex 19.5), Israel was bound to keep aloof from peoples and lands tainted by idolatry (Ezr ch. 9–10). *See* IDOLATRY (IN THE BIBLE).

Seminal Ideas. Ezra's reform was the starting point of a long development. Seminal forces, small at first and growing slowly, gave Judaism its special character.

God. Prior to the Exile, Israel's belief in the living God—the Lord of history intervening in Israel's life, the One before and above man yet close to him, the One far yet near—had frequently been couched in anthropomorphic language. *See* ANTHROPOMORPHISM (IN THE BIBLE). Without denying God's peerlessness, the anthropomorphisms of Scripture proclaimed Him as the God who loves, seeks, and cares. Postexilic generations, however, must have felt some embarrassment at language that seemed all too human. According to the TARGUMS, it was not God who ‘‘walked in the garden’’ (Gn 3.8) but the *memrā,* His word; it was the word, not God Himself, whom Moses called ‘‘a consuming fire’’ (Dt 4.24). By the 3d century B.C., the name YAHWEH was considered forbidden to human lips; ADONAI (My Lord) took its place. The Alexandrian Jewish translators of the Old Testament who produced the SEPTUAGINT simply wrote ὁ Κύριος (the Lord). Other circumlocutions were ‘‘the Name,’’ ‘‘Heaven,’’ or ‘‘Power,’’ all of which are echoed in the New Testament: ‘‘hallowed be thy name’’ (Mt 6.9), ‘‘the kingdom of heaven’’ (Matthew *passim*), ‘‘the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the Power’’ (Mt 26.64).

No matter how deep the emphasis on God's transcendence may have been, Judaism would not be what it is if the intensely personal God had been turned into a remote deity. The later rabbis, too, stressed that God was unlike man, but at the same time they tried to express the warm relationship between God and Israel through concepts such as the SHEKINAH, His indwelling among creatures. The Shekinah was said to go with Israel into exile, to dwell among the people even in their uncleanness, and to weep at the sadness that followed Jerusalem's destruction (*Meg.* 29a; *Yom.* 56b; *Lam. Rabbah* 1.46). In this

Breast Plate for Scroll of Law. (©Hulton-Deutsch Collection/CORBIS)

concept Judaism developed a counterpoise to the Christian message that God had come in the flesh to carry man's burden.

Israel. With the expulsion of pagan wives under Ezra, there began a growing, though at no time complete, isolation of the Jewish people from its neighbors. From then on, the Biblical belief that Israel was chosen for the sake of all the earth (Gn 12.3) and the noncanonical notion that the world was made for Israel's sake (Assumption of Moses 1.12) rivaled each other. Though the latter may suggest that the heavens and the earth were created for Israel's honor only, this and similar sayings must not be taken with unimaginative literalness. They are often no more than homiletic exaggerations. This one is not necessarily a sign of national vain glory; its underlying thought is rather that the material world is not an end in itself, that all things must serve the salvation of the just (cf. 2 Baruch 15.7)—an eminently Christian idea, too. Nonetheless, there is danger in such affirmations. Though Scripture never tires of proclaiming Israel's unmerited election (e.g., Dt 7.7; Ez 16.3–14), the assumption that it had proved its merit gained ascendancy in postexilic times. A Jewish legend (e.g., *'Avodah Zarah* 2b) has it that Torah was accepted by the chosen people, but only after it had been offered to all the nations and had been

The Western Wall in Jerusalem, the last remains of the Second Temple of Herod. (©David H. Wells/CORBIS)

rejected by them. (On the use of the term Torah without the definite article, see below.)

The terms pagan and sinner were frequently synonymous—a usage that prevailed even in early New Testament times. In his Pentecostal speech Peter reminded the men of Jerusalem that they had crucified Jesus ''through the hands of wicked men'' (Acts 2.23). The wicked men (''men without the Law,'' according to the Greek text) are Pilate and his soldiers, all unbelievers in the true God. When Scripture calls Israel God's very own, dearer than all other people (Ex 19.5), it did not pronounce it superior to the Gentiles. No doubt the religious and moral superiority of the Jewish people over the pagan world was real; still, to assert it was not altogether salutary.

''Turn to me and be saved,'' the Prophet had cried in Yahweh's name to all the ends of the earth (Is 45.22). But the prophetic word announced also a day of vengeance when God would crush the nations in His wrath [Is 63.4, 6; *see* DAY OF THE LORD (ESCHATOLOGY)]. This twofold attitude is heightened in Jewish APOCALYPTIC literature. One vision has it that all Gentiles will become just, worship the one God, and share in the future messianic blessings (e.g., 1 Enoch 10.21); another, that the Messiah will destroy the godless nations, the oppressors of Israel, with the word of His mouth (e.g., Psalms of Solomon 17.27). One would gravely misunderstand this dire prediction if he forgot that the bitterness spelled out here is common to all peoples trodden under foot.

Torah. Ezra's great work was to teach and expound the Torah. The Torah stands primarily for the Pentateuch, now and then for the entire Old Testament. In later literature, it embraces the whole tradition, written as well as unwritten. (Some scholars distinguish between ''the Torah,'' the five books of Moses, and ''Torah''—without the article—the whole body of law built on them by the rabbis, in other words, Biblical and Talmudic law.) A meaningful English rendering of Torah as found in the Bible is ''revelation''; its literal sense is ''instruction,'' ''guidance.'' It is God's instruction on what He would have His creature do in order to be just in His eyes, His guidance to Israel on how to follow Him on the road to holiness. The core of this revelation, the Ten Commandments, is surrounded by other laws and norms, statutes, or decrees; ''You shall'' is their idiom. Since a large part of the Pentateuch is legal in character, Torah came to be understood as law. Such is the translation of the Septuagint and the understanding of later Jewish tradition.

Though not revealed till Sinai, the Law was considered a living being, identical with the wisdom that existed before time (Prv 8.22–31). Like wisdom, the Torah was the craftsman at God's side; it served Him as the plan according to which He created the world (*Ab.* 3.14; *Gen. Rabbah* 1. 1). The Law was perfect and immutable; yet it had to be interpreted, supplemented, and adapted to the exigencies of time. There evolved, then, alongside the written law, sometimes overshadowing it, the unwritten law, ''the tradition of the ancients'' (Mt 15.2). On the one hand, rules were mitigated so as to make the Law workable; on the other, an ever-higher ''fence'' was built around it (*Ab.* 1.1)—a protective wall, with stop signs and danger signals, definitions and directives—that, to forestall transgression, left little room for personal decision. Although for the devout the Law was life and joy, the many—those, e.g., whose livelihood depended on the land—found its demands impossible to carry out. As the number of precepts increased, it had to be studied, too, before it could be kept. Hence the unlettered were thought of as the ungodly (see Jn 7.49).

The Final Events. Though the postexilic period was marked by an inner withdrawal from other nations, the ever-widening emigration of Jews to many lands created a vast Jewish DIASPORA whose synagogues became, paradoxically enough, proselytizing centers among the Gentiles. Moreover, foreign invasion and domination, as well as encounter with the two great cultures of Persia and Greece, helped the flowering of certain Biblical seeds, particularly that of hope.

The Prophets had seen the past as herald of the future: the Exodus of old foretelling a new exodus, the reign of David, that of another David (e.g., Is ch. 35; Jer 23.5–6). As time went on, some in Israel looked for a new priest to bring blessing to the people or for a righteous leader who would himself be a source of righteousness. Many others dreamed of a mighty deliverer who would free them from pagan tyranny. Whereas the majority of the people expected a Warrior-Messiah, a scattered few longed for the Chosen One, hidden in God's presence since the beginning of the world and before it, who would soon come in the likeness of a man, yet bearing a face ''full of graciousness, like one of the holy angels'' (1 Enoch 46.1).

For a long time the glittering magic and morbid sensuousness pervading so much of pagan fantasy about the afterlife had kept Israel from a fuller understanding of the world and life to come. In the centuries preceding the coming of Jesus, however, the hope in a blessed immortality, the bodily resurrection of the just and their share in God's triumph and reign, erupted in many hearts (*see* RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD). Full force was given to the Isaian words: ''Your dead shall live, their corpses rise; awake and sing, you who lie in the dust'' (26.19).

First Christian Century. These trends did not spring up at the same time, nor were they all universally accepted. In fact, 1st-century Judaism was intensely diversified, full of unrest and strife.

Sadducees. At the center was official Judaism, the small but powerful party of the SADDUCEES. Made up of the leading priests, the notables, the influential and wealthy families, they were defenders of the *status quo.* Clinging to the letter of Scripture, they rejected doctrinal development as well as the oral tradition. Thus the world to come was of little interest to them; they even mocked the hope that the dead would rise (see Mk 12.18–19). But their spiritual tepidity did not hinder them from upholding a rigid and stern jurisprudence. In their self-reliance they thought of man as the captain of his soul, the architect of his fortune (see Josephus, *Ant.* 13.5.9). As they disdained the common people, so were they disdained in turn. Since the grandeur of the Temple was their life, they disappeared with it in A.D. 70.

Pharisees. Pitted against these men of birth were the men of ritual perfection, the PHARISEES, the successors to the HASIDAEANS, those ''stout men in Israel'' who, at the time of the Machabean uprising, were passionately devoted to the Law (1 Mc 2.42). As their name (*pᵉrûšîm,* separated ones) indicates, the Pharisees kept apart from the masses who would not or could not observe the many precepts regarding ritual purity. The pharisaic movement drew its strength from the *ḥăbûrôt,* companies of like-minded men who encouraged one another in the exact fulfillment of the demands made on the pious Israelite: his food, his clothing, the very walls of his house; indeed, his entire life was under the regimen of the Law.

Despite the scrupulous attention the Pharisees gave to the Torah, they believed in a certain evolution of the Torah-bound life and tried to adjust the Law to changing circumstances. They were far from uniform in their interpretation. In the 1st century B.C. there were two great competing schools: the one of the unbending Shammai and the other of the more compassionate Hillel. When confronted, for example, with the authority of truth and its conflict with that sister of love, courtesy, in daily life, the two decided differently. The first would not permit wedding guests to call a homely bride pretty, whereas the latter held that every bride ought to be looked upon as beautiful and praised (*Ket.* 16b-17a). Their differences, mainly of a casuistic nature, were strong enough to produce the byword that ''the Torah has become as two Torahs'' (*Sanh.* 88b). In the end the camp of moderation prevailed over the more rigid school.

Most of the teachers and preachers, i.e., most of the men who determined the worship of the synagogues in the land, were Pharisees, a fact that explains the influence of the Pharisees on the people despite their aloofness. A saying attributed to the later Rabbi AKIBA BEN JOSEPH is almost a sum of their beliefs: ''All is foreseen, yet free will is given; the world is judged by goodness but all [judgment] is according to the amount of work'' (*Ab.* 3.22). God is sovereign, the Pharisees held, yet man is free. Man is to be judged after death; paradise, purgatory, or hell will then be his lot. In the end God's reign will appear when He will be all in all as the just rise to glory.

Many Pharisees served God faithfully, in genuine devotion, even with a gentle spirit (see Jn 3.1; Acts 5.34; 23.6). When the Gospels charge Pharisees with hypocrisy, this must be taken as prophetic speech, not as a scholarly appraisal of the entire movement, much less of every individual. The Talmud, too, distinguishes between the Pharisees moved by love of God and those driven, knowingly or unknowingly, by love of self (*Soṭ.* 22b). The faults castigated in the Gospels, e.g., those of equating things essential with nonessential or commandment with preference and even confusing one with the other (see Mt 23.16–18), are pitfalls that threaten the life of piety everywhere. Although Jesus and the early Church disagreed with the Pharisees on the function and the interpretation of the Law, they gave new weight and direction to other pharisaic beliefs.

Essenes. Whereas the Sadducees held the center of Judaism and the Pharisees struggled to seize it, the ESSENES deliberately remained at its periphery. Without deciding which of the two is the legitimate heir, one can trace the beginnings of the Essenes, like those of the Pharisees, to the early Hasidaeans (1 Mc 2.42). For some scholars, the term Essenes is a synonym for members of the QUMRAN COMMUNITY; but probably it is a generic name for several kindred groups devoted to an ascetic life. With the monks of Qumran it was a life of obedience, poverty, and chastity; of common study, common worship, and common meals; of strictest submission to the Law, according to a rule. Though they allowed no traffic with the common people, whom they considered unclean and thus enemies of God; though they despised the Sadducees, particularly the high priestly clique, as a band of usurpers; and though they shunned the Pharisees as ''preachers of falsehood'' and ''seekers after smooth things'' (1QH 2.32), the radiance of their lives broke through the walls of their ''cloister.'' For all the tremendous differences of some of their teachings from those of the infant Church, their influence upon the Church was considerable. Yet the community had a sudden end at the hands of Roman legionaries.

Zealots. Another peripheral movement, though a vocal and active one, was that of the ZEALOTS. Zeal for God, His law, and His glory (see Acts 22.3) has always been a distinctive mark of all Jewish piety. The zeal of the Zealots, however, was of a militant kind. Although the Pharisees eagerly awaited the collapse of the Roman Empire, the end of all godless men, and the coming of the messianic reign with its lasting peace, they did not consider it their task to hasten these events. On the contrary, the Zealots, an extreme wing split off from the main pharisaic body, held it their duty to intervene. ''God alone is Lord'' was their creed, and ''Freedom!'' was their battle cry. No one in Israel, they insisted, may obey an emperor who arrogates to himself the homage that is God's due.

The Zealots supported their conviction by violence. Some of them seem to have stabbed their opponents, particularly Jewish collaborators, to death in broad daylight. Because of their favored weapon, concealed in their robes, they were known as dagger men (σικάριοι). As ''underground fighters,'' lawless rebels against the Roman order, they are called λησταί (robbers, bandits, revolutionists) both by the Jewish historian Flavius JOSEPHUS (*Bell. Jud.* 2.253–254) and by the Evangelists (Jn 18.40; Mt 27.38, 44; *see* BARABBAS). Their wrathfulness was the ferment in the people's ''holy war'' against the Romans, whose last procurator, Gessius Florus, had plundered the Temple treasury, probably to make up a tax deficit. This uprising (A.D. 66–73) led to disaster; together with the later one of BAR KOKHBA (132–135), it cost the Jewish people the last vestige of political autonomy and cost Jerusalem its role as the spiritual center of all the Jews wherever they dwelt.

Opposition and Unity. There were other groups at the border of Jewish life, e.g., the penitential movements in the Jordan region, of which John the Baptist's was foremost. The Talmud speaks somewhat disparagingly of those who submerge themselves in water every morning (*Ber.* 22a). There are no exact statistics on the various movements. At the time of Christ, Palestine may have had about 1.5 million Jewish inhabitants, a small number compared to the estimated 4 or 4.5 million Jews already dispersed throughout the Roman Empire (seven percent of its total population). According to Josephus, who describes the major Jewish Sects, the number of Pharisees was 6,000, of the Essenes 4,000 (*Ant.* 13.5.9; 10.6; 17.2.4; 18.1.3–4; 20.9.1; *Bell. Jud.* 2.8.2–14). Although his figures cannot always be relied on, these estimates give at least an idea of the comparative strength of some of the leading movements. But they tell nothing of the extent, much less of the attitude of the people at large, the ''country folk'' (*'ammê hā'āreṣ*). In the New Testament some Pharisees are quoted as saying of them: ''This crowd, which does not know the Law, is accursed'' (Jn

7.49). The opposition among the four major groups was no less fierce. Strangely enough, the Law that united them also separated them. Yet as many-layered and strife-ridden as Judaism was, it was held together by the common confession: ''Hear O Israel! The Lord is our God, the Lord alone!'' (Dt 6.4).

Rabbinical Judaism. Wishing to have no part in the suicidal revolt of A.D. 66, Jewish Christians retreated to Pella beyond the Jordan. When the Roman army beleaguered the Holy City, Jews in their despair turned on Jews, one group excelling the other in violence. Thousands upon thousands died of starvation and disease, were crucified, deported, or sold into slavery. The ancient estimates of those killed and captured vary from more than half a million to more than a million.

Victory of Pharisaism. One man, however, was able to turn this disaster into a triumph. Before the city fell, Rabbi JOHANAN BEN ZAKKAI had himself carried out in a coffin. He went to the Roman camp and obtained the permission of its commander, Vespasian, to open a school for the study of Torah in the coastal town of Jamnia. This daring move enabled Judaism to survive; or more exactly, it established Pharisaism, rather the school of Hillel, as the foundation of all future forms of Judaism.

Great Bet Din. Rabbi Johanan was joined by other rabbis. Under his presidency, the Great Bet Din (*bet dîn,* house of judgment), a sort of supreme court or council, continued some of the functions of the extinct Sanhedrin. In the course of time it fixed the calendar and the canon of Scripture, from which it rejected the so-called Apocrypha—books contained in the Septuagint, such as Sirach, Tobit, 1 and 2 Maccabees—as well as the Gospels and other ''heretical'' writings (see Moore, 1:186–187). The Great Bet Din had to tackle also the many problems arising from the fact that at least one third of Torah, the laws pertaining to Temple worship, could no longer be carried out. The groundwork was laid, therefore, for teachings such as these: study of the laws on sacrifice takes the place of the sacrifices themselves; God accepts the former as if the latter had been offered (see *Pes.* K 60b). Since the Temple was destroyed, prayer, ''the service of the heart,'' acquired the atoning power that had resided in the institutions of old. ''We have no prophet, no priest, no sacrifice, no sanctuary, no altar to help win forgiveness for us,'' R. Isaac mourned; ''from the day the Temple was laid waste, nothing was left to us but prayer. Lord, hearken then, and forgive'' (*Midr. Teh.* 5.7).

Under Johanan's successor, Gamaliel II, Jewish Christians were expelled from the Synagogue by an ingenious strategem. A curse on renegades, heretics, and Nazarenes (i.e., Christians) was introduced into the daily prayers: that they be without hope and stricken from the book of life. No follower of Christ could have repeated this imprecation without committing spiritual suicide.

Talmud. At the turn of the 1st Christian century, Rabbi JUDAH HA-NASI, then head of the Great Bet Din, gathered the oral traditions and probably had them put into writing. The compilation was named MISHNAH for the method applied, i.e., repetition; it contained the important halakic (legal) teachings (*see* HALAKAH) of the preceding generations of rabbis, the Tannaim, or traditioners. The Mishnah soon became the standard work of study and investigation in the academies of Palestine and Babylon. The men who commented on it, the Amoraim, or expositors, produced the GEMARAH, or completion. Both, Mishnah and Gemarah, make up the TALMUD, which is, therefore, basically halakic. Haggadic material, however (*see* HAGGADAH), i.e., spiritual and moral reflections, together with practical counsels, metaphysical speculations, historical narratives, legends, scientific observations, etc., appear in it as well. The Talmud was completed at the end of the 4th century in Galilee and a century later in Babylonia; hence the two versions, the Palestinian and the Babylonian Talmuds. The Talmud is not the only compilation of rabbinic thought. There are, e.g., collections of haggadic commentaries on the Biblical books, the Midrashim (*see* MIDRASHIC LITERATURE).

What makes the understanding of the Talmud difficult is that it is a code of laws, a case book, and a digest of discussions and disputes that went on among various rabbis; interspersed are reflections of every kind; its contents are at times as motley as a daily newspaper. Now and then the opinions recorded are dissimilar or even contradictory. Quite often, the rabbis consider a man ignorant of the Law unworthy of trust, unreliable as witness in a court, unfit to be an orphan's protector. Yet the compilers of the Talmud rejoice in telling of the power a simple man has in heaven. During a drought, Honi (1st century B.C.) drew a circle around himself and said to God, ''I swear by Your great name that I will not budge from here until You have mercy upon Your children,'' and rain fell (*Ta'an.* 23a). Moreover, the Talmud engages in a great deal of casuistry, and all casuistry tends to be tortured; still, in admonishing its readers not to wrong another man through words, it calls moral demands that cannot be codified ''things entrusted to the heart'' (*Bava Metzia* 58b).

So great is the occasional contrast between rabbinical statements that, in one place, it can be said that the nations' charity is but sin since they practice it for no other reason than to boast; in another, that the Holy Spirit rests on a man, be he Gentile or Jew, according to his deeds (see Montefiore and Loewe, 562–563, 557). Many rabbinic sayings are, therefore, tentative or are located in

a definite situation so that evaluation of rabbinic thought is a special science, indeed, an art. It is not only the variety of opinions recorded in the Talmud and other rabbinical literature that hamper their appreciation, but also the style—succinct, telegraphic, often bare to the bone—makes the Talmud inaccessible without a guide. Such guidance was provided by the heads of the two leading rabbinic academies of Babylonia, titled Geonim, ''illustrious ones.'' From the 6th to the 11th centuries their authority was supreme all over Babylonia—which in the meantime had become the center of all Jewry—and thus, for most of that time, in other countries as well. Yet at the very moment the rule of talmudic Judaism seemed unassailable, it was contested by the Karaites, schismatics who, in the 8th century, repudiated the entire rabbinic tradition.

Medieval Thinkers. One who took up the defense of rabbinic Judaism against the Karaites was the Egyptian-born SA'ADIA BEN JOSEPH (882–942), ''the father of Jewish philosophy.'' In his main work, *Beliefs and Opinions,* he propounded the unity of revelation and reason. The new element in his thought is its debt to Moslem theology. Sa'adia thus ushers in a line of medieval thinkers whose thought is born of a meeting with Moslem and Christian theologies, Neoplatonism, or Aristotelianism. With AVICEBRON (IBN GABIROL), in the first half of the 11th century, the focal point of Jewish thought shifts to Spain. According to him all things emanate from God as the first principle, not by necessity but through His loving will. Avicebron's depth may be shown by the climactic stanza of one of his poems:

> When all Thy face is dark, And Thy just angers rise, From Thee I turn to Thee And find love in Thine eyes.

The first to treat Jewish ethics systematically was Avicebron's contemporary IBN PAQŪDA. His *Duties of the Heart* became a guide to the inner life for untold numbers of Jews. Rather than defend Judaism, the poet-philosopher JUDAH ben Samuel ha-Levi (*c.* 1080–*c.* 1145) attempted to show its superiority over Christianity and ISLAM. Although he enjoyed the comforts of ''the golden age of Spanish Jewry,'' he felt that the Jews were in exile and he dreamed of Zion. Jews, he held, bore the sufferings of the world; their restoration to the Holy Land would bring salvation to the entire earth. Yet he sang also: ''Would I might behold His face within my heart!/ Mine eyes would never ask to look beyond.''

The giant of Spanish-Jewish thinkers was the great Talmudist MAIMONIDES (Moses ben Maimon; 1135–1204). His work is many-sided; what made it original and influential, though at first bitterly opposed by Jews (his *Guide of the Perplexed* was burned), was the attempt to reconcile Aristotle with Holy Scripture. As a young man, he tried to sum up Jewish faith in 13 principles: (1) God exists and is the Creator of all things; (2) He is one; (3) He is without a body; (4) He is eternal; (5) man is obliged to worship Him alone; (6) the words of the Prophets are to be believed; (7) Moses is the greatest among them; (8) the Torah was revealed by God to Moses; (9) it is unchangeable; (10) God knows all things; (11) He rewards and punishes man according to his deeds; (12) the Messiah will come; and (13) the dead will rise.

Unless he believes in these fundamental principles, a Jew cannot attain everlasting bliss, Maimonides held. Some theologians of his day disagreed with him on the selection of these principles, or on the reduction of Jewish belief to 13 articles, or even on the basic assumption that Judaism possesses dogmas, binding tenets. Still, his ''creed'' survived the disputes and was eventually embodied—not in its original form but in both a prose and a poetic version of later dates—in the Siddur, the Jewish daily prayerbook. The prose version, by an unknown author, begins with the words: ''I believe [*'ănî ma'ămîn*] with perfect faith that the Creator, blessed be His name, is the Author and Guide of everything that has been created, and that He alone has made, does make and will make all things.'' The poetic version by Daniel ben Judah of Rome is known by its first word, *Yigdal,* ''Magnified and praised be the living God. . . .''

Significantly, the 13 principles were embodied in the liturgy of the synagogue. Any stress on Jewish faith without an accompanying emphasis on the sacredness of day, week, month, and year distorts the image of Judaism, at whose heart is *'ăvōdâ* [(divine) service, (the) work (of honoring God)]. There is no fullness of Jewish life without the SABBATH and the festivals throughout the year—without their joy and their sorrow, without their penitential mood and their delight in God's grace, without Israel's appeal to His mercy and its assurance of His faithfulness, without the remembrance of the past and the expectation of the future. *See* FEASTS, RELIGIOUS; PASSOVER, FEAST OF; BOOTHS (TABERNACLES), FEAST OF; ATONEMENT, DAY OF (YOM KIPPUR); DEDICATION OF THE TEMPLE, FEAST OF; PURIM, FEAST OF.

Cabala. Swift and fragmentary though this survey is, mention must be made, at least, of the sum of Jewish mysticism, the CABALA. Mystical thoughts had appeared intermittently for centuries: in some apocalyptic works as far back as the 2d century B.C., in esoteric teachings found in the oldest midrashic literature, and in early pharisaic speculations on the work of creation and the throne of God, ''the Divine Chariot'' (see Ezekiel ch. 1). In the 11th century the mystical force so long underground

came to the fore. By the 14th century the secrets of a few became the possession of many. In Christian mysticism the longing of the individual believer—irrevocably planted in the community of the faithful—for union with God prevails. In the Cabala (Kabbala) the personal element is hidden; ''the Law of the Torah became a symbol of cosmic law, and the history of the Jewish people a symbol of the cosmic process'' (Scholem, *On the Kabbalah* . . . , 2). The powerful hold of mystical trends on Jewish life is far greater than is generally assumed.

Among the devotees of cabalistic speculation were men as different as Joseph ben Ephraim CARO (1488–1575), the author of the *Shulchan Aruch* (Set Table); Shabbatai (Sabbatai) Sevi (Zevi; 1626–76), a false Messiah who, after having brought the Jewish masses everywhere to a high pitch of excitement, defected to Islam (*see* SHABATAIÏSM); and the Baal Shem Tov (*c.* 1700–60), the founder of the Hasidic movement, whose message of joy, song, and love in God swept across the Jewish communities of eastern Europe. The *Shulchan Aruch,* based on Spanish authorities, such as Maimonides, but neglecting the traditions of central and eastern Europe, sought to fix the Law in all its minutiae forever, as it were. Theoretically, no rabbinic code can be considered final; Halakah is ever in a fluid state. In practice, however, the *Shulchan Aruch* has dominated Jewish life as if it were God's infallible word. Through its unifications of various legal teachings, it became the strongest cohesive bond among Orthodox Jews. But their clinging to demands that have become obsolete made it a barrier, too; thus, even the most legitimate quests for reform were rebuffed.

Modern Times. The experience of having been misled by a ''Messiah'' who became an apostate and put the Jewish hope to shame was more than many hearts could bear. For a time HASIDISM, with its comfort of God's constant presence in the daily life of every Jew, lifted the Jewish soul to new heights.

Emancipation. Yet the deception was a trauma not to be healed quickly. Weariness set in and the appeal of the outside world became stronger. For centuries Jews had lived within the confines of the GHETTO, whose walls oppressed as well as protected. These walls had given them the chance of leading their own lives; but as they began to tumble, the old life no longer seemed desirable. Not a few Western Jews welcomed the age of ENLIGHTENMENT. Moses Mendelssohn (1729–86), a ghetto-born philosopher, counseled his fellow Jews to adapt themselves to the customs and laws of the countries in which they lived; yet he urged them to remain loyal to the faith of their forefathers. He maintained that Judaism was not a revealed religion, only revealed legislation. He accepted the Mosaic commandments and precepts as given to Jews in a supernatural way, but he recognized no eternal truths save those ''comprehensible to human reason and demonstrable by the ability to think.''

Cry for Reform. Ever since their loss of national sovereignty, Jews had lived at the fringe of history. All through the Middle Ages they had been a foreign body in a more or less unified society, objects of discriminatory measures, and victims of persecution. Suddenly emancipation—freedom, equality, status, and progress—beckoned before their eyes. An assembly of 110 notables convoked by Napoleon in 1806 marveled at the hidden plans of Divine Providence ''changing the form of human affairs, giving comfort to the distressed, and raising the lowly out of the dust'' (W. G. Plaut, *The Rise of Reform Judaism*, 72). Again, in 1844, the president of a rabbinic conference held at Braunschweig, Germany, proclaimed: ''Let us understand the time and use it . . . [so] that our holy religion, purified of all dross and additions, cleansed of all that is merely local or ephemeral, of all disfigurations which adhere to it, will rise in new glory, to fulfill its mission to mold mankind into one brotherhood'' (Plaut, 79).

Two years before, the Society of the Friends of Reform in Frankfurt had declared themselves in favor of unlimited progress in religious matters; they denied any authority to ''the collection of controversies, dissertations, and prescriptions commonly called Talmud,'' and they repudiated the traditional hope of being led back to the land of their forefathers by a messiah. ''We know no fatherland except that to which we belong by birth and citizenship,'' they proclaimed. (See Plaut, 52.)

Reaction. These and similar demands for an updating of Jewish worship, as well as the rejection of the Talmud's perennial authority and the novel actions taken, led to furious controversies. The promoters of the reform were denounced as deceitful or as lacking in scholarship. Bans were imposed by one side, only to be declared null and void by the other. Prohibitions were proclaimed against changing anything in the order of prayer, against using another language than Hebrew in Jewish worship, and against playing an instrument, e.g., an organ, in a synagogue. Observant Jews were warned against traffic with the dissenters; burial was refused to those who deviated from the practices of the past; the innovators were even denounced to the secular authorities. A prominent rabbi counseled the traditionalists of Hamburg: ''Go to the government and ask them to humble these wanton people . . . [and to] stay the arm of the evildoers'' (Plaut, 36).

Classical Reform in America. In the middle of the 19th century, Reform (Liberal or Progressive) Judaism

was brought to the U.S. by German-born rabbis. Before it reached the proportions of the 20th century, it had to struggle, though by no means as hard as in the land of its birth. In 1885, 19 rabbis assembled in Pittsburgh, where they formulated their ideological stance, known as the Pittsburgh Platform, which, interestingly enough, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the Reform rabbinical organization, never made its own, though the Platform reflected the thinking of its founders.

These were its principles. (1) Every religion is an attempt to grasp the infinite. Judaism presents the highest conception of the God idea. (2) The Bible is the record of the consecration of the Jewish people as priests of the one God and a potent instrument of religious and moral instruction. Though it reflects primitive ideas, modern discoveries are not antagonistic to the doctrines of Judaism. (3) The Mosaic legislation was a necessary system of training for the Jewish people during its national life in Palestine. In the modern world only its moral laws are binding. No ceremonies are to be retained except those of a sanctifying character. Everything not adaptable to modern civilization is to be rejected. (4) The Mosaic and rabbinical laws regarding diet or ritual purity are foreign to modern mental and spiritual outlooks. (5) The modern era of universal culture is a sign that Israel's great messianic hope is about to be realized. Hence, neither a return to Palestine nor a restoration of the ancient sacrificial system is desirable. (6) Judaism is a progressive religion, ever striving to be in accord with the postulates of reason. Christianity has a providential mission in the spreading of monotheistic and moral truths. (7) The soul of man is immortal but belief in bodily resurrection, hell, and paradise is to be rejected as not rooted in Judaism. (8) In the spirit of the Mosaic Law, which strives to regulate the relation between rich and poor, Jews are duty-bound to help solve the modern problems of social justice. (See Davis, 226–227).

Conservative Movement. American Reform Judaism rallied around the Pittsburgh Platform as the instrument that would take Jews ''out of medieval darkness into the light of modern progress.'' But, as had happened in Germany, some reform-minded men felt they could not go all the way with the leaders of the reform. In their eyes the decisive principle of the Platform was the spirit of the age, not that of Jewish tradition. The Law was indeed a living tradition and thus open to change, they argued, but all changes had to be made in harmony with what went before. The totality of Jewish history—past, present, and future—or, as Solomon Schechter (1850–1915), the founder of Conservative Judaism, called it, ''Catholic Israel,'' was ever to be the judge of true development. As the needs of the Jewish people are heeded, Jews dare not forget the primacy of faith in God and the demands of the Torah.

While thus dismissing a static attitude, the historical school kept a deep reverence for the past and its ways. Its perspective became that of Conservative Judaism. (Its main organizations are the United Synagogue of America and the Rabbinical Assembly of America.) At first glance, it might be considered midway between Orthodoxy and Reform, but its direction is complex. It upholds the rabbinical architecture of life in its entirety, but it interprets it with a certain freedom. It honors the ''creed'' of Maimonides, but it is responsive to modern critical views. Many of its rabbis see the Messiah as an ideal or an age to come, rather than as a person. The idea of a ''universal Israel'' and its refusal to stand by any platform or series of tenets make it broad enough to harbor within its ranks the Reconstructionist Movement.

The great concern of Reconstructionism is the survival of the Jewish people; its approach is that of 20th-century pragmatism. In the eyes of Reconstructionists, God is not the supreme being but the process that makes for salvation; to believe is to reckon with life's creative forces as an organic unity and thus give meaning to life; Jewish religious practices are folkways rather than divine demands; and Judaism itself is a civilization of which religion is but a part, however important.

Modified Reform. Half a century after the Pittsburgh Platform, Reform Judaism found it necessary to modify that statement. Therefore, in 1937 the Columbus Platform was issued. Its framers no longer speak of the ''God idea'' but ''of the One, living God, who rules the world through law and love . . . . Though transcending time and space, He is the indwelling Presence of the world.'' Man is His child and active co-worker. The new declaration still says that ''revelation is a continuous process, confined to no one group and to no one age,'' but it calls the Torah ''a depository of permanent spiritual ideas . . . , the dynamic source of the life of Israel.'' (See Finkelstein, 2:1327–89.) Earlier American Reform rabbis had flatly declared: ''We consider ourselves no longer a nation but a religious community, and therefore expect neither a return to Palestine . . . nor the restoration of any of the laws concerning the Jewish State.'' (See Davis, 227.) Now they see in the rehabilitation of Palestine ''the promise of renewed life for many of our brethren. We affirm the obligation of all Jewry to aid in its upbuilding as a Jewish homeland . . . , a haven of refuge for the oppressed [and] a center of Jewish culture and life.''

Classical Reform rejected all that was contrary to modern views and habits. The Columbus Platform, however, demands ''the preservation of the Sabbath, festivals, and holydays,'' and ''the use of Hebrew, together

with the vernacular, in our worship and instruction.'' Thus the way was paved for a deeper appreciation of traditional values and symbols, a move that is paralleled by a slow awakening in some Orthodox Jewish circles to the fact that not all rules or interpretations of the past are absolute and thus unalterable, that change and evil are not necessarily synonymous. Orthodoxy is by no means a monolithic body. It knows several strands, several philosophies of a life ruled by the Law. (Its major organizations are the Rabbinical Council of America and the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.)

Differences in Modern Practice. Although the contrasts are less harsh in the 1960s than they were years ago, the differences remain. The traditional service is, except for a few Aramaic interludes, in Hebrew. However, in the typical Reform Temple (the term temple was originally chosen as a substitute for synagogue to disavow hope for the rebuilding of the shrine that was once the pride of Jews) most of the prayers are in the vernacular. Since every congregation is independent, the proportional use of Hebrew and English in Reform and Conservative congregations varies. Traditional Jews will not pray, study Torah, or perform any act of worship unless their heads are covered. If they did otherwise, they would consider it irreverent, to stand slipshod in the presence of the Lord. The Orthodox Jews who follow custom rigidly have their heads constantly covered; at services they like to wear hats, whereas Conservatives use ''yarmulkes'' (Yiddish word for skullcaps), at times of varied colors and beautifully embroidered. Reform Jews wear no head covering, following in this the conventions of Western civilization, where the bared head is a sign of respect.

In Orthodox synagogues men and women are separated. In most Conservative synagogues and all Reform temples they are seated together. In a traditional service Scripture readings and prayers are chanted; in a modernized one, they are recited in a formal manner. In all Orthodox and many Conservative synagogues, priestly descendants (their shoes removed, as was done in the Temple of Jerusalem) chant the Aaronic blessing (Nm 6.22–27) over the people. The cantillation, at times amateurish, may jar a modern musically trained ear. In a reformed service, therefore, the rabbi imparts that blessing. There, as elsewhere, a prevailing criterion is decorum.

On awakening, the pious Jew praises God for having made the new day. He blesses Him for having given him sight, for clothing him, for having renewed his strength, for granting him the power to walk, for putting firm ground under foot. There is a whole system of blessings accompanying the observant Jew throughout the day. (*See* BERAKHOT.) If rightly used, such blessings open his heart to God's nearness and the many manifestations of His goodness. Yet like all acts to be performed at stated times, they are in danger of becoming routine. Fearing such mechanization or even the ''ritualization'' of religious life, Reform Judaism—mistaking the protests of the Prophets against sacrifices devoid of love as a condemnation of all ritual—has discarded the system of blessings and many other ceremonies as well, although a new appreciation of worship is dawning. Reform Judaism continues to see itself as ''Prophetic Judaism,'' keeping alive the social concern of the Prophets; hence the involvement of many Reform Jews (not to speak here of the commitment of other Jews) in the continuing struggle to obtain social justice.

To consecrate his life to the Lord, the tradition-bound Jew wears, during the morning service, PHYLACTERIES (*t^efillîn*) on head and arm near the heart; these are small boxes containing parchment strips with the words of Ex 11.16; 13.1–10; Dt 6.4–9; 11.13–21 and attached to leather straps. At all times, or at least during the morning prayers, he wears the *ṭallît,* a fringed garment used as a prayer shawl. Its purpose is to remind him ''not to follow [his] heart and eyes in lustful urge . . . [but] to be holy to [his] God'' (Nm 15.39–40).

Dietary Laws. Hebrew DIETARY LAWS, too, are meant to hallow a Jew's life. They recall that he lives under the discipline of the Law. Rabbinical tradition requires that animals be slaughtered by a Shoḥet (*šôḥeṭ*), an expert slaughterer who must see to it that the animal dies with the least possible pain and that blood is allowed to flow off freely. The cook, too, must observe certain regulations: the meat is to be cleansed and salted, so that every drop of blood will be drawn out. All vegetables are allowed. Of the animal kingdom, only fish with scales and fins, certain kinds of fowl, and those quadrupeds that chew their food twice and have cloven hoofs are permitted. Meat and dairy products may not be eaten together; hence, two separate kinds of dishes are used, and a six-hour interval must be observed between a meal with meat and one with milk or its derivatives. Reform Judaism has discarded the idea of *kašrût* (fitness), i.e., the laws regulating kosher food, although some of its adherents will, out of a loyalty to parents or to the Jewish past, abstain from pork. While many observant Jews modify the strict requirements of the Law to suit the demands of modern life, they expect their rabbis to observe, in their stead, the traditional rules uncompromisingly.

Bar Mitzvah. Every male child is circumcised. On the Sabbath following his 13th birthday a boy is called up to read publicly the proper passage from the Torah, thus becoming BAR MITZVAH (son of the commandment, man of duty). From that time on, he is obliged to fulfill all the commandments. In quite a few American congre-

gations, there is an equivalent service for 12-year-old girls, called bat mitzvah (daughter of the comandment).

Marriage. A traditional wedding is performed under a *huppâ* (canopy), a symbol of the home, the shelter of the marital state. The ceremony consists of a number of blessings. The first praises God for having created the fruit of the vine, of which both bride and bridegroom partake. After this sharing, the bridegroom places a ring on the bride's finger: ''By this ring you are wedded unto me according to the Law of Moses and that of the people of Israel.'' Whoever officiates, commonly a rabbi, renders thanks to God for creating all things for His glory, fashioning man and woman in His image, making them companions, and granting them joy. He begs for their continued happiness and ties their hopes to the messianic hopes of the Jewish people. At the wedding, a glass is shattered to remind the bridal couple in the midst of joy, as some have it, of the destruction of Jerusalem or, as others interpret it, of the ease with which domestic sanctity and peace can be broken.

Sometime before the wedding, a marriage contract (*k^e^tûbâ*) is drawn up, and it is read aloud at the marriage ceremony; it contains, among other things, the bridegroom's promise to the bride: ''I will work for you. I will honor you. I will support and maintain you as befits a Jewish husband.'' Complicated rules govern divorce. The *gēṭ,* or bill of divorce, must be drawn up by a recognized scholar. Reform rabbis, however, accept a civil divorce as terminating a Jewish marriage. In the Reform marriage ceremony, *ḥuppâ* and *k^e^tûbâ* are almost always omitted, as well as the reference to the restoration of the Holy City. Other English prayers, however, for the wellbeing of the bride and bridegroom, are added.

Death and Burial. As his hour of death approaches, a Jew steeped in the ways of his forefathers admits shame for his sins and asks forgiveness. He begs that his pain as well as his death atone for them, that he be granted the abounding happiness stored up for the just, and that he be admitted to God's presence, where there is fullness of joy. He may appeal to the Lord to take back the soul He lent him in mercy and peace, so that the Angel of Death cannot torment him: ''Hide me in the shadow of your wings.'' He then blesses his children. When the end is truly near, those gathered around him proclaim: ''The Lord reigns, the Lord has reigned, the Lord shall reign forever and forever.'' It is considered a sign of divine favor if a man can die with the profession of faith on his lips: ''Hear O Israel! The Lord our God, the Lord is one!''

Several hours after death, the body is washed in a prescribed way and dressed in a white shroud. For a man it is the same garment he wore for the first time as bridegroom, and later at every New Year's service, on the Day of Atonement, and at the Passover meal. A prayer shawl is wound around his body. All shrouds and coffins have the same simplicity for the rich as for the poor. The moment the coffin is lowered into the grave these words are said: ''May he come to his place in peace.'' If a son buries one of his parents, he prays thus:

> May His great name be magnified and sanctified in the world that is to be created anew, where He will quicken the dead and raise them up to life eternal, where He will rebuild the city of Jerusalem and establish His Temple in its midst, and where He will uproot all alien worship from the earth and restore the worship of the true God.

This KADDISH (*qaddîš,* hallowed) is one of several similar doxologies recited on various occasions. In hallowing the name of God for 11 months, a bereaved son hopes that through the power of praise his beloved parent may find peace in God. The Kaddish does not mention the dead. Yet the mourner's Kaddish is said on every anniversary. Although Jewish tradition frowns on extreme grief—excessiveness is said to imply that the mourner is filled with greater pity than God—the Orthodox rules on various periods of mourning are complicated and quite detailed. Reform Judaism has abandoned most of the practices with which tradition has surrounded the death event, particularly those of mourning, as cumbersome, harsh, and aggravating grief rather than offering solace.

Jews and Jesus. Ever since Jamnia, Judaism has precluded belief in Jesus as the Redeemer. Although some later Jewish teaching developed with Christianity in mind, the Talmudic sages avoided direct discussion of the gospel. The few hostile passages in the Talmud that, according to the opinion of competent scholars, refer to Jesus, do so without naming Him. Moreover, in speaking of Gentiles, rabbinic literature hardly distinguishes between Christians, worshipers of the one, true God, and pagans, worshipers of idols. Maimonides seems to have been the first to hold a mildly positive view of Christ's work. Maimonides (*Mishneh Torah, Hilkhot Melakhim* 11.4) held that Jesus' teaching, like Muḥammad's, ''only served to clear the way for the King Messiah to prepare the whole world to worship God with one accord'' (cf. So 3.9). Several decades after Maimonides, another rabbi distinguished between the Gentiles referred to in the Talmud and those of his own day. He called his Christian contemporaries ''nations restricted by the ways of religion''; and those of which the Talmudic teachers speak, ''nations not delimited by the ways of religion.'' There have been others who spoke of the kindness ''the man of Nazareth wrought to the world.''

But not till Reform Judaism made its voice heard did Jesus and Christianity—topics shunned till then by most

Jews and even today by some of them—become a matter of investigation. Not until then were such words spoken as those of Sigismund Stern, a German Jewish school teacher of the middle of the 19th century: ''Judaism and Christianity must hold out a brotherly hand to each other, for the sake of their common work for mankind . . . . [The Jewish believers] must love their Christian fellow men, not merely as fellow human beings, but feel related to them in faith and bound to them with special ties.''

Since then, a new appreciation of the person of Jesus—not to be mistaken, however, for faith in Him as the Christ—has set in. Even a scholar as steeped in tradition as Joseph Klausner (1874–1958) called Jesus a great moral teacher; Claude J. G. MONTEFIORE (1859–1939), the founder of Liberal Judaism in England, saw in Him a new type of prophet; Rabbi Leo Baeck (1874–1956)—the distinguished head of German Jewry at the time of Hitler and one-time president of the World Union for Progressive Judaism—acclaimed Him as the manifestation ''of what is pure and good in Judaism.'' The Conservative theologian Rabbi Milton Steinberg (1903–50) spoke of Him as ''an extraordinarily beautiful and noble spirit, aglow with love and pity for men,'' and the existential thinker Martin Buber (1878–1965) regarded Him as ''my great brother.'' Of the several statements made by American rabbis on this theme, the most interesting are those of Maurice Eisendrath, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, though they carry no official weight. Some consider them eccentric. In 1963 he called on Jews to reappraise their ''ofttimes jaundiced view of him in whose name Christianity was established,'' and in 1965 he asked that Jesus, ''this Jewish hero,'' be incorporated ''into our never too overcrowded company of saintly spirits.''

Present and Future. The largest Jewish communities are in the U.S., Russia, and Israel. Although the state of Israel guarantees freedom of worship, Orthodoxy so dominates the religious life that it prevents the other branches of Judaism from getting a foothold. Russian Jewry is threatened with spiritual extinction for lack of a sufficient number of synagogues, of religious training, and cultural activities. No attempt has been made to gather exact statistics on the number of the synagogue-affiliated among the 5 ½ million American Jews. Nor is the ratio of Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform membership certain. There were in 1965 more than 1,600 known Orthodox congregations, many of them quite small; the Conservative and Reform synagogues numbered 770 and 640 respectively. In all likelihood, each of the three branches has about one million adherents. According to one estimate, four million avail themselves of the service of the synagogue, at the high points of life.

It is impossible to say what the future holds for the various branches, indeed for the whole of American Judaism. Jews seem to be more exposed than other people to the apathy toward, even the estrangement from, religion that marks much of modern life. There are those who predict that the unprecedented freedom and comfort American Jews enjoy will quench all religious thirst and wipe out most of the marks that distinguish them from their neighbors; after a few generations, they will be little more than ''custodians of a museum.'' There are others, however, who see American Jewish life in flux and who hope for a new flowering, indeed, the emergence of a *Minhag America,* a fresh American-bred expression of the ancient Jewish way.

Christian View of Judaism. Christians have frequently seen Judaism as a ''service of death,'' misapplying the words of St. Paul, who says in 2 Cor 3.6 that ''the letter kills but the Spirit gives life,'' i.e., that the Law, when seen as God's inexorable demands, condemns the sinner to death, whereas grace renews and quickens him. Is the Christian bound to think that Judaism, however much alive empirically, is dead in God's judgment? Or is he bound to believe that God's hand is not shortened and the workings of grace not limited? Every morning the observant Jew remembers man's frailty and dependence, as well as God's sovereign goodness:

> Master of all worlds! Not because of our just deeds do we cast our humble prayers before You but because of Your abundant mercy. What are we? What is our life? What our love? What our justice? What our victory? What our strength? What our might? What are we to say before You, O Lord our God and God of our fathers? Indeed, before Your presence, the mighty are as nothing . . . the wise as without knowledge . . . . Yet, we are Your people, the children of Your covenant, the sons of Abraham Your friend . . . . It is, therefore, our duty to thank, praise, and glorify You . . . . How good is our portion . . . , how great our happiness that early and late, morning and night, twice every day, we may proclaim: Hear O Israel! The Lord is our God, the Lord alone!

There can be no doubt that God's love hovers over those who pray thus. ''It is not true,'' writes Cardinal Liénart, Bishop of Lille, ''that Israel, the chosen people of the Old Covenant, has become an accursed people in the New. Actually, the religious destiny of Israel is a mystery of grace, and we Christians ought to ponder it with respectful sympathy'' (*Lenten Pastoral* 1960). By encouraging common Biblical and theological studies as well as fraternal dialogue between Christians and Jews, Vatican Council II has clearly shown that it considers Judaism a living faith. (See section on the Jews of the *Declaration*

on the Church's Relationship to non-Christian Religions, 1965.)

See Also: JEWS, POST-BIBLICAL HISTORY OF THE; JEWISH PHILOSOPHY.

Bibliography: G. F. MOORE, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim,* 3 v. (Cambridge, MA 1927–30). C. J. G. MONTEFIORE and H. M. J. LOEWE, eds., *A Rabbinic Anthology, Selected and Arranged with Comments and Introductions* (London 1938; pa. New York 1963). M. KADUSHIN, *The Rabbinic Mind* (New York 1952); *Organic Thinking* (New York 1938). I. EPSTEIN, *Judaism: A Historical Presentation* (Baltimore 1959). D. S. RUSSELL, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia 1964). G. G. SCHOLEM, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (3d ed. New York 1954; repr. pa. New York 1961); *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism,* tr. R. MANHEIM (New York 1964). W. G. PLAUT, *The Rise of Reform Judaism* (New York 1963–). M. DAVIS, *The Emergence of Conservative Judaism* (Philadelphia 1963). N. GLAZER, *American Judaism* (Chicago 1957). J. B. AGUS, *Guideposts in Modern Judaism* (New York 1954). J. J. PETUCHOWSKI, *Ever Since Sinai: A Modern View of Torah* (New York 1961). L. JACOBS, *Principles of the Jewish Faith* (London 1964). *The Authorised Daily Prayer Book,* ed. H. J. HERTZ (rev. ed. New York 1959). E. GARFIEL, *The Service of the Heart; A Guide to the Jewish Prayer Book* (New York 1958). L. FINKELSTEIN, ''The Jewish Religion: Its Beliefs and Practices,'' *The Jews: Their History, Culture and Religion,* 2 v., ed. L. FINKELSTEIN (3d ed. New York 1960). M. N. EISENDRATH, *Can Faith Survive?* (New York 1964). K. GALLING et al., *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* 7 v. (3d ed. Tübingen 1957–65) 3:978–1000. R. R. GEIS et al., *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche,* ed. J. HOFER and K. RAHNER, 10 v. (2d, new ed. Freiburg 1957–65) 5:1156–71.

[J. M. OESTERREICHER]

JUDAS ISCAROIT

The Apostle who betrayed Jesus. The name Judas (Ἰούδας) is derived from the Hebrew *y*[e]*hudah* (Judah), the name borne also by St. JUDE THADDEUS. Iscariot (Ἰσκαριώτης and Ἰσκαριώθ) is usually explained by the equivalent of the Hebrew *'îš-q*[e]*rîôt* (man of Carioth); a town of uncertain site in southern Judah called Carioth-Hesron is mentioned in Jos 15.25. Judas was the son of a man named Simon (Jn 6.72; 13.26). Apart from these vague notifications nothing is known about the origin of the man who betrayed Jesus.

Apostleship and Treachery. The New Testament says nothing about the vocation of Judas. His name is simply mentioned with the rest of the Twelve Apostles, always at the end of the list (Mk 3.19; Mt 10.4; Lk 6.16). Undoubtedly he joined the other Apostles on their missionary journeys (Mk 6.7; Mt 10.1; Lk 9.1–2).

No Evangelist gives a character study of Judas. The attempt to determine the crises that led to his defection deals with half knowledge. In Jn 12.6 it is said that Judas was a petty thief and that his hand dipped into the common purse for personal advantage. It seems most probable, however, that the major crisis for Judas was the same as that faced and overcome by the other Apostles, the revelation of a suffering Messiah. This is seen most clearly in Mk 8.31–33. Peter's profession of faith in Jesus as Messiah is followed by Jesus' revelation that ''the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be put to death . . . .'' The effect of this statement on the Apostles was appalling. There was no place in their thinking for a suffering Christ. As David's descendant He must be a glorious political king. Peter was so certain of this that he took Jesus aside to remonstrate with Him. And then, even worse, Jesus taught the TWELVE that, not only was He to suffer, but they, too, must follow Him, each with his own cross (Mk 8.34–35). The last half of Mark's Gospel centers on the confusion and fear of the Apostles with regard to Jesus' future suffering (Mk 9.8–11, 30–31; 10.32–34, 43–45; 13.9–13). Judas's courage and faith must have been too weak to accept such a challenge. He traded in his apostleship for the small comforts he could obtain from the common fund.

The seeming waste of perfume at the Bethany anointing disturbed a number of the Apostles (Mk 14.3–9; Mt 26.6–9), but in Jn 12.1–8 Judas is singled out as particularly offended by it. Perhaps this was the final straw for him. Mark immediately follows this incident with the statement: ''And Judas Iscariot, one of the Twelve, went to the chief priests to betray him to them'' (Mk 14.10). Judas promised to inform the Sanhedrin of a time and place in which Jesus could be seized apart from the crowd: ''The chief priests and the Scribes were seeking how they might seize him by stealth and put him to death; for they said, 'Not on the feast, or there might be a riot among the people''' (Mk 14.1–2).

The opportunity arrived during the LAST SUPPER. Jesus was separated from the crowds, and He would soon move down to the olive trees at Gethsemani; night would mask the movement of the Sanhedrin forces. Jesus' response to Judas's plotting was a feeling of intense sorrow. It was one of His own community, one of His particular friends, who was betraying Him. Our Lord's words to and about Judas at the Last Supper are a personalization of Ps 40(41).10: ''Even my friend who had my trust and partook of my bread has raised his heel against me.'' It is this sad truth that is the common element in the varying traditions of Mk 14.20; Mt 26.23–25; Lk 22.21; Jn 13.18–26.

Judas's embrace of Jesus was a tragically clever move to point out Jesus in the darkness of Gethsemani. Luke cannot bring himself to state that Judas actually kissed Our Lord (Lk 22.47–48).