Melilah
MANCHESTER JOURNAL
OF JEWISH STUDIES

Melilah
MANCHESTER JOURNAL
OF JEWISH STUDIES

Melilah

MANCHESTER JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES

Melilah: Manchester Journal of Jewish Studies is distributed electronically free of charge at http:// www.mucjs.org/MELILAH/

Melilah is an interdisciplinary journal concerned with Jewish law, history, literature, religion culture and thought in the ancient, medieval and modern eras. It was launched in 2004 by Bernard Jackson and Ephraim Nissan under the auspices of the Centre for Jewish Studies at the University of Manchester as the New Series of the journal of the same name founded by Edward Robertson and Meir Wallenstein and published (in Hebrew) by Manchester University Press from 1944 to 1955. Five substantial volumes, each of around two hundred pages, were produced before the series was discontinued. In his editorial foreword to the first edition, Robertson explained that *Melilah* had been established to promote Jewish scholarship in the face of the threat posed by the War and its aftermath. The title of the journal refers to the ears of corn that are plucked to rub in the hands before the grains can be eaten (Deut. 23:25).

CONTENTS

Note: The original page numbers from the e-journal are given in square brackets.

[1] EQUAL PARTNERS? PROSELYTISING BY AFRICANS AND JEWS IN THE 17TH CENTURY ATLANTIC DIASPORA

Tobias Green*

Abstract: This paper examines the processes by which Africans proselytised Sephardic Jews on the coast of West Africa in the 16th and 17th centuries and were in their turn proselytised by Jews both in West Africa and elsewhere in the Atlantic world in the early modern era. Drawing on a wide range of archival and published sources, it shows that these activities were far from unusual in the Atlantic world at the time, and are evidence of a world of receptivity and understanding that belies traditional interpretations of Atlantic history. Analysing the conditions which produced the atmosphere in which such mutual conversions could occur, the paper argues that a relatively equitable balance of power was central to this process. Personal knowledge and human experience were crucial in breaking down cultural barriers in a way which permitted conversion; however, the wider economic forces which facilitated these exchanges were themselves distorting power relations, helping to shape Atlantic history on its more familiar, and intolerant, path.

The Atlantic Sephardic diaspora is one which remains unfamiliar to some historians of the early modern period. Only recently, indeed, has it become a focus of study for mainstream historiography.[1] Yet this was, in the 16th and early 17th centuries, a diaspora which was almost of equal import to the trajectory of Sephardic Jews as that in the Ottoman Empire. Retaining a variable degree of Judaism beneath the cloak of an enforced Christian faith, these Sephardic New Christians became important players on both sides of the Atlantic world: in Madeira, Cabo Verde and São Tomé, and in Brazil, Mexico and Peru.

In the vast geographical space which was occupied by this diaspora, there has now been a reasonable amount of research and publication devoted to the Sephardic New Christians of the American sphere.[2] Only recently, however, has there been any sustained research and publication on the question of the activity of the diaspora in Africa. Here, landmark new research by Mark and Horta, Mendes and Green has uncovered a significant amount as to the activities of a group of Sephardim living and trading on the *petite côte* of Senegal in the first three decades of the 17th century (Mark/Horta 2004; Mendes 2004; Green 2005; 2008).[3]

---

* Post-doctoral Fellow, Centre of West African Studies, University of Birmingham. Email: T.O.Green@bham. ac.uk

[1] One should cite here particularly the essays in Bernardini and Fiering (eds.) (2001); Wachtel (2001); and Israel (2002).

[2] Looking at Brazil, one can cite the work of Novinsky (1972) and Salvador (1969) and (1978): for Colombia there is the recent excellent work of Splendiani (1997), whilst for Peru both Millar Carvacho (1997) and Castañeda Delgado/Hernández Aparicio (1989; 1995) have done important work.

[3] The *petite côte* comprises the space between the Cape Verde peninsula where the modern city of Dakar is located in Senegal – the westernmost point of Africa – south to the deltas of Sîne-Saloum, a coastline of approximately 150 kilometres. For a more precise view, see the map of the Caboverdean region (downloadable from http://www.mucjs.org/MELILAH/articles.htm).

This research has been very revealing. The Sephardim in question originated from Amsterdam, and belonged to that group of New Christians who had sought religious sanctuary in the Dutch United Provinces and returned to their ancestral faith. Their presence in Senegambia was related to the trade in wax and hides in which the region specialised in these years (Green 2005: 172–3). The community grew to be quite sizeable in the second decade of the 17th century, running its own prayer meetings with the help of Torahs imported from Europe, and having ritual butchers who killed meat according to the laws of kashrut (Mark/Horta 2004: 247, 251). However, following a disastrous trading expedition in 1612 led by the community's leader, Jacob Peregrino, the Sephardic community in Senegal fell into a long decline from which it never recovered (Green 2005: 180–182).

One of the investors in these trading ventures from Amsterdam to West Africa was a certain Diogo Dias Querido. Dias Querido is an interesting figure from the period who has been discussed by various historians in the field (Wiznitzer 1960: 47; Schorsch 2004: 178). He appears to have developed his experience of the Atlantic world through managing a sugar refinery in Bahía, north-eastern Brazil, in the 1580s (Wiznitzer 1960: 47). Here he developed a reputation as a crypto-Jew, and may have been tried by the Portuguese Inquisition during the inquisitorial visit to north-eastern Brazil of 1591–1595.[4] He arrived in Amsterdam towards the end of the 16th century and was one of the founder members of Beth Yahacob, the first synagogue in the city.

[2] There is some circumstantial evidence suggesting that Dias Querido's work in Bahía may have brought him into personal contact with the peoples of the Senegambian coast in the 1580s.[5] This may perhaps explain his willingness to invest heavily in trading voyages to the region once established in Amsterdam, and also perhaps one of the more controversial elements of his Jewish practice in the Dutch United Provinces: for Dias Querido was one of those who actively sought to convert his African slaves to Judaism (Schorsch 2004: 178; see also IAN/TT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Livro 59, folio 130v).

The conversion of a Jewish master's slaves to Judaism was in fact far from unknown in Amsterdam, and, later, in the Sephardic colony of Suriname (Arbell 2002: 108). The congregational records of the 1640s reveal several interdictions regarding the participation of African members of the congregation in synagogal services (GAA, Portuguese Jewish Archives, Book 19, folios 173, 224, 281). This is evidence both of a reasonable African contingent in the congregation, and of a hardening of the inclusiveness which had characterised the congregation in its early years, a hardening which itself was probably the corollary of an increasingly racialised discourse as the 17th century unfolded.

At the same time, moreover, as Africans were being converted to Jews in Amsterdam (and elsewhere), an analogous process was occurring in reverse on the West African coast. Sephardim who had taken up residence in Senegambia, and second and third generation Sephardic New Christians residing here and on the Guinea Coast, increasingly adopted

---

[4] *Ibid.*, a deposition to the inquisitors of Lisbon after Querido's death noted that, when in Bahía, he had been an intimate of New Christians suspected of Judaising (IAN/TT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Livro 209, folio 679r).

[5] Thus in André Alvares d'Almada's account of the Senegambian region, written in 1578, he stated that the island of Gorée – situated just a few miles to the north of where the subsequent Sephardic communities of Senegambia were located – was a port of call for most of the foreign ships going to Sierra Leone, the pepper coast (Liberia), Brazil and the Spanish Indies. Moreover, says Almada, here they dealt with the mayor of Portudal (sic) – the subsequent centre for Jewish communities in the region – who was the overseer of the Wolof king's property. Almada (1994: 35).

elements of African religion.⁶ This was indeed a long-standing process, since as long ago as 1546 an accusation had been made to the Portuguese inquisitorial tribunal of Évora that the New Christians who lived on the African coast were adopting elements of African religious practice (A. Teixeira da Mota 1978: 8).⁷

This paper seeks to build on this evidence of a mutual receptivity of Sephardim and the peoples of this part of West Africa towards the religious practices of one another. For in this evidence of accommodation and reciprocity emerge ideas concerning the practice and the relationship of Africans and Europeans in this period which are at odds with some more traditional historiography. The willingness of Africans and Jews to adopt the faiths of one another hints at a clear acceptance by each group of certain common values, and at a level of cultural respect – it is not a world of exclusion, prejudice and unmitigated exploitation.⁸

Thus through this investigative framework we can attempt to answer some critical questions. What was it that allowed distinct groups such as Senegambians and Sephardim to find a shared context for their religious practice? And what was it, by contrast, which allowed this shared context to be overshadowed, permitting a more polarised Atlantic world to emerge? By studying how the process of mutual conversion worked, and how it eventually declined, we can perhaps begin to understand whether the Atlantic world which eventually emerged in the long 18th century had to be as brutal and as tragic as it turned out to be.

1

[3] By the early 17th century, one of the most unlikely centres for proselytising activity on the part of Jewry was the coast of West Africa. Many of the Sephardic New Christians who apostasised from Christianity and began to practise elements of Judaism did so after visiting the ports of Senegambia and Upper Guinea.⁹ One of them, Antonio Espinosa, gave a typical account of the evangelical activities of Jews in the port of Cacheu (modern Guiné-Bissau) *circa* 1630:

One day he and his crewmates gathered with four Portuguese men who knew Captain Correa [the captain of the ship in which Espinosa was sailing, who had already tried to convert Espinosa to Judaism] and they all said so many things to [Espinosa] about the Mosaic law, discoursing about it for a long time, and recounting how God had given the law to Moses on the mountain, and how on his descent from it he had found the people of Israel

---

⁶ The region of Senegambia comprises the area between the estuaries of the rivers Senegal and Gambia (the northern section of the modern country of Senegal); the Guinea Coast refers to the land south of the Gambia in what today is southern Senegal, Guiné-Bissau and northern Guinea.

⁷ The accusation stated that they had become polygamous and were indulging in animist rites; however it should be noted that polygamy is not itself universally prohibited by the Jewish faith.

⁸ This is, moreover, a direction in which recent historiography on both the Guinea Coast region and on Creole Societies of the Lusophone world is beginning to move. Lingna Nafafé (2007) argues strongly for a climate of mutual exchange rather than of mutual hostility on the Guinea Coast in this region, whilst the essays on Creole societies in Havik and Newitt (eds.) (2007) emphasise as a whole the need for co-operation in the construction of the Creole world.

⁹ For a full discussion of the role of West Africa in the apostasy of crypto-Jews of the 17th century, see Green (2007c).

fallen into idolatry, spending more than a whole sheet of paper explaining this to him, so that at the end [Espinosa] decided to follow the Mosaic law himself.[10]

However, this evangelical activity was not limited to the New Christians (and Old Christians) who passed through the region. The more devout Sephardim in the area began to proselytise some of their African servants and slaves. A document written in around 1620 referring to the "stubbornness" [*pertinacia*] of the New Christians around the world cited especially the dangers of the New World Amerindians being "perverted" by the many New Christians who were then making their way to the Viceroyalty of Peru via the River Plate. It was noted that:

> . . . the Gentiles [Amerindians] are at great risk of being taught Judaism, as experience has shown that this occurs in some of the provinces of Guinea, where [the people of the Hebrew nation] manage to teach Jewish rites and ceremonies to the Gentiles.[11]

This general evidence related to the conversion of Africans to Judaism on the Guinea Coast can be supplemented by other findings in the relevant archives. Mulatto Jews belonged to the congregation of Sephardim established in Portudal, Senegambia, in the 1610s (IAN/TT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Livro 58, folio 155r; IAN/TT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Livro 205, folio 583v). And moreover there was a widespread anxiety among the Christian community of the Portuguese settlements of West Africa regarding the religious activities of the Sephardim. Thus in a letter of July 30th 1635, the Bishop of Cabo Verde recounted a story which, for him, had all the hallmarks of another Jewish conversion in West Africa. Three African servants had circumcised themselves, although they were Christians; this was a matter of perplexity, since they gave signs of being good Christians: nonetheless, they were put in the stocks and given harsh penance as a warning to others (IAN/TT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Livro 217, folio 475v).

In this last case one can see many of the difficulties which emerge when trying to understand this question of conversion by Africans to Judaism. The bishop of Cabo Verde appeared to assume that circumcision was an irrefutable sign of Jewish influence, and was therefore somewhat confused by the strong signs of Christian faith among these "converts". Yet circumcision was just as strong a cultural practice for the peoples of the coasts of Senegambia and Guinea as it was for Sephardim. It may well be that there was nothing "Jewish" about this last trait at all, and that the auto-circumcision of these three Africans was merely a melding of their ancestral practice with Christianity.

The problem with such cases, in other words, is that of the perceptions and preconceptions of the sources. There was a certain blurring at the edges in the way in which Sephardim and Africans were perceived by *[4]* Iberian Christians of the early modern period. This makes specifics as regards the precise ritual activities of Judaism which Africans *may* have adopted in Senegambia elusive. As Sephardim had until recently been the stereotyped "other" of Iberian culture, Africans were often perceived through a Sephardic lens. It was this which led some of the first navigators to reach the Senegambian coast to believe that there were

---

[10]   AHN, Sección Inquisición, Libro 1031, folios 114v–115r. Original: "*y todos le dixeron al reo tantas cosas de la lei de moisses discurriendo el reo mui largo en ellas, y en el modo que dios abia dado la lei de Moisses en el monte, y como bajando del habia hallado que los del pueblo de isrrael abian idolatrado, gastando en esto mas de un pliego de papel, q al cavo el reo se avia resuelto de guardar la dicha lei*".

[11]   BL, Egerton, MS 344, folios 98r–v. Original: "*como por experiencia le tienen visto q hacen en algunas provincias de Guinea, adonde procuran ensenhar las cerimonias y ritos Judaicos a los Gentiles*".

communities of Jews here already – the griots, or praisesingers, whom, like Iberian Jews, lived in ghettos, married within their caste and were buried outside the communal cemetery.[12]

In such circumstances, the existence of a corroborative source for the conversions of Africans to Judaism is important, and in this case we are fortunate to have such a source through the existence of the aforementioned converted African Jews who were members of the Amsterdam synagogue in the early 17th century. Here the thorough research of Jonathan Schorsch on the relationship between Africans and Jews in the Atlantic world is of interest. Schorsch notes how no more than 15 Africans were buried in the community cemetery at Oudekerk in the years 1614–30 and 1680–1716 (Schorsch 2004: 178). This implies a thorough integration into the rituals of Judaism, as does the above-cited regulation that Africans could not read Torah portions in the synagogue of Amsterdam – implying that hitherto they had done so.[13] Although, as Schorsch notes, this must have represented a very small minority of cases, it nonetheless is evidence that such conversions did occur, and therefore supports the evidence noted above that they also occurred in West Africa.

Moreover, that the Sephardic communities of the Atlantic world were open to the conversion of Africans or those of African descent is attested by subsequent developments in the Atlantic. As Arbell has shown, the Dutch colony of Surinam on the northern coast of South America is of particular relevance here. In Surinam, the Sephardic population amounted to something like one third of the total population of free persons in the colony. Some of the Sephardim had sexual relations with African slaves in the colony, and a number of mixed race children were born (Arbell 2002: 108).

Although most of these children had not been born to Jewish mothers, many of them were instructed in the Jewish faith and took the names of Portuguese Jews. In the mid-18th century, as the community gravitated from the plantations towards Paramaribo, the colony's capital, many of these free mulattos became craftsmen and shopkeepers, some becoming quite wealthy. A ruling of 1754 entitled them to be admitted as members of the Jewish community, if not as *yehidim* (full-fledged members), and by 1759 a *siva*, or brotherhood of Jewish mulattos was established known as *Darkhe Sevarim* (The Ways of the Righteous).[14]

While this congregation consisted largely of the descendants of male Sephardim, and thus not of non-Jews who had been converted *per se*, the 1787 Hascamoth of the congregation included a provision which made it clear that blacks and mulattos were freely joining the congregation even though they had no Jewish forebears:

> About the difference between a full member and a congregant, it is resolved that all Jewish mulattos, blacks, mestizas and castices who carry the name of, or are known to be descended from the Portuguse/Spanish nation, will be considered "Congreganten". All other Negroes (sic) and Mulatto Jews who want to join voluntarily in the Portuguese Jewish persuasion as "Congregant", will be obliged to affirm this with their signature at the time of their acceptance, one and for all on equal terms.[15]

It is not clear from this Hascamah whether these converts were proselytised or whether they were voluntary congregants attracted in part by a thriving religious community. Yet even if

---

[12] This issue is discussed in much greater detail in Green (2007b), Part I.

[13] See above, 2.

[14] *Ibid.* The *yehidim* constituted the core of the community from which readers of Torah portions, and ritual officers were chosen. The term used is that of the congregation itself.

[15] *Ibid.* Note that "congreganten" is the Dutch spelling.

this cannot therefore be taken as evidence of an overt, proselytising effort on the part of the Sephardim in the Atlantic *[5]*world, it does still show a certain openness and tolerance of difference within the Sephardic community, and a recognition on the part of some that Africans, or those of African origin, could be members of a Jewish community.[16]

When one considers this evidence on the conversion of Africans to Judaism, it appears both logical and anomalous. The logic follows on from the fact that, in contrast to the stereotypes which existed – and exist – with regards to the closed nature of the Jewish community, Jews had traditionally been open to the conversion of non-Jews into their fold. As the scholar of the Sephardim, B. Netanyahu, has pointed out, the great Jewish sage born in medieval Iberia, Maimonides, had once written that people of all nations were able to be Jews,[17] while in Roman times Cassius Dio had written that he could not define who the Jews were "except to say that they are a people of different races who follow the laws of the Jews".[18]

Yet in spite of this history of openness there is something anomalous in this story, and this is that it was in opposition to the prevailing trends of the early modern era. For while it is true that the Jewish faith had in ancient and even medieval times been open to people converting from other faiths, it is also true that in Iberia this openness had been severely curtailed by the mid-13th century statutes of Alfonso X "*el sabio*" prohibiting any proselytising activity on the part of Jews (and Moslems).

Nevertheless, the evidence shows that this proselytising is what occurred, at least somewhat, in the early modern Atlantic. What is implied is a certain openness towards Africa and Africans on the part of the Sephardim, and towards Judaism on the part of Africans. It was in fact those Sephardim who had close personal knowledge of Africa and Africans who generally engaged in proselytising activity, men such as Diogo Dias Querido or the slave owners of Surinam. Knowledge and understanding of those of a different culture could bring respect and a desire to integrate, as the Sephardim themselves had discovered in West Africa.

2

While, as this paper has already noted, an active Sephardic community did exist on the Senegambian coast in the early 17th century, most of the Sephardic New Christians who came to this part of West Africa in the early modern period did so nominally as Christians. Whilst some of them retained a deep attachment to Judaism, and practised elements of the faith's rituals, most practised a sort of hybrid faith, maintaining some of the cultural and religious traditions of Judaism and some of those of Christianity; others were outright sceptics of all religion, perhaps hardly surprising given the experience of their parents'

---

[16] By contrast, the arrival of Ashkenazim in Paramaribo in the late 18th century caused severe tensions between Ashkenazim and Sephardim, and after a difficult spell of co-existence the Ashkenazim built a separate synagogue. *Ibid*., 108–111.

[17] Netanyahu (1997), 6 n.30: any person "who becomes a proselyte anywhere, whether he is an Edomite, an Ammonite, a Moabite, an Ethiopian [African] or of any other nation, and whether male or female, he is permitted to enter the congregation at once".

[18] *Ibid*., 6.

generation in Iberia.[19] As Israel has shown, the categories of "Jew" and "Crypto-Jew" were to a certain degree artificial in the early modern Atlantic; there was more of a continuum between the two groups, with individuals practising greater or lesser degrees of Judaism and Christianity (Israel 2002: 146).

Many of these New Christian *lançados* adapted quickly to cultural practices of West Africa. Already, as we have seen, by 1546 the New Christians of Guinea were said to be adopting elements of African religion.[20] Similarly, the most powerful Portuguese in the Senegambian region in the middle of the 16th century, known as Ganagoga, was a New Christian who had made a marriage alliance with the Fulani king (Almada 1994: 36; see also Carreira 1972: 67-8).[21] This can only have been possible through the willingness of Ganagoga to assimilate into the dominant cultural atmosphere of the Fulani of Futa Toro.[22]

Indeed, the trajectory of the New Christians in this region of West Africa in the 16th and 17th century centuries is largely that of a small minority group gradually being assimilated. While in the 17th century New Christian escapees from the Inquisition such as Alvaro Gonçalves Frances and João Rodrigues Freire continued to practise Jewish rituals in the region, and to convert New Christians to crypto-Judaism, their children became fully assimilated.[23] Alvaro's son Jorge, for instance, married a certain Crispina Peres who was later tried by the Inquisition in Lisbon on charges of witchcraft, having performed certain local religious practices in the port of Cacheu; in his testimony to the inquisitors, written in the mid-1660s, Jorge Gonçalves Frances recounted how there were only four people in Cacheu who followed the Catholic ritual without incorporating any pagan rituals.[24] As there remained not an inconsiderable population of New Christians there at this date, this is evidence that many of them had adopted African religious practice.

The religious world which the Sephardim found on the coast of Guinea was one that was both familiar and strange. During her trial by the Inquisition in the 1660s, Jorge Gonçalves Frances's wife, Crispina Peres, was accused of sorcery and worshipping fetishes, of organising pagan ceremonies on one of Jorge Gonçalves Frances's boats which involved a libation with cow's blood, of using local healers when her daughter fell ill in an attempt to discover who had poisoned her, and of keeping a bewitched snake.[25] This belief in and use of bewitched

---

[19] The variety of different religious positions of the New Christians in Cabo Verde is exposed fully in Green (2007b).

[20] See above, n.7.

[21] "Ganagoga" meant "someone who speaks all languages" in the language of the Bainung people of Casamance (southern Senegal). Almada says that this is how this individual was known in the region, whereas his original name was João Ferreira. Almada is in fact the only source we have for this individual's New Christian origins, and Ganagoga is only very briefly mentioned in one other source for the period.

[22] The Fulani, also known as the Peul, are a nomadic people who can be found from the Futa Toro region of northern Senegal through to Hausaland in northern Nigeria. In Senegal, their lands bordered the Wolof kingdoms to the east. There is also a considerable Fulani grouping in modern Guinea, which originated after a migration to the south led by the Fulani king Koli Tenguela in the 16th century. The Fulani have historically been thought of as an outcast group in West African societies, not only because of their nomadism but also since they have a markedly different appearance to other peoples in the region, being very tall and light-skinned. Ethnographers dispute as to whether they migrated from the Yemeni region of Saudi Arabia or rather from ancient Egyptian civilisations. For a more detailed grasp of the peoples of the region, see the "Peoples and Cultures" map (downloadable from http://www.mucjs.org/MELILAH/articles.htm).

[23] A full account of these practices and activities is found in Green (2007b): for Alvaro Gonçalves Frances see Part III, Chapter 3; for João Rodrigues Freire, see Part IV, Chapter 3.

[24] The best account of this is Havik (2004), 107–20.

[25] *Ibid.*, 107–8.

snakes in the cultural practice of this region of Africa is an ancient one that remained current into the 20th century, as emerged in the famous autobiography of the Guinean writer *[7]*Camara Laye, *L'Enfant Noir*, in which Laye described how – in the 1930s – his father kept a certain black snake which warned him of all that was to happen (Green 2002: 72).[26]

Yet to go with this sense of foreignness were ritual practices which were familiar. Circumcision was commonplace. The cultures of the Guinea Coast were matrilineal, in keeping with the matrilineality of the Jewish faith (Newitt 1992: 42). And though polygamy was practised, this is not itself universally prohibited by the Jewish faith. Instead the practice of diasporic Jews has often been to follow the marital customs of their host cultures, that is to be polygamous among the Moslems and monogamous among the Christians. Given this heritage of adaptability, the demands of polygamy would have been acceptable to many New Christians in West Africa.

In these circumstances one must recognise that there was a certain degree of inevitability in the adoption of African religious practice by these Sephardic New Christians. Where there were very few Jews, or even crypto-Jews, assimilation into the dominant cultural praxis was an obvious choice. By the mid-17th century those who genuinely wanted to be Jews were able to go to Amsterdam and London, or to the nascent communities in the Caribbean, as well as to the Ottoman Empire. These were areas to which the African coast had a long-standing connection, and thus those New Christians who failed to go were, by default, opting for the adoption of African religious practice.

This might imply that the choice of whether or not to adopt African rituals was down to the Sephardim themselves, were it not for an important additional datum. This is that the only region in this part of West Africa which had a recognised synagogue, Senegambia, was a region where many of these cultural characteristics did not pertain. The cultures in Senegambia were patrilineal, not matrilineal like those of Guinea (Havik 2004: 26–7; Brooks 2003: 51–2). This was moreover a region heavily influenced by Islam, the religion of the dominant Wolof people of the region. These cultural factors were crucial to the existence of the Jewish community in Senegambia. Judaism was a faith recognised and discussed in the *Qur'an*, while the existence of a patrilineal culture made intermarriage and integration into the host community difficult (*ibid*.). In these circumstances, it was much easier for the Sephardim to retain their own community and their separate practices which were recognised by the dominant religion of the region, Islam.

Paradoxically, it was in fact precisely the cultural points of similarity in the region of Guinea south of the Gambia river – matrilineality in particular – which made it easier for Sephardim to assimilate into the host culture and to lose their distinctive Jewishness. The conversion of the Jews to African religious practice was, therefore, whilst apparently a choice on their part, influenced by complex cultural factors which depended upon African realities and decisions.

This reveals that in the case of the conversions both of Africans to Judaism and of Jews to African religions, the main accent of emphasis for the conversion resided with the proselytiser rather than the proselytised. In this sense, Africans and Sephardim were equal partners in

---

[26] Camara Laye's masterpiece, *Le Regard du Roi*, was reissued as *The Radiance of the King* by New York Review of Books in 2001. This novel also references the use of snakes in the ritual of the Guinea coast.

the complex cultural interactions which accompanied the rise of the Atlantic world in the early modern era. Each group had the cultural facility both to open to another cultural practice, and to accept the other group into their practice. And this is of vital importance, since this reality hints at a level of potential co-operation and understanding which is at odds with the general perception of the trajectory of the Atlantic world in these years.

3

It is perhaps a melancholic truism that few movements are as new as they may seem. The roots of many innovations may well be seen in previous developments. Often, a moment of brilliance in art or literature *[8]*is itself derivative of something else; and the same can be seen in social change, even in a space like the early modern Atlantic, which was in so many ways an entirely novel space, and an early prototype for the sort of porous internationalism so common in the 21st century.

This conversion of Africans and Jews to the religions of one another appears as something of a surprise. But it is a surprise to readers of this paper perhaps largely because it is not a subject which has hitherto been given much attention. To the individuals involved, and in the time and space in which they moved, the reality would have been very different – and not so much of a surprise.

Firstly, one must recognise that from the moment of African-European contact on the coast of Guinea, a tradition developed of the conversion of Africans to the dominant European religion, Christianity. This was of course most marked through the onset of the trans-Atlantic slave trade. The entire moral justification of this trade was couched in the terms of the "saving" of African souls through their conversion to Christianity.[27] The islands of Cabo Verde were originally something of a holding ground for recently enslaved Africans, where the new slaves were instructed in the rudiments of Christianity, "converted", and then shipped across the Atlantic to continue with their "saved" existence elsewhere.

The importance of the conversion of Africans to Christianity in the rising ideology of the Atlantic world in the early modern era is underlined by the perception of Africans once this process had been completed. For, unlike the Amerindians, African slaves were seen as falling under the jurisdiction of the Inquisition in America – as, in other words, fully rational humans (Thornton 1998: 141; see also Green 2007c: 37). This therefore emphasised the role of conversion in the moral underpinning of the slave trade and in the economic fabric of the Atlantic world.

The key in this process transcended mere hypocrisy. What was at stake was the conversion of the subjugated majority to the religion practised by the dominant minority – that is, to the religion of the dominant power in the space in question. And this was something which in fact was in keeping with other trends in areas influenced by the Iberian world in this period.

One must, for instance, recall that there was a precedent for this process of conversion even in the recent history of the Sephardim themselves. As the brilliant scholars of the Sephardim Netanyahu and Roth have convincingly argued, many of the Jews of Spain had

---

[27]   Here the authorities followed Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas in asserting that one part of mankind had been set aside by nature to be slaves in the service of masters, and that such a slave depended on his master to exercise his choices for him. Russell-Wood (1978), 33–34.

converted to Christianity entirely voluntarily in the century between 1391 and 1492 (Roth 2002: 33-45; more generally, Netanyahu 1966, Kamen 1997, Green 2007a). While there had been some initial violence, the conversions which followed the fiery preaching of St Vincent Ferrer and the debates at Tortosa in the early 15th century were due rather to the failure of leadership and intellect in the Jewish community than to the conversions having been mostly forced (Roth 2002: 45ff).

Nor was this preceding history of conversion in Iberia limited to the Jews. Following the forced conversion of the Moslems of Spain in the first 20 years of the 16th century, many of them genuinely desired to adopt the Christian faith. The development of the Moslem apostasy in Spain was due principally to the abject failure of the religious authorities to institute adequate instruction of the *moriscos* rather than to any inherent seditiousness of the Islamic "fifth column".[28] In 1570, the *moriscos* of Valencia asked to be given priests and have churches built for them; otherwise, as they quite reasonably pointed out, "[we] will never be good Christians" (BL, Egerton MS 1510, folio 153v).

Moreover, one should not believe that this history of conversion was limited to Africans, Jews and Moslems. A common example of denunciations in the archives of the Portuguese Inquisition relate to *[9]*Portuguese residents in the region of Ceuta (Morocco), then in Portuguese hands, adopting the Islamic faith – that is, assimilating to the dominant creed of North Africa. Elsewhere in North Africa, in 1623 Amador Lozado, the captain of the fort at Arguim off the Mauritanian coast, was accused of being a secret Moslem, living with Moslem concubines and oppressing all the Christians in the fortress (IAN/TT, Inquisição de Lisboa, Livro 211, folios 192r–193r). Nor was this process confined to Africa, since in 1585 the inquisitors of Goa complained about the Old Christians who had gone to live among the Moors and converted (IAN/TT, CGSO, Livro 100, folio 15r, 17r).

There were, in other words, many contemporary examples to hand of peoples adopting the religions of others with whom they had come into close contact. In this sense there was nothing unusual about the process which has been outlined in this paper with regard to the Africans of the Upper Guinea Coast and the Sephardim. Yet as these examples also reveal, this process of conversion usually occurred when one or other of the groups was in a position of dominance within a given space. Thus what these stories of conversion can tell us is something about both the political and social condition of various nodes in the Atlantic at this time, and how the Africans and Sephardim viewed one another.

This is a subject which has recently entered the mainstream of Atlantic historiography following Jonathan Schorsch's magisterial book, *Jews and Blacks in the Early Modern World* (Schorsch 2004). Schorsch's analysis reveals the diversity of attitudes of Sephardim towards Africans and African-descended peoples in the Atlantic world, ranging from outright racism to co-operation and conversion. This range of attitudes suggests that the adoption of racist attitudes in the Atlantic was by no means an inevitability. Many other types of relationship were possible at the first meetings of Africans and Europeans, including those of reciprocity and co-operation.[29]

From the foregoing analysis, it would appear that central elements in this framework of reciprocity were personal experience and contact in a space with a relatively equitable

---

[28] This argument is set out in detail in Green (2007a), Chapter 7.
[29] This idea is explored in Nafafé (2007).

balance of power. Those Sephardim who did proselytise their slaves in Amsterdam appear, like Diogo Dias Querido, often to have been those who had personal knowledge of the African coast. At the same time, this contact was couched within a political reality where the African kings were undisputed political masters of the coast.[30] Personal relationships with Africans derived from a sphere where there was an equitable balance of power which did not foster prejudice, but rather a belief in a common, shared humanity, and in the applicability of religious tropes to peoples of different backgrounds.

Yet at the same time, the first 150 years of the trans-Atlantic slave trade had done much to weaken the power of the polities of Senegambia and Upper Guinea. The arrival of more horses had challenged existing military relationships and led to the fragmentation of the Wolof empire into 5 sub-kingdoms; it may also have weakened the hold of the empire of Mali over the principality of Kaabu, in modern Guiné-Bissau, leading to a power transfer from Niani, the previous capital of Mali located on the border of modern Guinea and Mali, to Songhai, further east into the central Sahel (Levtzion 1980: 96; Curtin 1975: 9). Thus, although personal contacts between Sephardim and Africans could lead to reciprocity and shared purpose, these contacts occurred within a wider framework where the conditions necessary for these harmonious relationships – an equitable balance of power – were being eroded.

One cannot therefore say that the rise of modern racism and prejudice in the Atlantic world was an inevitability. The shared conversions of Africans and Sephardim outlined in this paper, and the conditions in which they occurred, belie this familiar hypothesis. Yet at the same time, the conditions for relationships based on mutual humanity were eroded by economic conditions from the very moment that these relationships began. And thus, in spite of this paper's excursus into a secret history with more positive overtones, does the trajectory of Atlantic history retain its classical aura of tragic inevitability.

[10]ABBREVIATIONS

AHN Archivo Histórico Nacional, Madrid
BL British Library
CGSO *Conselho Geral do Santo Officcio* (documentary resource in IAN/TT)
GAA Gemeentearchief, Amsterdam
IAN/TT Instituto dos Arquivos Nacionais da Torre do Tombo, Lisbon

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Almada, André Alvares d' (1994): *Tratado Breve dos Rios de Guiné e Cabo Verde*, ed. Ferronha, António Luis Alves. Algevirão: Editorial da Ministério da Educação.

Arbell, Mordechai (2002): *The Jewish Nation of the Caribbean: The Spanish-Portuguese Jewish Settlement in the Caribbean and the Guianas*. Jerusalem: Gegen Publishing House.

Bernardini, Paolo and Fiering, Norman (eds.) (2001): *The Jews and the Expansion of Europe to the West, 1450–1800*. New York: Berghahn Books.

---

[30] For an example proving this power dynamic see Green (2005), 177, 182–3.

Brooks, George E. (1993): *Landlords and Strangers: Ecology, Society and Trade in Western Africa, 1000–1630*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Carreira, António (1972): *Cabo Verde: Formaçao e Extinçao de Uma Sociedade Escravocrata (1460–1878)*. Porto: Centro de Estudos da Guiné Portuguesa.

Castañeda Delgado, Paulino and Hernández Aparicio, Pilar (1989): *La Inquisición de Lima (1570–1635)*. Madrid: Editorial DEIMOS.

Castañeda Delgado, Paulino and Hernández Aparicio, Pilar (1995): *La Inquisición de Lima (1635–1696)*. Madrid: Editorial DAEMUS.

Curtin, Philip D. (1975): *Economic Change in Precolonial Africa: Senegambia in the Era of the Slave Trade*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Green, Toby (2002): *Meeting the Invisible Man: Secrets and Magic in West Africa*. London: Phoenix.

Green, Tobias (2005): "Further Considerations on the Sephardim of the Petite Cote", *History in Africa* 32 (2005), pp. 165–183.

Green, Tobias (2007a): *Inquisition: The Reign of Fear*. London: Macmillan.

Green, Tobias (2007b): *Masters of Difference: Creolization and the Jewish Presence in Cabo Verde, 1497–1672*. University of Birmingham – Unpublished PhD dissertation.

Green, Tobias (2007c): "The Role of the Portuguese Trading Posts of Guinea and Angola in the "Apostasy" of Crypto-Jews in the 17th Century", pp. 25–40 of Havik and Newitt (eds.) (2007).

Green, Toby (2008: forthcoming): "Amsterdam and the African Atlantic: The Role of Sephardim From Amsterdam in Senegal in the 17th Century", in Pomeroy, H et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 14th British Conference of Judaeo-Spanish Studies*.

*[11]*Havik, Philip J. (2004): *Silence and Soundbytes: The Gendered Dynamics of Trade and Brokerage in the pre-Colonial Guinea Bissau Region*. Muenster/New York: Lit Verlag/Transaction Publishers.

Havik, Philip J. and Newitt, Malyn (eds.) (2007): *Creole Societies in the Portuguese Colonial Empire*. Bristol: Bristol University Press, Lusophone Studies.

Israel, Jonathan I. (2002): *Diasporas Within a Diaspora: Jews, Crypto-Jews and the World Maritime Empires (1540–1740)*. Leiden: Brill.

Kamen, Henry (1997): *The Spanish Inquisition: A Historical Revision*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Levtzion, Nehemia (1980; first published 1969): *Ancient Ghana and Mali*. New York: Africana Publishing Company.

Mark, Peter and Horta, José da Silva (2004): "Two Early Sephardic Communities on Senegal's Petite Côte", *History in Africa* 31 (2004), pp. 231–256.

Mendes, António de Almeida (2004): "Le Rôle de l'Inquisition en Guinée: Vicissitudes des Présences Juives Sur la Petite Côte (XVe–XVIIe Siècles)", in *Revista Lusófona de Ciência das Religiões*, Ano III, 2004, no.5/6, pp. 137–155, also published at http://cienciareligioes.ulusofona.pt.

Millar Carvacho, René (1997): *Inquisición y Sociedad en el Virreinato Peruano: Estudios Sobre el Tribunal de la Inquisición en Lima*. Santiago de Chile: Ediciones Universidad Católica de Chile.

Mota, A. Teixeira da (1978): *Some Aspects of Portuguese Colonization and Sea Trade in West Africa in the 15th and 16th Centuries*. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Nafafé, José Lingna (2007): *Colonial Encounters: Issues of Culture, Hybridity and Creolisation. Portuguese Mercantile Settlers in West Africa*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Netanyahu, B. (1966): *The Marranos of Spain: from the late XIVth to the early XVIth century, according to contemporary Hebrew sources*. New York: American Academy of Jewish Research.

Netanyahu, B. (1997): *Towards the Inquisition: Essays on Jewish and Converso History in Late Medieval Spain*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Newitt, Malyn (1992): "Mixed Race Groups in the Early History of Portuguese Expansion", pp. 35–52 of Earle, T.F. and Parkinson, Stephen (eds.) (1992): *Studies in the Portuguese Discoveries: Proceedings of the First Colloquium of the Centre for the Study of the Portuguese Discoveries*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips Ltd..

Novinsky, Anita (1972): *Cristãos Novos na Bahia*. São Paulo: Editôra Perspectiva.

Roth, Norman (2002; 2nd edition): *Conversos, Inquisition, and the Expulsion of the Jews From Spain*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Russell-Wood, A.J.R. (1978): "Iberian Expansion and the Issue of Black Slavery: Changing Portuguese Attitudes, 1440–1770", *American Historical Review* 83/1, pp. 16–42.

Salvador, José Gonçalves (1969): *Cristãos-Novos, Jesuítas e Inquisição: Aspectos de sua Actuação nas Capitanias do Sul, 1530–1680*. São Paulo: Editôra da Universidade de São Paulo.

*[12]*Salvador, José Gonçalves (1978): *Os Cristãos-Novos e o Comércio no Atlântico Meridional (com enfoque nas Capitanias do Sul 1530–1680)*. São Paulo: Livraria Pioneira Editora.

Schorsch, Jonathan (2004): *Jews and Blacks in the Early Modern World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Splendiani, Anna María (1997): *Cincuenta Años de Inquisición en el Tribunal de Cartagena de las Indias, 1610–60*. Santafé de Bogotá: Centro Editorial Javeriano CEJA; 4 vols.

Thornton, John (1998): *Africa and Africans in the Making of the Atlantic World, 1400–1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2nd revised edition.

Wachtel, Nathan (2001): *La Foi du Souvenir: Labyrinthes Marranes*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Wiznitzer, Arnold (1960): *Jews in Colonial Brazil*. New York: Columbia University Press.

MAP 2. CABOVERDEAN REGION, 16th-17th CENTURIES

MAURITANIA

SENEGAL

MALI

THE GAMBIA

GUINEA-
BISSAU

Jeta Island

Bijagos
Archipelago

GUINEA-CONAKRY

SIERRA LEONE

Pepel
Djola
Manjaco
Balanta
Wolof
Mande
Susu
Peul
Susu Djalonke

Peoples and Cultures

AN INDEX TO FREY'S JEWISH INSCRIPTIONS
IN RECENT NEW EDITIONS

David Lincicum*

Abstract: This index indicates which inscriptions in J.-B. Frey's *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum* (*CIJ*), long seen to be in need of revision, have been re-edited in the six excellent volumes of Jewish inscriptions published recently in two series by Cambridge University Press and Mohr Siebeck in Tübingen. Though each of these volumes has its own index to Frey's corpus, to combine them here may facilitate ease of reference, especially helpful in evaluating older works which make reference to inscriptions by Frey's numbers.

The modest purpose of this index is to indicate which inscriptions in J.-B. Frey's *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum* (*CIJ*),[1] long seen to be in need of revision, have been re-edited in the six excellent volumes of Jewish inscriptions published recently in two series by Cambridge University Press and Mohr Siebeck in Tübingen. Though each of these volumes has its own index to Frey's corpus, to combine them here may facilitate ease of reference, especially helpful in evaluating older works which make reference to inscriptions by Frey's numbers. Of course, this is only a provisional index, and it is to be hoped that once the *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaeae/Palaestinae* project has been completed, a comprehensive index to Jewish inscriptions including much more information will be made available.[2]

The following abbreviations are here used:

JIGRE   William Horbury and David Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

JIWE 1–2   David Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe. Volume I: Italy (Excluding the City of Rome), Spain and Gaul; Volume II: The City of Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, 1995).

IJudO 1–3   *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis*: David Noy, Alexander Panayotov, and Hanswulf Bloedhorn, *Volume 1: Eastern Europe* (TSAJ 101; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004); Walter Ameling, *Band 2: Kleinasien* (TSAJ 99; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004); David Noy and Hanswulf Bloedhorn, *Volume 3: Syria and Cyprus* (TSAJ 102; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

---

*   D.Phil. Candidate, Keble College, University of Oxford. Email: david.lincicum@theology.ox.ac.uk.

[1]   J.-B. Frey, *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum. Recueil des inscriptions juives qui vont du IIIe siècle avant Jésus-Christ au VIIe siècle de notre ère* (2 vols.; Rome: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, 1936, 1952). Volume 1 was reissued with a substantial "Prolegomenon" by B. Lifshitz (New York: Ktav, 1975), and his additions are included in this index.

[2]   For the project announcement, see Hannah M. Cotton, Leah Di Segni, Werner Eck and Benjamin Isaac, "Corpus Inscriptionum Judaeae/Palaestinae", *ZPE* 127 (1999): 307–08.

CIJ #	New Edition		
1	*JIWE* 2.556	44	*JIWE* 2.431
2	*JIWE* 2.530	45	*JIWE* 2.525
3	*JIWE* 2.531	46	*JIWE* 2.468
4	*JIWE* 2.532	47	*JIWE* 2.486
5	*JIWE* 2.626.i	48	*JIWE* 2.443
6	*JIWE* 2.437	49	*JIWE* 2.492
7	*JIWE* 2.436	50	*JIWE* 2.429
8	*JIWE* 2.461	51	*JIWE* 2.460
9	*JIWE* 2.487	52	*JIWE* 2.485
10	*JIWE* 2.466	53	*JIWE* 2.484
11	*JIWE* 2.440	54	*JIWE* 2.493
12	*JIWE* 2.481	55	*JIWE* 2.463
13	*JIWE* 2.480	56	*JIWE* 2.475
14	*JIWE* 2.523	57	*JIWE* 2.425
15	*JIWE* 2.442	58	*JIWE* 2.448
16	*JIWE* 2.441	59	*JIWE* 2.470
17	*JIWE* 2.471	60	*JIWE* 2.434
18	*JIWE* 2.428	61	*JIWE* 2.478
19	*JIWE* 2.456	62	*JIWE* 2.477
20	*JIWE* 2.435	63	*JIWE* 2.500
21	*JIWE* 2.489	64	*JIWE* 2.430
22	*JIWE* 2.451	65	*JIWE* 2.464
23	*JIWE* 2.450	66	*JIWE* 2.413
24	*JIWE* 2.473	67	*JIWE* 2.452
25	*JIWE* 2.459	68	*JIWE* 2.491
26	*JIWE* 2.467	69	*JIWE* 2.416
27	*JIWE* 2.453	70	*JIWE* 2.494
28	*JIWE* 2.483	71	*JIWE* 2.495
29	*JIWE* 2.469	72	*JIWE* 2.616
30	*JIWE* 2.454	73	*JIWE* 2.p.337
31	*JIWE* 2.457	74	*JIWE* 2.p.337
32	*JIWE* 2.474	75	*JIWE* 2.407
33	*JIWE* 2.444	76	*JIWE* 2.409
34	*JIWE* 2.524	77	*JIWE* 2.408
35	*JIWE* 2.479	78	*JIWE* 2.533
35a	*JIWE* 2.527	79	*JIWE* 2.628.i
36	*JIWE* 2.526	80	*JIWE* 2.628.ii
37	*JIWE* 2.488	81	*JIWE* 2.324
38	*JIWE* 2.482	82	*JIWE* 2.350
39	*JIWE* 2.455	83	*JIWE* 2.206
40	*JIWE* 2.449	84	*JIWE* 2.340
41	*JIWE* 2.458	85	*JIWE* 2.259
42	*JIWE* 2.462	86	*JIWE* 2.276
43	*JIWE* 2.490	87	*JIWE* 2.242
		88	*JIWE* 2.288

89	*JIWE* 2.382	134	*JIWE* 2.228
90	*JIWE* 2.334	135	*JIWE* 2.327
91	*JIWE* 2.317	136	*JIWE* 2.205
92	*JIWE* 2.336	137	*JIWE* 2.222
93	*JIWE* 2.209	138	*JIWE* 2.232
94	*JIWE* 2.304	139	*JIWE* 2.208
95	*JIWE* 2.351	140	*JIWE* 2.338
96	*JIWE* 2.353	141	*JIWE* 2.345
97	*JIWE* 2.333	142	*JIWE* 2.263
98	*JIWE* 2.219	143	*JIWE* 2.346
99	*JIWE* 2.255	144	*JIWE* 2.246
100	*JIWE* 2.373	145	*JIWE* 2.257
101	*JIWE* 2.306	146	*JIWE* 2.256
102	*JIWE* 2.250	147	*JIWE* 2.238
103	*JIWE* 2.236	148	*JIWE* 2.253
104	*JIWE* 2.393	149	*JIWE* 2.223
105	*JIWE* 2.205a	150	*JIWE* 2.329
106	*JIWE* 2.321	151	*JIWE* 2.347
107	*JIWE* 2.294	152	*JIWE* 2.254
108	*JIWE* 2.551	153	*JIWE* 2.339
109	*JIWE* 2.277	154	*JIWE* 2.227
110	*JIWE* 2.235	155	*JIWE* 2.244
111	*JIWE* 2.212	156	*JIWE* 2.356
112	*JIWE* 2.229	157	*JIWE* 2.269
113	*JIWE* 2.374	158	*JIWE* 2.376
114	*JIWE* 2.309	159	*JIWE* 2.348
115	*JIWE* 2.299	160	*JIWE* 2.295
116	*JIWE* 2.315	161	*JIWE* 2.274
117	*JIWE* 2.213	162	*JIWE* 2.268
118	*JIWE* 2.342	163	*JIWE* 2.305
119	*JIWE* 2.354	164	*JIWE* 2.383
120	*JIWE* 2.337	165	*JIWE* 2.310
121	*JIWE* 2.231	166	*JIWE* 2.251
122	*JIWE* 2.262	167	*JIWE* 2.239
123	*JIWE* 2.326	168	*JIWE* 2.357
124	*JIWE* 2.267	169	*JIWE* 2.358
125	*JIWE* 2.344	170	*JIWE* 2.394
126	*JIWE* 2.282	171	*JIWE* 2.272
127	*JIWE* 2.293	172	*JIWE* 2.290
128	*JIWE* 2.316	173	*JIWE* 2.292
129	*JIWE* 2.237	174	*JIWE* 2.397
130	*JIWE* 2.355	175	*JIWE* 2.300
131	*JIWE* 2.375	176	*JIWE* 2.211
132	*JIWE* 2.281	177	*JIWE* 2.243
133	*JIWE* 2.286	178	*JIWE* 2.384

179	*JIWE* 2.230	224	*JIWE* 2.379
180	*JIWE* 2.255	225	*JIWE* 2.249
181	*JIWE* 2.303	226	*JIWE* 2.247
182	*JIWE* 2.385	227	*JIWE* 2.312
183	*JIWE* 2.386; *IJudO* 3.p.116	228	*JIWE* 2.207
184	*JIWE* 2.280	229	*JIWE* 2.204
185	*JIWE* 2.387	230	*JIWE* 2.291
186	*JIWE* 2.257	231	*JIWE* 2.283
187	*JIWE* 2.398	232	*JIWE* 2.359
188	*JIWE* 2.388	233	*JIWE* 2.361
189	*JIWE* 2.389	234	*JIWE* 2.323
190	*JIWE* 2.390	235	*JIWE* 2.273
191	*JIWE* 2.221	236	*JIWE* 2.367
192	*JIWE* 2.216	237	*JIWE* 2.258
193	*JIWE* 2.270	238	*JIWE* 2.296
194	*JIWE* 2.320	239	*JIWE* 2.368
195	*JIWE* 2.362	240	*JIWE* 2.369
196	*JIWE* 2.240	241	*JIWE* 2.370
197	*JIWE* 2.314	242	*JIWE* 2.308
198	*JIWE* 2.215	243	*JIWE* 2.371
199	*JIWE* 2.395	244	*JIWE* 2.319
200	*JIWE* 2.331	245	*JIWE* 2.260
201	*JIWE* 2.307	246	*JIWE* 2.330
202	*JIWE* 2.392	247	*JIWE* 2.380
203	*JIWE* 2.240	248	*JIWE* 2.335
204	*JIWE* 2.301	249	*JIWE* 2.261
205	*JIWE* 2.302	250	*JIWE* 2.233
206	*JIWE* 2.217	251	*JIWE* 2.629.i
207	*JIWE* 2.264	252	*JIWE* 2.271
208	*JIWE* 2.285	253	*JIWE* 2.297
209	*JIWE* 2.325	254	*JIWE* 2.248
210	*JIWE* 2.343	255	*JIWE* 2.298
211	*JIWE* 2.245	256	*JIWE* 2.218
212	*JIWE* 2.377	257	*JIWE* 2.275
213	*JIWE* 2.278	258	*JIWE* 2.313
214	*JIWE* 2.241	259	*JIWE* 2.366
215	*JIWE* 2.328	260	*JIWE* 2.234
216	*JIWE* 2.265	261	*JIWE* 2.311
217	*JIWE* 2.284	262	*JIWE* 2.352
218	*JIWE* 2.226	263	*JIWE* 2.220
219	*JIWE* 2.279	264	*JIWE* 2.332
220	*JIWE* 2.378	265	*JIWE* 2.322
221	*JIWE* 2.266	266	*JIWE* 2.287
222	*JIWE* 2.224	267	*JIWE* 2.381
223	*JIWE* 2.318	268	*JIWE* 2.349

269	*JIWE* 2.289	314	*JIWE* 2.172
270	*JIWE* 2.391	315	*JIWE* 2.11
271	*JIWE* 2.210	316	*JIWE* 2.98
272	*JIWE* 2.399	317	*JIWE* 2.2
273	*JIWE* 2.214	318	*JIWE* 2.114
274	*JIWE* 2.225	319	*JIWE* 2.560
275	*JIWE* 2.396	320	*JIWE* 2.59
276	*JIWE* 2.308	321	*JIWE* 2.171
277	*JIWE* 2.402	322	*JIWE* 2.32
278	*JIWE* 2.403	323	*JIWE* 2.16
279	*JIWE* 2.404	324	*JIWE* 2.121
280	*JIWE* 2.405	325	*JIWE* 2.101
281	*JIWE* 2.406	326	*JIWE* 2.116
282	*JIWE* 2.534	327	*JIWE* 2.185
283	*JIWE* 2.535	328	*JIWE* 2.111
284	*JIWE* 2.547	329	*JIWE* 2.22
285	*JIWE* 2.626.ii	330	*JIWE* 2.17
286	*JIWE* 2.536	331	*JIWE* 2.6
287	*JIWE* 2.612	332	*JIWE* 2.168
288	*JIWE* 2.537	333	*JIWE* 2.68
289	*JIWE* 2.538	334	*JIWE* 2.93
290	*JIWE* 2.58	335	*JIWE* 2.99
291	*JIWE* 2.33	336	*JIWE* 2.13
292	*JIWE* 2.53	337	*JIWE* 2.164
293	*JIWE* 2.92	338	*JIWE* 2.169
294	*JIWE* 2.47	339	*JIWE* 2.83
295	*JIWE* 2.203.xviii & 153	340	*JIWE* 2.50
296	*JIWE* 2.183; *IJudO* 2.212	341	*JIWE* 2.34
297	*JIWE* 2.14	342	*JIWE* 2.115
298	*JIWE* 2.173	343	*JIWE* 2.167
299	*JIWE* 2.119	344	*JIWE* 2.123
300	*JIWE* 2.15	345	*JIWE* 2.152
301	*JIWE* 2.96	346	*JIWE* 2.80
302	*JIWE* 2.79	347	*JIWE* 2.124
303	*JIWE* 2.46	348	*JIWE* 2.41
304	*JIWE* 2.69	349	*JIWE* 2.186
305	*JIWE* 2.8	350	*JIWE* 2.152
306	*JIWE* 2.91	351	*JIWE* 2.188
307	*JIWE* 2.184	352	*JIWE* 2.27
308	*JIWE* 2.12	353	*JIWE* 2.86
309	*JIWE* 2.20	354	*JIWE* 2.44
310	*JIWE* 2.120	355	*JIWE* 2.125
311	*JIWE* 2.82	356	*JIWE* 2.70
312	*JIWE* 2.563	357	*JIWE* 2.71
313	*JIWE* 2.54	358	*JIWE* 2.25

359	*JIWE* 2.126	404	*JIWE* 2.159
360	*JIWE* 2.23	405	*JIWE* 2.162
361	*JIWE* 2.102	406	*JIWE* 2.45
362	*JIWE* 2.60	407	*JIWE* 2.36
363	*JIWE* 2.127	408	*JIWE* 2.113
364	*JIWE* 2.39	409	*JIWE* 2.55
365	*JIWE* 2.170	410	*JIWE* 2.66
366	*JIWE* 2.75	411	*JIWE* 2.10
367	*JIWE* 2.567	412	*JIWE* 2.107
368	*JIWE* 2.189	413	*JIWE* 2.175
369	*JIWE* 2.28	414	*JIWE* 2.26
370	*JIWE* 2.112	415	*JIWE* 2.51
371	*JIWE* 2.94	416	*JIWE* 2.194
372	*JIWE* 2.190	417	*JIWE* 2.163
373	*JIWE* 2.157	418	*JIWE* 2.118
374	*JIWE* 2.56	419	*JIWE* 2.63
375	*JIWE* 2.109	420	*JIWE* 2.200
376	*JIWE* 2.18	421	*JIWE* 2.129
377	*JIWE* 2.128	422	*JIWE* 2.49
378	*JIWE* 2.176	423	*JIWE* 2.177
379	*JIWE* 2.108	424	*JIWE* 2.29
380	*JIWE* 2.557	425	*JIWE* 2.130
381	*JIWE* 2.191	426	*JIWE* 2.21
382	*JIWE* 2.192	427	*JIWE* 2.77
383	*JIWE* 2.117	428	*JIWE* 2.203.v
384	*JIWE* 2.165	429	*JIWE* 2.131
385	*JIWE* 2.548	430	*JIWE* 2.57
386	*JIWE* 2.30	431	*JIWE* 2.132
387	*JIWE* 2.35	432	*JIWE* 2.90
388	*JIWE* 2.38	433	*JIWE* 2.1
389	*JIWE* 2.72	434	*JIWE* 2.81
390	*JIWE* 2.166	435	*JIWE* 2.89
391	*JIWE* 2.110	436	*JIWE* 2.133
392	*JIWE* 2.9	437	*JIWE* 2.42
393	*JIWE* 2.76	438	*JIWE* 2.134
394	*JIWE* 2.19	439	*JIWE* 2.135
395	*JIWE* 2.47	440	*JIWE* 2.178
396	*JIWE* 2.3	441	*JIWE* 2.95
397	*JIWE* 2.193	442	*JIWE* 2.168
398	*JIWE* 2.106	443	*JIWE* 2.136
399	*JIWE* 2.174	444	*JIWE* 2.65
400	*JIWE* 2.24	445	*JIWE* 2.158
401	*JIWE* 2.187	446	*JIWE* 2.154
402	*JIWE* 2.100	447	*JIWE* 2.137
403	*JIWE* 2.52	448	*JIWE* 2. 203.xxxix

449	*JIWE* 2.138	493a	*JIWE* 2.203.xlii
450	*JIWE* 2.31	494	*JIWE* 2.540
451	*JIWE* 2.139	495	*JIWE* 2.541
452	*JIWE* 2.203.xl	496	*JIWE* 2.542
453	*JIWE* 2.64	497	*JIWE* 2.539
454	*JIWE* 2.73	498	*JIWE* 2.573
455	*JIWE* 2.37	499	*JIWE* 2.550
456	*JIWE* 2.85	500	*JIWE* 2.627.i
457	*JIWE* 2.179	501	*JIWE* 2.568; *IJudO* 3.Syr33
458	*JIWE* 2.196	502	*JIWE* 2.561
459	*JIWE* 2.97	503	*JIWE* 2.549
460	*JIWE* 2.195	504	*JIWE* 2.558
461	*JIWE* 2.181	505	*JIWE* 2.559
462	*JIWE* 2.62	506	*JIWE* 2.569
463	*JIWE* 2.43	507	*JIWE* 2.543
464	*JIWE* 2.608	508	*JIWE* 2.544
465	*JIWE* 2.4	509	*JIWE* 2.576
466	*JIWE* 2.84	510	*JIWE* 2.578
467	*JIWE* 2.160	511	*JIWE* 2.554
468	*JIWE* 2.140	512	*JIWE* 2.574
469	*JIWE* 2.48	513	*JIWE* 2.545
470	*JIWE* 2.618	514	*JIWE* 2.613
471	*JIWE* 2.151	515	*JIWE* 2.588
472	*JIWE* 2.197	516	*JIWE* 2.589
473	*JIWE* 2.155	517	*JIWE* 2.590
474	*JIWE* 2.74	518	*JIWE* 2.591
475	*JIWE* 2.5	519	*JIWE* 2.593
476	*JIWE* 2.103	520	*JIWE* 2.597
477	*JIWE* 2.7	521	*JIWE* 2.594
478	*JIWE* 2.87	522	*JIWE* 2.592
479	*JIWE* 2.565	523	*JIWE* 2.577
480	*JIWE* 2.198	524	*JIWE* 2.626.iii
481	*JIWE* 2.199	525	*JIWE* 2.599
482	*JIWE* 2.564	526	*JIWE* 1.174
483	*JIWE* 2.180	527	*JIWE* 2.619
484	*JIWE* 2.67	528	*JIWE* 2.617
485	*JIWE* 2.61	529	*JIWE* 2.626.iv
486	*JIWE* 2.182	530	*JIWE* 2.601
487	*JIWE* 2.141	531	*JIWE* 2.602
488	*JIWE* 2.142	532	*JIWE* 2.603
489	*JIWE* 2.143	533	*JIWE* 1.18
490	*JIWE* 2.156	534	*JIWE* 1.205
491	*JIWE* 2.144	534a	*JIWE* 1.15
492	*JIWE* 2.203.xix	535	*JIWE* 2.579
493	*JIWE* 2.203.ii	536	*JIWE* 2.581

537	*JIWE* 2.584	578	*JIWE* 1.77
538	*JIWE* 2.585	579	*JIWE* 1.47
539	*JIWE* 1.206	580	*JIWE* 1.42
540	*JIWE* 2.582	581	*JIWE* 1.59
541	*JIWE* 1.207	582	*JIWE* 1.101
542	*JIWE* 2.614	583	*JIWE* 1.69
543	*JIWE* 2.579	584	*JIWE* 1.70
544	*JIWE* 2.586	585	*JIWE* 1.94
545	*JIWE* 2.580	586	*JIWE* 1.79
546	*JIWE* 1.208	587	*JIWE* 1.53
547	*JIWE* 2.583	588	*JIWE* 1.46
548	*JIWE* 2.587	589	*JIWE* 1.44
549	*JIWE* 1.209	590	*JIWE* 1.62
550	*JIWE* 1.210	591	*JIWE* 1.66
551a	*JIWE* 1.211	592	*JIWE* 1.97
551b	*JIWE* 2.615	593	*JIWE* 1.111
551c	*JIWE* 1.212	594	*JIWE* 1.48
551d	*JIWE* 1.213	595	*JIWE* 1.75
551e	*JIWE* 1.214	596	*JIWE* 1.64
552	*JIWE* 1.19	597	*JIWE* 1.71
553	*JIWE* 1.20	598	*JIWE* 1.65
554	*JIWE* 1.21	599	*JIWE* 1.61
555	*JIWE* 1.25	600	*JIWE* 1.76
556	*JIWE* 1.26	601	*JIWE* 1.78
557	*JIWE* 1.24	602	*JIWE* 1.112
558	*JIWE* 1.27	603	*JIWE* 1.102
559	*JIWE* 1.28	604	*JIWE* 1.54
560	*JIWE* 1.29	605	*JIWE* 1.83
561	*JIWE* 1.23	606	*JIWE* 1.63
562	*JIWE* 1.215	607	*JIWE* 1.85
563	*JIWE* 1.40	608	*JIWE* 1.89
564	*JIWE* 1.216	609	*JIWE* 1.80
565	*JIWE* 1.217	610	*JIWE* 1.68
566	*JIWE* 1.218	611	*JIWE* 1.86
567	*JIWE* 1.38	612	*JIWE* 1.56
568	*JIWE* 1.36	613	*JIWE* 1.87
569	*JIWE* 1.82	614	*JIWE* 1.90
570	*JIWE* 1.84	615	*JIWE* 1.67
571	*JIWE* 1.81	616	*JIWE* 1.88
572	*JIWE* 1.57	617	*JIWE* 1.100
573	*JIWE* 1.58	618	*JIWE* 1.51
574	*JIWE* 1.49	619	*JIWE* 1.73
575	*JIWE* 1.72	619a	*JIWE* 1.113
576	*JIWE* 1.52	619b	*JIWE* 1.114
577	*JIWE* 1.50	619c	*JIWE* 1.115

619d	*JIWE* 1.116	653a (Frey)	*JIWE* 1.221
619e	*JIWE* 1.219	653a (Lif.)	*JIWE* 1.155
620	*JIWE* 1.193	653b	*JIWE* 1.157
621	*JIWE* 1.125	654	*JIWE* 1.150
622	*JIWE* 1.126	654a	*JIWE* 1.160
623	*JIWE* 1.122	655	*JIWE* 1.cf.163–8
624	*JIWE* 1.123	656	*JIWE* 1.196
625	*JIWE* 1.131	657	*JIWE* 1.169
626	*JIWE* 1.132	658	*JIWE* 1.170
627	*JIWE* 1.118	659	*JIWE* 1.171
628	*JIWE* 1.119	660	*JIWE* 1.172
629	*JIWE* 1.120	660a	*JIWE* 1.175
630	*JIWE* 1.121	660b	*JIWE* 1.176
631	*JIWE* 1.124	660c	*JIWE* 1.185
632	*JIWE* 1.134	660d	*JIWE* 1.187
633	*JIWE* 1.194	661	*JIWE* 1.183
634	*JIWE* 1.195	662	*JIWE* 1.180
635	*JIWE* 1.137	663	*JIWE* 1.181
635a	*JIWE* 1.138	664	*JIWE* 1.182
635b	*JIWE* 1.139	665	*JIWE* 1.179
636	*JIWE* 1.11	665a	*JIWE* 1.197
637	*JIWE* 1.203	666	*JIWE* 1.200
638	*JIWE* 1.4	667	*JIWE* 1.190
639	*JIWE* 1.5	668	*JIWE* 1.198
640	*JIWE* 1.6; *IJudO* 3.Syr43	669	*JIWE* 1.199
641	*JIWE* 1.202	670	*JIWE* 1.189
642	*JIWE* 1.9	671	*JIWE* 1.191
643	*JIWE* 1.7	672	*JIWE* 1.192
643a	*JIWE* 1.8	672a	*JIWE* 1.226
644	*JIWE* 1.2	673	*JIWE* 1.227
645	*JIWE* 1.201	674	*JIWE* 1.228
646	*JIWE* 1.1	675	*IJudO* 1.Pan2
647	*JIWE* 1.142	676	*IJudO* 1.Pan1
648	*JIWE* 1.141	677	*IJudO* 1.Pan3
649	*JIWE* 1.3	678	*IJudO* 1.Pan4
649a	*JIWE* 1.143	678a	*IJudO* 1.Pan5
650	*JIWE* 1.145	679	*IJudO* 1.p.1
650a	*JIWE* 1.146	680	*IJudO* 1.Dal2
650b	*JIWE* 1.147	680a	*IJudO* 1.Dal3
650c	*JIWE* 1.148	681	*IJudO* 1.Moes1
650d	*JIWE* 1.149	681a	*IJudO* 1.Thr5
650e	*JIWE* 1.144	681b	*IJudO* 1.App7
651	*JIWE* 1.151	682	*IJudO* 1.BS1
652	*JIWE* 1.152	683	*IJudO* 1.BS5
653	*JIWE* 1.220	683a	*IJudO* 1.BS7

683b	*IJudO* 1.BS9	709	*IJudO* 1.Ach43
684	*IJudO* 1.BS4	710	*IJudO* 1.Ach42
685	*IJudO* 1.BS10	711	*IJudO* 1.Ach44
686	*IJudO* 1.BS12	711a	*IJudO* 1.Ach46
687	*IJudO* 1.BS11	711b	*IJudO* 1.Ach45
688	*IJudO* 1.BS13	712	*IJudO* 1.Ach28
689	*IJudO* 1.BS15	713	*IJudO* 1.Ach30
689a	*IJudO* 1.BS14	714	*IJudO* 1.App10
690	*IJudO* 1.BS20	715	*IJudO* 1.Ach34
690a	*IJudO* 1.BS22	715a	*IJudO* 1.Ach26
690b	*IJudO* 1.BS23	715b	*IJudO* 1.Ach27
691	*IJudO* 1.BS17	715c	*IJudO* 1.Ach33
691a	*IJudO* 1.BS16	715d	*IJudO* 1.Ach31
691b	*IJudO* 1.BS19	715e	*IJudO* 1.App12
692	*IJudO* 1.Thr3; *IJudO* 2.12	715f	*IJudO* 1.Ach32
692a	*IJudO* 1.Thr4; *IJudO* 2.13	715g	*IJudO* 1.App13
693	*IJudO* 1.Mac16	715h	*IJudO* 1.Ach29
693a	*IJudO* 1.Mac17	715i	*IJudO* 1.Ach40
693b	*IJudO* 1.Mac13	716	*IJudO* 1.App2
693c	*IJudO* 1.Mac14	717	*IJudO* 1.App21
693d	*IJudO* 1.App9	718	*IJudO* 1.Ach47
694	*IJudO* 1.Mac1	718a	*IJudO* 1.Ach48
694a	*IJudO* 1.Mac6	719	*IJudO* 1.Ach51
694b	*IJudO* 1.Mac7	720	*IJudO* 1.Ach54
695	*IJudO* 1.Ach24	721	*IJudO* 1.Ach52
696	*IJudO* 1.Ach16	721a	*IJudO* 1.Ach55
696a	*IJudO* 1.Ach17	721b	*IJudO* 1.Ach56
696b	*IJudO* 1.Ach18	721c	*IJudO* 1.Ach53
696c	*IJudO* 1.Ach19	722	*IJudO* 1.Ach58
697	*IJudO* 1.Ach6	723	*IJudO* 1.Ach59
698	*IJudO* 1.Ach7	724	*IJudO* 1.Aegina
699	*IJudO* 1.Ach1	725a	*IJudO* 1.Ach70
700	*IJudO* 1.Ach1	725b	*IJudO* 1.Ach71
701	*IJudO* 1.Ach1	726	*IJudO* 1.Ach65
702	*IJudO* 1.Ach8	727	*IJudO* 1.Ach60
703	*IJudO* 1.Ach3	728	*IJudO* 1.Ach62
704	*IJudO* 1.Ach3	729	*IJudO* 1.Ach63
705	*IJudO* 1.Ach3	730	*IJudO* 1.Ach61
706	*IJudO* 1.Ach10	731	*IJudO* 1.Ach64
707	*IJudO* 1.Ach12	731a	*IJudO* 1.Delos
708	*IJudO* 1.Ach13	731b	*IJudO* 1.App20
708a	*IJudO* 1.Ach9	731c	*IJudO* 1.Cre3
708b	*IJudO* 1.Ach2	731d	*IJudO* 1.Cre1
708c	*IJudO* 1.Ach23	731e	—
708d	*IJudO* 1.Ach25	731f	*IJudO* 2.5

731g	*IJudO* 2.2	770	*IJudO* 2.172
732	*JIWE* 2.596	771	*IJudO* 2.169
732a	*JIWE* 2.595	772	*IJudO* 2.180
733 St	*JIWE* 2.552	773	—
733a	*JIWE* 2.570	774	*IJudO* 2.179
733b	*JIWE* 2.555	775	*IJudO* 2.205
733c	*JIWE* 2.619	776	*IJudO* 2.206
733d	*JIWE* 2.600	777	*IJudO* 2.196
733e	*JIWE* 2.546 & 562	778	*IJudO* 2.208
733f	*JIWE* 2.629.ii	779–80	—
733g	*JIWE* 2.620	781	*IJudO* 2.219
734	*JIWE* 2.598	782	—
735	*IJudO* 3.Cyp3	783	*IJudO* 2.245
736	*IJudO* 3.Cyp1	784	*IJudO* 2.244
737	*IJudO* 3.App23	785	*IJudO* 2.232
738	*IJudO* 2.36	786	*IJudO* 2.233
739	*IJudO* 2.41	787	*IJudO* 2.234
740	*IJudO* 2.42	788	*IJudO* 2.236
741	*IJudO* 2.43	789	*IJudO* 2.235
742	*IJudO* 2.40	790	*IJudO* 2.237
743	*IJudO* 2.M2	791	*IJudO* 2.238
744	*IJudO* 2.46	792	*IJudO* 2.239
745	*IJudO* 2.32	793	*IJudO* 2.240
746	*IJudO* 2.33	794	*IJudO* 2.241
747	*IJudO* 2.35	795	*IJudO* 2.231
748	*IJudO* 2.37	796	*IJudO* 2.162
749	*IJudO* 2.21	797	—
750	*IJudO* 2.54	798	*IJudO* 2.156
751	*IJudO* 2.53	799	*IJudO* 2.157
752	*IJudO* 2.146	800	*IJudO* 2.151
753	*IJudO* 2.48	801	*IJudO* 2.150
754	*IJudO* 2.49	802	—
755	*IJudO* 2.47	803	*IJudO* 3.Syr53
756	*IJudO* 2.25	804	*IJudO* 3.Syr54
757	*IJudO* 2.223	805	*IJudO* 3.Syr58
758	*IJudO* 2.221	806	*IJudO* 3.Syr61
759	*IJudO* 2.214	807	*IJudO* 3.Syr62
760	*IJudO* 2.173	808	*IJudO* 3.Syr63
761–63	—	809	*IJudO* 3.Syr64
764	*IJudO* 2.182	810	*IJudO* 3.Syr65
765	—	811	*IJudO* 3.Syr66
766	*IJudO* 2.168	812	*IJudO* 3.Syr59
767	—	813	*IJudO* 3.Syr55
768	*IJudO* 2.175	814	*IJudO* 3.Syr60
769	*IJudO* 2.176	815	*IJudO* 3.Syr70

816	*IJudO* 3.Syr68	865	*IJudO* 3.App12
817	*IJudO* 3.Syr56	866–68	—
818	*IJudO* 3.Syr57	869	*IJudO* 3.Syr30
819	*IJudO* 3.Syr76	870	*IJudO* 3.Syr28
820	*IJudO* 3.Syr49	871	*IJudO* 3.Syr29
821	*IJudO* 3.Syr44	872	*IJudO* 3.Syr31
822	*IJudO* 3.Syr46	873	*IJudO* 3.Syr24
822n.	*IJudO* 3.Syr47	874	*IJudO* 3.Syr27
823	*IJudO* 3.Syr45	875	*IJudO* 3.Syr20
824	*IJudO* 3.Syr48	876	*IJudO* 3.p.24
825	*IJudO* 3.App22	877	*IJudO* 3.p.24
826	*IJudO* 3.Syr83	878	*IJudO* 3.Syr12
827	*IJudO* 3.Syr82	879	*IJudO* 3.Syr1
828a	*IJudO* 3.Syr85	880	*IJudO* 3.Syr2
828b	*IJudO* 3.Syr84	881	*IJudO* 3.p.1
829	*IJudO* 3.Syr86	882	*IJudO* 2.246
830	*IJudO* 3.Syr88	883–909	—
831	*IJudO* 3.Syr87	910	*IJudO* 2.251
832	*IJudO* 3.Syr127	911–24	—
833	*IJudO* 3.Syr128	925	*IJudO* 2.250
834	*IJudO* 3.Syr96	926–30	—
835	*IJudO* 3.Syr98	931	*IJudO* 2.249
836	*IJudO* 3.Syr97	932–53	—
837	*IJudO* 3.Syr100	954	*IJudO* 2.4
838	*IJudO* 3.Syr100	955–90	—
839	*IJudO* 3.Syr102	991	*IJudO* 3.Syr5
840	*IJudO* 3.Syr105	992–1009	—
841	*IJudO* 3.Syr103	1010	*IJudO* 3.Syr51
842	*IJudO* 3.Syr104	1011	*IJudO* 3.Syr52
843	*IJudO* 3.Syr94	1012–23	—
844	*IJudO* 3.Syr130	1024	*IJudO* 3.App1
845	*IJudO* 3.Syr91	1025–1232	—
846	*IJudO* 3.App13	1233	*IJudO* 3.Syr22
847	*IJudO* 3.App14	1234–1413	—
848	*IJudO* 3.Syr41	1414	*IJudO* 2.184
849	*IJudO* 3.p.66	1415	*IJudO* 3.Syr78
850	*IJudO* 3.p.66	1416	*IJudO* 3.Syr79
851	*IJudO* 3.p.66	1417	*IJudO* 3.Syr80
852	*IJudO* 3.App15	1418	*IJudO* 3.Syr80
853	*IJudO* 3.Syr35	1419	*IJudO* 3.App21
854–60	—	1420–23	—
861	*IJudO* 3.Syr34	1424	*JIGRE* 3
862	*IJudO* 3.p.231	1425	*JIGRE* 4
863	*IJudO* 3.Syr37	1426	*JIGRE* 5
864	*IJudO* 3.Syr38	1427	*JIGRE* 1

1428	*JIGRE* 2	1473	*JIGRE* 62
1429	*JIGRE* 6	1474	*JIGRE* 63
1430	*JIGRE* 7	1475	*JIGRE* 64
1431	*JIGRE* 8	1476	*JIGRE* 65
1432	*JIGRE* 13	1477	*JIGRE* 130
1433	*JIGRE* 9	1478	*JIGRE* 137
1434	*JIGRE* 14	1479	*JIGRE* 138
1435	*JIGRE* 127-128	1480	*JIGRE* 66
1436	*JIGRE* 16	1481	*JIGRE* 106
1437	*JIGRE* 17	1482	*JIGRE* 107
1438	*JIGRE* 15	1483	*JIGRE* 108
1439	*JIGRE* 21	1484	*JIGRE* 109
1440	*JIGRE* 22	1485	*JIGRE* 110
1441	*JIGRE* 24	1486	*JIGRE* 111
1442	*JIGRE* 25	1487	*JIGRE* 112
1443	*JIGRE* 27	1488	*JIGRE* 113
1444	*JIGRE* 28	1489	*JIGRE* 114
1445	*JIGRE* 135	1490	*JIGRE* 30
1446	*JIGRE* 19	1491	*JIGRE* 67
1447	*JIGRE* 20	1492	*JIGRE* 68
1448	*JIGRE* 136; *IJudO* 2.M5	1493	*JIGRE* 69
1449	*JIGRE* 125	1494	*JIGRE* 70
1450	*JIGRE* 129	1495	*JIGRE* 71
1451	*JIGRE* 29	1496	*JIGRE* 72
1452	*JIGRE* 41	1497	*JIGRE* 73
1453	*JIGRE* 42	1498	*JIGRE* 74
1454	*JIGRE* 43	1499	*JIGRE* 75
1455	*JIGRE* 44	1500	*JIGRE* 76
1456	*JIGRE* 45	1501	*JIGRE* 77
1457	*JIGRE* 46	1502	*JIGRE* 78
1458	*JIGRE* 47	1503	*JIGRE* 79
1459	*JIGRE* 48	1504	*JIGRE* 80
1460	*JIGRE* 49	1505	*JIGRE* 81
1461	*JIGRE* 50	1506	*JIGRE* 82
1462	*JIGRE* 51	1507	*JIGRE* 83
1463	*JIGRE* 52	1508	*JIGRE* 31
1464	*JIGRE* 53	1509	*JIGRE* 32
1465	*JIGRE* 54	1510	*JIGRE* 33
1466	*JIGRE* 55	1511	*JIGRE* 34
1467	*JIGRE* 56	1512	*JIGRE* 35
1468	*JIGRE* 57	1513	*JIGRE* 36
1469	*JIGRE* 58	1514	*JIGRE* 84
1470	*JIGRE* 59	1515	*JIGRE* 85
1471	*JIGRE* 60	1516	*JIGRE* 86
1472	*JIGRE* 61	1517	*JIGRE* 87

1518	*JIGRE* 88	10*	*JIWE* 2.610
1519	*JIGRE* 89	11*	*JIWE* 2.372
1520	*JIGRE* 90	12*–14*	—
1521	*JIGRE* 91	15*	*JIWE* 2.252
1522	*JIGRE* 37	16*–23*	—
1523	*JIGRE* 92	24*	*JIWE* 2.40
1524	*JIGRE* 93	25*	*JIWE* 2.148
1525	*JIGRE* 94	26*–27*	—
1526	*JIGRE* 95	28*	*JIWE* 2.606
1527	*JIGRE* 96	29*	—
1528	*JIGRE* 97	30*	*JIWE* 2.122
1529	*JIGRE* 98	31*	*JIWE* 2.145
1530	*JIGRE* 38	32*	*JIWE* 2.104
1531	*JIGRE* 115	33*	*JIWE* 2.78
1532	*JIGRE* 116	34*	—
1533	*JIGRE* 118	35*	*JIWE* 2.105
1534	*JIGRE* 119	36*	*JIWE* 2.605
1535	*JIGRE* 120	37*	*JIWE* 2.604
1536	*JIGRE* 133	38*	*JIWE* 2.607
1537	*JIGRE* 121	39*	*JIWE* 2.149
1538	*JIGRE* 122	40*	*JIWE* 2.150
1539	*JIGRE* 40	41*	*JIWE* 2.203.ix
1*–4*	—	42*–77*	—
5*	*JIWE* 2.341	78*	*IJudO* 1.BS21
6*–7*	—	79*–80*	—
8*	*JIWE* 2.400	81*	*JIWE* 2.401
9*	*JIWE* 2.609	82*–103*	—

SOME COMMENTS ON MICAH BERDICHEVSKY'S
SAUL AND PAUL

Daniel R. Langton*

Abstract: Although Micah Berdichevsky (1865–1921), a giant of Hebrew literature, never completed his book-length study of the apostle Paul, his literary executors ensured that *Saul and Paul* was published in 1971. Like the better known study by Joseph Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul* (1939), Berdichevsky's work was a Zionist perspective on the founder of Gentile Christianity, written in Hebrew. Central to *Saul and Paul* is a mysterious document that Berdichevsky believed to be an ancient Jewish account of the conversion and missionary success of Paul, namely, the tale of the pagan priest, Abba Gulish. He went on to argue that *Saul and Paul* had been two different individuals, the one Jewish, the other pagan, and that Christian tradition had amalgamated them. Attributing historicity to a Hebrew legend rather than a Greek Christian one, Berdichevsky argued that Paulinism was an essentially pagan philosophical system. While many before and after him would find the seeds of Christianity in the Jewish Paul's adoption of non-Jewish, Hellenistic ideas, Berdichevsky went one step further and denied Paul even a Jewish birth. In addition to a comparison of Klausner and Berdichevsky's views of Paul, this short article includes the Hebrew text and translation of the story of Abba Gulish.

In a recent article entitled 'Berdichevsky's *Saul and Paul*: A Jewish Political Theology' (2007),[1] Yotam Hotam argues that the apostle Paul had been portrayed by the Hebrew literary scholar as the villainous creator of Christianity. According to Berdichevsky's fiercely Zionist critique, Christian religion was to be explained as a Hellenistically derived form of 'spiritualism' whose origins had had little or nothing to do with the 'natural' religion of Judaism. In his concern to properly contextualize Berdichevsky's complex study, Hotam devotes only two pages to an overview of the work in question, and it seemed to the present author that the creativity and ingenuity of Berdichevsky deserved a slightly fuller treatment. A closer reading of the text of *Shaul ve-Paul* is also warranted since it is only available in Hebrew; it is largely incomplete and a more critical analysis of its coherence (or lack of) is called for; and the medieval source upon which Berdichevsky's theoretical edifice is founded is little known. Finally, while Hotam briefly mentions Joseph Klausner's better-known New Testament scholarship (which was also originally written in Hebrew), the similarities and differences between the two Zionist readings of Paul demand a few further observations. This short essay, then, should be regarded as complementary to, and is offered in support of, Hotam's interpretation of *Saul and Paul* as a political theology. As such, it is part of a growing body of studies that have sought to elucidate the ideological motivations that lie behind the

* Lecturer in Modern Jewish-Christian relations, Centre for Jewish Studies, University of Manchester. Email: Daniel.Langton@manchester.ac.uk

[1] Yotam Hotam, 'Berdichevsky's *Saul and Paul*: A Jewish Political Theology', *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies* 6/1 (2007), 51–68.

tradition of Jewish historical consideration of Christian origins that goes back to the *Wissenschaft des Judenthums* (the historical study of Judaism), of which the best known example is Susannah Heschel's *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus* (1998).[2]

In order to understand just how radical an interpretation of Paul is offered by Berdichevsky, let us begin with a short overview of the interpretation offered by Joseph Klausner (1874-1956), the Jewish historian and prominent Zionist whose approach to Paul was also profoundly shaped by his nationalist ideology.[3] Born near Vilna, Lithuania, Klausner studied in Germany and became a committed Zionist, attending the first Zionist Congress in Basle in 1897. Following the Bolshevik Revolution (October 1917) he emigrated from Odessa, Russia, to Palestine. From 1925 he taught Modern Hebrew Literature and the History of the Second Temple Period at the Hebrew University. He became increasingly nationalist in his views and was regarded as the ideologue of the Revisionist Party, which from the 1920s and 30s was the principal *[2]*opposition to Weizmann's leadership. Not Orthodox, Klausner would probably have identified with the Conservative movement if it had existed in *Eretz Yisrael* at that time.[4] His historical writings on Jesus and Christian beginnings were amongst the earliest comprehensive treatments in Hebrew; in addition to *Jesus of Nazareth* (1922) he wrote *From Jesus to Paul* (1939).[5]

Klausner's interest in both Jesus and Paul stemmed from a concern to reclaim influential Jews for Jewish history or, more precisely, to utilize them in the Zionist project to construct a strong nationalist identity. This involved contrasting Jewish and Christian worldviews, as Klausner made clear in his conclusion.

> My deepest conviction is this: Judaism will never become reconciled with Christianity (in the sense of spiritual [religious and intellectual] compromise), nor will it be assimilated by Christianity; for Judaism and Christianity are not only two different religions, but they were also *two different world-views*. Judaism will never allow itself to reach even in theory the ethical extremeness characteristic

---

[2] Susannah Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998). A useful introduction to the study of Jewish ideological approaches to the New Testament can be found in Jonathan Brumberg-Kraus, 'A Jewish Ideological Perspective on the Study of Christian Scripture', *Jewish Social Studies* 4/1 (1997), 121–152, albeit that this is a little dated now. In the specific case of the apostle Paul, one might point to: Daniel R. Langton, 'Modern Jewish Identity and the Apostle Paul: Pauline Studies as an Intra-Jewish Ideological Battleground', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28/2 (2005), 217–258; Daniel R. Langton, 'The Myth of the "Traditional Jewish View of Paul" and the Role of the Apostle in Modern Jewish–Christian Polemics', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28/1 (2005), 69–104; Pamela Eisenbaum, 'Following in the Footnotes of the Apostle Paul', in Jose Ignacio Cabezón & Sheila Greeve Davaney, eds., *Identity and the Politics of Scholarship in the Study of Religion* (London: Routledge, 2004), 77–97; Stefan Meissner, *Die Heimholung des Ketzers: Studien zur jüdischen Auseinandersetzung mit Paulus* (Mohr: Tübingen, 1996); Nancy Fuchs-Kreimer, 'The Essential Heresy: Paul's View of the Law According to Jewish Writers, 1886–1986', PhD thesis, Temple University (May 1990); Donald A. Hagner, 'Paul in Modern Jewish Thought', in Donald A. Hagner and Murray J. Harris, eds, *Pauline Studies: Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1980), 143–165; Halvor Ronning, 'Some Jewish Views of Paul as Basis of a Consideration of Jewish-Christian Relations', *Judaica* 24 (1968), 82–97.

[3] This short overview of Klausner was first published in Daniel R. Langton, 'Modern Jewish Identity and the Apostle Paul: Pauline Studies as an Intra-Jewish Ideological Battleground', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28/2 (2005), 223–226.

[4] Kling argued that, in matters of religion, Klausner was not an Orthodox Jew, and many of his friends were secular Zionists, although he himself was observant of tradition. Simcha Kling, *Joseph Klausner* (Cranbury, NJ: Thomas Yoseloff, 1970).

[5] Joseph Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth: His Life, Times, and Teaching*, trans. by Herbert Danby (London: Allen & Unwin, 1925). Hebrew original *Yeshu ha-Notsri* (Jerusalem: Shtibel, 1922); Joseph Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul*, trans. by William F. Stinespring (London: Allen & Unwin, 1943). Hebrew original *Mi-Yeshu ad Paulus* (Tel Aviv: Mada, 1939).

of Christianity; this extremeness has no place in the world of reality, and therefore is likely in actual fact to be converted into its direct opposite – into brutality such as has been seen in the Middle Ages and in our own time in any number of 'Christian' countries.[6]

The Zionist concern with the differences between Jewish and non-Jewish worldviews provides the key to Klausner's understanding of Paul. The apostle's background had been one of Hellenistic Judaism and paganism. Far from *Eretz Yisrael*, Paul had been 'detached from authentic, living Judaism, which was rooted in its own soil'.[7] This accounted for his message, 'a whole new doctrine which was not Judaism, [but] which was in fact anti-Judaism, the complete antithesis of Judaism'.[8] Specifically, it accounted for his teachings regarding dying and rising gods.[9] But Klausner was drawn to Paul for more than simply the opportunity to hold him up as a representative of a hostile Christian religion or non-Jewish worldview. At the same time, there was a desire to reclaim Paul the Jew as a significant player in world history, to recognize even in the apostle to the Gentiles the genius and power of authentic Judaism. Klausner was appreciative of certain of Paul's 'lofty and beautiful' teachings,[10] and he acknowledged that the influential Christian thinker's dependence upon Torah (and even the oral law) had helped protect Judaism down through the centuries.[11] In attempting to have his cake and eat it, Klausner explained:

> Intensive research over many years has brought the writer of the present book to a deep conviction that there is nothing in the teaching of Paul – not even the most mystical elements in it – that did not come to him from authentic Judaism. For all theories and hypotheses that Paul drew his opinions *directly* from the Greek philosophical literature or the mystery religions of his time have no sufficient foundation. But it is a fact that most of the elements in his teaching which came from Judaism received unconsciously at his hands *a non-Jewish coloring* from influence of the Hellenistic-Jewish and pagan atmosphere with which Paul of Tarsus was surrounded during nearly all of his life, except for the few years which he spent in Jerusalem. . .[12]

Klausner was prepared to accept that Paul had probably studied for a while under Gamaliel in Jerusalem, his Pharisaic training evidenced by his use of scripture.[13] While there, he had possibly met Jesus and had *[3]*come to vigorously oppose him.[14] A combination of Jesus' crucifixion and Stephen's martyrdom had provoked an epileptic fit or vision that had put Paul on a very different path, his guilt in opposing Jesus only being relieved by his devotion to the risen Christ.[15] Thereafter, Paul had devoted himself to the Gentiles, adopting a *Realpolitik* approach which Klausner recognized as making possible the success of Christianity, the contradictions he had introduced being both inevitable and necessary for that success.[16] The

---

[6] Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul*, 609.
[7] Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul*, 465.
[8] Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul*, 443.
[9] Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul*, 344–45.
[10] Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul*, 603.
[11] Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul*, 606-609. The early Church Father Augustine portrayed the Jews as guardians of scripture, and argued that they should be protected so that their Law, which they did not accept testified to the truth of Christianity, should not be forgotten. *City of God* 5 (414–25). Ironically, Klausner sees Paul in a similar role on behalf of the Jews, unwittingly acting as their protector as a result of his dependence upon the Law.
[12] Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul*, 466.
[13] Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul*, 309–12, 606–609.
[14] Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul*, 314–15.
[15] Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul*, 325–30.
[16] Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul*, 429–30.

apostle's talent for adaptability ('a thorough-going opportunist . . . a clever politician') had allowed Paul to appeal to the Gentiles by teaching of the Jewish messiah without reference to Jewish nationality.[17] In that he believed that Jesus' teaching would not have won over the non-Jewish world, Klausner regarded Christianity as the creation of Paul, 'who was much more denationalized and divided in soul than was Jesus – the latter being a Jew of Palestine only, and hence not affected by foreign or conflicting influences'.[18] At the same time, he accepted that, as far as Paul was concerned, his negation of the importance of Israel's Torah that he had taught and preached had not cut him off from the people of Israel.[19]

Klausner's use of Paul as an object lesson, illustrating the opposing worldviews of Judaism and Christianity, was fundamentally a Zionist critique. Paul's inauthenticity was, he claimed, rooted in his lack of intimacy with the Land. His creation of a world religion was made possible only by de-nationalizing Judaism, something that neither the prophets nor Jesus had sought to do. All the same, one is left in no doubt that any positive assessment of his significance should be understood in terms of the influence of authentic Judaism. After all was said and done, Paul was a Jew and a significant figure in the national history of the Jews. The unresolved tension accounts in part for Klausner's somewhat confusing claim that Paul's new religion was 'Judaism and non-Judaism at the same time'.[20]

Klausner's historical study is undoubtedly the best known Jewish nationalist critique of the co-founder of Christianity. Far fewer will have heard of the study of Paul by Micah Joseph Berdichevsky (1865–1921) or Mikha Yosef Bin-Gorion as he preferred to call himself.[21] While both men clearly expressed a political agenda through their readings of Paul, seeking to create a myth of Christianity for a Jewish audience, they did so in very different ways. In contrast to the studies by Klausner, who engaged with the wider historical scholarship of the day, Berdichevsky's work was very much the product of an individual novelist, journalist and folklorist, rather than an historian *per se*, with little interest paid to the researches of others, and with a much freer reign granted to his imagination.

Born into a *hasidic* rabbinic family in Ukrainian Medzibezh, Berdichevsky's traditional *yeshivah* education was undermined by his surreptitious reading of *Haskalah* works. These writings of the Jewish Enlightenment eventually resulted in rebellion and a life-long literary obsession with the inner turmoil of those individuals torn between modern ideas and traditional ways of life and thought. After leaving Russia he studied in both Switzerland and Germany, where he settled; his compositions in Yiddish, German and Hebrew included articles and stories, collections of Hebrew myths, and analyses of the origins of Judaism with particular emphasis on the Samaritans. He has been described as one of the founding fathers of secular Jewish nationalism, not least because his compilations of Jewish legends championed a nationalistic, worldly alternative to the religiously normative view of Jewish history.[22] But *[4]*it is for his scholarly writings on Christianity that this giant of modern Hebrew literature is of interest here. In addition to the posthumous *Jesus Son of Hanan*

---

[17] Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul*, 312, 431, 446.

[18] Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul*, 309–12, 590.

[19] Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul*, 415–16.

[20] Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul*, 465.

[21] For both names there are many alternative spellings. Note that while 'Berdichevsky' is used in the text above, the relevant alternative will be given when citing works published under a different name.

[22] M.Y. Berdichevsky, *Miriam and Other Stories*, trans. by Avner Holtzman (New Milford: The Toby Press, 2004), 9.

(1959)[23] – which controversially identified Jesus of Nazareth with the Jesus ben Hanan mentioned in Josephus *and* with the Actian character of the martyr Stephen – Berdichevsky also wrote the equally incendiary *Saul and Paul* (1971). Both were probably originally written in Berlin, shortly before the author's death.[24]

Shaul ve-Paul represents one of the most striking interpretations of the apostle to the Gentiles offered by any Jewish author, and one which ran entirely contrary to the traditional Christian account of the Jewish Saul who converted to become the Christian Paul and apostle to the Gentiles. The main idea appears to have been that Saul and Paul were two different individuals whose distinct traditions had been amalgamated by the early Christians into the familiar New Testament narrative. In developing his theory, Berdichevsky identified the earliest version of Paul's blinding and conversion as the mysterious Hebrew legend of Abba Gulish, a non-Jewish pagan priest who converted to Judaism and spread his teaching among the Gentiles of the Hellenistic world. Later, Berdichevsky suggested, the Gentile followers of Paul and the Jewish followers of Jesus merged this figure with another, a Jew called Saul, to create the composite, fictitious figure of Saul-Paul, who functioned as a unifying figure between the two groups and as a bridge between the Hellenistic and the Jewish elements of Christian thought.

As an uprooted, marginal thinker, capable of embracing logically contradictory positions and emotions, the nature of Berdichevsky's manuscript does not make for easy analysis.[25] To make matters worse, he failed to complete his study of Paul and it was left to his literary executors to collate the material and publish it in fragmented form.[26] His wife, Rachel Bin Gorion, translated some of the book from the original German into Hebrew and his son, Immanel Bin Gorion, finished the translation, arranged it, and added editorial comments together with a short introduction, summary chapter and an endnote. Of Micah's material, the first part, which was entitled Consecutive Chapters and which was almost completed, includes the story of Abba Gulish and analyses the different versions of the accounts of

---

[23] Micah Yosef Berdichevsky [Bin Gorion], *Yeshu ben Hanan*, ed. Immanuel Bin Gorion (Jerusalem: Mosad Ha-Rav Kuk, 1959).

[24] Micah Yosef Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, ed. Immanuel Bin Gorion (Tel Aviv: Moreshet Micha Yosef, 1971). The fragmentary nature of the work makes dating difficult, with some parts self-evidently written long before the other parts.

[25] For example, Berdichevsky's primary interest in the parallels between Paul and Abba Gulish are undermined by his speculative identification of Paul with several other individuals including Apollos in the New Testament and possibly even rabbi Akiva in the Talmud: M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 36, 127, 129–130. More difficult still is the confusing interchangeability of the names Saul, Saulus, Paul, Paulus, Saul-Paul and Abba Gulish. It appears that Berdichevsky had not entirely decided upon the strict distinction between the Jewish figure of Saul and the Gentile figure of Paul or Abba Gulish. Within the first part of the book, he could write, for example, 'Another detail which may give proof of Abba Gulish and Abba Saul being identical: Paul the Apostle was also slandered against in that he had embezzled funds meant for the poor': M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 18. Within the Notes section, he explicitly identifies Abba Gulish with both Abba Saul and Paul (e.g. ibid., 126, 127) and explicitly distinguishes between Saul and Paul (e.g. *ibid*., 127, 128, 129). Nevertheless, Berdichevsky's son and editor, Immanuel Bin Gorion, understood the two-person theory to be his father's main thesis, explaining, 'The book was to be given the title *Saul and Paul* in order to demonstrate from the start that, in the author's opinion, these are two traditions; not necessarily a case of Saul the Jew turning into Paul the apostle to the Gentiles, but a case of the original figure being one of a non-Jew . . . [Only later] was created that intermediate figure, Saul of Tarsus.' Comments by Immanuel Bin Gorion in M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 7. See also *ibid*., 145. The two-person theory is also the reading adopted in, for example, Yotam Hotam, 'Berdichevsky's *Saul and Paul*: A Jewish Political Theology', *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies* 6/1 (March 2007), 51-68, and Jonathan D. Brumberg-Kraus, 'A Jewish Ideological Perspective on the Study of Christian Scripture', *Jewish Social Studies* 4/1 (1997), 124.

[26] Comments by Immanuel Bin Gorion in M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 7.

Paul's conversion, offers a commentary on a number of episodes in the book of Acts such as Paul's visits to Athens and Ephesus, and considers such themes as the distinction in Christian tradition between the killed hero (Jesus) and the escaped hero (Paul). The second part, which was entitled Diverse Chapters, includes standalone studies of various Pauline topics such as the purpose of Paul's visit to Jerusalem, speeches in Paul's defence, and his views on baptism. It begins with a short introductory piece in which Berdichevsky *[5]*offers a critical reading of Acts. The third part, which is entitled Notes, is a set of jottings from his work journal which includes possible alternative versions. Berdichevsky had to both write another section that identified traces of Paul (and Peter) in the writings of Josephus and also include an appendix devoted to the epistles attributed to Paul and demonstrating that 'Pauline' polemic had been directed again the Samaritans (this being a favourite subject in Berdichevsky's researches).

In terms of sources for the life of Paul, Berdichevsky's interest in the New Testament is limited. His use of Acts is focused primarily upon passages where the apostle is involved in mission to the Gentiles and where he confronts Hellenistic worship and ritual. He is also suspicious of the epistles, which are regarded merely as literary forms expressing the views of a fictional character.[27] Nevertheless, he accepts that the New Testament does offer evidence of a Jew called Saul, about which little is actually known, who was also mentioned in Jewish sources. According to Berdichevsky, the first authentic reference to this Saul is Acts 13:2–3, where he is said to have been chosen by the Holy Spirit;[28] just as significantly, Christian tradition held that he had received his divine calling from the risen Jesus.[29] The same character could also be found in Jewish literature. No doubt referring to a sage from the mishnaic period called Abba Shaul, Berdichevsky stated, 'Abba Saul is a figure of importance among the tannaim [sages]'.[30] He also makes the unsubstantiated assertion that '[i]n modern Hebrew literature, Paul the apostle is sometimes called Abba Saul.'[31] In summary, the only thing known for sure about this Saul (from Berdichevsky's point of view) was that he was Jewish.[32]

---

[27] 'More than once (in the books of the New Testament) we have before us a fictional apostle's letter': M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 102. According to Immanuel Bin Gorion, his father also searched for traces of Paul and his teachings in Flavius Josephus, although with what success we do not know since he never wrote the chapter. He had been particularly interested in the case of the unknown man on whose account the Jews were expelled from Rome (*Antiquities* 13.3.5). Comments by Immanuel Bin Gorion in M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 7.

[28] M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 126. In fact, according to Berdichevsky, the Saul of the New Testament is himself a composite character. He regards the young man at whose feet Stephen's executors laid their cloaks (Acts 7) to be a distinct figure from the Saul who persecuted the early Christians. Although 'later legend combined them into a single figure', Berdichevsky was not convinced that 'the same young man who looked after the garments became the zealous persecutor of Stephen's followers and the destroyer of the community'. M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 32.

[29] '[Saul] had the privilege to be called, according to legend, by Jesus . . . Jesus appeared to him ['Saul-Paul'] after his [Jesus'] death'. M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 127–128.

[30] 'Tannaim' refers to the sages living in the first- to second-centuries who were involved in the compilation of the Mishnah. For Abba Saul, see Niddah 24b and Avot 2:8: M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 18, 21–22. Later, he asserts that the story of Paul (Abba Gulish), who had opposed pagan idols with the knowledge of the one true god, had influenced talmudic and midrashic tales of Abraham attacking statues of idols. Such influence was suggestive to him of an early date for the story of Abba Gulish. M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 129.

[31] M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 17.

[32] As Immanuel Bin Gorion notes, '[W]e can only say with certainty about . . . the one called Saul, that he was Jewish, which is obviously not the case with Paul'. Comments by Immanuel Bin Gorion in M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 145.

Berdichevsky's conceit is that one need not identify the Jewish Saul with the figure of Paul. To learn more about Paul, one should rather turn to the tale of Abba Gulish. This apocryphal story is valued very highly by Berdichevsky because he believes it to be derived from a Hebrew tradition that was ancient enough to be taken seriously as an alternative to the New Testament account(s) of Paul. Although the legend was discovered in a medieval manuscript, he emphasises that it is 'written in the Hebrew of the *[6]*Mishnaic and Talmudic period', that is, it possesses an ancient pedigree.[33] Since it was not to be found in the talmudic literature, he is also hopeful that it was relatively free from religious bias.[34]

> In the story of Abba Gulish we have a Hebrew text about Saul-Paul and his path to the faith . . . But it is no secondary [or derivative] text of Paul's conversion as presented in Acts of the Apostles. The story of Abba Gulish needs to be seen as a relic from an earlier time . . . [A] picture emerges which is nearer the historical background than that presented in Acts.[35]

This story tells of a pagan priest called Abba Gulish who served as a priest in 'an idolatrous temple' in Damascus and who used to pilfer the donations. Habitually calling upon his idol for healing and receiving none, he one day called upon 'the Sovereign of the Universe' who promptly cured him. Moving to Tiberias he converted to Judaism where 'he ran after the *mitzvot* [commandments]' and began a new life as an administrator for the poor. Eventually he was overcome by temptation and began embezzling money again – with the consequence that he went blind. Returning to Damascus, he stood before the Gentiles (who believed that he had lost his sight because he had scorned the idol) and delivered a public speech. Pointing out that in all the time he had stolen from the temple donations the idol had never punished him, he went on to confess that he had resumed his criminal activities in Tiberias until struck down. He therefore attributed his condition not to the idol but to the One 'whose eyes roam the whole world and no misdeed is beyond Him to see [and punish]', whereupon, having witnessed to God's power and judgement, his sight was miraculously restored. And 'from the nations thousands and tens of thousands . . . [found] shelter under the wings of the shekhinah', that is, converted to Judaism.[36]

According to Christian tradition Paul had been a Jewish convert to Christianity, while Abba Gulish was a pagan who converted to Judaism. What, then, made Berdichevsky think that Abba Gulish and Paul were one and the same person? His evidence was a string of

---

[33] The story was included in a collection of *aggadot* in Moses Gaster, *Sefer hama'asiyot* ('The Book of Tales', Ramsgate: 1896), republished as *Sefer hama'asiyot: The Exempla of the Rabbis* (London: 1924), which Gaster had printed from a manuscript which he had dated variously from the ninth- to the thirteenth-centuries. Berdichevsky was delighted to discover that the story was also to be found in the *Midrash ha-Gadol* (published as David Hoffman, *Great Midrash: Exodus* [Berlin, 1913]), a compilation of commentaries on the Torah dating to perhaps the fifteenth-century which apparently drew upon a lost source that included the tale of Abba Gulish and whose text is identical to that of the *Sefer hama'asiyot* (except for its attribution). M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 11, 13, 15–16.

[34] Berdichevsky explains his rationale: 'It will not be surprising to say that Rabbinical texts, written in the Talmudic and Midrashic period, are capable of reflecting a much earlier period. Ancient themes, excluded from the Holy Scriptures due to dogmatic or historical tendencies, have come up again and become preserved in Talmudic literature, some in disguised and some in open fashion. In the body of religious tractates whose main aim is to strengthen and exalt monotheistic faith, you occasionally come across idolatrous residues form the earlier days, and these residues completely contradict the book's intentions and morality'. M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 18.

[35] M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 17. Rather confusingly, Berdichevsky says in this paragraph: 'Abba Gulish is to be read as Abba Saul.' Since his main thesis is to *distinguish* between the Jewish Saul and the Gentile Abba Gulish or Paul, this must be put down to a copying error or confusion or evidence of Berdichevsky's experimentation with an alternative theory.

[36] See my appendix 'The Story of Abbu Gulish in *The Book of Tales*' for the Hebrew text and translation.

intriguing parallels in the stories. He highlights the importance placed in both accounts upon Damascus,[37] and notes that both Paul and Abba Gulish had been treasurers[38] associated with accusations of embezzlement of funds meant for the poor.[39] Both men are described as zealous against idolatry,[40] both became fully convinced of the new faith's power and truth having had their blindness miraculously healed,[41] and both are responsible for the conversion of many *[7]*gentiles.[42] Pointing out that, as a convert, Abba Gulish would not have been appointed administrator of poor money entrusted to the temple priest, Berdichevsky comes to the conclusion that the text as it stands does not make sense, and that it must be referring to 'a *new* community whose members, who had just come to the faith, appointed him their treasurer'.[43] The conversion of Abba Gulish, he argues, had been from idolatry to an early form of Christianity rather than to Judaism. Thus the story was in fact a *Christian* one, albeit preserved in modified form by a Jewish source. In Berdichevsky's mind, the legend of Abba Gulish represents an alternative but more authoritative version of the conversion of Paul. He argues that the recognition of Paul's pagan background also explains his success among them, for real influence over the Gentiles could only have been exerted by one who had emerged from among them, and all the more so by a former priest.[44] When properly reconstructed, the story ran as follows.

> [Paul] was an idolatrous priest in a temple in Damascus; and there appears to have been there a small Christian community, which was persecuted by the idolatrous priests, and especially by [Paul]. At a time of severe illness and inner distress, [Paul] appealed to the god of the Christians and was healed; at that moment he became a Christian. On behalf of the Christian community he was appointed as treasurer, became blind, went back to Damascus and could see again. Thanks to the miracle, he succeeded in converting Damascenes to Christianity.[45]

The Hebrew version of the story might have been adapted by its editors so that the name 'Jesus' had been replaced by 'Sovereign of the Universe' but the essence of the story remained the same: the hero was a pagan who became an emissary to the pagans on behalf of a community of the faithful.[46] Without explaining how there came to be an embryonic Christian community in Damascus for Paul or Abba Gulish to join in the first place,

---

[37] M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 126.

[38] M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 126.

[39] Berdichevsky infers this from 2 Corinthians 8:20–21 where Paul writes, 'taking precaution so that no one will discredit us in our administration of this generous gift'. M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 18.

[40] Citing the Actian accounts of Paul's speeches to the pagans in Athens (17:16–34) and in Ephesus (19:23–41), Berdichevsky points out that Paul's theology simply focuses on idolatry and is therefore a lot less refined than in other speeches, implying greater authenticity. M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 126.

[41] Saul's three days of blindness are also compared to the Jewish tradition that Joseph held his brothers under arrest for three days and Jonah's three day sojourn in the bowels of the fish: M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 34.

[42] Comments by Immanuel Bin Gorion in M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 149.

[43] M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 18.

[44] M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 126.

[45] M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 126. This is one of several occasions when, rather confusingly, Berdichevsky writes 'Saul' despite the fact that the logic of the two-person theory requires 'Paul'. It may be a copying error or reflect some confusion in his thought. Possibly this is a draft in which Berdichevsky was experimenting with an alternative theory in which Saul, Paul and Abba Gulish are one person. According to the two-person theory, he cannot actually mean 'Saul', since he argues elsewhere that Saul was a distinct person, a Jew who is referred to in the early part of Acts and (as Abba Shaul) in a few tractates in the Talmud. He cannot mean 'Saul-Paul' since he is explicit elsewhere that this character of Christian tradition is a fictional construct that amalgamates the Jewish Saul with the Gentile Paul. In this quotation, then, 'Saul' has been replaced with 'Paul.'

[46] M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 126.

Berdichevsky was nonetheless convinced that the former pagan priest was soon leading this Gentile Christian group and, ultimately, should be held responsible for its spectacular success.

Over time, Berdichevsky suggests, this new anti-idolatrous Gentile movement sought to attach itself to the existing monotheistic tradition of Judaism.[47] With the destruction of the Temple, Judaism itself had become fragmented and it so happened that the form of Judaism that the Gentile Paulinists found most conducive was the Jewish-Christian movement, that is, the followers of Jesus.[48] The Gentile known as Abba Gulish or Paul and the Jew Saul were two different people, but, as a means by which to give Gentile Christianity greater credibility, they were merged within Christian tradition. Berdichevsky argues that 'only after the characters of Saul and Paul were joined together was a story of conversion attributed to Saul, also.'[49] As he explains,

> A religious movement became attached to Abba Gulish the convert. The circle of the followers of Jesus . . . which converged after his death, was initially independent and developed separately. Later on the two movements merged . . . Paul, the gentile, became connected with the figure of Saul since the latter had the privilege to be called by Jesus, according to legend.[50]

*[8]*The predominance of the miraculous conversion story within Christian tradition could be explained psychologically in terms of the desire of many early Christians to sever their oppressive ties to their past, 'and Paul's example served as a source of encouragement for them.'[51]

Berdichevsky is keen to stress several key findings. Firstly, Christianity's roots had been pagan, not Jewish. Secondly, Gentile Christianity's ancient strategy to invest itself with authority by associating with Judaism had now been revealed and discredited. Thirdly, the universalist tendency of its founder, Paul, had been trumped by the Jewish nationalist spirit for, according to Berdichevsky, the historical development had been from the notion of a cosmic Christ to that of a Jewish messiah, and not *vice versa*, as many scholars would have it. According to his own researches,

> Gentile Christianity won 'ordination' from Judaism after the fact . . . Christianity did not reach the Gentiles via Jewish Christianity. It stands more to reason that Christianity, which was Gentile from its beginning, succeeded in gaining followers among the Jews. Accepted opinion indicates, of course, a reverse process: Jewish Christianity existed first, and then a Gentile Christianity was added to it; the two competed and finally the Gentile Christianity won. But it is near certain that things occurred in a different order. It appears that Christianity was born within Diaspora Jewry; through the conversion of many Gentiles, new ideas and redemptive hopes arose. These *general* ideas slowly took on a *national* form; thus it turned out that the saviour of humankind gradually became the saviour of Israel . . . [T]he Jewish-national Christianity rose up against the international ambitions which had preceded it.[52]

---

[47] 'Paulinism and Islam are two religions which arose by themselves and only later sought to become tied to Judaism'. M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 129.

[48] M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 128.

[49] M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 126–127.

[50] M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 127, 128.

[51] M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 37.

[52] M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 128. This was reflected in the Christian literature: 'In the Acts of the Apostles, the figure of Paul became secondary in importance compared to the figure of Saul; in other words, Saul overcame Paul'. *Ibid*., 129.

Both Klausner and Berdichevsky had sought to criticise Paul from a Zionist perspective. But whereas Klausner had ultimately found fault with the Diaspora Pharisee in his lack of nationalist feeling yet, at the same time, had been uncomfortable about disowning him entirely, Berdichevsky's critique was quite unambivalent. Attributing historicity to a Hebrew legend rather than a Greek Christian one, Berdichevsky saw Paulinism as an essentially pagan philosophical system. But while many before and after him would find the seeds of Christianity in the Jewish Paul's adoption of non-Jewish, Hellenistic ideas, Berdichevsky went one step further and denied Paul even a Jewish birth. In this way he refuted the idea that Christianity was simply Judaism polluted by pagan thought; rather, by attributing its emergence to a pagan priest, the Zionist scholar sought to demonstrate the fundamentally non-Jewish, alien nature of Christianity.

In his article, Hotam is eminently sensible to stress the ideological significance of Berdichevsky's incomplete work over the quality of the scholarship. Certainly there has been no interest among New Testament scholars in the Abbu Gulish / Paul thesis since it was first published in 1971. No doubt this is because it appears as a quaint throw-back to some kind of nineteenth-century speculative scholarship, such as the Life-of-Jesus genre, whose authors breathlessly asserted the conspiratorial links between Jesus and secret Jewish societies and who proffered conspiracy theories for his death and resurrection. One might argue that a similar fate has befallen Hyam Maccoby, whose own revisionist history of Paul as a gentile-born opportunist, *The Mythmaker*, was also dependent upon an ancient account of dubious historical import.[53] Fundamentally, however, the logic of Berdichevsky's anti-Christian polemic fails at an internal level, about which Hotam has nothing to say. Berdichevsky assumed three concentric rings of Jewish authenticity in the ancient world (that is, Palestinian Jewry, Diaspora Jewry, and converts to Judaism) and stressed that the first two had already diverged considerably in the first-century. It was the third circle, that of the pagan converts to Diaspora Judaism, he says, that had been the source of early *[9]*Christianity.[54] It is therefore difficult to see how, if Berdichevsky had finished his book, he would have reconciled the claims that Paul converted to Christianity *and* that he was responsible for its pagan origins. If the 'small Christian community' in Damascus which Abbu Gulish / Paul joined was 'Christian' in any meaningful sense, then where did they get their ideas from if not from a Jewish-Christian source? Why call them 'Christians' (*notzrim*) if they are understood to have no connections to Jesus of Nazareth? If, on the other hand, these 'Christians' whom Abba Gulish / Paul joined as a convert had been composed of pagan converts to Judaism who had veered away to create a new universalist religion (a kind of proto-Christianity), why not say so, and why not explicitly define which of their beliefs should be regarded as foundational for Christianity?

Berdichevsky's *Saul and Paul* is certainly a political theology of sorts, but it is also a useful reminder of the power of rhetoric. The breathtaking audacity of the central claim is all the

---

[53] In *The Mythmaker: Paul and the Invention of Christianity* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1986) and *Paul and Hellenism* (London: SCM, 1991), Maccoby augments the epistles and some of Acts with Epiphanius' (315–403) *Refutations of Heretics*, which records the accusations of the Ebionites (an early Jewish sect) against Paul. Maccoby concludes that Paul had no Pharisaic background, had Gentile parents, converted to Judaism in Tarsus, worked for the temple Police in Jerusalem and, having been disappointed in his advancement, founded a new religion in his search for fame. Amy-Jill Levine has described the later work as 'an assertive amalgam of insightful observation, historical fancy, and inconsistent argument'. *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 86:1–2 (1995), 230.

[54] M.Y. Bin Gorion, *Shaul ve-Paul*, 128.

more effective because it is communicated by a world-class writer. Arguably, it is only because it comes to us in an incomplete form that we are able to see so clearly how Berdichevsky's obsession with questions concerning Jewish authenticity coloured the study. The unresolved tensions that proliferate throughout the work reveal the Zionist author's primary concern, namely, to preserve the Jewish land, religion and people from the charge that they had given birth to Christianity; he could not tolerate the idea of Israel tainted by the link to the Diaspora religion *par excellence*. Berdichevsky's determination to rewrite the history of Christian origins is shared in common with many other Jewish commentators on the New Testament, including Klausner, but the extraordinary lengths he would go to achieve this end, in distinguishing Saul and Paul, make him unique.

Appendix: The Story of Abbu Gulish in The Book of Tales[55]

Rabbi Pinchas said, There was a story in Damascus about an idolatrous temple there. It had a priest whose name was Abba Gulish and he served before the idol many years. One time, a spirit of distress came upon him, and he cried for help before the idol for many days but to no avail. After that he went outside one night and said, 'Sovereign of the Universe, hear my prayer and redeem me from my distress.' And he was cured. He stole away and came to Tiberias and converted [to Judaism] and he ran after the *mitzvot* [commandments]. He was appointed administrator for the poor [but as soon as] monies were entrusted to him, the hands that had been accustomed to pilfer when they had been in the idolatrous temple, began to pilfer the dedicated money [once more]. Immediately he felt [pain] in one of his eyes and it became blind. Again, he reached out for the dedicated [funds] and felt [pain] in the other one and it became blind. And those from his [previous life and] place would come to Tiberias and see him blind and tell him, 'Abba Gulish, what were you thinking, that you scorned the idol and abandoned it so that it punished you so?' And more and more others [came and reproved him]. What did he do? He said to his wife, 'Stand! Put all other business on hold until we have been to Damascus.' And she took hold of his hand and they set off. As they arrived at the small towns within the environs of Damascus, people gathered about him and said, 'Here is Abba Gulish. The idol did right to you in that he made you blind.' He said to them, 'I have not come [for any reason] other than to seek him and to make peace with him, [and then] perhaps he will open my eyes for me!' But he was scorning them [in saying this] all the way to Damascus. Having entered [the city], the people of Damascus gathered about him, and said to him, 'Master Abba Gulish, what is the purpose of your visit?' He said to them, 'What does it look like?' They replied, '[If] you think you are scorning the idol, he is scorning you more.' And mocking them, he said, 'I have come to make peace with him, perhaps he will take pity on me. Only go and bring together all the people of the city.' They gathered crowds upon crowds on the roofs and on the ground and inside the temple to watch Abba *[10]*Gulish [and what would happen] in the idolatrous temple. He told his wife to stand him on the platform that he knew was there. He went and stood on it and said to them, 'My brothers, people of Damascus, while I was a priest and serving this idol, people used to

entrust me with deposits. And I was able to betray them, since the idol has no eyes to see, nor ears to hear, so as to punish me. Now I have gone to [the One] whose eyes roam the whole world and no misdeed is beyond Him to see [and punish]. And my hands wished to pilfer and take [again], as I had been accustomed, but before I even had a chance to do it, he punished me. Therefore *He* blinded my eyes.' Rabbi Pinchas ha-Cohen ben Khama said, He did not come down from the platform until the Holy One, blessed be He, restored his sight and doubled his honour and authority with the people, so that His Name was sanctified in the world. And there thousands and tens of thousands from the [Gentile] nations converted [to Judaism] and they attained [the blessing] of finding shelter under the wings of the *Shekhinah* through him.

מ ע ש ה. ת נ ו ר ב נ ן. אמ' ר' פינחס מעשה היה בדמסקיה שהיה שם בית צלם אחד. והיה לו
כומר ושמו אבא גוליש. והיה משמש לפני הצלם שָׁנִים הרבה. פעם אחת הגיעו אננקי¹ שלצער צעק
לפני הצלם ימים הרבה ולא הועיל לו. אחר כך יצא לחוץ בלילה ואמ' רבונו שלעולם שמע תפלתי.
ופדני מצרתי, ונתרפא. גנב עצמו ובא לו לטבריה ונתגייר. והיה מרדף אחר המצות. נתמנה פרנס
על העניים. כיון שנכנסו מעות תחת ידו. הידים שהיו למודות למשמש כשהיו בבית הצלם. התחילו
להיות ממשמשות בקדש. מיד חשש באחת מעיניו ונסמית. שוב שלח ידו בהקדש וחשש בשנייה
ונסמית. והיו בני מקומו באין לטבריה ורואין אותו שהוא סומא. ואומרין לו אבא גוליש. מה ראית
שהיית שוחק בצלם ומניח אותו. ולא היה גובה ממך. וכן אחרים. וכן אחרים. אמ' לאשתו
עמדי || עד שנלך לדמשק. ואחזה בידו והיו מהלכין. כיון שהגיעו לעיירות שבתחום דמשק היו
מתכנסין עליו ואומרין הרי אבא גוּלִיש. יפה עשה לך הצלם שסימא את עינך. אמ' להן אני לא
באתי אלא לבקש ולהשלים לו שמא יפתח לי עיני. והיה שוחק עליהן. עד שנכנס לדמשק. כיון
שנכנסו. נתכנסו עליו אכלוסי דמשק אמרו לו מרי אבא גוליש מה אתה עושה. אמ' להן מה שאתם
רואין. אמרו לו סבור אתה שאתה מלעיג בצלם אף הוא מלעיג בך יתר. ושיחק בהן ואמ' להן
להשלים לו באתי. שמא ירחם עלי. אלא לכו קבצו כל בני המדינה. נתכנסו חיילות חיילות על הגגות
ועל הארץ. ובתוך הבית. לראות לאבא גוליש. כיון שנתמלא בית ע״ז. אמ' לאשתו שתעמידו על העמוד
שהיה מכיר שם. הלך ועמד עליו. ואמ' להן אחי בני דמשק בשעה שהייתי כומר ומשמש לצלם הזה.
היו בני אדם מפקידין אצלי פקדונות. והייתי כופר בהן לפי שאין לצלם עינים לראות. ולא אזנים
לשמוע. כדי שיפרע ממני. עכשיו הלכתי אצל מי שעיניו משוטטות בכל העולם ולא יבצר ממנו
מזמה. ובקשו ידי לעשות ולמשמש וליטול || כמו שהייתי למד. ולא הספקתי לעשות עד שנפרע
ממני. לפיכך סימא את עיני. אמ' ר' פינחס הכהן בן חמא לא ירד מן העמוד. עד שהאיר לו הקב״ה
את עיניו. וכפל כבודו ומוראו על הבריות. כדי שיתקדש שמו בעולם. ונתגייר[ו] מן האומות אלפים
ורבבות. וזכו להסתופף תחת כנפי השכינה על ידו.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Berdichevsky, Micah Yosef [Bin Gorion], *Yeshu ben Hanan*, ed. Immanuel Bin Gorion (Jerusalem: Mosad Ha-Rav Kuk, 1959).

Berdichevsky, M.Y., *Miriam and Other Stories*, trans. Avner Holtzman (New Milford: The Toby Press, 2004).

Bin Gorion, Micah Yosef, *Shaul ve-Paul*, ed. Immanuel Bin Gorion (Tel Aviv: Moreshet Micha Yosef, 1971).

Brumberg-Kraus, Jonathan, 'A Jewish Ideological Perspective on the Study of Christian Scripture', *Jewish Social Studies* 4.1 (1997), 121–152.

Eisenbaum, Pamela, 'Following in the Footnotes of the Apostle Paul', in Jose Ignacio Cabezón and Sheila Greeve Davaney, eds., *Identity and the Politics of Scholarship in the Study of Religion* (London: Routledge, 2004), 77–97.

Fuchs-Kreimer, Nancy, 'The Essential Heresy: Paul's View of the Law According to Jewish Writers, 1886–1986', PhD thesis, Temple University (May 1990).

Gaster, Moses, *Sefer hamaʿasiyot* ('The Book of Tales', Ramsgate, 1896), republished as *Sefer hamaʿasiyot: The Exempla of the Rabbis* (London, 1924).

Hagner, Donald A., 'Paul in Modern Jewish Thought', in Donald A. Hagner and Murray J. Harris, eds., *Pauline Studies: Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1980), 143–165.

Heschel, Susannah, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

Hotam, Yotam, 'Berdichevsky's *Saul and Paul*: A Jewish Political Theology', *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies* 6.1 (2007), 51–68.

Maccoby, Hyam, *The Mythmaker: Paul and the Invention of Christianity* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1986).

Maccoby, Hyam, *Paul and Hellenism* (London: SCM, 1991).

Klausner, Joseph, *Jesus of Nazareth: His Life, Times, and Teaching*, trans. Herbert Danby (London: Allen & Unwin, 1925). Hebrew original *Yeshu ha-Notsri* (Jerusalem: Shtibel, 1922).

Klausner, Joseph, *From Jesus to Paul*, trans. by William F. Stinespring (London: Allen & Unwin, 1943). Hebrew original *Mi-Yeshu ad Paulus* (Tel Aviv: Mada, 1939).

Kling, Simcha, *Joseph Klausner* (Cranbury, NJ: Thomas Yoseloff, 1970).

Langton, Daniel R., 'The Myth of the "Traditional Jewish View of Paul" and the Role of the Apostle in Modern Jewish–Christian Polemics', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28.1 (2005), 69–104.

Langton, Daniel R., 'Modern Jewish Identity and the Apostle Paul: Pauline Studies as an Intra-Jewish Ideological Battleground', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28.2 (2005), 217–258.

Levine, Amy-Jill, Reviewed work: *Paul and Hellenism* by Hyam Maccoby, *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 86.1/2 (Jul.–Oct., 1995), 230–232.

Meissner, Stefan, *Die Heimholung des Ketzers: Studien zur jüdischen Auseinandersetzung mit Paulus* (Mohr: Tübingen, 1996).

Ronning, Halvor, 'Some Jewish Views of Paul as Basis of a Consideration of Jewish-Christian Relations', *Judaica* 24 (1968), 82–97.

THE NATURE OF ULTRA-ORTHODOX
RESPONSES TO THE HOLOCAUST

Dan Garner*

Abstract: This study examines the religious response to the Shoah of Rabbi Kalonymous Shapira, a Chasidic leader in the Warsaw Ghetto during the Second World War. The responses of the Ultra-Orthodox to the Holocaust have long been neglected and/or marginalized, only coming back into considered focus in more recent years. These responses were often associated with the idea of 'punishment for sin' in relation to theological justification of the Holocaust. Yet Shapira's response contains surprising elements concerning his attempt to understand theologically the unfolding sufferings through which he and his community lived (and died). These surprising tendencies can be characterized as 'atheodic' and 'antitheodic' in nature in that they evidence the relinquishing of the effort to justify and explain the suffering. Together these tendencies show Shapira's response to be both more complex and sensitive than Ultra-Orthodox thought has often been given credit for.

Introduction

Within the scholarly literature there has been much discussion of the variety of theological responses to the Holocaust. However, for reasons that will be examined below, little interest has been shown in responses emanating from within Ultra-Orthodox circles. It is only in more recent years that the complexity and depth present within these *charedi* responses has really started to be taken seriously.[1] At the same time as these responses have become more widely known, the scholarship of Holocaust theology in general has been significantly advanced by the work of Zachary Braiterman, who has provided an original and useful analysis of the field by developing the idea of 'antitheodicy'. In this paper I will seek to develop further Braiterman's analysis through a constructive criticism of his concept, and then attempt to apply this new analysis to the Ultra-Orthodox response of Rabbi Kalonymos Shapira, in order to uncover the complexity and depth present in this particular Ultra-Orthodox response. Key to this undertaking will be the recognition of a religious response to suffering and evil that I will term 'atheodicy'. The argument will be developed over three main parts. Part one will examine the consensus view of the Ultra-Orthodox responses to the Holocaust, part two will examine and critique Zachary Braiterman's concept of antitheodicy, and part three will explore Shapira's response to the Holocaust, demonstrating the antitheodic and atheodic content within it; consequently revealing the deep complexity of Shapira's Holocaust theology. In light of this it will be shown that the *charedi* responses

* PhD candidate, University of Manchester. Email: thebluetemple@yahoo.co.uk
[1] For a comprehensive overview of Ultra-Orthodox responses to the Holocaust see part one of S. Katz, S. Bider and G. Greenberg, eds., *Wrestling With God: Jewish Responses During and After The Holocaust* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

have not solely relied upon a one-dimensional theodicy to deal with the religious problems raised by the Holocaust.

Common Views of the Ultra-Orthodox Response

It is only since the 1990s that scholars working within Holocaust theology have begun seriously to focus on the variety of Ultra-Orthodox thought related to the Holocaust. There are a number of possible reasons for this, but one of the primary reasons is that many of the sources were until that time unavailable in English translation, being found only in Hebrew or Yiddish. As well as this, these responses have also been marginalised by being characterized as relying on one-dimensional extremist theodical positions. The Ultra-Orthodox have often been associated with promoting the idea that the Shoah was a punishment sent by God in response to the Jewish sins of assimilation and/or Zionism. This broad characterization of the Ultra-Orthodox views can be clearly seen when Zachary Braiterman states, "In our own day, ultra-Orthodox Jews explain and accept the Holocaust as God's response to the putative sins of assimilation and Zionism."[2] Steven Katz has also stated that, "Satmar Hasidim and other right-wing Orthodox Jews . . . continue to account for the Holocaust through recourse to the doctrine of 'for our sins we are punished'".[3]

*[2]*There is in fact good reason for such a charge to be laid at the door of *some* of the *charedi* rabbis who have attempted to deal theologically with the Holocaust. Most prominent and controversial of these is Rabbi Yoel Teitelbaum (1887–1979) of the Satmar Chasidic community. Despite being a survivor of the Shoah he still developed a theological response to the suffering based primarily on the idea of punishment for sin. He stated, "It is because of the Zionists that six million Jews were killed. The fact is that this is the bitter punishment stipulated in the Talmud . . . (Tractate Ketuboth 111) which results in the payment of a spiritual and physical debt from the Jewish People. Afflictions and tribulations only appear in this world because of the wicked, and the punishment is meted out first upon the righteous."[4] One leading scholar of *charedi* responses, Gershon Greenberg, further explains Teitelbaum's position: "the people of Israel were sworn not to rebel against the nations that ruled them in exile, and they were not to hasten the end of history . . . by ascending to the land of Israel en masse. The nations, conditional on these two oaths, were sworn not to overly oppress the people of Israel."[5]

However, to take Teitelbaum's view as being wholly representative of the Ultra-Orthodox responses would be grossly unfair. In more recent years the work of four scholars in particular has begun to do a great deal to balance out this somewhat skewed view. Gershon Greenberg,[6]

---

[2] Z. Braiterman, (*God) After Auschwitz* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1998), 20.

[3] S. Katz, 'The Issue of Confirmation and Disconfirmation in Jewish Thought after the Shoah', in S. Katz, ed., *The Impact of The Holocaust on Jewish Theology* (New York: New York University Press, 2005), 52.

[4] Y. Teitelbaum, extract from section 110 of *VaYoel Moshe* (1961), found in translation at www.jewsagainstzionism. com.

[5] G. Greenberg, 'Ultra-Orthodox Jewish Thought about the Holocaust since World War II', in S. Katz, *The Impact of The Holocaust on Jewish Theology*, 134.

[6] See Greenberg's articles in S. Katz, *The Impact of The Holocaust on Jewish Theology* (New York: New York University Press, 2005), and part one of Katz et al, *Wrestling With God*.

Nehemiah Polen,[7] Eliezer Schweid[8] and Pesach Schindler[9] have all advanced the understanding of the *charedi* reaction to the Shoah. Importantly, their work (in combination with a number of the primary texts being published in English) has allowed a much deeper and thoughtful analysis of these responses to take place. What becomes evident from contact with the primary sources and through the work of these scholars is that Teitelbaum's extreme response is a symptom of the central Ultra-Orthodox concern of understanding everything as coming from God and as consequently being good in nature.

Pesach Schindler has described the problem as follows: "All that emanates from God is *hesed* (goodness, kindness), though it may be hidden (*nistar*) from man's finite perspective. Suffering must therefore be accepted with love (*kabbalah be'ahavah*) and *mesirat nefesh* (personal sacrifice) on the basis of faith (*emunah*) and unquestioning trust (*bitahon*) in God's ultimate justice."[10] Teitelbaum's solution is one of the most simplistic and extreme ways to account for evil within such a theological context, and it is this extremity which has drawn attention to his response. It is not however the only possible solution, as will be seen below when we examine the response of Kalonymos Shapira. Before that examination is undertaken, we must first be familiar with the work of Zachary Braiterman, whose concept of antitheodicy will help shed some light on the surprising nature of Ultra-Orthodox responses to the Holocaust.

A Constructive Critique of Braiterman's Concept of 'Anti-theodicy'

The scholar Zachary Braiterman has argued that there is a deep strain of what he calls antitheodic thought in Holocaust theology. By this he means that as a discourse Holocaust theology has generally refused to justify God. He defines antitheodicy as, "the religious refusal to "justify," "explain," or "accept" the *[3]*relationship between God and evil".[11] He finds this refusal, albeit to different extents, in the work of Eliezer Berkovits, Richard Rubenstein and Emil Fackenheim, three of the most prominent post-Holocaust theologians to write in this area. From his examination of these thinkers he concludes that Holocaust theology has been largely antitheodic in nature. To fully understand this category of antitheodicy we must first understand the category of theodicy itself.

Theodicy is the attempt to account for evil and suffering by justifying their relationship to God. Judaism has traditionally held that God is a divinity of goodness, power and knowledge, a combination of attributes which, at face value at least, clash with the presence of evil and suffering in the world. This clash has over time come to be known as the problem of evil. This is a problem that has differing forms depending on which tradition is approaching the issue. For example, from the perspective of the Western philosophical tradition the problem of evil is essentially a logical trilemma stemming from the perceived infinite nature of God's attributes. Here, God becomes omnipotent, omniscient and all loving, and solving the problem becomes an exercise in pure logic.

---

[7] N. Polen, *The Holy Fire: The Teachings Of Rabbi Kalonymus Kalman Shapira, The Rebbe of the Warsaw Ghetto* (New Jersey: Jason Aronson, 1994).

[8] E. Schweid, *Wrestling Until Day-break* (Lanham: University Press Of America, 1994).

[9] P. Schindler, *Hasidic Responses to the Holocaust in the Light of Hasidic Thought* (New Jersey: KTAV Publishing House Inc, 1990).

[10] Schindler, *Hasidic Responses to the Holocaust in the light of Hasidic Thought*, ix–x.

[11] Braiterman, *(God) After Auschwitz*, 20.

For Jewish theology (unlike pure philosophy), this problem has to be worked out in a theological manner based upon the written and oral traditions of the faith, rather than in the strictly logical manner of the philosophical tradition. In Jewish tradition this theological problem of evil is intimately bound up with the concept of the Covenant, because it is this institution which binds the two parties, God and His people, together in an agreement which sets out what is expected of the two participants. God commands the laws by which the people should live and elaborates on what rewards can be expected if those laws are kept. However the consequences of not observing the law are also made clear; God can punish His people if they sin. We see here that the strictly logical problem of evil is not actually the primary concern for Jewish theology; rather it is a secondary problem when compared to the central issue of the Covenant, which defines the context and contours of the problem. The concept of the Covenant has generated one of the most prominent Jewish theodicies, which is that of retribution for sin. This is a response that explains, justifies and accepts suffering as a punishment from God due to human failure to keep God's laws, and as such it is a strongly theodic response to suffering. Chapter 32 of Deuteronomy, which stresses the perfect justice of God and the ubiquity of human sin in comparison, is one of the scriptural roots of such a theodicy.

It is this kind of strong theodicy that Rabbi Teitelbaum utilizes in his response to the Holocaust. He sees Zionism in particular as a sin against God's law and as a result of this sin the people were punished through the Holocaust. Of course this is not the only kind of theodicy generated by Judaism. There have been a number of differing theodicies developed through Jewish history, such as the rabbinic view of suffering which, particularly in the thought of Rabbi Akiba, emphasised an attitude of submission to God in the light of suffering.[12] Rather than either seeing it as an occasion of strict punishment for sin, or questioning God's justice, Akiba sought to cultivate an attitude of submission which saw suffering as a precious experience.[13] Another prominent theodicy has been the appeal to heaven as a final justification of the injustice and suffering of this world. In this response worldly injustice is understood as temporary injustice which will be rectified in the world to come, in which the innocent who have suffered will be redeemed.

What these theodicies have in common is that they all seek to justify and explain the suffering in one way or another, and from this we can see what it is that Zachary Braiterman is arguing when he says Holocaust theology has been significantly antitheodic in nature. He is suggesting that it has abandoned central Jewish theodicies like punishment for sin, in favour of responses which refuse to understand or accept evil and suffering as theologically justified. Instead they may deny the possibility of theodicy after catastrophic suffering like the Holocaust, or seek to protest the relationship between God and the *[4]*suffering. Of Holocaust theology Braiterman concludes, "They (the Holocaust theologians) deactivated central tropes like retribution, the world-to-come, afflictions of love, and prophetic rebuke by moving them out into the margins of their thought. In the process, post-Holocaust religious thought came to constitute a *unique*, antitheodic loop in the semiotic web of Jewish tradition."[14] Braiterman has built upon the work of Anson Laytner who, in his book *Arguing*

---

[12] A. Laytner, *Arguing With God: A Jewish Tradition* (New Jersey: Jason Aronson, 1990), 115.
[13] Laytner, *Arguing With God: A Jewish Tradition*, 108.
[14] Laytner, *Arguing With God: A Jewish Tradition*, 167.

With God: a Jewish Tradition (1990),[15] identified and stressed a long history of Jewish protest/argument with God in relation to human suffering. In this sense antitheodicy has long been a part of Jewish tradition, albeit in a peripheral manner when compared to the dominant theodic stream. Braiterman's analysis has much to commend it and his work has significantly advanced the understanding of what has occurred in Holocaust theology, but his argument does suffer from two problems, one being methodological, and the other being conceptual. Firstly, Braiterman's study is too narrow to justify the conclusion that Holocaust theology is broadly antitheodic in nature. Secondly, the term antitheodicy is too broad a term to apply to the variety of responses which abandon the dominant Jewish theodicies.

Braiterman reached his conclusions concerning Holocaust theology primarily through the examination of the works of Berkovits, Rubenstein and Fackenheim and although these are all key contributors to the post-Holocaust theological debate, they are not the only ones to have helped construct the discourse. Important and original contributions have been made by Ignaz Maybaum, David Blumenthal, Arthur Cohen, Irving Greenberg, Hans Jonas, Melissa Raphael, not to mention the many *charedi* responses. Therefore Braiterman's thesis concerning the antitheodic nature of Holocaust theology needs to be applied to a wider range of responses in order to judge whether Holocaust theology has been truly antitheodic in character, and if so to what extent. But even if the general application of antitheodicy to Holocaust theology is currently problematic, Braiterman's concept has nonetheless been useful since it has helped identify a significant characteristic of at least some of the key contributions to the field of Holocaust theology.

We have seen that Braiterman applies the term antitheodicy to responses which refuse to 'justify, explain, or accept' the relationship between God and evil. The problematic nature of this application can be seen by contrasting two hypothetical responses, both of which are significantly different yet could both be labelled as antitheodic, given Braiterman's definition of that term. The first hypothetical response is one that seeks no justification or explanation of the suffering, but instead focuses on divine mystery, arguing that the nature of God's relationship to the Holocaust is beyond humankind's limited comprehension. The second hypothetical response is one that seeks to protest against the suffering; bringing the event to God's attention by following the long Jewish tradition of arguing with God over His ways with creation, as in scripture when Abraham argues with God over the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah in Genesis 18.

These two responses are markedly different in their approach and nature, with the first rejecting immediate justifications or explanations, and the second refusing to accept the suffering as just but instead recommending religious protest as a proper response to the situation. The first is a theological response centred on divine mystery; the second is a theological response of protest, yet both could constitute antitheodicy in Braiterman's scheme, since they reject or ignore the traditional theodic answers which seek to explain and justify suffering. The concept of antitheodicy therefore becomes problematic because it covers responses that are markedly different in nature. This can be remedied by giving the term antitheodicy a more acute definition which is narrower in terms of the kind of responses to which it can be applied. To this writer's mind, antitheodicy as a term suggests a clear and active denial or impassioned rejection of the general project of theodicy. Consequently this

---

[15] Laytner, *Arguing With God: A Jewish Tradition*.

term could be applied strictly to the types of response which focus on religious protest, or which deny that theodicy is possible in the first place. These kinds of responses easily fit within a category which suggests ideas of denial and rejection.

[5]Having given antitheodicy a stricter definition, we are left with the other kinds of responses that are neither strongly theodic nor antitheodic. These unclassified responses are now in need of categorization. The first hypothetical response examined above was one which focussed on divine mystery. Such a response does not really involve the idea of being passionately against the idea of theodicy, nor does it involve explaining or justifying the suffering in a positive sense. Rather it appears as acquiescence in the face of the limits of human cognition and comprehension. This kind of response may best be termed 'atheodicy'. This is a word which suggests a failure, relinquishing or relaxing of the traditional theodic attempt to explain and justify suffering, yet does not strongly indicate a turn toward the outright rejection of the possibility of theodicy, as is the case in antitheodicy. Neither does this word suggest the idea of religious protest.

The appeal to mystery and the limit of human comprehension are not the only kinds of response that could fall under this category of atheodicy. Any kind of response which seeks to respond to suffering with a type of religious meaning that does not seek to explain or justify the suffering could be counted as a form of atheodicy. For example, responses which seek to focus on the idea of God suffering with His people and providing consolation at the expense of explanation or justification could be deemed as atheodic. Similarly, appeals to healing and restoration from suffering and evil can be seen as atheodic, particularly if these responses focus on this activity in the absence of attempts at explaining or justifying the evil and suffering. The emergence of the term atheodicy generates a concept which, when applied to Holocaust theology, could help provide a more nuanced account of its character, since it lets us see with greater acuity the variety of religious responses that have been offered in response to the Shoah.

What emerges from this discussion of antitheodicy is a three-fold model of theological responses to evil and suffering: theodic, atheodic and antitheodic responses. In this model, the theodic responses would consist of efforts to offer full justifications and explanations of suffering, e.g. punishment for sin. The atheodic responses would consist of attempts to focus on divine mystery/theological silence, the idea of healing from suffering, and the idea of God suffering with His people. Antitheodic responses would consist of reactions which advocated protest to God over the suffering, or responses which deny the possibility of any theological meaning being found in suffering at all. With this in mind we may now turn to the Ultra-Orthodox response of Kalonymous Shapira: our new category of atheodicy coupled with the sharper definition of antitheodicy will now make it possible to show the complexity and depth of at least some of the Ultra-Orthodox thinking that has been generated in response to the Holocaust.

Shapira's Response

Rabbi Kalonymos Kalmish Shapira (1889–1943) was the leader of the Piacezna Chasidic community in Poland and came to be imprisoned in the Warsaw Ghetto during the early years of the Shoah. He suffered greatly during this time, not only through seeing many of

his community perish, but also through losing a number of his closest family members including his mother, his son and his daughter-in-law. He was himself eventually murdered by the Nazis in the autumn of 1943. Yet in the years before his death he managed to write regular religious responses to what was happening in the form of commentaries on the *Sidra* (Portion of the Week). From 1939 to the summer of 1942 he produced the main body of his text, which was eventually published posthumously under the title *Esh Kodesh* (Sacred Fire, English translation 2004) after being found in a buried metal container during the post-war reconstruction of Warsaw.[16] *Esh Kodesh* charts his response over the first three years of the war, and also contains additions made in late 1942 after the Warsaw Ghetto deportations. As with many Chasidic thinkers, Shapira's initial response was resolutely theodic in character. He sought to square the Holocaustal experience with the strongly held Chasidic conviction that God was the motivating force behind history and therefore the unfolding events must have a divine purpose.

[6] In much the same way as Teitelbaum would do after the War, Shapira initially constructed a response that viewed the suffering as punishments for Jewish sins, primarily the sin of assimilation. Shapira scholar Nehemia Polen comments on Shapira's initial stance: "The first year's *derashah* is very much in the traditional mode, with a heavy emphasis on religious failings and chastisement."[17] This can be seen in September 1939 when Shapira wrote, "they strayed from the path, and in heaven there began the accusations against them. The charges stated that because of the great capriciousness of the Jewish people, because they were so steeped in their ignorance, they did not even acknowledge God's sovereignty . . . Consequently, they were banished from the palace of the King, to dwell among people who torture them and cause them suffering."[18] God, here as the king, is chastising the Jews for their sins. If Shapira's response had been limited to this early formulation, his reaction would have to be judged as essentially the same as Teitelbaum's response, i.e. strongly theodic, providing a full explanation and justification of the Shoah. But Shapira did not maintain this strongly theodic stance throughout the rest of his writings, and his attempt to explain and justify the sufferings became noticeably uncertain and hesitant as time progressed.

As the Nazi oppression grew in its severity, Shapira's response began to evolve theologically from its initially simplistic formulation of punishment for sin. This evolution in thought makes his response considerably more complex in nature, since these changes occurred whilst he was still trying to understand how the events carried divine meaning, something which caused great strain on his thinking and forced him into dexterous theological innovation. In *Esh Kodesh* Shapira was largely involved in what was essentially a theodic endeavour in that he desperately wanted to explain and justify theologically what was happening. Despite this strong theodic desire he began to generate various forms of atheodic and even antitheodic arguments in the ongoing process of responding to the Holocaust. The appearance of both atheodic and antitheodic elements ultimately makes clear the failure of the strong theodic project when confronted with the extreme evil that was manifesting around Shapira and his community.

---

[16] K. Shapira, *Sacred Fire*, trans. J. Worch (Lanham: Aronson, 2004).
[17] Polen, *The Holy Fire*.
[18] Shapira, *Sacred Fire*, 8.

Before examining the antitheodic and atheodic content of Shapira's response a brief examination of his particular theodic arguments is necessary. Although we will see that his response came to incorporate atheodic and antitheodic ideas, it would be wrong to conclude that Shapira abandoned any attempt to explain what was happening in a theological sense. The central theodic idea that appears persistently throughout his response concerns the complex interrelationship between the mystical concepts of *hesed* (mercy) and *gevurah/din* (power/judgement). These are two (amongst ten) attributes of the divine that function within the mystical Godhead in the mystical tradition of the Kabbalah; a tradition of great influence on Chasidism. Time and again Shapira tries to work out the earthly suffering as a consequence of *din* obscuring *hesed*. Nehemia Polen expands on this aspect of Shapira's thought: "Rabbi Shapira no longer speaks of the enemy as the instrument of divine punishment. Rather, the enemy's words and actions are clearly labelled as evil. Nevertheless, even at this point, he maintains the Chasidic view that evil is always a perversion of the good, whose energetic spark it has captured and misdirects; but precisely because the vivifying power of evil is a distorted form of the good, it can be transmuted and "sweetened" back to its divine source."[19] Showing how this tension links back to the idea that all that comes from God is good, Pesach Schindler further elaborates: "The apparent evil is merely a lower form of good, or the outer shell for the good, which is transformed into absolute good through man's acts of goodness."[20] To the extent that Shapira had a theodicy (after his rejection of the idea of punishment for sin), it developed along these lines. He tried to understand all that was happening as being in someway a [7]hidden good, but this effort became increasingly hard for him to maintain and the effort became supplemented and even occasionally eclipsed by the presence of antitheodic and atheodic appeals.

The antitheodic content of Shapira's response will now be examined. This category of response has a limited but significant presence in his thought[21] — something which is quite surprising given the Chasidic commitment to seeing all things as ultimately being from God and therefore good. Interestingly, this presence also goes against Braiterman's view of the Ultra-Orthodox responses as being theodically one-dimensional, and ironically provides evidence to strengthen Braiterman's assertion that Holocaust theology is a discourse composed of antitheodic stances and ideas.

Initially Shapira was against the idea of protesting or questioning God's justice, as is seen from his entry on 20 July 1940: ". . . they raise questions in their minds: How long will this go on? Who knows whether we will be able to bear it? Etc. As a result of the doubts, fears grow, the body is weakened, and the knees buckle. This is why it is most important to strengthen our faith to reject the questions and the thoughts, and to believe in God".[22] Here we see a rejection of antitheodicy in its form of protest, and instead the developing of a position centred on unquestioning faith. The subsequent presence of antitheodicy shows the

---

[19] Polen, *The Holy Fire*.

[20] Schindler, *Hasidic Responses to the Holocaust in the light of Hasidic Thought*, 30.

[21] Nehemia Polen was the first to recognize properly the theme of religious protest in Shapira's thinking, though he did not put it in terms of antitheodicy, since Braiterman had not yet coined the term. Polen's recognition of protest in Shapira may be found in Polen, *The Holy Fire*.

[22] Shapira, *Sacred Fire*, 116.

extent to which Shapira was struggling to understand the events within the confines of the idea that all which comes from God is good.

The first real evidence of antitheodicy in Shapira's thought appears in his entry on 28 September 1940: "But what can we do when they do not permit us to cry out, or even congregate for prayer, and we are forced to pray in hidden places, and every Jewish heart must lament this alone? At least in the depths of his heart, every Jew must shout out to God about it."[23] This need to 'shout out' intensifies in Shapira's thought only a week later when on October 3 1940 he wrote: "The screams that come of our tremendous bitterness and pain is indisputably our own voice. How could You bear to hear our pain and not have mercy, God forbid?"[24] This is a very clear example of antitheodicy in its protest form, issued from within a perspective of faith. These two examples show that antitheodicy begins to creep into Shapira's response roughly a full year after the War began. This motif of religious protest appears numerous times from this point on in *Esh Kodesh*.

Shapira develops rules of acceptability in relation to this phenomenon of religious protest. In his entry for March 29 1941, he argued that religious protest was a valid option and not a sinful activity. Whilst writing about Exodus 5:21–23 where Moses asks God why He mistreated His people, Shapira stated: "If Moses had sinned with his question, how did he earn the privilege of this revelation of the name of God, *YHVH*?"[25] Later in that year (1941) on 15–22 December, in his writings for Chanukah, Shapira set out how protest was acceptable if done from within the context of prayer and faith. He exclaimed:

> They question God, asking, "Why have You forsaken us? If we are being tortured in order to bring us closer to Torah and worship," they argue, "then why, on the contrary, is the Torah and everything holy being destroyed?" Now if a Jew utters these words in a form of prayer or supplication, as an outpouring out *[8]*of his heart before God, it is a good thing. But if, God forbid, he really is questioning – even if not God directly but his internal faith, God forbid – then may God protect us![26]

Antitheodicy can, according to Shapira, have a sanctioned place even within Chasidic theology, which generally attempts to see all things as being for the good and directed by God.

In the form of religious protest antitheodicy does have a positive value for Shapira, as long as it is done from a perspective of faith and prayer, which consequently gives the protest legitimacy and acceptability. If done outside of these bounds the protest appears to become a kind of blasphemy which is damaging to the person engaged in it. Antitheodicy begins to feature particularly strongly toward the end of *Esh Kodesh*. On 27 June 1942, in one of his last entries, Shapira writes with great emotion:

> . . . it is a marvel how the world exists after so much screaming. When the Ten Rabbis martyred by the Romans were suffering, the ministering angels cried out, "Is this Torah, and its reward?" A voice from heaven responded, "If I hear one more cry I will turn the whole world back to water." Yet now, immaculate children, purest angels, together with the greatest, holy Jews, are murdered

---

[23] Shapira, *Sacred Fire*, 124.
[24] Shapira, *Sacred Fire*, 131.
[25] Shapira, *Sacred Fire*, 164 note: It is unclear whether Shapira uses the Tetragrammaton in the original Hebrew text since the original is currently unavailable to this author. Given the context of the quotation it is possible that he did, but it is also possible that as a Chasidic rabbi he would have chosen not to do so due to its sacred nature.
[26] Shapira, *Sacred Fire*, 250–51.

and butchered just because they are Jews . . . and the world does not turn back into water? It remains standing, steadfast, as though God is untouched by events, God forbid?[27]

All of this questioning and protest is still done from within a position of deep faith, but whereas at the start of the War antitheodic protest was rejected outright as a damaging practice, it has by the end of *Esh Kodesh* become assimilated into his response as a key component of his faith which, if done under the right circumstances, is both legitimate and positive in nature. Consequently his attempt to fully explain and justify the suffering endured by his community is cast in a very uncertain light as he wrestled with how the events can be good and directed by God when they were so horrific in nature.

Antitheodicy is not the only development which can be identified in Shapira's writings. The category of atheodicy is also to be found in his thinking. As we will now see, although Shapira never abandons his faith, his position eventually evolves into a position which no longer seeks to explain or justify the suffering, thus becoming essentially an atheodic response in its final phases. Shapira's response in *Esh Kodesh* actually exhibits differing forms of atheodicy; in particular appeals to divine mystery/silence, the idea of the suffering God, and the idea of healing from the suffering are all found to varying extents. We will however examine his response principally for the atheodic appeal to divine mystery and silence. This is because the appeal to theological mystery is of primary importance for making a response 'atheodic' in nature. For instance, a response could conceivably feature a call for healing and restoration yet still at the same time explain/justify the suffering theodically, e.g. the argument could be laid out: 'for our sins we have been punished, and now we must both repent and heal.' Appeals to the idea(s) of healing and/or divine suffering are not therefore *necessarily* atheodic in nature. They are context-sensitive and only become atheodic when used in conjunction with an appeal to mystery, or when the response focuses on healing/divine suffering exclusively, making no attempt to account for the suffering. The use of divine mystery by Shapira is therefore crucial to casting other aspects of his response in an atheodic light. The importance of this appeal consequently demands primary attention when examining *Esh Kodesh* for atheodic content.

Shapira's appeal to mystery and silence first appears as early as 2 December 1939, when he stressed silence in relation to the growing suffering whilst elaborating on Joseph's dream of the sheaves (Genesis 37:7).[28] As the months progressed his appeal to silence increased and a year later on 21 December 1940 he wrote of God's knowledge being greater than that of human knowledge. He wrote of a suffering, "whose purpose is incomprehensible to us – to the contrary, it may appear purposeless".[29] In his entry of *[9]*26 July 1941, whilst appealing to the idea that the times may indicate the birth pangs of the messiah, Shapira hints that even if the birth pangs explain the ongoing suffering as being necessary, they can do so only, "to the limits of our comprehension",[30] which signifies that the process is more mysterious than humans can actually know or understand, thus leaving the suffering under-explained and significantly mysterious in nature.

During the Chanukah of 15–22 December 1941, Shapira stresses the limits of human knowledge of divine matters, by contrasting it with our knowledge of mundane things. He

---

[27] Shapira, *Sacred Fire*, 328.
[28] Shapira, *Sacred Fire*, 22.
[29] Shapira, *Sacred Fire*, 160.
[30] Shapira, *Sacred Fire*, 198.

writes: "How can we expect or hope to understand these, God's actions, and then allow our faith to be damaged, God forbid, upon finding that we cannot understand them? If one blade of grass created by God is beyond our understanding, how much more unfathomable is the soul . . . and how much less even than this can we understand the mind of God? How could we possibly expect to grasp with our mind what God knows and understands?"[31] We find Shapira reinforcing faith in God by stressing the limited human intellect – a clear example of atheodicy since it does not explain or justify the suffering but rather focuses on the mystery of the divine and the narrow limits of human comprehension. Here, faith without explanation is the focus of Shapira. He picks this idea up again in his entry of 7 March 1942 where, whilst considering the Law of the Red Heifer (a purification law) of Numbers 19:1–2, he discusses whether we may ask about the meaning of a commandment and stresses that this Law of the Red Heifer "is Torah at the level of 'We will do and we will listen'. We do not conceptualize or even ponder the meaning of this Torah."[32] This he uses to urge his Chasidim to have a strong and un-questioning faith that all which is happening is for the good. He states: "We learn from this that the underlying meaning of the Law of the Red Heifer is a return to the level of "We will do and we will listen" – not to question, God forbid; just to believe that since everything is from God, it is good. Faith such as this both purges and atones, and advocates on behalf of the Jewish people."[33] This is to say that sometimes there is no apparent explanation and in such cases the proper response is simply to have faith that all is happening for the good. This is an argument for faith which neither explains the suffering nor justifies it with reason. In fact it is the opposite; it is faith without understanding.

The fact that Shapira was stressing such a position during this time (early 1942) shows the level of dissonance within his thought, since it was, as we saw above, only the previous Chanukah that Shapira elaborated on the legitimacy of protesting to God over what was happening, yet here he appears to be saying that the events cannot be questioned or protested; rather they should be accepted. This highlights the tension in his thought as he tries to maintain an unquestioning faith in God over what was happening to him and his community. The atheodic content of his thought is seen in his faith that all must be good even though he cannot explain how or why it is for the good, and, in combination with this, the antitheodic elements appear to act as a means to vent his anguish at the ever unfolding and incomprehensible suffering. In this sense the two may not be as contradictory as they first seem, but nonetheless these two poles of faith and protest are hallmarks of a deeply troubled and anguished response.

In one of the very last footnote additions to his manuscript, Shapira describes the circumstances facing the remnants of the Warsaw Ghetto in late 1942. He wrote: "Those individuals who survive, pitiful and few, are broken in slavery and Egyptian bondage, downtrodden and terrified for their lives. There exist no words with which to lament our woes."[34] Here, in one of his final additions, all attempts at a theodicy which explains and justifies the suffering appear to have ended. There is no talk of punishment for sin and no words of explanation or justification. Shapira is left with only a faith that redemption will

---

[31] Shapira, *Sacred Fire*, 251.
[32] Shapira, *Sacred Fire*, 307.
[33] Shapira, *Sacred Fire*, 308.
[34] Shapira, *Sacred Fire*, 209.

come, "in *[10]*the blink of an eye".[35] Remembering his initial theodic reaction to the Holocaust, Shapira's response can now be seen clearly to shift from a position of 'punishment for sin' which explains and justifies the events, to a position of extreme faith which incorporated a legitimized form of religious protest and, in the final account, no longer sought to present an effective explanation or justification of the suffering. Shapira's faith remained throughout his whole writing, but his theodic response morphed over time into a theology in which atheodic and antitheodic elements played increasingly important and central roles.

Conclusion

What then can be concluded from this short examination? Shapira's response proves one thing conclusively: that Ultra-Orthodox thought is not as recidivistic as has often been thought. In fact through Shapira's response we see that Ultra-Orthodox thought did not always respond to the Holocaust by appealing to a relatively uncomplicated theology of punishment and sin. Although the idea of punishment for sin was appealed to by some Chasidic thinkers this was certainly not the case for all, especially in the case of Shapira, who abandoned such an explanation early on in the War. What this common stereotype of the Chasidic responses really masks is a much deeper theology in which worldly events have to be squared theologically with the idea that all things are from God and therefore ultimately for the good. This challenge can manifest answers along the lines of punishment for sin, but this is far from the only possibility. Shapira's atheodic and antitheodic appeals, both of which grow throughout *Esh Kodesh*, show that Shapira was able to develop other possibilities (namely divine mystery and religious protest) within a Chasidic theological framework.

    We have seen how divine mystery and religious protest become prominent features of his thought, and these two are only some of the theological possibilities he develops. A comprehensive and detailed analysis of his work would show that he developed other important theological concepts which helped form his response, such as the idea of God's suffering and a focus on healing from the catastrophe. As indicated above, the theodical side to his theology focussed on the idea of working out suffering in mystical terms of judgement and mercy within the Kabbalistic understanding of the Godhead. All of these are of importance and interest, and a testament to the complexity of Shapira's theological response. What we can conclude here however is that his theology shows that faith did not have to be buttressed by comprehensive theological explanations or justifications when it came to encounters with extreme evil and suffering.

    Shapira's response may provide evidence to confirm a conclusion made by Gershon Greenberg, who has observed that one of the main characteristics of Ultra-Orthodox responses given from within the Shoah is that of an appeal to silence: "Concepts of the path from the disastrous present to the salvational future differed according to the respective thinkers' time-space position. When the experience of tragedy was direct and the catastrophe was simultaneously subjective and objective, the attempt to verbally express the path was

---

[35]   Shapira, *Sacred Fire*, 209.

abandoned."[36] Shapira's response, which was given from within the Holocaust temporally and spatially, clearly shows this abandonment of verbally expressing the way to a salvational future from the darkness of the Holocaust, primarily in his atheodic appeal to divine mystery which comes to largely replace the attempt to explain what is happening theologically and how it relates to redemption.

Through these antitheodic and atheodic appeals Shapira was able to respond both meaningfully and sensitively to the mass suffering of his community in a way that often offered hope despite the communal agony. Particularly in his antitheodic innovations, he developed a cathartic tool for expressing feelings of anger, uncertainty and fear over what was happening. For Shapira, the concepts of atheodicy and *[11]*antitheodicy offer ways to both understand and cope with suffering in ways that do not require full explanation or justification of the events. Where the strongly theodic answers such as punishment for sin seemingly fail for those who are living through episodes of catastrophic suffering, these two theological options of atheodicy and antitheodicy provide ways of facing the problem through a recognition of the divine mystery of things, and through a theological mechanism of religious protest.

This is the first time (to my knowledge) that the fully defined categories of antitheodicy and atheodicy have been applied to, and recognized within, Shapira's response. Others may have noticed Shapira's use of religious protest (particularly Nehemia Polen[37]), but not as an example of the category of antitheodicy as defined by Braiterman or as refined in this article. Similarly the theme of divine mystery may have been recognized within Shapira's response (as with Gershon Greenberg's observation of silence as being an important feature of responses from within the Shoah) but not as an example of the category of atheodicy as here defined.

In more broad terms we may conclude that the category of atheodicy helps in further understanding the nature of Holocaust theology by providing a new analytical tool with which to analyse the responses within this field. In combination with theodicy and antitheodicy, the category of atheodicy helps comprehend the character of a given response by revealing the different strands which together form that particular theological response. As in the case of Shapira, the finer details of a theologian's thought can be revealed, allowing for a deeper appreciation of his or her thinking, which in turn can help us to see how a body of responses (in this case the Ultra-Orthodox) are more nuanced and complex than may initially have been thought. To be sure, this is not the only way such results can be gained, but it does provide a particularly clear taxonomy of responses from which to analyse a theological response. When a response is developed over a significant period of time it is also possible, using the three-fold model given here, to see how a thinker's theodic efforts may transform and evolve either within their own intellectual life, or in response to a specific event they lived through or confronted. This allows the theological impact of events (such as the Holocaust) upon Jewish thought to be seen with greater clarity and depth.

---

[36] G. Greenberg, Introduction to Part 1 'Ultra-Orthodox Responses During And Following The War' in Katz et al, *Wrestling With God*, 23.

[37] Polen, *The Holy Fire*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Braiterman, Z., (*God) After Auschwitz* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1998).

Katz, S., ed., *The Impact of The Holocaust on Jewish Theology* (New York: New York University Press, 2005).

Katz, S., S. Bider and G. Greenberg, eds., *Wrestling With God: Jewish Responses During and After The Holocaust* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

Laytner, A., *Arguing With God: A Jewish Tradition* (New Jersey: Jason Aronson, 1990).

Polen, N., *The Holy Fire: The Teachings Of Rabbi Kalonymus Kalman Shapira, The Rebbe of the Warsaw Ghetto* (New Jersey: Jason Aronson, 1994).

Shapira, K., *Sacred Fire*, trans. J. Worch (Lanham: Aronson, 2004).

Schindler, P., *Hasidic Responses to the Holocaust in the Light of Hasidic Thought* (New Jersey: KTAV Publishing House Inc., 1990).

Schweid, E., *Wrestling Until Day-break* (Lanham: University Press Of America, 1994).

Teitelbaum, Y., extract from section 110 of *VaYoel Moshe* (1961), found in translation at www.jewsagainstzionism.com

[1]   A SURREALIST READING: FORMLESSNESS AND
NONDIFFERENTIATION IN YITZHAK ORPAZ'S *THE
HUNTING OF THE GAZELLE* (*TSEYD HA-TSVIYAH*, 1966)
A CYCLE OF THREE STORIES*

Giulia F. Miller**

Abstract: This article offers a Surrealist reading of Yitzhak Orpaz's *The Hunting of the Gazelle*. It emerges from a larger project that attempts to define Hebrew Surrealism and which draws heavily upon the writings of Menashe Levin (1903–1981) and Yitzhak Oren (1918–2007) as well as those of Orpaz. The apparent absence of Surrealism in the history of Modern Hebrew literature illustrates why Levin, Oren and Orpaz are so important and why they stand out from their peers. While Orpaz's Surrealism is manifest in his three novellas 'The Death of Lysanda' (1964), 'Ants' (1968) and 'A Narrow Step' (1972), the fact that these texts have already received some critical attention has allowed the focus here to remain upon the lesser-known trilogy of short stories, *The Hunting of the Gazelle*. This trilogy is a unique example of Surrealism because it represents textually a sense of formlessness and nondifferentiation between subject and object. Following a close reading that examines in detail the ways in which this sense of formlessness is achieved, reference will be made to an interview recorded with Orpaz in which he describes the methods used to write the trilogy. These writing methods are reminiscent of automatism, a technique practised and recommended by the pioneering French Surrealists of the twenties and thirties. In the interview, Orpaz vehemently rejected the notion of 'automatism' in his writing, preferring to describe it as 'controlled ecstasy.' Here it will be argued that Orpaz's 'controlled ecstasy' is nevertheless a type of automatism. The conclusion will show that a Surrealist reading of Orpaz's trilogy makes a useful contribution to ascertaining the nature and function of Hebrew Surrealism.

Introduction

The research for this paper was initiated by the following question: Why is it that avant-garde's literary trends such as Futurism and Expressionism have been evidently incorporated into Modern Hebrew poetry and prose – alongside detailed and comprehensive critical discourse regarding this incorporation – whereas the same cannot be said of Surrealism? There is no official Hebrew or Israeli Surrealist movement or extensive critical study of

 ** Postdoctoral Fellow, Department of Jewish Studies, Penn State University. Email: gfm2@psu.edu

Hebrew Surrealism either in literature or in the visual arts and – as I shall demonstrate – this particular absence is true in only a few other countries and consequently Israel stands out in being one of these countries.[1] The question thus raised two concerns: the first, which cannot be denied, is the complete absence of a collective, national Israeli affiliation with Surrealism and the second, which is more problematic, is the seeming lack of a Surrealist influence upon Modern Hebrew literature.[2] The latter concern is not as relevant to other national literatures simply because so many countries have or have had nationally affiliated Surrealist movements, which in turn suggests an impact. The fact that there has never been a Hebrew or Israeli equivalent renders the concern more pertinent. My question then developed into something of a more historicist nature: is it possible that there are instances of Hebrew Surrealism within literature that are the result of an inner poetic need rather than any conscious affiliation with the movement? If so, how would we define this particular Surrealism and what would it signify?

My response to these questions was originally twofold: first I analysed a selection of little known Modern Hebrew texts from the nineteen thirties that do surprisingly suggest a direct influence by the French Surrealist movement in particular on Modern Hebrew literature. The author of these texts, Menashe Levin (1903–81), who was one of the principal translators of French literature into Hebrew, not only employed Surrealist metaphors and similes in his short stories but also translated Rimbaud's *[2]Illuminations* (*Les Illuminations*) – a collection of prose poems, first published in 1886 that were greatly admired by the French Surrealists and are considered to form part of the second historical stage of Surrealism alongside the writings of Comte de Lautréamont – before producing his own prose poetry, a genre that was extremely rare at the time.[3] In spite of this fact, Levin has been given very little critical attention. Dan Miron and Nurit Gertz are exceptions, but although the latter does concede a certain influence of French Surrealism on Levin's work, her analyses are minimal whilst Miron asserts that Levin's writing is decidedly anti-Surrealist.[4] Although I do challenge this reading elsewhere, I shall not discuss Levin in this particular paper.

Second, I hoped to identify those texts which possess characteristics that are reminiscent of Surrealism but which have been created in a Hebrew and Israeli context that is independent of the movement. This is necessarily complex since it implies an affinity with

---

[1] The eminent Surrealism scholar and theorist, Jacqueline Chénieux-Gendron, argues: '[T]here are hardly any countries in which some sort of group laying claim to Surrealism has not arisen.' See Jacqueline Chénieux-Gendron, *Surrealism* (Columbia University Press, New York, 1990), 186. Similarly, Penelope Rosemont's international anthology features Surrealists from all over Europe, North and South America, Asia, Africa, Australasia and the Middle East but not Israel. See Penelope Rosemont, ed., *Surrealist Women: An Anthology* (The Athlone Press, London, 1998).

[2] This article focuses upon Surrealism rather than its precursor Dada. In view of the fact that one of Dada's main proponents, Tristan Tzara (b. Sami Rosenstock), author of seven manifestoes, was Jewish, it would be interesting to consider the effect of Dada upon Modern Hebrew literature, especially poetry. Indeed, this is a very under explored topic. However, I would argue that the two movements are fundamentally different, which is why I would advocate a separate study. Certainly, in 1940 the Dada architect and painter, Marcel Janco, immigrated to Israel and founded the artists' kibbutz, Ein Hod. His subsequent influence upon Israeli visual art – rather than literature – is also a topic worthy of further exploration.

[3] Dan Miron, 'The Poetry of Menashe Levin – the Path That Had Not Yet Been Taken' ('Shirat Menashe Levin – Ha-Derekh she lo Nits'adah'), in Menashe Levin, *Night Time Overture* (*Ptih.ah Le-Laylah*) ed. Dan Miron (Hotsa'at Qeshev, Israel, 2003), 29.

[4] Miron, 'Afterword', in Menashe Levin's *The Flying Danseuse (Ha-Raqdanit Ha-Me'ofefet)* (Mosad Bialiq, Jerusalem, 2000), 328.

an already established group, yet this affinity is allegedly unintentional and in several respects dissimilar. As for the first characteristic, the original French Surrealist movement has always acknowledged Surrealist 'precursors' suggesting that a work may be unintentionally Surrealist. On the other hand, analyses of Surrealism tend to focus upon actively intentional Surrealist activity and conscious participation with the movement as a collective, i.e. via specialist journals or exhibitions or identification with a particular national Surrealism, i.e. French, Belgian, Romanian, Japanese.[5] This paper however assumes the premise that it is possible to be 'unintentionally' Surrealist. Concerning the second characteristic, Yitzhak Orpaz's Hebrew Surrealism is rooted within Hebrew and Israeli literary cultural sources and has seemingly emerged as a response to an inner poetic need rather than as a conscious affiliation to an international movement.

The purpose of this paper is to offer a Surrealist reading of Orpaz's *The Hunting of the Gazelle* trilogy, a series of relatively unknown texts that have never before been analysed from a Surrealist perspective.[6] Although there is considerable criticism of Orpaz's writing as a whole, there is barely anything written on this trilogy. As I shall make clear at a later stage, Orpaz insists that Surrealism has influenced neither his writing methods nor his writing and, consequently, much of his work – and in particular these three short stories – exemplifies an organic Hebrew Surrealism that has been created in an Israeli context and yet still bears significant resemblance to the movement. In addition to this, as we shall later see, Orpaz's writing methods are also very evocative of those recommended and practised by the pioneering French Surrealists.

The Absence of Surrealism in Modern Hebrew Literature

Surrealism, which officially began in Paris in 1924 with the publication of André Breton's *Manifesto of Surrealism* (*Manifeste du Surréalisme*), had by the nineteen thirties become a significant international movement reaching most of Western and Eastern Europe, North and South America, the West Indies, Africa and Japan.[7] In each of these places the influence of French Surrealism evolved and developed *[3]*differently into a wide range of diverse strands and manifestations.[8] Each manifestation was formed in relation to its own specific historical and political circumstances. Some strands were more politically motivated than others but the common theme was the break from the authority of the past. This break made itself evident via a move away from realism. In literature, the Surrealists' preferred

---

[5] This paradox is reflected in the writings of André Breton, founder of the French Surrealist movement. In his 1924 Manifesto he wholeheartedly acknowledges Surrealist precursors yet in April 1964 he declares: 'The *quality* of being surrealist remains sanctioned, in the end, not only by such poetic and artistic 'talent' but by reference to a precise collective active . . . 'Group' activity is essential, not only to the life of surrealism, but to its specificity'. See 'Against the Liquidators', in Franklin Rosemont, ed., *André Breton: What is Surrealism? Selected Writings* (Pathfinder, New York, 2004), 466.

[6] Yitzhak Orpaz, 'The Hunting of the Gazelle' (Tseyd Ha-Tsviyah), in *City With No Refuge* (*Ir She-Eyn bah Mistor*) (Ha-Qibuts Ha-Me'uḥad, 1973), 43–67.

[7] Robert Short, 'Dada and Surrealism', in Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, eds., *Modernism: 1890– 1930* (Penguin Books, London, 1991), 306.

[8] With regard to the Middle Eastern context, the Egyptian Surrealist movement was formed in the mid 1930s and the Cairo group was one of the most active. See 'Introduction', in Franklin Rosemont, ed., *André Breton: What is Surrealism? op. cit.*, 90.

mode was poetry, although – as I shall discuss at a later stage – novels that contained the 'marvellous' were also encouraged.[9] French Surrealism's international influence continued even during the nineteen forties when Nazi military occupation banned Surrealist activity. It flourished both underground as well as in exile and indeed Nazi restrictions prompted even more fervent activity in those places where it had not been banned, such as England, Martinique, Haiti and Egypt.[10] Likewise, during the nineteen fifties Cold War period when the Surrealist movement was at its most precarious, new groups – Canada, Argentina, Austria – still continued to form. By the early nineteen seventies when the Arab Surrealist Movement in Exile began – with members from Iraq, Algeria, Lebanon and Syria – there were only a very few countries where French Surrealism had not made some impact and Israel is one of these countries. Even today there is a wealth of active international Surrealist movements; moreover, scholarship on Surrealism and its legacies is abundant.

In order to appreciate fully the significance of Orpaz's own Hebrew Surrealism it is worth considering, if only briefly, the relevance of this absence to the Hebrew context. First of all, the fact that the Surrealist movement made little impact upon Modern Hebrew literature produced in Palestine during the late twenties and thirties is a curious one for two reasons: (a) during the late nineteen twenties and early nineteen thirties when Surrealism's main centre was France, there is evidence that suggests significant knowledge of French culture within the Hebrew-reading public of contemporary Palestine; (b) during this very same period, there are numerous examples of modernistic forms of writing by Hebrew authors in Palestine.

(a) The French literary and artistic movements of the interwar period were certainly known to the Hebrew-reading public in contemporary Palestine. In mainstream newspapers such as *Ha-Arets* there are references to French art: for example in 1932 there is an article by Sonia Greenberg on the 'Exhibition of French Art 1200–1900' that was held at the Royal Academy of Arts in London and featured *inter alia* major Impressionist works by Claude Monet, Edgar Degas and Edouard Manet.[11] It was in 1932 that the Tel Aviv Museum of Art was opened to the public and its collection of modern and contemporary art had already been founded as early as 1930. Similarly, in specialised literary journals such as *Texts* (*Ketuvim*, 1926–33) and *Columns* (`*Urim*, 1933–39) there are numerous surveys of the cultural scene in France, more specifically Paris, from art to music. The absence of articles on the development of French Surrealism is a striking one especially because one can find in *Texts,* for example, essays on Rimbaud and Verlaine as well as articles on dreams and the unconscious.[12] It is certainly remarkable that subjects such as dreaming and the unconscious were discussed in great depth alongside lengthy critiques of contemporary French culture and yet the term 'Surrealist' seems completely absent.

However, this is not to say that the members of the French Surrealist movement were completely unknown. In 1932 Yitzhak Norman wrote a significant piece for *Texts* on Paul Valéry in which he mentions Louis Aragon, André Breton and Philippe Soupault as belonging to the 'Dada Group', which by then was an inaccurate labelling.[13] In 1933, V.

---

[9] See André Breton, 'Manifesto of Surrealism', in *Manifestoes of Surrealism* (University of Michigan Press, Michigan, 1972), 14. I shall explain the 'marvellous' in my section on Orpaz's three novellas.

[10] Penelope Rosemont, *International*, 119–120.

[11] *Ha-Arets*, 5 February 1932.

[12] *Texts*, Tel Aviv, 1926–27, issues dated 17/12/1926 and 3/11/1927.

[13] *Texts,* Vol. 6, issue date 6/7/1932, 3.

Lichter wrote an article for *Texts* on contemporary art that *[4]*mentions experimental French movements including Dadaism.[14] Similarly in the journal that followed, *Columns*, it is obvious that there was a considerable awareness of modernism and the avant-garde; there is a large essay devoted to Expressionism; there are even references to Leon Trotsky's theories on art and philosophy as well as a brief mention of Jean Cocteau, both of whom are related in various ways to the French Surrealists.[15] Thus, there was an interest in modernistic developments taking place in France but for certain reasons, as yet unknown, those journalists reporting from Paris neglected to elaborate upon the activity of Surrealist writers and visual artists. There were even ideological similarities between certain writers and editors at *Columns* and the French Surrealists inasmuch as they were anti-nationalist. The latter were opposed to Zionism as they were to all forms of nationalism.[16] Meanwhile, Shlonsky wrote an influential article entitled 'Do not kill' (Lo Tirtsaḥ) in which he attacked not only European patriotism but also the Palestinian Revisionist Party and the Workers Movement as all being manifestations of extreme nationalism.[17]

(b) During the late twenties and early thirties in Palestine – a complex period of primarily local, nationalistic literature represented by authors such as Israel Zarchi, Yehuda Yaari, Yitzhak Shenhar – a small yet significant number of Hebrew authors were experimenting with new, modernistic – and more specifically avant-garde – schools of writing such as Expressionism and Futurism. These were published in the specialist literary journals *Texts* and later *Columns*. Prose writers such as Nathan Bistritski and Haim Hazaz are considered the founders and key proponents of Modern Hebrew Expressionism – this is noteworthy since the latter lived in Paris from 1921–31 yet his writing clearly incorporates German rather than French influences – whilst poet Avraham Shlonsky is known for his embrace of Futurism as revealed by his extensive use of neologisms, his rejection of traditional Hebrew poetic forms and his rhetoric of newness: new rhyming schemes, new meters, new images all for the new homeland.[18] With the exception of the aforementioned Menashe Levin none of these authors favoured French modernism over German, Austrian or Russian.[19]

There are certainly possible explanations as to why other modernist forms of writing such as Futurism and Expressionism found favour over Surrealism during this particular period. It is partly happenstance; after all, it is simply not possible to have a straightforward adaptation of genres from European literature into Modern Hebrew. Specific periods in European literature such as the Enlightenment or Romanticism do not run parallel with their Hebrew equivalents and there is no straightforward overlapping between the two. The

---

[14] *Ibid.*, Vol. 7, issue date 19/1/1933.

[15] *Columns*, Tel Aviv, issues dated 17/11/1933, 21/7/1933 and 12/1/1934 respectively.

[16] This opposition however was mostly demonstrated through indifference; a thorough study of political Surrealist writing reveals only one article on the subject. This article is entitled 'Pamphlet against Jerusalem' ('Pamphlet contre Jérusalem'). It was written in 1925 by Robert Desnos, who was the only prominent Jewish member of the French Surrealist movement – in it he expresses opposition towards the Zionist movement. See Robert Desnos, 'Pamphlet contre Jérusalem', in *La Révolution Surréaliste* (Librairie Gallimard, Paris Issue No.3, 15 April 1925).

[17] Avraham Shlonsky, 'Lo Tirtsaḥ', in *Columns* 28/7/1933.

[18] For further discussion on Shlonsky see Michael Gluzman, *The Politics of Canonicity: Lines of Resistance in Modernist Hebrew Poetry* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 2003), 47.

[19] It is also worth mentioning at this stage that Menashe Levin's widow, Masha Levin, told me that in fact her husband had translated extracts of Breton's *Manifesto* into Hebrew. Interview with Masha Levin, recorded, Tel Aviv, August 2005.

development of Modern Hebrew literature does not occur in a clear chronological manner and one genre does not simply follow another in the same way that Surrealism, for example, followed Dada. Rather, genres and schools of writing in Modern Hebrew occur at various times in a jumbled way.[20] This is particularly the case with modernism and with unambiguous schools of writing such as Surrealism, Impressionism, Futurism and Expressionism, avant-garde movements that are easy to distinguish in European literature because they are firmly embedded in specific and often short-lived *[5]*historical/political/social circumstances, which simply do not correspond with what was happening in Palestine.

The haphazard nature of choosing one avant-garde style over another is supported by a further consideration: since the precise physical act of writing Modern Hebrew literature was a Zionist act and thus radical by definition, the nature of Hebrew literary modernism is necessarily different to that of its European counterpart. Its implicit relation to Zionism renders the concept of Hebrew modernism as a 'revolutionary' response to an existing Hebrew literary canon complex and multifaceted. Early Hebrew modernist writing produced in Palestine during the interwar years fulfilled the function of a nation-building tool in exactly the same way as Hebrew non-modernist writing did. Modernist or not, all Modern Hebrew texts were considered an enrichment and a building block in the development of the new culture of the new nation. To produce an Expressionistic or Futuristic work was a positive act that implicitly and explicitly supported the creation of a new national literature. These works were never intended to destabilise the quest for a Jewish State, or, more precisely, they were never intended to destroy Zionism. Modernising the Hebrew language for the purpose of literary expressions – i.e. through abandoning Biblical forms or introducing neologisms, or new syntactical models – were constructive rather than destructive. In other words, authors such as Eliezar Steinman, Haim Hazaz and even Menashe Levin, who employed European models of modernist literature were above all being radical inasmuch as they introduced such styles to Modern Hebrew literature at a time when there had been no precedent to refer to.

The revolutionary nature of modernism is completely different in the European context because the rebellion did not occur in the actual process of writing but rather in the form and content of the text that was written. If we are to focus more specifically on the French context and on the roots of Surrealism we can see that France was already an established and geographically fixed nation with an established language and culture and therefore possessed the privilege of being able to focus on rupture and destruction. The relationship between thought and language was more natural and fluent in the French author because he was writing and expressing himself in his native language and it was precisely this fluency that the French Surrealists attempted to challenge and destabilise via automatism, especially automatic writing. *The Manifesto of Surrealism* published in 1924 offers a comprehensive definition of Surrealism:

> Surrealism, n. Psychic automatism in its pure state, by which one proposes to express – verbally, by means of the written word, or in any other manner – the actual functioning of thought. Dictated by thought, in the absence of any control exercised by reason, exempt from any aesthetic or moral concern.[21]

---

[20] Gershon Shaked, *Hebrew Narrative Fiction 1880–1980* (*Ha-Siporet Ha-Ivrit 1880–1980*) (Ha-Qibuts Ha-Me'uḥad and Keter Publishing House, 1998), 145.

[21] Breton, 'Manifesto', 26.

Although automatism and particularly written automatism quickly became a contentious issue – partly because automatic texts were completely unreadable but mostly because it was understood that automatic writing was theoretically impossible – it was practised with great diligence during the early years of the movement. Certain techniques and rituals that helped bring about the required mental state for automatic writing became the subject of numerous passionate discourses. The early French Surrealists tried and perfected several methods with which to induce the most authentic written automatism.

One could argue that the complex literary heritage of the early Hebrew modernists and the fact that none of them spoke Hebrew as their mother tongue meant that written automatism would have been difficult to achieve. Meanwhile other modernist movements such as Futurism or Symbolism that did not insist on automatism would have been more appealing to the early Hebrew modernists. Certainly, Expressionism called for spontaneity but it was not as extreme and it did not require accurately and devoutly writing down the words that immediately sprung to mind.

[6] The absence of Surrealism in Modern Hebrew literature is perhaps even less surprising in the late nineteen thirties and nineteen forties because of the previously alluded-to Nazi restrictions imposed upon Surrealist activity at the time. Founding member André Breton was in exile in the United States and although the other key members remained in France, they published very little and did so under pseudonyms.[22] In addition, by the late nineteen thirties the political situation in Palestine – the consolidation of the Jewish population had led to a renewed surge of Arab political activity – and elsewhere was such that European modernism and avant-gardism was deemed less and less relevant to Modern Hebrew culture.[23] Certainly in the case of Menashe Levin, his experimental writing was perceived as trivial and even irresponsible in the light of local and international affairs.[24]

A further reason as to why European modernism (and by extension, Surrealism) had become even more irrelevant is perhaps related to the issue of uprooted identity and its impact on 'open' and experimental writing. Whereas the majority of Hebrew writers of the twenties and thirties had arrived in Palestine from Eastern Europe, often via Western Europe or the United States, most of the writers publishing in the late thirties and early forties had been born and raised in Palestine and instilled with the Zionist ideals of their parents. The writers of this generation were significantly influenced by Soviet socialist realism and favoured this style of writing over the Anglo-American or Western European ideals to which they were also exposed.[25] In 1946 Moshe Shamir published a manifesto entitled 'With my Generation' ('Im Bney Dori') where he decries Western modernism and declares that it is degenerate.[26] This manifesto argues that the function of literature lies not in its aesthetic qualities but in its impact on history and society.

---

[22] Jacqueline Chénieux-Gendron, *Surrealism*, 71–78.

[23] Nevertheless, as I have already mentioned in a previous footnote, Egyptian Surrealism was active during the nineteen thirties.

[24] Dan Miron, 'Afterword', in Menashe Levin's *The Flying Danseuse*, 282.

[25] Gershon Shaked, 'First Person Plural: Literature of the 1948 Generation', *The Shadows Within: Essays on Modern Jewish Writers* (The Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, New York and Jerusalem, 1987), 145–165.

[26] Moshe Shamir, 'With My Generation' ('Im Bney Dori') in *Anthology of Friends* (*Yalkut Ha-Re'im*) eds. Shlomo Tanai and Moshe Shamir (Mosad Bialiq, Jerusalem, 1992), 211–216.

The ethos encapsulated in this manifesto was the predominant one at this time and it is not surprising that attempts at modernistic prose and poetry seemed minimal.[27] I say 'seemed' because it was during this period that the Israeli literary canon began to form and, as with any canon, numerous works are necessarily excluded. Moreover, if French Surrealism was itself allegedly borne out of an overly rooted and established identity, a reaction to an extremely lengthy and entrenched period of realism and naturalism, why would native-born Hebrew writers be less prone to experimental writing? The answer is that they probably were not less prone and it refers back to the idea of a contrived canon: in the forging and creating of a new national identity, it is 'logical' to begin with a mimetic mode. It is only once this mimetic mode has completely run its course that there should be a need to deviate. Of course, this 'logic' is extremely prescriptive and artificial. There is no reason why a new national literature should be mimetic other than as a means of constructing a particular literary image. Moreover, the emergence of French Surrealism also belongs to a specific French narrative and to argue that no such writing existed before this emergence would be too facile. Nevertheless, the predominant version of the Israeli literary canon begins with realism and this continued throughout the nineteen fifties with deviant authors such as Yitzhak Oren (1918–2007) – who dealt with contentious issues such as repressed Jewish sexual violence towards the Arab – being clearly marginalised in favour of his more well-known peers, Aharon Megged and Moshe Shamir.[28]

The year 1960 was a key point in the history of Surrealism; following a period of relative inactivity the French movement enjoyed a resurgence that dovetailed neatly with the emergence of sixties radicalism. A [7]proliferation of Surrealist groups formed all over France and publication of literary works, tracts and declarations was immense; there was a significant increase in the number of Surrealist exhibitions and shows that were taking place around the country.[29] Indeed, sixties radicalism helped to resuscitate interest in French Surrealism and endowed the latter with a renewed social significance. This in turn inspired an international reawakening of the movement. Throughout the sixties new groups were formed and major international exhibitions were held in Paris, New York, Milan, São Paulo, Prague and Chicago with artists contributing from at least thirty different countries.[30] Furthermore, in spite of the fact that both Breton's death in 1966 and the Paris student riots of 1968 significantly destabilised the French movement's hitherto strong identity, this destabilising was not felt in the international arena where even more groups continued to proliferate well into the nineteen seventies.

It is clear that the advent of European sixties radicalism cannot be transferred to an equivalent Israeli context; however, it is fair to assert that Modern Hebrew fiction during this period was beginning to broaden considerably and was becoming more open to non-conventional, non-mimetic forms of literature. Although there is no evidence of translations of Surrealist works into Hebrew during this period, it is certain that other modernist works were accessible to a Hebrew reader. For instance, Franz Kafka's *America* was published in

---

[27] This manifesto is compromised by the fact that it is too facile to assert that modernism is socially irrelevant.

[28] It is perhaps worth noting that in the early nineteen fifties Peggy Guggenheim donated her collection of Abstract and Surrealist art to the Tel Aviv Museum. Consequently, Surrealist visual art was definitely accessible to those who might have been interested.

[29] Rosemont, *International*, 288.

[30] *Ibid*., 288.

Hebrew in 1964 whilst the Hebrew edition of *The Castle* was published in 1967.[31] In this sense, Yitzhak Orpaz does not differ radically from his contemporaries in the same way that Levin and Oren did. Texts such as A.B. Yehoshua's *The Death of the Old Man* (*Mot Ha-Zaqen*, 1962) and Amos Oz's *Where the Jackals Howl* (*Artsot Ha-Tan*, 1965), which both exemplify a deviation from the mimetic restrictions of the forties and fifties, both preceded Orpaz's Surrealist works.[32] Indeed, authors such as Oz, Yehoshua and Orpaz are frequently referred to as the 'New Wave' generation. Nevertheless, I would argue that Orpaz's texts are far more reminiscent of the traditional Surrealist movement than those of Oz and Yehoshua and convey a spirit that is truer to Surrealism than that of his – more popular – peers.

Yitzhak Orpaz's Hebrew Surrealism

Yitzhak Orpaz's first collection of stories entitled *Wild Grass* ('*Esev Pere*, 1959) was pointedly realist.[33] His later works however – more specifically his three novellas, 'The Death of Lysanda' ('Mot Lisandah', 1964), 'Ants' ('Nemalim', 1968) and 'A Narrow Step' ('Madregah Tsara', 1972) – have been described as Surrealist.[34] I would also include 'The Hunting of the Gazelle' ('Tseyd Ha-Tsviyah', 1966), as belonging to this Surrealistic series. In spite of this labelling, Orpaz has never expressed any affinity with Surrealism and one could argue that his tendencies towards Surrealism are indicative of a trend that emerged from within the traditions of Hebrew literature.

Orpaz's Surrealism manifests itself in two distinct forms, the second of which forms the main focus of this paper: the first may be seen in the aforementioned three novellas, 'The Death of Lysanda', 'Ants' and 'A Narrow Step'. These novellas demonstrate the social implications of Surrealism via a plot that is suffused with cruel displays of anarchy, subversive representations of religion (more precisely, Judaism), provocative scenes that transgress social values such as implied paedophilia and frequent descriptions of (female) sexuality coupled with the grotesque.

*[8]*As I indicated in the introduction, the Surrealists' preferred mode of writing was poetry, which they considered superior to the novel. The one exception was if the novel contained the Surrealist marvellous.[35] Indeed, both 'Ants' and 'A Narrow Step' contain examples of the Surrealist marvellous. The Surrealist marvellous is closely intertwined with Surrealism's notion of perception. That is, Surrealism views man as alien from his surroundings; these surroundings are senseless and arbitrary. Any order that is perceived in the external world such as that expounded by fixed categories such as rationalism or positivism come from man alone and is therefore insufficient.[36] For instance, the Surrealists assert that the division of experience into outer and inner and by extension into dream or

---

[31] Hannan Hever, *Fiction That Is Written Here* (*Ha-Sifrut She Nikhtevet Mi-Kan*) (Hemed Books, Tel Aviv, 1999), 68.

[32] A.B. Yehoshua, *The Death of the Old Man* (*Mot Ha-Zaqen*) (Ha-Qibuts Ha-Me'uḥad, Tel Aviv, 1962); Amos Oz, *Where the Jackals Howl* (*Artsot Ha-Tan*) (Masadah, Tel Aviv, 1965).

[33] Yitzhak Orpaz, *Wild Grass* (*Esev Pere*) (Machbarot Lesifrut, Tel Aviv, 1959).

[34] Gershon Shaked, 'The Surrealist Stories' ('Ha-Sipurim Ha-Sure'alisaṭiyim'), in *Hebrew Narrative Fiction*, 151–153.

[35] The Surrealist marvellous should not be confused with traditional pre-Surrealism definitions of the marvellous, such as those defined by Tzvetan Todorov or Christine Brooke-Rose.

[36] William Plank, *Sartre and Surrealism* (UMI Research Press, Ann Arbor, 1981), 65.

wakeful consciousness is entirely superficial. The world of dreams flows into that of wakefulness and vice versa – the boundaries separating the two are artificial and permeable and simply constitute man's inaccurate perception of the universe. Surrealism believes that through Surrealist activity, i.e. the awakening of certain mental faculties, this inaccurate perceived order might be broken down so that man is finally unified with his surroundings. Once this perceived order is broken down then man will finally experience a heightened reality, or more precisely, a 'Surreality'. The breaking down of perceived order can manifest itself in several different ways: the straightforward dismantling of certain social and religious structures or the more extreme dismantling of the individual's perception of form and structure, i.e. between subject and object, time and space.

According to the above definitions, it seems fair to assert that it is actually impossible to imagine Surreality. To envisage an experience of the world that is unencumbered by logic, rationalism, form or structure is actually unachievable. Consequently, one might argue that the individual can only catch glimpses of Surreality. Thus, it is not surprising that Breton offered a method with which to obtain such glimpses. This method is the quest for, and affirmation of, the marvellous. The marvellous may be loosely defined as a necessarily temporary provocation or disruption of a positivist or rationalist way of thinking. It is an image that affects human sensibility.[37] It comprises a momentary awareness of the innate interrelationship between dream and waking life, between the unconscious and the conscious, between the everyday and the poetic. The Surrealist experience of the marvellous, which can only ever be brief, ends alienation and transforms the world into an adventure whereby there exists a causality so that everything is suddenly imbued with meaning and significance. It is not *per se* a world where strange things happen but rather a world that on occasion appears aglow with a strange quality.

Texts that describe such moments of the Surrealist marvellous – classical examples include Louis Aragon's *Paris Peasant* (*Le Paysan de Paris*, 1924) and Breton's *Nadja* (1928) – are nearly always narrated in the first-person and describe daydreams, visions, hallucinations, revelations in such a way that the surrounding material reality is enhanced rather than undermined.[38] The position of the reader is immediately one of belief rather than of hesitation; there is an understanding that the narrator is truthfully describing his experience of reality.

Both 'Ants' and 'A Narrow Step' contain examples of the Surrealist marvellous and both are located within specifically Israeli and Jewish contexts. In both novellas, the reality described is familiar to both reader and protagonist; there are no supernatural elements. However, this familiarity is pushed to its extreme limits at the onset of invasive elements such as the ants or Sabi, the grotesque dwarf. Moreover, the protagonist-narrators describe these invasions as though they are closely intertwined with their own unconscious needs and fears. For example, in 'A Narrow Step', Sabi, the misshapen dwarf slyly enters the otherwise normal lives of the two protagonists, Miri and Yeruham, who is the narrator. At first, Sabi's presence is innocuous but soon it is apparent that he not only poses a threat but that he has abilities that suggest the supernatural. Nevertheless, he is presented in such a way that neither the reader nor the *[9]*protagonists doubt his 'realness'. Closer analysis of the dwarf

---

[37] Breton, 'Manifesto', 16.
[38] See Louis Aragon, *Paris Peasant* (Picador, Paris, 1971) and Andre Breton, *Nadja* (Penguin Books, London, 1999).

suggests that his arrival undermines Miri and Yeruham's putative bourgeois contentment and corresponds uncannily with their unconscious desires to break free from this contentment. In this sense, their encounter with him is in fact an encounter with themselves.

The second way in which Orpaz's Surrealism manifests itself is the focus of this paper and is exemplified in *The Hunting of the Gazelle*. I would argue that this type of Surrealism is unique. It does not contain examples of the marvellous but rather recalls the more traditional Surrealist pursuit of automatic writing. I choose the word 'recall' with caution; well-known examples of automatic writing, such as Breton's 'Soluble Fish' ('Poisson Soluble', 1924) are densely populated with complex Surrealist imagery and always appear nonsensical at first glance.[39] It is only after a concerted effort to decipher this imagery that the narrative becomes comprehensible. This is not true of Orpaz's trilogy; nevertheless, Orpaz's particular use of language – use of repetition, ambiguity of subject-object relations, ambiguity of time sequences, blurring of descriptions of subject and landscape – evoke a restrained automatism. Interestingly enough, Orpaz, whilst resolutely denying any influence of Surrealism and rejecting the label 'Surrealist', employs a method of writing very similar to that proposed by the French Surrealists.

Orpaz explained that the trilogy was written during the hottest months of the summer in ecstatic, dream-like circumstances.[40] For example, during this period he would fall asleep and dream that the sea was rising very high and then slowly descending as if to swallow him up. Instead of being afraid, Orpaz would experience a wonderful sweetness and then wake up just before being engulfed. Still dazed from his apocalyptic reveries, he would leap out of bed, jump onto his chair, and drink a cup of hot tea. Semi-naked, wrapped in a single sheet and sweating from the profuse heat, he would then begin to write. Furthermore, even if he could not remember what he had written the previous day, he would nevertheless carry on writing. Orpaz would translate this intensity into words, and in fact most of the dreams described in his stories are based on his own dreams (or memories of dreams) including that of the rising sea, an image that occurs as a leitmotif in several of the cited works. In addition, Orpaz described how during these ecstatic periods of creativity, he would listen to Johann Sebastian Bach and Gustav Mahler and that in the case of 'The Hunting of the Gazelle' the first few paragraphs are unintentionally reminiscent of a fugue.

However, Orpaz insists that this type of writing does not constitute automatism but rather a 'controlled ecstasy':

> It is the moment in which ecstasy, internal spontaneity and controlled imagination come together; a blazing but controlled imagination that is already set to stanzas, notes and fugues.[41]

Although Orpaz rejects the term 'automatism' in favour of 'controlled ecstasy' one cannot deny that his intensive method of writing is still reminiscent of that propounded by the French Surrealists who also favoured certain ecstatic conditions in which to create; perhaps, however, it is more akin to Louis Aragon's methods of writing than to André Breton's. That is, Breton argued that automatism should remain as close as possible to that particular blind source which inspired it; Aragon on the other hand claimed that this blind source merely

---

[39] Breton, 'Soluble Fish', in *Manifesto*, 93.
[40] Personal interview with Orpaz, recorded in Tel Aviv, August 2005.
[41] *Ibid*.

suggested a rhythm or an image which in turn was developed in conjunction with full consciousness.[42]

I shall discuss Orpaz's rejection of the 'automatism' label in my conclusion but first I would like to consider how the effect of automatism is achieved within the trilogy. I would suggest that it is the sense of formlessness and nondifferentiation that creates the impression – false or otherwise – that the text was written purely in response to an inner rhythm or voice. This formlessness manifests itself in various ways: first, between the subjects within the narrative who are described in such a way that they appear to merge *[10]*into one another; second, in the description of subjects who seem to repeatedly fuse with the surrounding landscape as if they were one and the same; third, via the description of the subjects' relationship with the objects around them; fourth, the seeming disintegration of time; fifth, the blurred synchronicity between the three stories that create the impression they are one and the same text. Furthermore, as I shall demonstrate, this formlessness also exists at a much deeper level, between language and reality.

Brief Outline of the Three Stories: 'The Hunting of the Gazelle', 'The Expulsion' ('Ha-Gerush') and 'The Bus Stop' ('Ha-Taḥanah')

Prior to an analysis, it seems appropriate to give a short summary of each story. The first story, 'The Hunting of the Gazelle', takes place at an unspecified time, probably somewhere in the South of Israel.[43] In this story the three nameless protagonists, a man, a woman and a male driver are travelling in a jeep, looking for gazelles to hunt and kill. The first time that the man shoots, he misses and the gazelle escapes. This occurs a second time as well. The third account is less clear and the fourth is a repetition of the first two. In between these four accounts, the story consists of a description of the man's thoughts regarding his prey and various observations he makes of his female companion and the driver, as well as descriptions of the landscape. Moreover, each of these descriptions is repeated and the result is a lengthy and seemingly stagnant text.

'The Expulsion'

A man named Adam and a nameless woman go for a walk in the Golan at an unspecified time.[44] Adam is leading the woman and everything that he does such as sit down or drink, she does too. They reach an inflorescence, which covers them like a strange wedding canopy and as they walk reeds wound their feet. It is evident that they are going to a particular and significant destination. At one point, Adam sits down on a hill and suddenly hears a voice calling him. He experiences what appears to be a revelation: a bright, transparent goblet in the heavens, upturned and open at both ends. He falls to the ground and loudly declares that he can at last see.

---

[42] Jacqueline Chénieux-Gendron, *Surrealism*, 50.
[43] Orpaz, 'The Hunting of the Gazelle', in *City with No Refuge*, 43–67.
[44] Orpaz, 'The Expulsion', in *City*, 59–67.

Meanwhile, the woman removes her clothes and throws herself into a stream. She suddenly stands up and finds a pebble in the water. She then rubs the pebble over her breasts and thighs in a clearly sexual way. Following this, she coils herself around an ancient tree trunk. The man covers her naked body and is then overcome by an incredible hunger; he eats an apple. He then realizes that the light will never return to him and that he has been cursed for eternity. He is described as one who has been banished, too afraid to turn and look at what he has left behind.

At the end of the story, Adam leaves his wife and children and donning the crown of thorns on his head, he lies where the first ancient dead man lay – namely the original Adam – and continues the ritual. Yet, the resurrection does not really occur but only seems to because of the way in which the light illuminates the head of the dead.

'The Bus Stop'

The third story, 'The Bus Stop', is even more complex.[45] It consists of approximately four scenes that are repeated throughout the text with slight changes in detail each time. As we shall see, these minute *[11]*changes perform specific functions within the narrative. The first scene is a description of what the narrator can see from his seat, namely a bus stop. He can also hear the sound of the sea but he does not know where this sound comes from.

The second scene is a description of the bus arriving at the bus stop and of an old seed-seller who is sitting nearby. Young people then emerge from the corner of the street and surround him. In the third scene, a soldier and a young girl appear from the corner of an alleyway, hands entwined. The focus then returns to the old seed-seller who is sitting with his eyes shut, hugging his box of seeds. In the fourth scene, the young people taunt the old seed-seller and accidentally stumble into a pram with a little girl in it. The narrator imagines that he is secretly communicating with the little girl. There is then a switch from first person to second person, which is entirely different in content to the rest of the text and seems almost like a momentary lapse or reverie. Scenes that are, for the most part, variations of the first four, follow this literary lapse.

The Merging of Subjects

In the story 'The Hunting of the Gazelle', this technique is evident. First, the three subjects are nameless. The fact that they are nameless makes them less easy to identify and it is certainly very easy for the reader to blur the actions of 'the man' with those of 'the driver'. Very little information is given to differentiate the three characters. We know for example that all three are wearing sandals. We also know that they drink their cups of water differently: i.e. one sprays the water out in a jet, the other empties the cup in one gulp and the other drinks slowly in large gulps.[46] Otherwise very little is known. It is as though they can only be defined by how they differ from each other and these differences are so slight that the overall

---

⁴⁵ Orpaz, 'The Bus Stop', in *City*, 67–79.
⁴⁶ Orpaz, 'The Hunting of the Gazelle', in *City*, 44.

impression is one of vagueness. They are unfinished sketches whose lines overlap, rather than solid, tangible personalities. The actions of each of the characters are also extremely subtle, which makes them harder to tell apart; for example, the driver turns his head only slightly and at one point the narrator says that with the jolting of the jeep it appears as if there are three heads shaking and jumping.[47] Were it three 'people' rather than three 'heads' the reader would understand that there are three completely different individuals, three subjects. Three 'heads' compounds the sense that the man, the driver and the woman are barely indistinguishable and transforms them into objects. This is markedly different to Orpaz's protagonists in the three previously mentioned novellas, each of whom are given names – Yeruham, Miri, Jacob, Rachel, Naphtali – and clear distinguishing traits such as jobs, desires, fears, a past, etc. They are clear subjects within the narrative whereas the status of subjectivity in 'The Hunting of the Gazelle' is ambiguous and in constant flux.

   It is certainly no coincidence that this endless flux of subjectivity should be punctuated by styles of drinking water. Water is not only a key leitmotif in Orpaz's trilogy but it also corresponds with the fluidity and formlessness of each of the texts. In 'The Hunting of the Gazelle', for example, the vagueness of the narration is loosely bound together by the water motif. Water not only distinguishes the three characters but in some instances it connects them. For example, in the following passage, which is repeated twice more in the text, the descriptions of water slowly but surely submerge the two characters so that they feel identical physical sensations:

> [12]This was the moment when the driver of the jeep told her something that had happened to his fisherman friend, who caught a woman with his harpoon. Now the two of them laughed and felt the water's caress upon their skin.

> This was the moment when the driver of the jeep told her about his fisherman friend who caught a water maiden with his harpoon. And they felt the jubilation of the water upon their skin.

> This was the moment when the driver of the jeep told her about his fisherman friend, who caught a woman with his harpoon . . . this was the moment when the woman and the driver of the jeep both laughed and saw lots of fish and heard the burbling of lots of water in their ears.[48]

In these three variations there is a gradual crescendo of collective sensory experience, from a mere 'caress' to 'lots of fish' and the sensation of being so submerged that they can both feel water in their ears. The metaphoric language employed manifests itself into a shared reality, which in turn complicates the role of imagination. If it were simply that the evocative power of words inspired the imagination of the driver and the woman then surely they would imagine things differently. The fact that they experience identical sensations suggests even more strongly that there is no differentiation between language and reality. The signifier 'water' does not simply refer to the signified, it also summons it into being; thus, hearing the story is the same as experiencing it.

   This revitalising of the relationship between language and the world is a key concern within traditional Surrealist philosophy. That is, as we have already established, the Surrealists argue that man can only be completely unified with his surroundings through the breaking down of perceived order. Language is part of this perceived order and employing

---

[47] *Ibid.*, 44.
[48] *Ibid.*, 48, 55 and 56 respectively.

this language limits the individual to only experiencing the perception intrinsic within that language. According to the Surrealists, it is metaphor in particular that allows the individual to be liberated from these confinements of perception and thus it contributes to this revitalising of the relationship between language and the world.[49] According to the Surrealists, metaphor is not simply a way of comparing one thing to another; it is also a means of creating something completely new. Indeed, much Surrealist writing and criticism describes the metaphor in terms of alchemy, whereby one element literally transforms into something else.[50] More crucially, this transformation is not simply conceptual, but it is also the transformation from the figurative to the literal.

Thus, Orpaz's text is not just telling the reader that the driver and the woman are experiencing the story through words; rather, it is showing the reader that through Orpaz's narrative the inconceivable is possible, in this case a collective physical sensation brought about by description alone.

The merging of subjects is also evident in 'The Bus Stop'; this merging is achieved at a purely textual level. The first evident example is contained in the repeated line whereby the gymnast's hair 'flutters over her eyes' followed immediately by 'the eyes of the old seed-seller are closed'. This line, which is repeated three times during the text, fuses the two characters simply by virtue of the proximity of the word 'eyes'. That is, it is as if one triggers the other. Moreover, each of the three repetitions reveals miniscule variations, so that what initially appeared to be a clear pattern within the text rapidly dissolves. Nevertheless, linguistically speaking there is always a relationship between the two sentences; this is because the location of the word 'eyes' is always constant. It is the nature of the relationship that is destabilised because of the subtle deviations:

> The head's hair flutters over her eyes. The eyes of the old man the seed-seller are closed . . .

> Her head's hair flutters over her eyes. The eyes of the old seed-seller are closed . . .

> Her head's hair flutters over her face, covers her eyes. The eyes of the old seed-seller are closed.[51]

With each variation the figure of the girl slowly but gradually emerges and this emerging corresponds with the increasingly developing sentences. At first, the reader is not even sure whose hair is fluttering over her eyes but by the third variation the girl not only has hair and eyes but also a face. Ironically, perhaps, these deviations can only ever be of interest to the reader since the eyes of the seed-seller are *[13]*forever closed. On the other hand, the girl's sight is also blighted by the fact that hair is forever covering her eyes and in this sense the two characters are also brought together by virtue of their mutual blindness. In view of their blindness, the fixed juxtaposition of 'eyes' and 'the eyes of' within the narrative – separated only by a full stop – corresponds with their marred vision at a textual level. Certainly, in the Hebrew, the difference between 'the eyes of' and 'her eyes' is only very slight.[52]

'The Bus Stop' also contains a slight switching of scenes, which similarly creates a sense of blurring between subjects. The first scene is as follows:

---

[49] Inez Hedges, *Languages of Revolt: Dada and Surrealist Literature and Film* (Duke University Press, Durham N.C., 1983), 81.

[50] The concept originates with Rimbaud's 'alchemy of the word' ('alchimie du verbe'). See Rimbaud, *A Season in Hell* (*Une Saison en Enfer*).

[51] Orpaz, 'The Bus Stop', 68, 70, and 73, respectively.

[52] In the Hebrew the three repeated lines read as follow: eyneha.eyne

> They bumped into a child's pram . . ."Savages", cried the woman who was pushing the child's pram, in one hand she held a lemon lollipop . . . {this} woman, maybe the mother, her face broad and impervious.

The second is as follows:

> They bumped into a wheelchair . . ."Savages", cried the woman in the wheelchair and her face was impervious. But a young, tall, woman was pushing the wheelchair . . . the face of the woman in the wheelchair was impervious . . . her lips sucking on a lollipop. The eyes of the young woman stared at her, the woman, maybe her mother, with concern.[53]

Certainly, in Hebrew the word for pram and the word for wheelchair are construct nouns and can be easily exchanged simply by switching the second noun.[54] There is really very little to distinguish the female pushing the pram and the female invalid; and the rapid switch from the independent mother figure to the dependent invalid is as discreet as the switch in Hebrew from pram to wheelchair. This denotes a crumbling of subjectivity, since the identity of the woman pushing the pram is unstable as is the identity of the female invalid. The only way to explain the rapid switch would further involve a complete collapse of time, the dismissal of categories – past, present and future. After all, the key distinguishing feature between the two females is that in the first part of the story the narrator imagines that he is speaking to the child in the pram and in the second part he imagines that he is speaking to the young woman pushing the wheelchair. One could assume that the woman pushing the pram has aged and become the invalid. This would certainly explain why they appear so interchangeable. Thus, the merging between the two female characters is taken to its extreme and they are in fact the same.

The Merging of Subject and Nature

In 'The Hunting of the Gazelle', it is clear that there is a deliberate blurring of the gazelle and the woman and therefore the man's relationship to both. This is achieved through the order in which descriptions are given. For example at the start of the story, the narrator describes how the man and the gazelle look at each other: whilst he raises his rifle she is looking at him as though hypnotised. However, when he shoots, the next sentence is immediately a description of the woman – 'her frozen face and her thin neck' – as opposed to a description of the gazelle's reaction, which is what the reader expects.[55] The fact, furthermore, that the woman's neck is described as thin, reminds the reader of the gazelle's neck, which is given an identical description. This is not to mention the fact that the state of being hypnotised is attributed to both the woman and the gazelle at different stages of the text. An even more precise merging is when the narrator says that the woman stamps her feet and that her feet trip along like a distant gallop. This is immediately following a description of how the man will slaughter the gazelle and what he will do with her skin and also her hooves.[56]

---

[53] *Ibid.*, 68 and 70.
[54] Eglat tinokot / Eglat naḥim
[55] Orpaz, 'Hunting', 46.
[56] *Ibid.*, 48.

*[14]*Even the fact that the man and the male driver, when drinking their cups of water, are described as being quick or not even drinking properly, whereas the woman drinks slowly sip by sip, carefully at an even pace, silently absorbed,[57] reminds the reader that the two men are planning to go to Eyn Netifim because this is where the gazelles go to drink. The woman's slow drinking of her water therefore emphasises the idea of the unsuspecting victim. Again, it is the water leitmotif and its correspondence with the fluidity of the text that brings together different parts of the text, in this case the (female) human and the (female) animal, which in turn compounds the sense of nondifferentiation.

'The Hunting of the Gazelle' contains a further example of merging subjects with nature, namely a description whereby the red granite appears to be fluid and flow into both the gazelle's eyes and those of the man, as if the landscape were a part of both of them. Furthermore the description is repeated four times during the story, each time with a slight variation. As we shall see, these variations perform a very precise function.

> A liquid the colour of coffee, the colour of warm-orange, the colour of molten gold – encircled her big pupils and flooded them. And from there the warm gold flowed into the eyes of the man.
>
> The brown-orange flooded them. From the eyelashes from the eyelids the warm orange flowed to her pupils and from there to the eyes of the man.
>
> The warm-orange flooded them. From the eyelashes from the eyelids, perhaps from reddening rocks in the bosom of the mountain, the warm-orange flowed to her pupils and from there to the eyes of the man.
>
> The warm-orange flooded them. From the eyelashes from the eyelids, perhaps from the reddening rocks of the mountain's bosom, the warm-orange flowed to her pupils and from there to the eyes of the man.[58]

The most noticeable aspect of these variations is that the source and nature of the 'liquid colour' is very gradually realised and consolidated both in terms of the words used but also in terms of punctuation. It is yet another instance whereby gradually developing sentences correspond with a process of becoming. In the first repetition there is no indication as to the exact source or nature of this 'liquid colour'. Furthermore, the exact hue is not known, it is as at once like coffee, like gold, like orange. Likewise, in the second repetition, the nature of the liquid – which we now know to be either brown-orange or warm-orange – is ambiguous, yet its liquid trajectory is highlighted by the complete lack of commas in the last sentence. Indeed, this lack of commas also gives the impression of immediacy, the sense that there are no structures in Orpaz's story to act as obstacles. The disintegration of syntax is a linguistic means of representing the completely uninterrupted path of the warm/brown-orange.[59] The language used to narrate the story thus seems at one with the reality represented within the story. By the third variation the reader assumes that the source is in fact the granite – definitely warm-orange at this point – yet this granite is still described using the indefinite article. It is only in this last variation that the granite – and probable source of the 'liquid colour' – is given the definite article. The granite thus assumes essence and form and yet at

---

[57] *Ibid.*, 44.

[58] *Ibid.*, 46, 50, 54 and 55 respectively.

[59] In Hebrew, the 'warm-orange' and the 'brown-orange' are only differentiated by the letter vav and it is quite easy for the reader to accidentally slip from one to the other.

the same time it has an amorphous quality that allows it to appear like liquid forever flowing from rocks to the man to the gazelle.

The second part of the trilogy, 'The Expulsion', is a particularly interesting case because the putative religious plot is almost subsumed by the role of nature in the story. Whilst the landscape in 'The Hunting of the Gazelle' is limited and bare, that of 'The Expulsion' is absolutely full of different birds and animals and plants. There are rock partridges, mountain swallows, warblers, hawks, rabbits, butterflies, lizards, ferns, terebinths and thorns. Whilst Adam's revelation keeps him apart from nature, his female companion, who has not shared this experience, becomes more and more integrated with the landscape. *[15]* Thus, she does not hear Adam shout but instead she hears the babbling of a nearby stream. She eventually flings herself, naked, into the current and is described as follows:

> The thorny ferns did not scratch her skin, the rocks' sharp edges did not wound her, the hard tree knots caressed her like sponges. The water seemed to gush out from her body, to flow from her eyes, from her navel . . .[60]

Again it is water that connects forms usually considered as separate and contributes to the sense of fluidity of boundaries between the woman and nature. The physical water in the story does not differentiate between the woman and the surrounding rocks; it flows through her regardless. She is just another rock for the water to flow through. She remains unharmed and instead of being treated like an alien body she is rapidly integrated into the landscape. She is no longer a recognisable human; she has transformed into something that is completely unaffected by thorns, sharp rocks, etc. The merging of woman and landscape is total and absolute.

Although 'The Expulsion' contains other examples of the bringing together of subject and landscape I shall only consider one more that is again repeated with slight variations:

> Her brownish-red hair burst out from beneath Adam's straw hat, flooded her nape and shoulders and in the strong afternoon light seemed to flow towards the shining rocks . . .

> There stood a rabbit . . . its skin brownish-red like the colour of the woman's hair . . .

> The mound crouched like a kind of animal . . . its head gleamed brownish-red, like the woman's hair. . .[61]

In the first description the language is figurative; it is the strong illusory effects of the sun that inspire the poetic image of the woman's brownish-red hair flowing to the rocks. That is, the rocks are not really affected; they just seem to be. As the descriptions progress, it seems that in actual fact her – very precisely coloured – hair is reflected elsewhere in instances where the effects of the sun are not the cause.[62] In this case it is colour rather than water that connects the various forms. Moreover, the similes in the last two variations begin with the landscape rather than with the woman and in this sense the landscape becomes the subject, so that there is no hierarchy of imagery. The other way around – the woman's hair resembled that of the rabbit, the mound – would perhaps sound more natural and it would have rendered the human subject as the focal point within the narrative.

---

[60] Orpaz, 'The Expulsion', 63.
[61] *Ibid.*, 60, 61 and 62.
[62] Even if the sun were the cause, it would be extremely uncanny if everything, including rabbits and mounds of earth, were bathed in exactly the same brownish-red hue.

The Merging of Subject and Object

The merging of subject and object in 'The Hunting of the Gazelle' is a pertinent example of the Surrealist perception of metonym. In the same way that the Surrealist metaphor is viewed as an alchemical process whereby the figurative becomes manifest or literal, the same is true of metonym. In the case of 'The Hunting of the Gazelle' it is not simply that the subjects are being metonymically described via the parts to which they are attached, but rather these parts become the subject. For example, at the very start of the story there is the following sentence:

> The peaked white hat, the jeep driver's sailor's hat, made a quarter turn behind. . .[63]

This is the first instance where the subject and object are blurred. That is, it is the hat that is described as turning as opposed to the person wearing the hat. However, the text in its entirety – the overall atmosphere of formlessness that prevails – creates the impression that the hat really is turning and is not simply metonymically describing the movement of the girl, who is the one wearing the driver's cap. Similarly, after a shot is fired, we read:

> *[16]* His head then moved, or, more precisely, almost moved, in the brim of the straw hat, the man's hat, worn by the head of the woman.[64]

Again the 'head' is described as a separate entity. Instead of saying 'he' moved, or 'he moved his head', it is the 'head' that moves and it is the hat that is being worn by the 'head' of the woman, and not by the 'woman'. Moreover, the reader is given the impression that it is precisely a 'head' that moves and not the 'woman'; and it is precisely a 'hat' that is being worn by a 'head' instead of a figurative translation that would say such and such turned around and such and such wore a hat.

The third example is in the sentence:

> The Adam's apple of the driver in the jeep laughed.[65]

Here the subject of the sentence, in this case the driver, is erased: it is not he who is laughing but instead it is his Adam's apple. Again the text implies that this sentence is not only a figurative description of the man laughing but an image wherein an Adam's apple is capable of laughing independently of the person to which it is attached. In all three cases the expected subject of the sentence, i.e. the driver, the man, and the woman are not the ones carrying out the action but it is the otherwise inanimate objects that are doing so instead. The figurative language of metonymy is realised within the reality of the text.

The Disintegration of Time

In 'The Hunting of the Gazelle' the actions of the three characters frequently appear synchronised. For example, the man loads his rifle and at the exact same moment the male driver puts his knife back into its sheath and at exactly the same moment the woman is

---

[63] Orpaz, 'Hunting', 43.
[64] *Ibid.*, 50.
[65] *Ibid.*, 50.

watching as though hypnotised.[66] In addition, the phrase, 'it was at that moment when', appears throughout the text as if to emphasise the synchronicity or lack of temporality. That is, the reader doesn't know which action came first, how long it lasted and when exactly the following action occurred. It could have occurred at any or all of the time; furthermore, as far as the notion of time is concerned the story seems to be progressing but, due to the constant repetition of phrases and even whole paragraphs, the reader is lulled into a sense of time standing still. Dialogues are repeated, actions are repeated, thoughts are repeated and even the constant moving of the vehicle versus the movement of the gazelle, seem to cancel each other out. Moreover, the fact that the hunter never catches the gazelle, never slays her, never skins her compounds the impression that time is not moving. In other words, the putative quest for the gazelle symbolises a clear sequence of events that is never realised in the story.

The disintegration of time occurs in almost the same way in 'The Bus Stop'. There are barely any time markers – i.e. afterwards, beforehand – within the text, apart from the phrase, 'it was that moment when'. This phrase occurs six times within the text, again creating a confusing sense of temporality within the narrative. In four out of the six, the phrase is employed to mark the gradually deteriorating fate of the old seed-seller: in the first two scenes he is simply surrounded by the young boys; in the third, his chair falls to the ground, with him in it, and all his seeds are scattered; in the final version, he falls again but this time it is the more troubling image of his limbs that are scattered as well as his seeds. This final scene is a complete unravelling of the old man so that he too has lost his (physical) form.[67]

A second way in which the text evokes a disintegration of time is in its consistent use of water imagery. 'The Bus Stop', which is the text that most recalls Yitzhak Orpaz's aforementioned reverie, is replete with descriptions that allude to the sea and to the movement of the waves endlessly hitting the shore and erasing what has been, so that the effect of time appears to dissolve. The story begins with the narrator *[17]*describing how he can hear the sea but he doesn't understand where this sound is coming from. This unbidden sound then permeates the text completely, so that the narrator perceives everything in terms of the sea. In the following passages, the narrator repeatedly describes a scene where a group of young boys approach an old man:

> They cover the old seed-seller like the sea.

> They cover the old seed-seller like the sea. And the old man's head sinks and re-emerges alternatively.

Like a torrent, they flood, like the sea, they cover, the old man, seller of seeds. But the old man's head turns ('sav') and re-emerges from the sea. His head falls backwards, a white moss is growing from his sides and skull.

> The seed-seller's old ('sav') head sinks and rises alternatively, like a cliff in the sea. A white moss is growing from his sides and skull.[68]

---

[66] *Ibid.*, 45.
[67] 'Bus', 67, 69, 71 and 76 respectively.
[68] *Ibid.*, 67, 70, 72, and 73 respectively.

In this series of repetitions, as with others I have discussed, such as 'The Hunting of the Gazelle', there is a gradual crescendo of imagery although it seems to peak at the third variation and then subside, almost like a textual equivalent of a wave. The language employed is unusual and clearly alluding to the sea. This is particularly the case with the motion of the man's head, as well as the word 'moss' which, whilst in English does not sound too out of place, is very peculiar in the Hebrew. Moreover, the subtle exchange of 'sav', which in Hebrew can mean both 'old' and 'turn' and which appears at almost the same point of the sentence in both the second and third variation, enhances the fluidity of the water motif through language.

The Synchronicity Between the Three Stories

The reader of 'The Hunting of the Gazelle' and 'The Bus Stop' and, in certain instances, 'The Expulsion' could believe that he is reading two and sometimes three versions of the same story. In each of the stories there is a clear objective; in 'The Hunting of the Gazelle' it is the hunter who wishes to catch his prey. This hunter has a female companion. In 'The Expulsion' it is Adam who is determined to find a particular location and he too has a female companion; in 'The Bus Stop' the narrator is trying to communicate with a small girl. It is only in 'The Expulsion' that the objective is putatively attained. All three females are repeatedly compared to animals, i.e. gazelles, rabbits, lizards. These comparisons, in turn, are frequently rearranged in the different stories; for instance, Adam's companion is described as having stalk-like hands whereas the gazelle is described as having stalk-like hands. Or, the hunter's companion is described as drinking her water slowly, in large gulps, which is exactly how Adam's companion drinks her water.

Second, there are very clear parallels in the inner voice of the male protagonists. This inner voice permeates each of the three stories, speaking through each of the three male protagonists. For instance, in 'The Hunting of the Gazelle' there are several variations on the following:

To be strong, to be strong, said the man suddenly to himself.[69]

. . . It is my responsibility to take you with me . . . it is my responsibility to shoot you. . .[70]

Meanwhile, in 'The Expulsion' we find:

It is your responsibility to be strong, he said to himself.[71]

Likewise, in 'The Bus Stop':

"You are beautiful, dear girl", in my heart I called out to her, "and it is my responsibility to tell you something."

[18] "It is my responsibility to tell you something, dear girl" I said to myself, "It is my responsibility to be able to tell you something." [72]

---

[69] 'Hunting', 48.
[70] *Ibid.*, 49.
[71] 'Expulsion', 61.
[72] 'Bus Stop', 74.

In each case, the inner voice is urging the protagonist to achieve a particular goal: the hunter's objective is to kill; Adam's objective is to experience a revelation; the narrator from 'The Bus Stop' feels he has to speak to the young girl about something, although he does not know what. Moreover, each inner voice is associated with duty, with responsibility, and this duty is clearly in conflict with the inner desires of the protagonist. Consequently, there is a struggle between desire and duty. 'The Expulsion' is the only example where duty overcomes desire and it is surely no coincidence that this is the story with the most overt religious overtones. In the other two texts it is as though the sense of responsibility is endlessly swamped by intervening thoughts and images. Certainly, in 'The Bus Stop' this is portrayed by a distinctly dreamlike landscape wherein characters eerily transform – a baby in a pram is suddenly a girl in a wheelchair – and once familiar scenes repeatedly undergo subtle changes. The physical landscape in the story is forever shifting, forever impossible to navigate and the language also captures this sense of the ungraspable. In the following passage, the voice of the narrator appears subsumed by the oneiric landscape that he is trying to describe. The use of parenthesis is misleading because it is ostensibly there to describe the alleyway and yet when the sentence resumes it repeats part of this description, and this repetition is consequently disorientating. Moreover, parentheses are also intended to impose a time sequence upon a narrative, but in this instance the reader is simply led in circles:

> Only the tops of the trees pruned into squares, and between them, fifty meters above the pavement, enclosed between the main street and one unpaved alleyway, – three houses, walls pressed together but of different heights, so that, the tallest among them, its concealed side is lost in the main street and it stretches as if whispering something to the middle house, which also stretches to the ear of the house on the left – an old house with two floors whose concealed side is lost in one unpaved alleyway.[73]

The motif of the 'unbidden' inner voice also connects 'The Bus Stop' and 'The Expulsion'. In the former, the narrator repeatedly declares that there are two voices that appear out of nowhere; in the latter also Adam hears a voice but does not understand where it comes from. Certainly, in the former example there are no religious connotations to this voice whereas in 'The Expulsion', there are. Again, the very clear sense of duty forbids the blurring and confusion of two competing voices that exists in 'The Bus Stop'.

There are particularly striking parallels between the way in which the hunter addresses his prey in 'The Hunting of the Gazelle' and how the narrator addresses the young girl in 'The Bus Stop'. For instance, in 'The Bus Stop' the narrator declares:

> You are beautiful, dear girl, but you don't have to stare at me like that . . .[74]

Similarly, in 'The Hunting of the Gazelle' the narrator imagines that he is speaking to his prey:

> You didn't have to stare at me like that, dear gazelle.[75]

Third, there is a consistent merging of the descriptions between the nameless female in 'The Expulsion' with that of the young girl in the 'The Bus Stop' and that of the female companion in 'The Hunting of the Gazelle' as well as the female animal, namely the gazelle. It is

---

[73] *Ibid*, 69.
[74] Orpaz, 'The Bus Stop', 71.
[75] Orpaz, 'Hunting', 51.

surprisingly the neck that most links the four females. In 'The Hunting of the Gazelle' there are numerous descriptions of the gazelle's thin neck but also that of the female companion:

> Her neck was very flexible. She could turn her head on it as though on an axis.[76]

Meanwhile, in 'The Expulsion':

> The woman attached herself to the trunk . . . encircling it with her flexible neck.[77]

*[19]*And in 'The Bus Stop':

> Her head moved this way and that way upon her thin neck. I feared lest it would break . . .[78]

The focus on the neck is quite striking, reminiscent of dreamlike imagery from other literary texts such as Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, where there is similarly a focus upon the various contortions of the neck as distinct from the rest of the body. It is similarly the eyes and, more precisely, interpreting their gaze which is a common theme in all three stories. Moreover, this need to interpret also manifests itself in the stories with the consistent use of 'perhaps', a word that instantly introduces vagueness and lack of clarity. Although 'perhaps' appears at several points, the following, taken from each of the stories, are specifically related to the gaze.

> Her eyes were big and round. At first it was impossible to decipher what was expressed in them. Perhaps it was that thing one calls . . . astonishment.[79]

> Adam hastened his step. He remembered the woman's eyes as they had stared at the animal . . . they were open and cunning, perhaps from fear, he thought to himself.[80]

> Her eyes were wide, and perhaps as a result, it seemed as though they were breathing.[81]

This all-encompassing sense of doubt and ambivalence contributes to the atmosphere of nondifferentiation within the three texts. That is, the protagonist is unable to decode the signs that surround him; everything is a guess, there is no clarity. Moreover, in each instance, the indecipherable entity is the female and each female is described in such a way that human and animal elements appear merged. For example, in the first quotation the hunter imposes an anthropomorphic characteristic upon the gazelle, the idea that she might be 'astonished'. Similarly, the protagonist in 'The Expulsion' could be seen as doing the opposite, attributing traits to a human that are often associated with animals – fear and cunning. In fact, the word 'cunning' is also used later in 'The Expulsion' to describe a rabbit, which suggests that the adjective is deliberately employed to link the two, human and animal. In the third quotation, the protagonist again experiences confusion as he attempts to interpret the girl's gaze, and the fact that he sees her eyes as 'wide' also links her to the 'open' and 'round' eyes of the gazelle and Adam's companion.

The last two examples of synchronicity relate solely to the first and third story. In 'The Hunting of the Gazelle' the following variations occur:

---

[76] 'Hunting', 52.
[77] 'Expulsion' 63
[78] 'Bus', 71.
[79] 'Hunting', 46.
[80] 'Expulsion', 61.
[81] 'Bus', 71.

He moved his hand in an arch, as though pointing to the lap of the mountain, which could not be seen, because it was hidden behind the nearby hills.

He moved his hand in an arch, as though pointing to the lap of the mountain, which could not be seen, because the nearby hills covered it.

The man moved his hand in an arch towards the big mountain, which was hidden behind the granite promontories.[82]

In these variations there are switches between subject and object in the final clause. In the first variation, the lap of the mountain, the 'it' is the subject; in the second variation, the nearby hills are the subject and the lap, the 'it', is the object. In the last variation, it is the big mountain that has become the subject of the narrative.

Similarly, in 'The Bus Stop', there are three occasions when the soldier appears:

*[20]*His left hand – and the beret inside it – was directed towards the bus stop's post, as though pointing to it.

His left hand – and the black beret inside it – was directed towards the bus stop's post, as though pointing to it.

The soldier's eyes were not laughing. His left was directed towards the bus stop's post, as though pointing to it.[83]

In these variations, there is not a switch from subject to object but rather the subject appears to transform. The 'left' in the first two variations refers to the soldier's left hand whereas in the final variation 'left' seems to indicate his left eye.

Lastly, in both stories there are anomalous switches to a second person narration. In 'The Bus Stop', this occurs with a sudden meditation on walking through the sea:

You walk by the sea. The sand is soft, as though it melts beneath your feet. The waves are not hurrying, and neither do you. The edge of the sea is not far, you can see it with your naked eye, approximately, at the place where the sky begins. Your legs stride through the water, on the sands that are below the water. You count: how many waves until I get there? Ten, maybe eleven.[84]

This atypical narration also occurs in 'The Hunting of the Gazelle':

You climb the mountain . . . you stride towards its peak . . . the granite rock collapses beneath your feet . . . you climb the mountain for an hour, two hours, three years, four eternities . . . And behind the square rock – this you know for certain – rises the crest of the tall mountain . . . And you know that here a meeting is intended . . . you only have to raise your eyes.[85]

These unexpected changes in the narration are again related to the motif of the competing, ambiguous voices. Whereas the protagonist in 'The Expulsion' has a very clear objective that he dutifully attains, the putative objective in the other two stories constantly eludes the protagonists. In the first example, it is only a sense of urgency that propels the voice rather than a clear goal, whereas in the second there is at least the intimation of a 'meeting'. Moreover, in both cases, the switch in narrative voice occurs only once, as though to remind both the protagonist and the reader of something that transcends the reality described. Even if this 'something' refers to religious experience, which is of course a matter of interpretation, it dissolves rapidly into yet

---

[82] 'Hunting,', 45, 47 and 57.
[83] 'Bus', 67, 70 and 73.
[84] *Ibid.*, 69.
[85] 'Hunting', 55.

another one of the many voices within the text. In this sense, it does not stand out as a superior aspect of reality. If the incongruous voice of these two second-person reveries is in fact the voice of revelation then it blends effortlessly with the voice of dialogue, the voice of personal desire, the voice of speculation, the voice of anxiety and so forth.

Conclusion

In this article I have demonstrated the way in which Orpaz's trilogy creates an effect of formlessness and nondifferentiation. The particular use of language – use of repetition, ambiguity of subject-object relations, ambiguity of time sequences, blurring of descriptions of subject and landscape – are the textual equivalent to a visual representation of formlessness as might be exemplified by a painting or photograph. In addition, this formlessness subverts not only established codes of perceiving the world; it also subverts established codes of describing this world. The disorientating use of punctuation and syntax for example defies logical and rational ways of ordering narrative, whilst the lack of a comprehensive beginning, middle and end undermines the sense of control which is usually provided to the reader via narrative structure. Out of the three stories 'The Expulsion' stands out; unlike 'The Hunting of the Gazelle' and 'The Bus Stop', which both have a series of competing voices, 'The Expulsion' has one dominant voice that the protagonist follows without being distracted by the voice of his female companion or that of the *[21]* landscape. He confidently follows a particular path and consequently there is a clear ending to the story. Although the voice that Adam hears could be interpreted as the voice of religious experience or revelation, the story's position in the trilogy suggests that this voice is simply one of many and thus possesses no hierarchical authority. Moreover, the story's consistent affinity with the two other texts underlines its unstable position. That is, if it were not for Adam's personal conviction, for his personal sense of how the universe should be structured, the text could easily dissolve into a fluidity of images similar to those in the other two stories.

Of course, the question that remains to be asked is: why is *The Hunting of the Gazelle* trilogy significant? First, I believe it to be a pertinent example of an organic Hebrew Surrealism that has been written from within a specifically Israeli and Jewish context. The fact that Orpaz adamantly denies any association with the Surrealist movement as a whole consolidates this claim. As I intimated at the start of this article, the term 'Surrealist' is complex. Whilst Breton always acknowledged 'precursors' he nevertheless insisted that to be Surrealist was to be consciously affiliated to the Surrealist movement and cause; to contribute to Surrealist catalogues, to participate in Surrealist exhibitions and to endeavour to follow the Surrealist manifesto with its unique rules and methods. This active and conscious participation has always manifested itself nationally, rather than regionally or linguistically. Thus, for example, there have been Australian and New Zealand Surrealist groups rather than perhaps Anglophone Surrealist groups. As I have also said, Israel is one of the very few countries that have not created a national Surrealist group.[86] Of course, these national

---

[86] This paper did not focus upon the visual arts but I would like to briefly mention Miriam Bat-Yosef, whom I have interviewed and who appears to be the one exception. She is a self-proclaimed Surrealist painter, and has lived in Paris for over thirty years, having decided that her native country was hostile to Surrealism and her work. Her situation merits further research.

affiliations are also problematic inasmuch as they forcefully categorise literary and artistic expression, which in itself imposes a structure and is therefore un-Surrealist. Orpaz's trilogy however demonstrates that the need to express a Surrealist vision of the universe can be non-derivative. I believe that interpreting the trilogy in this way is novel: neither scholars specialising in Surrealism nor Israeli literary critics have considered *The Hunting of the Gazelle* to be a pertinent example of Hebrew Surrealism.

Second, although Orpaz's experimental works, including the aforementioned three novellas as well as the trilogy, were produced during the so-called 'New Wave' generation, I believe that his unique Hebrew Surrealism – and in particular that of *The Hunting of the Gazelle* – sets him apart from his peers, writers such as Oz and Yehoshua, who also produced modernist works. While canonical texts such as Yehoshua's 'The Yatir Evening Express' (1959) or 'Facing the Forests' (1968) contain dreamlike sequences and climactic scenes of destruction, they each contain a clear narrative, and the form and structure of the represented universe remain intact.[87] Furthermore, *The Hunting of the Gazelle* strongly resists interpretation. Whereas the two aforementioned stories by Yehoshua lend themselves quite easily to a plethora of symbolist, allegorical and postcolonial readings, the same is not true of Orpaz's trilogy. The complex and disorientating language prevents this. In this sense, Orpaz's trilogy is unique because its Surrealistic form renders it perhaps more extreme than the modernist texts of Orpaz's peers. Although elsewhere I suggest that this extremity is related to Orpaz's relatively less popular status within Modern Hebrew letters I shall not discuss this here, since it would require further detailed discussion of his numerous other works. Nevertheless, the fact that Orpaz only received his first literary prize twenty years after his first publication whereas Oz and Yehoshua enjoyed almost immediate success is a topic worthy of further research.[88] This in turn raises further questions that in turn form part of a larger project: is it *[21]*possible that there have always been examples of Hebrew Surrealism – i.e. works by Menashe Levin, Yitzhak Oren – but that they have always been marginalised by the Hebrew literary canon? Is it possible that there are more palatable versions of Hebrew modernism than others? To answer such questions would necessitate a completely different methodology to the one used in this paper; nevertheless, the simple fact that Orpaz's *The Hunting of the Gazelle* elicits a Surrealist reading certainly brings the issue of canonicity versus marginality to the fore. *The Hunting of the Gazelle* is only one example of a Hebrew Surrealist text, but there are more, both by Orpaz and by other authors, and it would certainly be very revealing to pinpoint their common features and to offer a precise definition of Modern Hebrew Surrealism. What is it? What is its function? How important is its existence to studies in international Surrealism?

---

[87] Indeed, it has often been argued that Yehoshua was greatly influenced by Jean-Paul Sartre, a fairly significant fact when discussing Surrealism. That is, the Surrealists' notion of formlessness and nondifferentiation between subject and object was a positive one, one that eventually led to a more authentic relationship between man and his surroundings. Sartre on the other hand rejected this state of seeming absurdity, which he experienced as 'nausea', and instead insisted upon the function of language as a means of maintaining form and total differentiation. See Plank, *Sartre and Surrealism*, 83.

[88] This is in addition to the fact that Orpaz is considerably less well known internationally and has only been translated into four languages, in stark contrast to Oz or Yehoshua, whose works are available in over thirty different languages.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources (General)

Aragon, Louis, *Paris Peasant* (Picador, published by Pan Books, London, 1980).

Breton, André, *What is Surrealism? Selected Writings*, Franklin Rosemont, ed., (Pathfinder, London 2004).

Breton, André, *Mad Love*, trans. Mary Ann Caws (University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln and London, 1987).

Breton, André, *Manifestoes of Surrealism* (Ann Arbor Paperbacks, The University of Michigan Press, 1972).

Breton, André, *Nadja* (Penguin Books, London, 1999).

Levin, Menashe, *Me'ah Leylot Be Yafo Ha-Atiqah* (Ha-Qibuts Ha-Me'uḥad & Sifriat Po'alim, Israel, 1983).

Mabille, Pierre, *Mirror of the Marvellous: The Classic Surrealist Work on Myth* (Inner Traditions, Rochester, Vermont, 1998).

Shamir, Moshe, and Tanai, Shlomo, eds., "Moshe Shamir 'Im Bney Dori' ", in *Yalkut Ha-Re'im* (Mosad Bialiq, Jerusalem, 1992).

Yitzhak Orpaz

Orpaz, Yitzhak, *Esev Pere* (Ha-Qibuts Ha-Me'uḥad, Israel, 1979).

Orpaz, Yitzhak, *Fourmis* (Liana Levi, Paris, 1988).

Orpaz, Yitzhak, *Ir She-Eyn Bah Mistor: Sipurim* (Ha-Qibuts Ha-Me'uḥad, Israel, 1973).

Orpaz, Yitzhak, *Lizloah Et Ha-Me'ah* (Ha-Qibuts Ha-Me'uḥad, Israel, 1993).

Orpaz, Yitzhak, *Nemalim* (Ha-Qibuts Ha-Me'uḥad, Am Oved, 1968).

Orpaz, Yitzhak, *Shalosh Novelot* (Sifriat Po'alim, Tel Aviv, 1972).

Orpaz, Yitzhak, *The Death of Lysanda*, trans. Richard Flint (Cape, London, 1970).

[23] Secondary Sources

Brooke-Rose, Christine, *A Rhetoric of the Unreal: Studies in Narrative and Structure, Especially of the Fantastic* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1981).

Chénieux-Gendron, Jacqueline, *Surrealism*, trans. Vivian Folkenflik (Columbia University Press, New York, 1990).

Gertz, Nurit, *Sifrut ve-Ide'ologiah be-Erets-Yisra'el bi-Shnot ha-Shloshim* (Ha-Universitah Ha-Petuḥah, Tel Aviv, 1988).

Gluzman, Michael, *The Politics of Canonicity: Lines of Resistance in Modernist Hebrew Poetry* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 2003).

Miron, Dan, 'Afterword', in Menashe Levin's *Ha-Raqdanit Ha-Me'ofefet* (Mosad Bialiq, Jerusalem, 2000).

Miron, Dan, 'Shirat Menashe Levin: Ha-Derekh she lo Nits'adah', in Menashe Levin, *Ptiḥah Le-Laylah*, ed. Dan Miron (Hotsa'at Qeshev, Israel, 2003).

Plank, William, *Sartre and Surrealism* (UMI Research Press, Ann Arbor, 1981).

Rosemont, Penelope, ed., *Surrealist Women: An International Anthology* (The Athlone Press, London, 1998).

Shaked, Gershon, *Ha-Siporet Ha-Ivrit 1880–1980* (Ha-Qibuts Ha-Me'uḥad and Keter Publishing House Ltd., Tel Aviv, 1998).

Shaked, Gershon, *The Shadows Within: Essays on Modern Jewish Writers* (The Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, New York and Jerusalem, 1987).

Short, Robert, 'Dada and Surrealism', in Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, eds., *Modernism* (Penguin Books, London, 1991).

Todorov, Tzvetan, *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre* (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York, 1975).

Newspapers and Journals

Desnos, Robert, 'Pamphlet contre Jérusalem', in *La Révolution Surréaliste* Number 3, 15th April, 1925, Numbers 1–12, 1924–29 (Arno Press, New York).

Ketuvim, Tel Aviv, Issues: 17/12/1926; 3/11/1927; 6/7/1932; 19/1/1933.

`*Urim*, Tel Aviv, Issues: 17/11/1933; 21/7/1933; 12/1/1934.