

**THE MAKING OF THE *ENCYCLOPAEDIA JUDAICA*
AND THE
*JEWISH ENCYCLOPEDIA***

David B. Levy, Ph. D., M.L.S.

Description: The *Jewish Encyclopedia* and *Encyclopaedia Judaica* form a key place in most collections of Judaica. Both works state that they were brought into being to combat anti-Semitism. This presentation treats the reception history of both the JE and EJ by looking at the comments of their admirers and critics. It also assesses how both encyclopedias mark the application of social sciences and emphasis on Jewish history, as well as anthropology, archeology, and statistics. We will consider the differences between the JE and EJ, some of the controversies surrounding the making of the encyclopedias, and the particular political, ideological, and cultural perspectives of their contributing scholars.

David B. Levy (M.A., '92; M.L.S., '94; Ph. D., 2002) received a Ph. D. in Jewish studies with concentrations in Jewish philosophy, biblical archeology, and rabbinics on May 23, 2002, from the Baltimore Hebrew University. David has worked in the Humanities Department of the Enoch Pratt Public Library since 1994. He authored the Enoch Pratt Library Humanities annotated subject guide web pages in philosophy (24 categories), ancient and modern languages (Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, Spanish, German), and religion. He is widely published.

Introduction:

The 1901-1906 *Jewish Encyclopedia* and 1972 *Encyclopaedia Judaica* form an important place in collections of Judaica. Both works were brought into being to combat anti-Semitism, to enlighten the public of new discoveries, and to disseminate Jewish scholarship. Both encyclopedias seek to counter-act the lack of knowledge of their generations and wide

spread assimilation.

Both works have their admirers and detractors. The EJ has been called “a shining landmark,”¹ “a work of transcendent value,”² “an indispensable reference tool,”³ and “an essential purchase for colleges, universities, seminaries, and all public libraries.”⁴ On the other hand the EJ has been called by Solomon Zeitlin a product of “public relations,” “often inaccurate,” and “inconsistent.”⁵ The JE has been praised for its thoroughness, beautiful illustrations, enrichment of Jewish cultural life, “monumental epoch making climax of Jewish progress in the 19th century,”⁶ and “a peacemaker between different denominations of Judaism.”⁷ It has also been said of the JE that “it will teach the gentile to respect where he has despised; it will teach the Jew to respect himself.”⁸ However, the JE has been criticized for overstating its case with regards to the importance of the Jews , “placing overemphasis on individuals born Jews but whose association with the Jewish community was tenuous,”⁹ and as “contradictory,” and incorrect.¹⁰ At first, Steinschneider claimed it was “dilettantish,” and Ahad Ha-Am claimed it was “just another American work that is done with big noise and publicity.”¹¹ However they came to appreciate its value later.

Right wing Jews sometimes find both encyclopedias as promoting a modern non-traditional, and at times irreverent approach to sacred traditions. Such traditionalists reject “Higher Biblical Criticism” which both encyclopedias incorporate. Higher Biblical criticism divides the Biblical text into various sources, each with its own author, origin, and dating thereby placing revelation in a precarious position. Many traditionalists find it impossible to reconcile the doctrine of divine revelation with the evidence of textual errors and duplication that suggest that the Torah was written by human beings, even if divinely inspired. In addition the application of the findings of the emerging fields of comparative religion, archeology, folklore, and linguistics often reinforce Biblical criticism by undermining the uniqueness of biblical stories and rituals. Finally, Darwinian evolutionism seemed to remove the concepts of divine creation and providence from the story of the origin and direction of the world. Likewise these encyclopedias tend to present the Talmud not necessarily as a divinely revealed work¹² but as a historical document seen “as a storehouse of archeology that serves as an important source of information on Jewish culture and on the history of science and civilization.”¹³ Hence they place modern and traditionalist approaches in tension.

Both encyclopedias also saw themselves as a way to combat anti-Semitism by increasing general non-Jewish knowledge about Jews and Judaism. The JE followed in the wake of the Dreyfus Affair while the EJ followed in the wake of raised Holocaust consciousness during the 60s and 70s. It can be argued that the resurgence of anti-Semitism provided increased external motivations to undertake comprehensive Encyclopedic works. The encyclopedias were seen to combat prejudice through presentation of accurate information about Jews and Judaism. The Anti-Semitism of the century, rather than discouraging encyclopedic work, renewed urgency for promoting an accurate understanding of Judaism and Jews. Both Isidore Singer and the editors of the EJ proposed their works in order to combat anti-Semitism by educating the non-Jewish world. However, Schwartz identifies the belief that the JE could end anti-Semitism as naïve. Schwartz writes, “Like many others of their time, the men involved in the encyclopedia project were naïve in their belief that knowledge could end prejudice. The JE increased Christian understanding of Jews at the time as the many articles and reviews indicated, but it hardly quashed anti-Semitism.”¹⁴ Schwartz further notes, “Some strove to combat anti-Semitism through education. Articles, pamphlets, and newspapers attempted to dispel negative stereotypes and replace them with factual evidence of positive Jewish characteristics. In large measure, the JE belongs to this genre of defense literature as both exemplar and summary.”¹⁵

Both encyclopedias received entries from scholars across Europe and the Americas. While the JE marked the shift of Jewish scholarship from Europe to the Americas, the EJ marked the shift of Jewish scholarship to also include Israel.

Both represent a particular political, ideological, and cultural bias of the scholars’ own historical context, religious affiliation, and scholarly methodologies.

Both encyclopedias further represent the incorporation of new archeological discoveries. The JE incorporated the findings of Schechter’s Cairo Geniza while the EJ incorporated

findings of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Both encyclopedias mark the application of social sciences and emphasis on Jewish history, as well as anthropology, and statistics.

The Jewish Encyclopedia

Singer first conceived of the scope of the JE to demonstrate the role that Jews and Judaism have played in diverse areas of general culture, such as science, art, literature, industry, and commerce. Singer wanted the JE to be scientific in method and without any religious bias. It would serve as a compendium for scholars and as a guide for the Jewish and general public. The JE was to contain a complete survey of Jewish history, literature, and theology, plus material on Jewish communities, sociology, and archeology as well as biographies of prominent Jewish scholars, theologians, poets, businessmen, and physicians. Subject areas of history, biography, sociology, and anthropology comprised the greatest number of articles in the JE. As stated in the *Preface* the objectives of the JE included, “keeping abreast of the times in Biblical matters... to acquaint the student with the results of modern research in many fields that are altogether new and bristling with interesting discoveries... Assyriology, Egyptology, and archeological investigation in Palestine.”¹⁶ Singer also wanted the JE to be ecumenical by improving the mutual understanding of Christian and Jew.

The JE marks the culmination of a century of European Jewish scholarly activity. It also is an important source of information about the attitudes, ideals, and concerns of Jewish scholars at the turn of the century. Cyrus Adler, Richard Gottheil, Kaufman Kohler, Marcus Jastrow, Joseph Jacobs, Louis Ginzberg, Morris Jastrow, Gotthard Deutsch, Emil G. Hirsch, Solomon Schechter, and Crawford H. Toy served as members of the editorial board of the JE. Tension arose among the editors at times with coalitions being forged between conservative traditionalists, Cyrus Adler and Solomon Schechter and more liberal reform scholars such as Kaufman Kohler, Isidore Singer and Hirsch. Schechter likened the relationship between Conservative and Reform to that of the English government with two parties in constant opposition, yet dedicated to serving the same cause. Schechter branded reform “Paulinism,” while Singer called conservatism, “Roman Catholic Israel.” Interestingly Orthodox traditionalists like Judah David Eisenstein used the JE to condemn the JTS and brand it non-orthodox. Eisenstein argued that Ginzberg’s article, “Law, Codification” which was approved by Schechter was proof that the leaders of the JTS expounded higher biblical criticism when in fact Schechter expressed disdain for Higher Biblical criticism as “the Higher anti-Semitism.” As well as Schechter’s dislike for the detrimental effects of hurrying to rush entries, the controversy between Schechter and Eisenstein contributed to Schechter’s resignation and he was replaced by Wilhelm Bacher.¹⁷

The JE sought to incorporate in a comprehensive manner the method, mood, and content of *Wissenschaft des Judentums* scholarship thus fulfilling the desire of many European Jewish *Wissenschaft* scholars for providing a summary of a century of research mostly in Europe. Publication of the JE in the English language marked the passing of the mantle of scholarly hegemony to the United States thereby coming to symbolize the emerging cultural and intellectual independence of American Jewry. The JE more than any other

English language encyclopedia incorporates the findings of *Wissenschaft des Judentums* scholarship.

A. *Wissenschaft des Judentums*

Wissenschaft des Judentums originated in Germany in the 1800s out of the desire on the part of some university trained Jews to modernize the study of Judaism in accordance with the model of objective critical scholarship. Its founders included Abraham Geiger, Zacharias Frankel, Leopold Zunz, and Heinrich Graetz. Zunz was convinced that the Jew could not attain full emancipation until Judaism was accorded respect and raised to its rightful place among academic disciplines. Frankel and Graetz emphasized the crucial role *Wissenschaft des Judentums* would play in the increase in Jewish self-knowledge thereby creating a recovery of Jews' self awareness and preservation. Significant *Wissenschaft* breakthroughs included Zunz' studies in liturgy and *Midrash*, Michael Sachs' research on Spanish Jewry, Solomon Munk's work on Medieval Jewish philosophy, Graetz 11 volume history of the Jews, Benno Jacob's biblical studies, and Frankel's study of the *Mishnah*. *Wissenschaft des Judentums* sought to expand the depth and breadth of Jewish knowledge and hone new methods for analysis of Jewish texts. The centers for *Wissenschaft des Judentums* research included Frankel's *Judische-Theologisches Seminar* in Breslau, Abraham Geiger's *Hochschule fuer die Wissenschaft des Judentums*, Azriel Hildesheimer's *Rabbinerseminar fuer das Orthodox Judentums* in Berlin, and Jews' College in London. Graetz' *Monatsschrift fuer Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* was a voice of the movement in Europe while the Jewish Quarterly Review was *Wissenschaft's* voice in America. The spread of *Wissenschaft* led to a receptivity to the idea of a Jewish encyclopedia on Jews and Judaism in the world, but evoked criticism by some traditionalists, who are skeptical, if not hostile to the free inquiry of *Wissenschaft* which is not bashful to question tradition in a spirit unencumbered by religious authority. Although Ginzberg was critical of *Wissenschaft* scholars for their late dating of the origins of *Kabbalah* and for their rationalist anti-mystical bias, *Wissenschaft des Judentums* exerted a great influence on the scope and overall approach of the JE. The JE is pro-*Wissenschaft*.¹⁸ The only perceptible significant departure from *Wissenschaft* methodology is the inclusion in the JE of Judeo-German (Yiddish literature) thereby overcoming the unfavorable prevalent *Wissenschaft* tendency to pay scant attention to modern Yiddish literature of Mendele Mokher Seforim, I.L. Peretz, Sholom Alekhem, and countless others.

Bias and Unstated Ulterior Assumptions in the JE

The JE reflects a particular political, ideological, and cultural bias illuminating the contributors' own historical context, religious affiliations, and scholarly methodologies. Schwartz argues that the anthropological entries by Fishberg promote the desired integration of Jews into the non-Jewish culture by suggesting that unfavorable traits are not intrinsic to Jews' natures but the result of external conditions. It is assumed that once the external conditions improve for Jews the negatives attributed to their characters will disappear enabling Jews to integrate fully into Western society.

Likewise the entries on American Jewish history also represent unstated ulterior objectives and biases. Schwartz suggests that the motive to show conclusively that Jews were instrumental to the initial settlement of the Americas as well as contributed to Columbus's journey monetarily and through invention of astronomical instruments Jews developed, is fueled by the desire to prove the right of Jews to belong in America so that the Jewish roots in the United States are emphasized. Schwartz further argues that the illustrations and photographs of American synagogues, cemeteries, hospitals, and other institutions is motivated by the desire to give a belief of permanence to the Jewish American community and to promote the view that Jews have successfully adapted in America. Schwartz suggests that the American Jewish history entries are written with a motive to counter anti-Semitic charges of the worthlessness and parasitism of Jews and to promote positive stereotypes. Schwartz contends further that the emphasis on Jewish servicemen in the JE represents the unstated need to refute the accusation that Jews do not do their share to serve their country. It is thus an attempt to demonstrate the patriotism of American Jews. Schwartz writes, "In sum the JE unabashedly sings the praises of Jews and Judaism in America. There is abundant evidence of Jewish roots, belonging, religious development, success, and contribution, more than enough to demonstrate that the Jewish experience in America was indeed different. Here Jews did not labor under the curse of any kind. Here one would find no litany of persecutions. Here an emancipated Jewry could successfully integrate into society while maintaining a creative cultural and religious life. Ample reassurance is given that any deviations from this sanguine picture- either from Jews who do not fit the pattern of successful adaptation or from non-Jews who practice discrimination- are atypical, the exceptions that prove the rule."¹⁹ Schwartz suggests that the tone of the articles are apologetic. The entries dismiss anti-Semitism as the irrationality of medieval prejudices, attributing attacks to ignorance and delirium on the part of the perpetrators.

Schwartz further argues that the articles on Eastern European Jewry emphasize the extent to which Jews originally lived in harmony with other non-Jewish neighbors and display an anti-*Shtetl* mentality which assumes the necessity of enlightenment for Eastern European Jews. Schwartz argues that the articles are written with a typical Russian *Haskalah* perspective which equates the traditional Jewish way of life with ignorance, narrowness, and superstition. The view that "Hasidism is blamed for contributing to mental stagnation and intellectual obscurantism" and the critique of the stifling atmosphere of the *heder* education and *yeshivish pilpul* is an unstated bias of the Enlightenment perspective of the writer. The unstated message is that the Eastern European Jew must be brought out of primitivism and superstition by ameliorating his living conditions.

Conclusion on JE

The JE summarized and preserved Jewish *Wissenschaft* scholarship in English and America. The JE signified the transference of both the center and language of Jewish scholarship. Joshua Trachtenberg saw publication of the JE as the "first great fruit of Jewish learning in America."²⁰ In 1955 he believed that it still was "unsurpassed as the greatest single achievement of American Jewish scholarship." Salo W. Baron described it

as “an extraordinary achievement and turning point in the history of Jewish learning in the U.S., a signal of the entrance of America into the field of Jewish *Wissenschaft* studies with distinction.”²¹ Shimeon Brisman describes the publication of the JE as a unique event that “signaled the beginning of the American era in Jewish cultural and intellectual history” directly influencing the course of Jewish learning in the United States.²²

The contributors of the JE felt the need to articulate a modernized Judaism intellectually compatible with current scholarship including Biblical criticism and Darwinianism. The JE broadened the discipline of Jewish Studies by including the nascent fields of the history of Zionism, Yiddish Literature, and Jewish Statistics. It also served as a catalyst for American Jewish History later to be championed by Jacob Marcus. The JE put America on the map as a place for serious Jewish scholarship. The JE provided a forum for scholars like Kohler, Gottheil, Kayserling, Bacher, and Jacob to summarize their research for a broad audience. It also provided the opportunity for young scholars like Ginzberg and Lauterbach to hone their skills. During his time with the project Ginzberg prepared 406 articles and several monograph length entries such as “Allegorical Interpretation of Scripture” and “Law, Codification” which remain classics. The impact of the JE on Christian scholarship was seen concretely in George Foote Moore’s book *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*. The JE thus altered the tone of subsequent Christian scholarship on Judaism.

The JE, although outdated in some respects, continues to be an important reference tool. Joshua Bloch, head of the Jewish Division of the N.Y. Public Library in 1926, noted that “there is not a day when we do not have occasion to make use of the volumes of the JE and to send numerous readers to its pages.”²³

The JE proved to be influential with regard to subsequent encyclopedias of Judaism. It became the standard, providing concrete guidelines for topic headings, entry size, and style. As well as the culmination of previous encyclopedias,²⁴ the JE became the paradigm with which later Jewish encyclopedias looked. While Judah David Eisenstein’s *Otsar Yisra’el* (1907-1913) was written in reaction to the limits of the JE, the later *Russian Jewish Encyclopedia*,²⁵ the more popular *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* (1939-43), the never completed *German Encyclopedia Judaica* (1928-34), and *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (1972) were all influenced by the precedent of the JE.²⁶ We now turn to the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*.

Encyclopaedia Judaica

The initiative for the EJ came from Nahum Goldman, the last survivor of the board of editors of the Berlin *Encyclopedia Judaica*. Determined that the Nazis should not have the last word, he proposed a Jewish Encyclopedia.²⁷ Silver notes, “Many in Israel were eager that the never completed German Encyclopedia Judaica receive an appropriate completion. As if to perpetuate that unfinished but invaluable work, a number of articles from it have been translated and placed in the EJ.”²⁸ A small amount of the initial funding, obtained by Dr. Goldmann came from German reparations due for the cessation of work on the Berlin *Judaica*.²⁹ Later the Rasco Company in Israel and later the Israel

Institute for Scientific Translation in Jerusalem helped with an offer to publish the books in Israel, because of lower printing costs.

Work on the EJ was begun in the United States under the editorship of Benzion Netanyahu (zl) of Philadelphia, then editor of the *Encyclopedia Hebraica*. AA. Neuman (zl) then president of Dropsie College became chairman of the American board of editors, later succeeded by Alexander Altmann (zl) of Brandeis University. Benzion Dinur (zl) of Hebrew University became chairman of the Israeli board.

Work began in 1966 and responsibility was accepted by Keter Publishing House which produced the 16 volumes two days ahead of the scheduled 5 year production date. Many Jewish scholars throughout the world were asked to contribute, but some scholars declined, refusing to hurry and rush through the work.³⁰ In charge of the board as general editor was Cecil Roth (zl) who died in 1970. In 1970 Geoffrey Wigoder (zl) took his place. The New York office was headed by Dr. Frederick Lachman, who coordinated the departments and divisions whose editors were in North America.

In 1966 the 25,000 entries were determined. The subject matter was divided into 20 major divisions and these were broken down into departments, each with its own editor so that altogether over 300 editors worked on the encyclopedia. According to Wigoder, “every one of the 25,000 entries went through 18 editorial stages and 32 technical stages.”³¹ The categories treated by the scholars included those such as: Bible, Hebrew, Semitic languages, Second Temple Period, Rabbinic literature, Talmud and Talmudic period, Jewish law, Jewish Philosophy, Mysticism, Medieval Hebrew Literature, Judaism, Jewish History, Zionism, Contemporary Jewry, Holocaust, Modern Hebrew Literature, Participation of Jews in World Culture, Modern Yiddish Literature, Americana, *Eretz Yisrael*.

The contributors were truly international. For example all four top editors (Drs. Cecil Roth, Louis Rabinowitz, Rabbi Posner) were British while the managing director of Keter Publishing House, Yitzak Rischin was from Australia, while other senior members of the editorial staff included Dr. Alexander Carlebach (formerly of Belfast) and Mrs. Joan Comay (from South Africa).

The work of illustrations and graphics department was headed by Mr. Moshe Shalve. It is reported that some of the photographs for the work were obtained by an American girl who met a Russian student and asked him to get her some slides of illuminated Hebrew manuscripts guarded in Leningrad. The EJ has made them available to the Western World for the first time.³²

Special features include a 100 year Jewish calendar, a 26 page chart of Jewish history, a 50 page guide to ancient Israelite pottery, a table listing Hebrew newspapers, a full table of places in Israel, a Hebrew grammar, entries on the figure of the Jew in literature, descriptions of the treatment of Biblical figures in art, inserts on aspects of Jewish artistic expression, a selection of autographs of famous Jews, maps, diagrams, charts, and genealogical dynasties of Talmudic masters and Hasidic leaders.

Recent Developments Effecting the EJ

In Ariel we read, “Every field of Jewish scholarship has undergone basic revision in the light of discoveries such as the Cairo Geniza and the Dead Sea Scrolls; the application of the social sciences- sociology, economics, demography- to Jewish history; the perspective of the biblical period afforded by archaeology and the new illumination of the entire Near East of antiquity.”³³ The EJ is a result of these new disciplines and approaches. The introduction to the EJ notes, “Social and economic history was barely recognized as a subject for serious research three quarters of a century ago; now it takes a foremost position in historical scholarship.”³⁴

The following chart can be used to compare the JE with the EJ

<u>Jewish Encyclopedia</u>	<u>Encyclopaedia Judaica</u>
European and American scholars	55% Israeli scholars/ 30% U.S. scholars
No index	computerized index
26 columns on Jewish ethics	10 columns on Jewish ethics
Jewish law classified in Rabbinics	Jewish law as an independent discipline
Legendary material	Legendary material more downplayed
No entry for Kabbalah	Scholem’s 120,000 word essay on Kabbalah ³⁵
Downplay Hasidism	Long essay on Hasidism and genealogical tables
No Jewish life in Muslim Lands	Jews in Muslim lands
Rabbi Akiba essay by Louis Ginzberg	Rabbi Akiba essay 1/3 JE length
26 columns on Jesus	8 columns on Jesus
Sparse on Biblical Archeology	Many findings on Biblical Archeology
Black and White	Color photographs
Pre-Holocaust (post-Dreyfus)	Post-Holocaust

The EJ is the product of developments in the growing understanding of the full significance of East European Jewry in Jewish history, the impact of Jews in Muslim lands, the study of Jewish mysticism by Gershom Scholem, the subject of Jewish law as an independent discipline from Talmud and Rabbinics, the importance of Jewish art, the increased interest in Yiddish language and literature, Biblical Archeology, the field of modern Zionism in all its political, national, religious, and cultural forms, and the Holocaust which has all developed as a result of a still evolving understanding of Jewish studies. Chaim Raphael refers to this expansion of scope in modern Jewish studies as a “changing point in consciousness.”³⁶ *Catholic Library World* notes, “New developments in scholarly research is consolidated into this work: The Dead Sea Scrolls, recent excavations, Masada, the Dura-Europas synagogue in Syria- all relatively recent discoveries are evident.”³⁷

The contributors of the EJ do not fail in being seriously interested in the past because they view the past as dated and the present superior to the past. Rather the perspective is taken that views all periods equally immediate to God. Many of the contributors survived the Shoah and had no false illusions in the superiority of the present. However we can note the Enlightenment assumption that values “scientific method” above “medieval superstition and backwardness” is probably a bias the EJ does not escape. The perspective of scientific historicism holds itself superior to religious beliefs that can not be proven and which it views as naïve and uninformed.

Traditionalist Unease with the Modern Biblical Approach in the EJ

Chaim Raphael claims that the modern critical treatment of the Bible in the publication of the 1901-1906 JE, was more of a shock in 1906, than in the EJ of 1972. During the 19th and 20th centuries German Biblical scholarship, basing itself on Ibn Ezra and Spinoza had opened the Bible up to a radically different approach that called into question the unitary nature of the Torah as a divinely revealed work written by Moses on Har Sinai. In 1901-1906 the JE contained three sections in approaching the Bible: Traditional, Legends, and critical.

Raphael asserts that to read the critical section for a traditionally-educated Jew was almost like eating non-Kosher food. He comments, “Even to read it was daring. To believe it, even tentatively, was almost blasphemy.”³⁸ German scholarship had called for (1) comparisons of the Bible to parallels in ancient Mesopotamian Literature,³⁹ (2) the understanding of religious ceremonies through anthropology and folklore, (3) application of the findings of archeology to parallels with other ancient cultures of the Near East,⁴⁰ (4) etymological studies of Hebrew with Aramaic, Sumerian, Akkadian, etc.⁴¹ and (5) the *Wellhausen Documentary hypothesis* that the Pentateuch is an amalgam of four sources (JEPD) and the process of editing and redaction.⁴²

According to Raphael the passing of seventy years has made the appearance of these views in the 1972 EJ less shocking. Even traditionalists, have become more acclimated to and tolerant of the radical findings of Higher Bible criticism. The EJ still recognizes the difficulty that some of its material on the Bible may have for some traditionalists. It notes, “Special problems were posed in the Bible division in view of the great varied and even radically opposing attitudes to the Bible and Bible Scholarship... It was felt that an encyclopedia designed to reflect all aspects of knowledge relevant to Jewish culture must in the sphere of Bible bring to the reader all views from the most traditional to the most critical.”⁴³

Nonetheless the 1972 EJ is modern in its capacity to usher the reader into a kind of skepticism and away from the traditional faith placed in the Pentateuch as the word of G-d. For example by showing internal apparent inconsistencies in place names as evidence for a complex multiple editing process or the repetition of certain teachings, themes, phrasing, and terminology by a particular editing school... some readers’ faith may be called into doubt. The section on the *Masorites* and *Masorah* also suggests that the Biblical text was subject to subsequent editing and revision. The 1972 EJ does however,

contain a postscript by Rabbi Louis Rabinowitz emphasizing that the true traditionalist still believes that the entire Torah is a “unitary document, divinely revealed, and entirely written by Moses (except for possibly the last eight verses recording his death written according to the *gemara* either in a moment of prophecy or by Yeshua ben Nun).

The Differences in Introductions of the JE, The German *Judische Lexicon*, and the EJ

As we have seen one of the purposes of Singer’s 1901-1906 JE, as stated in the introduction, was to rebut anti-Semitism, which, it believed, could be corrected by eradicating ignorance.⁴⁴ The Enlightenment assumption that reason, knowledge, and argument were the cure to persecution caused by ignorance influenced the motivation for the making of the JE. Singer’s naïve view that ignorance is the root of all evil is made problematic by the fact that one of the most educated groups of people in the world, the Germans, were instrumental in trying to exterminate the Jewish people.

The reader of the introduction of the German *Judische Lexicon* which began in the 1920s and the 1972 EJ in English will be struck by the differences concerning the phrasing of the stated purposes of these two works. In the *Geleitwort*⁴⁵ of the German Encyclopedia there is emphasis on the urgency (*dringende*) of the need for such a work whose purpose is to gather (*zu sammelnden*) knowledge (*Wissenstoffes*) in immense ascent to a thorough knowledge (*ins Unabsehbare gestiegen, anderseits eine auf inniger Verrautheit*), for a reliable understanding of Jewish Science in all its ramifications (*zuveilissige Kenntnis der Judischen Wissenschaft in allen ihren Verzweigungen*) to promote community awareness (*gemeinverstandlichen*). We read in the *Geleitwort* of the danger (*die Gefahr*) of forgetfulness (*Vegessenwerdens*) of the Jewish community as a result of small familiarity with the Hebrew language (*Infolge der geringen Kenntnis der Hebraischen Sprache*). It would appear that before impending crisis and catastrophe in Jewish history a pattern emerges whereby a need to provide access to the well springs of Jewish learning is made available in an effort to avert disaster.

The goal of the German *Judische Lexicon* is to widen (*weiten*) the Jewish circle (*Judischen Kreisen*) of access (*der Zugang*) to the sources of Jewish science (*zu den Quellen judische Wissenschaft*) so that Jewish spiritual history (*judischer Geistesgeschichte*) will not be locked (*verschlossen*) and lost to the community.⁴⁶ The purpose (*Zweck der Enzyklopadie*) is summed up in the sentence, “*Darum bedeutet die Schaffung* (There is the meaning of the production) *einer modernen Enzyklopadie des Judentums gewissermassen* (of a modern Jewish Encyclopedia to a certain degree) *eine Erlösungswerk fuer* (as a redeeming work for) *viele zerstreute* (disseminating) *und meist unzugängliche* (making accessible the inaccessible) *historische Werke des Judentums* (the historical work of the Jews).

The passionate determination for a “redeeming work” (*Erlösungswerk*) in the German *Judische Lexicon* is substituted by a cool appeal to objectivity in the English EJ. In Ariel the purpose of the work is put this way, “An up-to-date balanced summary of knowledge and scholarship on every subject of Jewish interest- this is the objective of the English

language *Encyclopaedia Judaica*.”⁴⁷ *Booklist* notes a threefold purpose of the English EJ by writing, “The value of this work is in the role it can play in Jewish education and culture, in the spread of Jewish knowledge... and in the closer linking of Israel with Jews as well as non-Jews the world over.”⁴⁸ Silver notes the importance of Israel as the center of the EJ’s production by remarking, “EJ asserts the claims of Israeli scholarship to primacy in the world of Jewish learning. Germany had its day in the late nineteenth century, which was marked by the *Real-Encyclopaedie des Judentums*; the English-speaking world had its day, which was signaled by the JE; and now, Jewish learning centers in Jerusalem, which to the EJ’s editors is its natural home.”⁴⁹

Positive Reviews of the Encyclopaedia Judaica

A. Charles Berlin for Library Journal

Charles Berlin calls the publication of the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* “a very welcome event.”⁵⁰ Berlin writes, “The publication of this work, providing a synthesis of this vast corpus of information, with special attention to the past 75 years (especially the development of the Jewish community in the United States, the destruction of European Jewry in the Holocaust of World War II, and the establishment of the state of Israel), is a very welcome event.” Berlin further writes, “A welcome feature that greatly enhances this handsomely bound set is the approximately 8000 illustrations, although frequently the choice of a title page for an illustration is ill-advised, and in many instances it is difficult to justify the space allocated to a particular illustration.”⁵¹ Berlin notes that generally consultation with the 560 page index is “well worth the effort.” Berlin concludes his review with a positive assessment by writing, “But as the latest, most comprehensive, and in many cases, most authoritative summary of research in all areas of Jewish scholarship, this new encyclopedia should be readily available in, and is recommended for, all academic libraries and medium and large public libraries.”⁵²

B. Daniel Jeremy Silver for CCAR Journal

Daniel Silver is generally positive about the EJ.⁵³ Daniel Silver opens his book review of the EJ with the following positive remark, “Probably the most important event in our scholarly world last year was the publication of the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (EJ) under the general editorship of Cecil Roth. The volumes are beautifully printed and the pages are full of colored reproductions, charts, maps, and photographs which give the books a live and vigorous air. For those of us who were weaned on the Jewish Encyclopedia (JE), the new EJ emits a sense of life and of the present which the softer print and more modestly styled older set simply did not exude.”⁵⁴ Silver confesses that the haste of the publication has not made for slovenliness. He asserts that in the hundred pages of the encyclopedia he has read he has yet to find a major typographical error. Silver considers it a good thing that the EJ’s emphasis “is on the todays and tomorrows of Jewish life” for “its Judaism belongs to a live people.” Silver notes the great advancement to learning in mysticism and *Kabbalah* as the result of Scholem’s contribution. Towards the end of Silvers review he concludes on a positive note by writing, “With it all, EJ provides us with a good and valid encyclopedia. Those interested in historic theology and philosophy may find that

some articles are not the equal of the JE predecessors. But some are better. The article on Jerusalem is a masterpiece. Any judgement should recognize that the EJ's great virtue is that it is concerned not merely with antiquarian scholarship. JE presented us completed faith. EJ presents us the Jewish people. It is much more vigorous, alert, and vibrant."⁵⁵

C. Time Magazine- a popular magazine with a large readership

Time magazine is generally positive⁵⁶ and calls the EJ "monumental." It cites the input of Israeli Botanist Yehuda Feliks to illustrate how the exciting field of modern genetics has much insight to offer on the ancient story of Jacob's breeding of monochrome sheep to produce spotted offspring. *Time* magazine implies that the new field of genetics is creatively applied to the interpretation of Jacob's secret as a keen perception of the laws of heredity to mate hybrids so that their recessive genes emerge to produce a maximum of spotted offspring. The reviewer in *Time* magazine positively comments, "Feliks' hypothesis, complete with genetic charts showing the results of the crossbreeding, is one of thousands of examples of the learned, the witty, and the arcane that fill the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*..."⁵⁷ *Time* magazine further positively notes, "The result shows few signs of haste. Some entries are so exhaustive as to be exhausting..." *Time* further is positive when it writes, "Such flaws pale beside the quantity and quality of the material that is included. Historian Arthur Hertzberg's meticulous article on Jewish identity examines every mode of definition, historical, sociological, and religious, carefully setting the Orthodox view against others."⁵⁸ *Time* further positively concludes, "David Flusser of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem has written a treatise on Jesus that Christians would do well to read." *Time* considers Gershom Scholem's 83 page article on *Kabbalah* "the most lucid treatment of the complex subject available."⁵⁹ *Time* is not alone in noting that the pages of the EJ are interleaved "with magnificent illuminations from medieval Jewish manuscripts and pictures of mosaics and frescoes from ancient synagogues."

Criticisms of the EJ: Zeitlin, Agus, and the Jewish Spectator

A. Zeitlin

Zeitlin asserted that the Jewish community does not have the reservoir of expert Jewish scholars capable of ascending to the task of the EJ. He writes towards the end of his critique, "The publication of the EJ is not a major accomplishment of world Jewish scholarship. On the contrary it reveals the paucity and decadence of Jewish learning. Many articles are below the standards of a good encyclopedia, they are sophomoric. The items dealing with the early history of the Jews are replete with distortions of historical facts. They may misguide the reader. In the articles on *Halakhah* and Rabbinics we note the lack of understanding of the text. The contributors are not to be reproved. A person cannot give more than he possesses. Many of the contributors are scholarly benighted. The blame is with the publishers and editors."⁶⁰ Zeitlin suggests that publishing of the EJ was an effort in public relations. Zeitlin finds twelve aspects of the EJ which he faults.⁶¹

B. Agus

Agus is critical of the EJ for its inadequate treatment of reform and conservative Judaism. Further Agus feels that the Jewish attitudes toward Christianity are too brief and not well developed.⁶² Agus writes, “The main failing of the EJ in relation to Christianity is that it does not contain a positive evaluation of the ideals that Christianity conveyed to Western culture, nor does it take up the task of explaining why Christianity succeeded in winning the Roman world, whereas Judaism failed to do so, a question that is certainly in the mind of the modern Jew.”⁶³

C. *The Jewish Spectator*

Like Zeitlin, Trude Weiss-Rosmarin in the *Jewish Spectator* points out inaccurate information and claims the existence of a generally low level of scholarly expertise. The *Jewish Spectator* asserts that the work is laden with errors concerning more traditional Jewish areas of study where faith and *Halakhah* still remain strong. We read, “As for teachers of the *Mishnah* and *Talmudim*, only the more important ones are listed- the *Tannaim* on one folio page and the *Amora'im* on two folio pages.”⁶⁴ The *Spectator* implies that the EJ is harnessing authoritative Western modes of scholarship to short change the representation of Judaism’s more traditional heritage.

The *Jewish Spectator* is highly critical of the editors of the EJ’s penchant for Jews prominent in the world of entertainment while giving less attention to current Jewish scholars.⁶⁵

As for keeping up with recent developments, the *Jewish Spectator* claims that the EJ has failed in that area when treating the work being done on the Cairo *Genizah*, U.S. Jewish communities, the Who is a Jew Controversy, and the Shoah. The *Jewish Spectator* suggests that the editors of the EJ might have achieved their goals more successfully if they had attempted through greater care and thoroughness to compile a shorter reference book of precise factual information rather than a reference book in the French Encyclopedist tradition of numerous book length expositions.

Conclusion:

Both the 1906 JE and the 1972 EJ constitute important compilations of Judaica. Both have sought to catalogue, preserve, and promote knowledge about Judaism and the Jewish people in order to enhance our legacy and to overcome ignorance and anti-Semitism. As with all such ambitious and living documents, they have attracted both praise and criticism. The lively debate generated by these works is a testament to the dynamism and vigor of modern Jewish scholarship. It is the constant striving to improve, reformulate, add to, and go beyond these reference works that epitomizes the richness of Jewish Studies today.

¹ Agus, Jacob, "The Encyclopaedia Judaica," Conservative Judaism 26, (1971), 46

² Choice (October 1972), 449.

³ Library Journal, (August 1972), 2562.

⁴ Catholic Library World, (October 1972), 163.

⁵ Zeitlin, Solomon, JQR 63 (1972-1973), 1-28.

⁶ American Israelite (11 July, 1901): 1.

⁷ A Historic Jewish Banquet in the City of New York (tendered to the Editors and Publishers of the Jewish Encyclopaedia) (New York, 1901), 15; Kohler wrote, "The Jewish Encyclopaedia goes forth as a peacemaker and friendly intermediary between all shades of opinion among the Jews, between Orthodoxy and Reform, Radicalism and Conservatism, Nationalist and Cosmopolitan, as well as between Jew and non-Jew." Kohler in an appeal to Jewish unity later wrote, "Let all differences of opinion be waived. Let all wrangling and bickering between Reform and Orthodoxy, between Conservative and Radical, between East and West, in pulpit and press, cease once and for all! Mark well! There is no plural in the verb Sh'ma- hear; no plural to the noun Israel. I am the very last to deprecate Orthodoxy. It is the soil out of which we have drawn sap and marrow" (Kaufmann, Kohler, *A Living Faith: Selected Sermons and Addresses from the Literary Remains of Dr. Kaufmann Kohler*, ed. Samuel S. Cohon (Cincinnati, 1948), 8-18.).

⁸ Presbyterian Banner (Pittsburgh), (18 June 1901) and St. Paul Dispatch (20 July 1901), in *Opinions of the Worlds Press*, 13-14, 21-22.

⁹ Hirsch, Emil G., Athenaeum, no.3907 (13 Sept 1902), 346.

¹⁰ Eisenstein, Judah David, *Critical Review of the Legal Articles of the Jewish Encyclopaedia Volume 1* (including discussion with Lewis N. Dembitz and S. Mendelsohn) (New York, 1901), 1-13; idem *Otsar zikhronotai*: (New York, 1929), 320-29.

¹¹ Both Steinschneider and Ahad Ha-Am came to acknowledge the importance of the JE. Ahad Ha-Am corresponded with Singer concerning the possibility of issuing a Hebrew translation and Steinschneider too changed his mind about its value. See: George Alexander Kohut, "Steinschneideriana," *Studies in Jewish Bibliography and Related Subjects in the memory of Abraham S. Freidus 1867-1923* (New York, 1929), 84-85, 107-108; Ahad Ha-Am, *Igrot Ahad Ha-Am* (Jerusalem, 1924), 3: 19-20, 23-35.

¹² In Rabbinic theology the Talmud is a co-terminous revelation with the Torah on Har Sinai because Pirke Avot reads, "*Moshe Kebeil Torah MiSinai*" and since the text does not say "*ha-Torah*" but "*Torah*" in general it refers to the *oral law* as well as the *written law*.

¹³ Schwartz, Shuly Rubin, The Emergence of Jewish Scholarship in America: The Publication of the Jewish Encyclopaedia, Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1991, 130.

¹⁴ Schwartz, Shuly Rubin, The Emergence of Jewish Scholarship in America: The Publication of the Jewish Encyclopaedia, Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1991, 165.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 108.

¹⁶ *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, Preface, p.xiii.

¹⁷ Eisenstein's critique of the sympathies of the JE for Higher Biblical criticism must be tempered with the fact that Joseph Jacobs as later head of Biblical entries sought to attempt to present what was felt to be the proper Jewish attitude toward higher biblical criticism. Schwartz writes, "There is a definite though somewhat uneven movement away from the conscious embrace of both non-Jewish collaboration and the results of higher biblical criticism toward a more conservative Jewish stance that still remains grounded in scientific critical methods" (145). The tension between reform and conservative elements of the JE, but their shared commonality is seen in the following remark by Schwartz, "... though Lauterbach and his fellow traditionalist collaborators differed from their more liberal counterparts in their commitment to Jewish peoplehood, their personal observance of the *mitsvot*, and their uneasiness with Reform, all shared with their Reform collaborators a modern, historical conception of Judaism and were united by their commitment to strengthening Jewish life and *Wissenschaft des Judentums* in America" (163).

¹⁸ Hirsch praises Zunz as the founder of the modern scientific study of Judaism. Zacharias Frankel's *Darkhe ha-mishnah* is called one of the most valuable attempts at systematic exposition of the history of rabbinic literature and theology. The history of *halakhah*, *Dor dor ve-Dorshav* by Isaac Hirsch Weiss is termed "stupendous."

¹⁹ Schwartz, Shuly Rubin, The Emergence of Jewish Scholarship in America: The publication of the Jewish Encyclopaedia, Cincinnati: HUC Press, 1991, 119.

²⁰ Trachtenberg, Joshua, "American Jewish Scholarship," in the Jewish People Past and Present, vol. 4, N.Y., 1955, 415, 417.

²¹ Baron, Solo W., *Steeled By Adversity, Essays and Addresses on American Jewish Life*, Philadelphia, 1971, 397-401

²² Brisman, Shimeon, A History and Guide to Judaic Encyclopaedias and Lexicons, Cincinnati, 1987, 32

²³ Schwartz, Shuly Rubin, The Emergence of Jewish Scholarship in America: The Publication of the Jewish Encyclopaedia, Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1991, 166.

²⁴ Previous motions for publishing Jewish Encyclopaedias can be noted. Isaak Jost in 1840 called on scholars to join in compiling an "*Encyclopadie der Judische-Theologischen und literarischen Kenntnisse*. David Cassel and Moritz Steinschneider published a prospectus for a similar work in 1844. In 1837 Ludwig Philipson had proposed a *Real Encyclopadie oder eine Konversations-Lexikon des Judenthums*. In Eastern Europe during the same time Singer was promoting the idea of the JE, Ahad Ha-Am was simultaneously issuing a proposal in 1894 for a Jewish Encyclopaedia in Hebrew to be called, *Otsar Hayahadut*. The tradition of compiling Encyclopaedias can be said to stem from the 18th century where Diderot published his *Encyclopedie* between 1751-1757 to which D'Alembert, Voltaire, Rousseau, and Montesquieu contributed. The perspective of Diderot's Encyclopaedia was the Enlightenment which was very critical of superstitious religion and belief. *The Encyclopaedia Britannica* was published in 1771. La Grande Encyclopedie between 1882-1902 saw publication. *The Brockhaus Konversationslexikon*, *Chambers Encyclopaedia*, *The New American Cyclopaedia* (1858), *Hastings Dictionary of The Bible* (1899-1902), and *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (1829-1903) followed.

²⁵ The sixteen volume Russian Jewish Encyclopaedia, *Evreiskaia Entsiklopedaia* came out in St. Petersburg with contributors such as Zalman Shazar. This work tended to be particularly strong in East European Subjects. According to Solomon Zeitlin, this work is the best Jewish Encyclopaedia of all the Jewish Encyclopaedias (Zeitlin, Solomon, "Encyclopaedia Judaica: The Status of Jewish Scholarship," *JQR* 63 (1972-73), 28.

²⁶ There have also been a series of one-volume Jewish Encyclopedias that have appeared since 1958 including: (1) *The Encyclopaedia of the Jewish Religion* (Jerusalem-Tel Aviv, Massada- P.E.C. Press, 1966) edited by R.J.Z. Werblowsky and Geoffrey Wigoder; (2) *A Book of Jewish Concepts* by Philip Birnbaum (N.Y., Hebrew Publishing, 1964); (3) *The Book of Jewish Knowledge* by Nathan Ausubel (N.Y.,

Crown, 1964); (4) *The New Standard Jewish Encyclopaedia* (Garden City, Doubleday, 1970) edited by Cecil Roth and Geoffrey Wigoder; (5) *The Junior Jewish Encyclopaedia* (7th rev. ed., N.Y., Shengold, 1970); (6) Two volumes on Holocaust have appeared in Yiddish *Algemayne Entsiklopedye* as volumes 6 and 7 of *Yidn* (N.Y., Dubnov Fund and Encyclopaedia Committee, 1963 and 1966); (7) *Haentsiklopedyah Haivrit* (Jerusalem, Massada and Encyclopaedia Publishing Co., 1949-).

²⁷ Wigoder, Geoffrey, Ariel, no.30-34, 1972-73, 108.

²⁸ Silver, Daniel, J., "Book Review," *CCAR Journal*, Vol. 19, no.4 (1972): 89.

²⁹ American Zionist 62, (1971-72), 32.

³⁰ We read in Ariel, "experts were so wrapped up in teaching and in their own writings that they could not undertake an entry within our timetable" (109).

³¹ Wigoder, Geoffrey, "Making The Encyclopaedia Judaica," Jewish Digest, (1972), 46.

³² American Zionist 62 (1971-72): 32.

³³ "The New Encyclopaedia Judaica," Ariel, no.30-34, 1972-73, 108.

³⁴ Introduction to Encyclopaedia Judaica, 4.

³⁵ Reinhold Scholem on January 5, 1973 wrote to Gershom notifying him, "*Time* (the issue of November 20, 1972) ran a story on Keter Publishing House's Jewish Encyclopedia and called your eighty-three-page article "the most lucid treatment of this complex subject. My copy of your article on the Kabbalah from the *Judisches Lexikon* has only fifty-one pages" (see: Gershom Scholem: A Life in Letters 1914-1982, edited by Anthony David Skinner, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002, p.448). Scholem responded from Jerusalem on January 30, 1973, "Its no wonder my present article on the Kabbalah is at least twice as long as the earlier essay in the first German language *Encyclopedia Judaica*, volume 9, 1932 (and not the *Judisches Lexikon*, to which I didn't contribute). In reality, it's even much longer. For it's a summary of forty years of additional research. I wrote the first text in 1931; the other in 1970. Moreover, these articles on Jewish mysticism will appear in a special book, which should be at least four or five hundred pages" (450).

³⁶ Raphael, Chaim, "Encyclopaedia Judaica," Commentary, (August 1972), 36.

³⁷ Catholic Library World, (October 1972), 162.

³⁸ Raphael, Chaim, "Encyclopaedia Judaica," Commentary (August 1972), 38.

³⁹ For example *Bereshit* can be compared to Babylonian *Enuma Elish*; the Joseph/Potiphar episode can be compared to *Egyptian Story of Two Brothers*; Torah law can be compared with case law in the Code of Hammurabi (1792 B.C.E.) i.e. the goring ox (Ex. 21:28-36), false accusation (Deut.5:20; 19:16-21; Ex.23:1-3), kidnapping (Ex. 21:16; Deut.24:7), sharecropping (Lev.19:23-25, adultery (Deut. 22:22), rape (Deut. 22:23-27), incest (Lev. 18:6-18; 20:10-21), strike parent (Ex.21:15), two men fight and cause miscarriage in women (Ex.21:22-25)

⁴⁰ For example *Cherubim* and winged lions are also found in Assyrian culture. Further the term *Tzelem* in *Bereshit* has proven to be a physical object. Archeologists have found in the city of Assur in the 1930s a monument/stele/ statue called *Tzelem* which served as a substitute representative for individuals i.e. this is the Tzelem of so and so.

⁴¹ For example Kutscher authored a work on loan words in the *Tanakh* i.e. the Egyptian loan word “*sack*” makes its way into the Joseph *novella*, the Akkadian loan word “*rakiah*” means copper beaten dome and finds its way into the creation account of the *firmament*, and “*Pardes*” is a loan word from Persian. Shmuel Krauss authored a dictionary of Greek and Latin loan words into the Talmud.

⁴² The documentary hypothesis can point to the fact that in some cases Sinai is called Horeb, Jethro is called Hobab, etc to suggest different editorial schools. Further the fact that the manna and quail and Moshe striking the rock is mentioned two times is used to suggest two different editorial schools. Likewise three sets of the ten commandments in Exodus 20 (*Zakor et Yom HaShabat*) and Deuteronomy 5 (*Shamoor Et Yom HaShabat*) suggest different editorial schools. Modern critics of the Bible argue that the ten commandments in Exodus 34 are the product of an organized agricultural society for it says, “Six days you shall work, but on the seventh day you shall cease from labor, you shall cease from labor even at plowing time and harvest time...” Traditionalists can claim that such claims have already been treated in the *gemara* for example which mentions that Jethro had seven names. The conclusions traditionalists draw from this evidence is radically different than the Documentary hypothesis.

⁴³ Introduction to *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, p.9; It should be noted in some cases the EJ is closer to the traditional view than the JE. For example the critical section of the JE suggest that the biography of Abraham in Genesis is probably to be regarded as legendary, while the EJ remarks that the evidence of sociological and onomastic nature that has been accumulated since the discoveries of Nuzi and Mari tends to show that Abrahamic traditions are more likely to be authentic reflections of a true historical situation rather than retrojections from a later period.

⁴⁴ Raphael, Chaim, Commentary (August 1972), 38.

⁴⁵ The following literal translation from the German 1920s EJ is by David B. Levy.

⁴⁶ Leo Strauss writes of Germany’s liberal democracy that offered German Jews assimilation but through this process had locked them off from their Hebrew traditions. In some sense Hermann Cohen’s *Die Religion Der Vernunft* in the spirit of Kantian *Aufklarung* was an attempt to lead Wissenschaft des Judentums Jews back to the roots of the prophetic tradition. (see: *Die Religionskritik Spinozas als Grundlage seiner Bibelwissenschaft Untersuchungen zu Spinozas Theologisch-Politischen Traktat*, “Vorwort,” Akademie-Verlag, Berlin 1930.)

⁴⁷ Ariel, no.30-34, 1972-73, 107.

⁴⁸ Booklist, (November 1, 1972), 212.

⁴⁹ Silver, Daniel J., *CCAR Journal*, vol. 19, no.4 (1972): 89; Silver further remarks, “The EJ was not only edited in Israel, but is to a large degree about Israel. Sections on the great archeological sites, coins and currency, immigration and absorption, modern Hebrew writing and art, are remarkably full and complete” (90).

⁵⁰ Berlin, Charles, *Library Journal* 97 (1972): 2562.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ Silver however contends that “The EJ is not without faults. Many of the assigned articles were rewritten by unseen hands, in many cases by men for whom English obviously was not a native tongue. Some effectively written pieces were turned into prosaic Encyclopaediae. Each article is signed, but the sense of a single rather prosaic style permeates” (90).

⁵⁴ Silver, Daniel J., “Book Review,” *CCAR Journal* vol. 19, No.4 (1972): 88.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 92.

⁵⁶ However *Time* is critical that the treatment of the Arab refugee question is not very successful in its attempt to present the Arab side. Further it notes that there is no treatment of Jewish humor beyond Hebrew parody- because say the editors, they could not find a suitable author” (*Time* (Nov.20, 1972): 92.

⁵⁷ *Time* (Nov. 20, 1972): 91.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ See footnote #35

⁶⁰ Zeitlin, Solomon, “The Encyclopaedia Judaica: The Status of Jewish Scholarship,” *JQR*, 1972-73, 27.

⁶¹ Zeitlin critiques the following 12 aspects of the EJ:
(1) The article on Shavuot is inadequate and full of mis-statements whereby carelessness and lack of comprehension is demonstrated.” (2) The article on the *Am Ha-Aretz* uses Danby’s faulty translation of Hagigah 2:7. Zeitlin points out that the term *Perushim* in the meaning of Pharisees never occurs either in the *Mishnah* or in the *tannaitic* literature but only in the dialogs between Sadducees and Pharisees. He points out the following falsities, (a) the synagogue as a house of worship came into Jewish life after the destruction of the Second Temple, (b) the name *Perushim* was adopted under the meaning of exponents or expounders of the law, (c) Pharisees exclusively believed in the coming of the messiah, (d) Pharisees exclusively used the term *Bore Olam* and *HaMakom* when referring to G-d, (e) the Talmud quotes *halakhah* in the name of the Pharisees; (3) The statement made by the author of the article on the messiah is faulty and has Christological connotations. According to Rashi, Zechariah did not make mention of the messiah although the Church fathers interpreted this idea of messiah in verse 12, ch.6 as Jesus; (4) In the article on proselytes the author was careless in quoting the opinion of R. Eliezer or misunderstood the Talmud. The laws of conversion should have been listed; (5) The author of the article on Zealots presents a pseudo-historical essay whereby the author is confused and distorts the writings of Josephus who differentiated between Zealots and Sicari; (6) Zeitlin finds the article on economic history faulty for its using of the Roman term Palestine rather than the Hebrew and Greek term *Judaea* and the Roman term Dead Sea rather than Sea of Salt or *Lacus Asphaltis*. Zeitlin writes, “Does the author not know the simple fact that the land where the people lived was called *Judaea* and the people were called *Judaeans*.” Zeitlin asserts that the article about the economics does not reflect at all the economic situation of the Jews of *Judea*; (7) The writer of the article on Jewish identity does not cite sources and attempts a much too ambitious subject for such a short space; (8) The writer of the article on Chronology is historically wrong about the Seleucid era; (9) The article on *Halakhah* is “full of mistakes and misunderstandings about the rabbinic texts, works from faulty translations, and lumped together all the *takkanot* during existing Jewish history so that there is no presentation of historical development whereby the distinction between *Takkanot ha-kahal* and *Takkanot of Tannaim* is blurred; (10) The article on the Dead Sea Scrolls and Qumran community is written from a partisan point of view (note Zeitlin misdated the Dead Sea Scrolls as medieval and not dating from the late Second Temple period); (11) Zeitlin is critical that the EJ should devote attention to items about Jewish gangsters and not important Jewish scholars. He writes, “There is a touch of vulgarity in this undertaking of the EJ. There is an item about Louis Lepke Buchalter, who was an American gangster executed for murder. There is also an item about another gangster Siegel Bugsy whose motto was “don’t worry, we only kill each other.” However there is not item about the well known Jewish scholars like Dr. J. Teicher and Professor S. Hoenig, and others. I daresay that the inclusion of gangsters and exclusion of Jewish scholars is an affront to learning and Jewish scholarship. It is a sad reflection on the editorial policy.”

⁶² Agus, Jacob, “The Encyclopaedia Judaica: A Review Essay,” *Conservative Judaism* 26, 1971-72, 55.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Weis-Rosmarin, Trude, *Jewish Spectator*, October 1972, 6.

⁶⁵ Zeitlin also questions editorial choice when he objects, “the inclusion of gangsters and the exclusion of Jewish scholars is an affront to learning and Jewish scholarship. It has a touch of vulgarity” (JQR 64 (July 1973): 81.

Bibliography

Reviews and Announcements of the Jewish Encyclopaedia and Articles and Books

Abelow, Samuel P. “An Index to the Jewish Encyclopaedia, Containing References to Articles that Deal with the History of the Jews in the United States,” in Index to the PAJHS, nos. 1-20, N.p., 1914

Ahad Ha-Am (Asher Ginzberg). Igrot Ahad Ha-Am. Vols. 2 &3. Jerusalem, 1924

AZJ, 11 September 1891, pp.434-35

AH, 1901-1905.

AI, 11 July 1901, p.1 and 18 July 1901, p.5

American Journal of Theology 6 (1902): 762-64; and 9 (1905): 521-26

Archives Israelites, 8 August 1901, pp.249-51, and 7 January 1904, pp.6-7

Athenaeum, no. 3852 (1901), pp. 246-47; no. 3907 (1902), pp. 345-46; no. 3966 (1903), p.579; no. 4007 (1904), p.209; and no. 4012 (1904), p.380

Bacher, Wilhelm. “Die Juedische Enzyklopadie.” AZJ 70 (1906): 114-16.

Berger, A and Kaufman, R, “Jewish Encyclopaedias and Other Reference Books in the Last Twenty Years,” Jewish Book Annual 15 (1957): 41-49.

Christian Advocate, 1 August 1901, p.1229

Christian Observer, 10 July 1901, p.667

Die Deborah. New series 1 (1901): 225-28; and 2 (1902): 226

Eisenstein, J.D. Critical Review of the Legal Articles of the Jewish Encyclopaedia Volume I. New York, 1901

Evening Post, 2 November 1901, p.19

Friedlaender, Israel. “The Jewish Encyclopaedia.” Ha-Shiloah 8 (1901): 254-61.

Hebrew Standard (New York), 28 October 1904, p.12

Jacobs, Joseph, *The Jewish Encyclopaedia: A Guide to Its Contents, An Aid to Its Use*, New York, 1906.

JChr, 23 February 1901, pp. 18-19; 31 May 1901; 11 July 1902, p.13; and 26 December 1902, p.18

JCom, 5 July 1901 pp.1-4; 12 July 1901, pp.1-5; and 19 July 1901, pp.2-7.

JExp, 18 January, 1901, p.8 and 19 July 1907

Krauss, Samuel. "Eine neue Encyclopaedie." *Yeshurun* 8 (1902): 332-34, 344-46

Launching of a Great Work: *The Jewish Encyclopaedia*. Publishers Announcement on the Completion of the First Volume. New York. 1901.

Levy, Louis. "Une Encyclopedie Juive." *L'Univers Israelite*, 9 August 1901, p.660-61

Menorah: A Monthly Magazine for the Jewish Home 24 (1898): 334-36; 30 (1901): 123-24; 31 (1901): 123-24; 39 (1905): 113-118; and 39 (1905): 150-51.

Nation, 31 October, 1901, pp. 341-42; and 2 October 1902, p.272.

New York Times, 22 May 1901, p.9; 20 July, 1901, p.11; 16 August 1902, p.559; 2 February 1904, p.125; and 26 March 1904, p.207.

Opinions of the Press on the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*. [New York, 1901?].

Opinions of the World's Press on Volume I of the Funk & Wagnalls *Jewish Encyclopaedia*. [New York, 1901?]

Perles, Felix, *Juedische Skizzen*, Leipzig, 1912.

RA, 15 June 1901, pp.555, 562-64; 27 July 1901, pp.709-10; 7 & 14 December, 1901, pp.375-76, 399-401; and 26 March 1904, pp.113-116.

Revue des Etudes Juives 43: 291; 45: 138; 46: 282-83; and 48: 287-88.

Sun, 6 October 1901, sec. 2, p.2

Zeitschrift fuer hebraische Bibliographie 5 (1901): 115-116.

Book Reviews of the Encyclopaedia Judaica

Agus, Jacob B., Conservative Judaism, Vol. 26, No.4 (Summer, 1972): 46-57.

Association for Jewish Studies Newsletter, vol. 3, No. 1 (Oct., 1972): 5-7 and No. 8 (Feb., 1973): 7-8.

(Baruch Levine reviews the Bible in EJ and Jacob Neusner reviews Talmudic Studies)

Berlin, Charles, Library Journal 97 (1972): 2562.

The Booklist 69 (1972): 209-12.

Israel Book World, No. 6 (Dec., 1971): 2-4.

Johnston, Albert H., Publishers Weekly (Feb. 28, 1972): 46-47

Raphael, Chaim, Commentary, Vol. 54, No.2 (1972): 36-44.

Rothenberg, Joshua, Zukunft 78 (Oct.1972): 332-33

Ryan, John J., Wall Street Journal (Dec. 21, 1972)

Schulman, Elias, Forward 76 (March 18, 1973): p.M2.

Silver, Daniel Jeremy, CCAR Journal, Vol. 19, No.4 (1972): 88-92.

Temkin, Sefton, Jewish Chronicle Literary Supplement (June 2, 1972), p.iii

Time (Nov. 20, 1972): 91-92

Weis-Rosmarin, Trude, Jewish Spectator, Vol. 37, No.8 (Oct., 1972): 3-6 and 30.

Zafren, Herbert C., Jewish Encyclopaedias of the Last Fifteen Years, Jewish Book Annual 31 (1973-74): 21-28.

Zeitlin, Solomon, JQR 63 (1972): 1-28.