BIBLE AND PEDAGOGY IN THE TEACHING OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION

Harvey Shulman

The Bible is infrequently taught in Western civilization courses in North American universities. The overwhelming number of university students are biblically illiterate and, in most instances, their teachers seem not to be better informed than those whom they are instructing. Attempts to introduce the Bible and other Judaic material in general Western civilization programs will engender opposition from many university faculty including Jewish academics who have chosen to reject what they often see as the confining world of a distinctive Jewish framework. There is also an uncritical appropriation of traditional Christian notions of the "Old Testament." Academics have little trouble teaching the Iliad and the Odyssey, texts that represent oral and written traditions that have evolved and have been rewritten over a period of hundreds of years. Paradoxically, when it comes to Bible and Talmud, these same people will not teach or familiarize themselves with these materials because they reject anonymous, divine, or divinely-inspired authorship. It is this bias that ignores the greatest text in Western civilization, the product of a rich 3,000-year-old oral/written tradition and civilization.

An examination of curricula in North American universities would reveal that the Bible is infrequently taught, or read, in Western civilization courses. With the exception of the very few students in Near Eastern programs and departments of Religion and Judaic Studies, the overwhelming number of university students are biblically illiterate and, in most instances, their teachers seem not to be better informed than those whom they are instructing.

In the course of this purposefully discursive and general essay, it will first be argued that there is a need to separate and distinguish the Bible from "New Testament" study. It will be further indicated that the traditional reading of the Bible by biblical scholars has introduced, intentionally or not, a "persuasive" bias in the reading and the interpretation of texts. As well, there is a general disinterest and ignorance of academics toward biblical material. Disciplinary over-specialization and narrow methodological concerns have moved teaching and research into an ever-increasing focus on minutae — all of this coming at the expense of a generation of students who are being denied the opportunity to receive a general education in the study of Western society and culture. An overwhelming number of secular students in the

Jewish Political Studies Review 1:3–4 (Fall 1989)

diaspora will never select a course in which the Bible is taught. The solution to this curricular lacuna is not to be found in increasing the number of Judaic Studies courses and programs, but in the introduction of the Bible and other Judaic material in general Western civilization programs.

The inclusion of Judaic material and concerns in the context of Western civilization courses will engender opposition from many university faculty, including Jewish academics who have chosen to reject what they often see as the confining and limiting world of a distinctive Jewish framework. The paucity of Judaic material in syllabi can, in part, be attributed to strong assimilationist inclinations among diaspora Jewry, an uncritical appropriation of traditional Christian notions of the "Old Testament" by Jewish faculty, and for some, the attractions of a number of twentieth century ideological, modern and postmodern tendencies. Ironically, Christianity, Marxism, and secularism, in general, share a vision of the Bible and Judaism as "particularistic." (This reading of Judaism has a great impact on Jewish academics who see themselves as "progressive" — after all, if someone like the distinguished historian Isaac Deutscher was able to reject "Judaism" for socialism in spite of having received a traditional yeshiva education, it is certainly easier for Jewish academics, without a basis in Jewish learning, to do the same. See Appendix for further observations on Isaac Deutscher.) Few will ever realize that "the Bible is very likely the first legal and sacred book in human history intended not for a royal and/or priestly caste but for all — for, as we would say, a general audience."[1]

This essay will conclude with an illustration of how biblical materials have been neglected in political theory texts and briefly suggest how ancient Hebrew thought is important to the study of Western traditions, specifically democratic theory. Although the Bible, as text, is the focus of this essay, it constitutes one example only of the continuing exclusion of Judaic texts and problematics in the study of Western civilization, from antiquity to the present.

Distinguishing the Hebrew Bible from the New Testament

The traditional representation of the Bible ("Old Testament") in courses in Western civilization and political theory entails a vision of God and society which emphasizes the harshness of Jehovah, and depicts an ancient people which, although chosen by God, fails to realize His expectations or warrant His beneficence. When the Bible is referred to, it becomes, literally, the "Old Testament," superseded, if not replaced, by the "New Testament." Jesus becomes the embodiment of

the new covenant: a covenant not based on a "harsh" and "particularistic law," but on a compassionate and reassuring faith, universal in its teaching. The "spirit of the law" and "circumcision of the heart" replace the Israelite "obsession" with the "letter of the law" and its undue concern with "outdated and primitive rituals."

The legal philosopher, Carl Friedrich, while acknowledging the seminal contribution of the "Old Testament" to Western civilization's understanding of the law, still describes it in terms of "sanctimonious" and "pharisaism." He states that "no sharper contrast can be imagined than the beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount and the Curses of the Old Testament."[2] Eric Voegelin, in his discussion of prophecy, states that "the prophets were about to relegate Israel to a dead past by transferring the Kingdom of God into something which, at the time, was no more than the shooting lights of a new dawn on the horizon."[3]

The Bible and history seem to be presented here in a manner that may easily lead one to forget that the prophets are part of the corpus of the Old Testament and that compassion, forgiveness, equity, and justice, broadly understood and enforced, are the distinguishing and distinctive qualities of the biblical narrative. It is common for biblical scholars to refer to the ethical monotheism of the prophets as the foundation of a "living Old Testament," while the God of Leviticus and Deuteronomy, in contrast, is depicted as a "tribal" God. For example:

> Christianity owed its chief debt to the Hebrews, but from the Old Testament it took over the Prophecy, not the law. In this connection, Eusebius maintained that the prophecies contained hidden secrets, "disguised," he said, because the Jews would have destroyed the writings if the predictions of their doom had been written plain. Moses was not so important to the Christians.[4]

For Jews and Judaism, however, prophecy "stood in the mainstream of Israel's tradition":[5] the moral exhortations of the prophet, and the apodictic and casuistic laws of Deuteronomy, reflect contextual distinctions, not qualitative differences. The conflict between those who overemphasize ceremonial rituals and those who fervently remind the people of the need to transform the purity of their thoughts does not emerge with Christianity. The ongoing tension between priest and prophet over cultic observance and spiritual regeneration is continually addressed in the biblical narrative.[6] Indeed:

> The fact that the rabbis not only declared that the age of prophecy had ended, but insisted that the talmudic sage ranked higher than the prophet, seems to suggest that community has a higher appreciation of its covenantal relationship to God when it sees Him as its teacher than when it sees Him as an authoritarian voice dictating His will through the prophets.[7]

The reading into the prophets of a spirit and tradition of internationalism tended, and often intended, to diminish the distinctive contribution of the ancient Hebrews. To Harry Orlinsky, "the national God of biblical Israel is a universal God, but not an international God. With no people other than Israel did God ever enter into a legally binding relationship."[8] The biblical narrative, even as it affirms the national heritage of the Jews, will, as well, remind the people to "remember that you were slaves in Egypt,"[9] and "when an alien settles with you in your land, you shall not oppress him. He shall be treated as a native born among you, and you shall love him as a man like yourself, because you were aliens in Egypt."[10]

In addition, the *Noahide* injunction of monotheism (the chronologically prior universal covenant), belief in a common humanity, and the obligation to follow specific moral and ethical imperatives, irrespective of one's particular faith, are demanded of all mankind. These moral imperatives constitute the foundation of a tradition of tolerance in Judaism and express themselves in the idea that salvation is for the pious of all religions, not exclusively for the Jews. This tolerance emerges out of an historical and national consciousness, but at the same time, it recognizes and respects the integrity and worth of other religions.

Christianity, on the other hand, argues for the end of national distinctions — "Jews and Greeks alike are under the power of sin."[11] Paul, the Hellenized Jew, Saul, is to be the "Apostle to the Gentiles." The consequence, however, of this internationalism is a theology which demands an acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah and as the Son of God, in order for one to attain salvation. This exclusivity leads inevitably to a denial of universal religious toleration. The notion that "hardly any thinker will deny that the religion of Jesus is loftier than that of Moloch"[12] is an uncritically held conclusion of many secular and Christian university students. As long as the study of Judaic materials continues to be taught exclusively in Jewish studies programs and courses, they will inevitably fail to reach out to the larger Jewish and non-Jewish student population who are unlikely to ever encounter Jewish source material, or history, in Western civilization curricula.

In teaching Western civilization courses with required biblical material, it is imperative to question and evaluate some of the basic and unsubstantiated presuppositions that inform and even dominate contemporary ethical, moral and political appraisals of biblical thought. Consider, for a moment, the traditional comparison made between *Tanakh* and the New Testament. The former is seen to represent the "Old Covenant," now superseded, if not replaced, by the "New Covenant." Jesus of Nazereth, as redeemer, is the vehicle of salvation through faith; Judaism, with its supposed overemphasis on rituals and deeds, is continually depicted as the religion of the Pharisees, as

portrayed in the Gospels and Paul's letters. Judaic "harshness" and "exclusivism" is contrasted with Jesus' message of compassion and love. The message of the Gospels is to "Always treat others as you would like them to treat you...."[13]

This ethical imperative, however, is of course not a New Testament creation. It will be necessary to remind, if not inform, students for the first time that Leviticus 19:18 enjoins one to "love your neighbor as a man like yourself."[14] In addition, a generation prior to Jesus, Hillel the Elder is asked by a heathen to teach him the entire Torah. Hillel replies: "What is hateful to you, do not do to your neighbor: that is the whole Torah; the rest is commentary; go study."[15] (Unfortunately, in many references to this text the last two words are often omitted.)

Students should be made aware of the fact that Hillel is a Pharisee: the moral and spiritual tone of this statement, as well as its source, would be unrecognizable if one depended solely on the New Testament's assessment and portrayal of the Pharisees. The inaccurate usage of "Pharisee" as synonymous with "hypocrite" or "self-righteous legalist" has been uncritically assimilated into the Western vocabulary and consciousness.[16] It is interesting pedagogically, as well, to compare Hillel's statement, "...judge not thy associate until you comest to his place..."[17] to Jesus' later reference to "pass no judgment, and you will not be judged."[18] Compassion, understanding, and strictures and guidance about how human beings ought to behave toward each other are fundamental tenets of ancient Jewish thought.

The principal task of educators must, as a consequence, be to communicate the Judaic tradition through its own texts and commentaries. Emanuel Rackman notes that the rabbis debated an even more exalted moral imperative than that of loving one's neighbor; this goes back to Genesis 1:27 which says that "God created man in his own image." The rabbis determined that this was the more important precept of human behavior and it demands that, as a human being, one should elevate and dignify one's life to conform to God's image of man. If one keeps in mind the divine quality of human life and its affirmation and ennoblement by God, disrespect for one's fellowman is tantamount to being disobedient toward God — "That man was endowed with the divine image meant also that every murder was deicide. Even suicide was deicide."[19] The essence of the rabbinic argument was one's neighbor should be treated with the respect due to him as a human being, and this is a more demanding and humane relationship than one which defines obligation as a "categorical imperative." There are times, the rabbis argued, that we should treat our neighbor better than we treat ourselves.

In part, the tension between Judaism and Christianity lies in the fact that "at the center of Judaism is the tradition or, if you will, a Book; in Christianity, it is the figure of a man."[20] To criticize Christ is

to deny the faith; to evaluate, judge and indeed criticize Moses is the affirmation of a tradition of learning and questioning intrinsic to Judaism. The following Midrash is revealing:

> Would that they had deserted Me and kept my Torah; for if they had occupied themselves with the Torah the leaven which is in it would have brought them back to Me.[21]

The synagogue cannot be understood exclusively, perhaps even primarily, as a house of prayer; it is, above all, a house of study. In teaching the Bible and New Testament to students in Western civilization programs, it is imperative to engage in close textual analysis and, when explicating the text's meaning and context, to distinguish between the narrative and a Christian and secular interpretive tradition, which, in many instances and over two millennia, has distorted Judaic history and Judaism. The rabbinic notion is that the essential attribute of Moses was his role as teacher; this does not seem to have made an impact on the Western tradition. Students are unlikely to encounter the idea "that Moses was a leader who taught his people to do without him by learning how to lead themselves,"[22] even as he leads them out of barbarism and slavery into freedom and civilization. What stands out, however, for a great deal of modern scholarship is the "harsh" decision by Moses to have 3,000 people summarily executed as the appropriate punishment for their having built the Golden Calf.

The Problem of Bias

The traditional reference to "our" Judeo-Christian heritage, although well-meaning, is generally accompanied by a belief that an independent, rich and vital Judaism ended with the arrival of Christianity and the destruction of the Second Temple. For the nineteenth century German biblical scholar Julius Wellhausen (and others), "What importance the written letter, the book of the law, possesses for the Jews, we all know from the New Testament."[23] As to the relevance of distinctive Judaic commentaries on the Bible, Wellhausen will contemptuously dismiss Midrash as "the consequence of the conservatism of all the relics of antiquity, a wholly particular artificial reawakening of dry bones...."[24] This all-too-typical view of Christian Bible scholarship is what the teacher must challenge in bringing the study of the Bible into Western civilization courses and general education programs.[25]

The uniquely Judaic commentaries of Talmud and Midrash will rarely be consulted, perhaps not even acknowledged as worthy of attention, in the study of the Bible and ancient Jewish history. For

Harry Orlinsky, "such a procedure is tantamount to utilizing only the rabbinic sources for a study of the New Testament period in the Greco-Roman world!"[26] Herbert J. Muller, in an otherwise generally favorable interpretation of Judaic contributions to Western civilization, is still able to write:

> Before the first captivity in Babylon, Judaism had been a growing, creative religion. Now the loss of political freedom brought a loss in religious freedom. As Israel fell back on the Law, the Law was made rigid, tight, and binding. The prophet gave way to the high priest and then to the annotator; the religious genius that had created the Old Testament was confined to the commentaries of the Talmud; then the Talmud, too, was closed. Moreover, the Law fixed the national role as a peculiar people. Their jealous God made them intolerant, their religious food laws made them unsociable.[27]

Muller proceeds to contrast Jewish "particularities" with the larger, "more tolerant" world in which Jews were living, and tends to blame persecutions on the Jews themselves. Perhaps his most venal analogy is to state that: "Hitler's creed included versions of the basic Hebrew-Christian myths of a revelation, a golden age and a fall, a chosen people, a divinely inspired prophet, and a divinely constituted authority."[28]

Although academics are unlikely to perceive or to invoke an "ideological symmetry" between Judaism and Hitler, this author's experience of teaching in a Western civilization curriculum has demonstrated that most university freshmen believe, even if somewhat vaguely, that the Jews "rejected the still greater treasure which God offered them in the coming of Jesus of Nazareth,"[29] and that the Bible's message is one of "Yahweh's primitive provincialism."[30] Voegelin's observation that "the conception of war as an instrument for exterminating everybody in sight who does not believe in Yahweh is an innovation in Deuteronomy,"[31] is an enticing and disarmingly attractive proposition for the biblical neophyte.

These perceptions are not due to malice or anti-Semitism, but are the unfortunate consequences of inadequate knowledge and text selection on the part of ill-informed teachers and academic administrators at all levels of education. It would perhaps be useful, pedagogically, to contrast the biblical narrative's treatment of warfare with the tenor and flavor of the Near Eastern documentary record. Assurnasirpal (ninth century Assyrian ruler) writes:

> 600 of their warriors I put to the sword; 3,000 captives I burned with fire; I did not leave a single one of them alive to serve as a hostage....Hulai, their governor, I flayed, and his skin I spread upon the wall of the city; the city I destroyed, I devastated, I

> burned with fire....From some I cut off their hands and fingers; and from others I cut off their noses, their ears...of many I put out their eyes. I made one pillar of the living and another of heads, and I bound their heads to tree-trunks round the city.[32]

Whatever the justification of violence in the Bible, or lack of it, one must be sensitive to the historical record and the prevalence of barbarism and genocidal behavior on the part of the empires with which the ancient Israelites had to contend.[33] The Deuteronomic message is not that of glorifying war or violence — it is that of justice and the development and growth of a people toward civilization.

* * *

This distorted vision of the Jewish heritage is not necessarily, or only, the consequence of a hostile or ignorant Christian tradition which has systematically distorted and/or ignored the beauty and richness contained in the Bible. The omission of Judaic political tradition and thought has also evidently been a characteristic feature of political theory courses in Israeli universities.[34] In the diaspora, Jewish academics have been at the forefront of "universalizing" the curriculum with the consequence being that while political traditions and readings will undoubtedly represent Jesus, Paul, St. Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Luther and Calvin, one will have to search diligently for Judaic materials which rarely are included in syllabi in political theory or Western civilization courses. The only reference to Judaism in many of these courses will be to invoke a "Judeo-Christian heritage," leaving students with a hybrid which, for Judaism, if not for Christianity, is analytically imprecise and misleading.

Where there exists the rudiments of a Jewish consciousness among academics, it may manifest itself in the inclusion of Spinoza; purportedly, this is to illustrate that "Judaic" learning has not disappeared. Yet, as important and enjoyable as the teaching of Spinoza is, this material in the hands of Judaically illiterate teachers reads as a "proof text," all but affirming that the Bible and Judaism have to give way to secularism, the Enlightenment and modernity. Undoubtedly, these Western civilization courses will refer to the Aristotelian influence on Thomas Aquinas' thought; not many of them will, however, teach, let alone mention Maimonides, and his reading of Aristotle — and, indeed, Thomas Aquinas' familiarity with the Rambam.

When political scientists investigate biblical material and ask questions of it that reflect the concerns of their discipline, they tread on dangerous, if not sacred, territory. They may well antagonize Bible scholars who have invested a great deal of their life in acquiring

sophisticated linguistic-historical skills and devoted their best scholarly years in an attempt to arrive at an accurate translation of a single text or document. They have at their disposal the intricate and centuries-long tradition of biblical scholarship. While one may casually offer observations about the idea of kingship in Judea, there are scores of Bible authorities who have engaged in passionate debate over the historical sequence of the J,E,D,P redactions. Nevertheless, it is necessary to resist the proprietary arguments of disciplinary specialists who would retain exclusive rights and jurisdiction over an entire area of knowledge in dire need of intelligent inclusion in a wide range of university programs and general texts which treat Western culture and society.

From the perspective of the "generalist" teaching students in a Western civilization program, it is necessary and fruitful to evaluate the significance of the biblical text as it has been redacted. Whether Moses was the author of Torah or not; whether David wrote the Psalms or only some of them; or whether the Deuteronomic text or texts precede(s) or follow(s) the literary prophets are secondary to the fact that the Bible has been studied for two millennia, in Hebrew and in translations, in more or less the same sequence and order as it is read today. The impact of Bible on Western civilization, however scholars interpret its chronology, authorship or authenticity, must be seen in terms of a complete and comprehensive text, reproduced over time independent of Near Eastern departments, schools of archeology or Bible scholars.

The political scientist, sociologist and intellectual historian must venture into Bible study so that the Jewish heritage, embodied in this great founding text of Western tradition, will receive its due attention. Students in the humanities and social sciences need to know a great deal more than they presently do about the Bible: it is precisely here that generalists have a pivotal role to play. Those teaching in Western civilization programs should avoid the temptation of immersion in the labyrinth of source- and form-criticism. And as magnificent as the Bible is as a literary document, one should not accentuate the importance of the Bible as a primarily literary text but rather to focus on the text "as a symbolism which articulates the experience of a people's order — of the ontologically real order of Israel's existence in historic form."[35]

The contribution of social scientists and historians to Judaic political thought and Bible study must be, in the first instance, as advocates of a method of analysis which preserves the integrity of the text. Although one should familiarize oneself with anthropolitical and archeological evidence, read in form, source, and literary criticism, and examine the latest deconstructionist and modernist interpretations of the Bible, it is necessary, pedagogically, to assert the holistic primacy

of the text and of the material contained therein. Academics must point out that the study of distinctive Judaic texts has been ignored, abused and misused from the time of Paul to that of Archbishop O'Connor.[36]

It is interesting to note that academics have little trouble teaching Homer to students and expounding enthusiastically on the richness and complexity of his writings, pointing out the considerable skepticism about the historical personage of someone called Homer. The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are texts which represent oral and written traditions which have evolved and have been rewritten over a period of hundreds of years. Paradoxically, however, when it comes to the Bible and the Talmud, these same people will not teach or familiarize themselves with these materials because they reject anonymous, divine or divinely-inspired authorship. They seem not to understand the enormous incongruity of their bias, a bias which ignores the greatest text in Western civilization, the product of a rich three thousand year old oral/written tradition and civilization.[37]

* * *

The introduction of biblical material in general education programs dealing with the Western tradition may also face opposition from some observant Jews, who feel that the Bible should not be read as an academic text. Further, they would argue that Judaism cannot be appropriated intellectually apart from a religious commitment to its practice.[38] Is one, in fact, able to read the Bible intelligently without reference to the commentaries of Rashi, Maimonides and Nachmanides? Indeed, is it possible to study the Bible without years of immersion in Talmud?[39] Does the knowledge acquired in rabbinical schools and yeshivas lead to the specific type of insight and information required in introducing the Bible to secular students of Western civilization and culture? These questions should not be dismissed precipitously. This author believes it imperative, minimally, that academics (Jewish and non-Jewish) in the social sciences and humanities familiarize themselves with the basic classical commentaries and Midrash on the Bible.

The appropriate intellectual formation and commitment necessary for satisfactory comprehension of this relatively new area of study for generalists with a background in other disciplines will depend on the boundaries of the research and the questions to be answered. Whatever one's religious commitment may be, it must be acknowledged that learning to read with discernment is a difficult task and one which requires systematic study and access to creative and informed intellects. And in that relatively new approaches must be charted in complicated material, it is appropriate to maintain a modicum of humility about one's conclusions.

Academic Disinterest and Ignorance

A major obstacle facing academics engaged in the research and teaching of biblical and other Judaic materials is the generalized ignorance and often vocal opposition of one's own colleagues. Secular culture, whatever its many virtues and attractions, has diminished and neglected the importance of religion in Western civilization courses generally; in particular, the study of the Bible is often absent in university syllabi. When this author periodically asks whether his students have had occasion to read the Bible in the course of their education, except for a few with private or parochial school education, the response is overwhelmingly negative. Very few of them attend church or synagogue, so one cannot even assume a generalized familiarity with their own religious traditions or texts. Our colleagues, at least in the diaspora, often seem no more informed than their students. In political theory courses, for example, all roads lead to and from Athens. For most theorists, the study of the Bible is predicated on faith, not reason; it is viewed as "out of bounds" for dispassionate philosophical inquiry. (Of course, as noted, these same people have few problems teaching Paul, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, etc.)

In many North American universities, it is often precisely Jewish faculty who are opposed to integrating Judaic materials into the general curricula. These same faculty members have no problem with adjusting syllabi to take into account everyone else's tradition but their own. Invariably, all "liberation" movements, be they national, female or gay, will find their way into the curricula. Yet Jewish history and the Jewish struggle for liberation and national identity is still deemed particularistic, parochial, and too confining for intellectual inquiry and curricular inclusion. It is not uncommon for political theorists to include literary materials in political science courses: as academics open to the scholarship of other disciplines, one accepts the possibility that literature has a great deal to say about Western civilization, its culture, values and ideas. Almost all political scientists and historians have referred to Homer's Iliad and Odyssey in teaching Greek thought, as these classics tell a great deal about the earliest stages of one aspect of Western civilization. Few, however, would accord the Bible the same status, as "great literature." It follows, then, that one of the major tasks will be to educate one's colleagues and curriculum committees, as well as one's students.

* * *

Within the context of political science courses, and in the humanities and social sciences in general, it is necessary to adopt a "Maccabean

pedagogy." That is, one must, where academically appropriate, maintain the distinctiveness and specificity of Jewish political thought and traditions in the face of those who would assimilate, excessively contextualize, marginalize, or, in one way or another diminish this yet for many "hidden," rich literature and heritage.[40] The sociologist Max Weber concluded that "in richness and variety the literary production of pre-exilic Israel is unsurpassed by any other literature."[41] Unfortunately, syllabi and curricula in Western civilization courses seem not to be aware of this abundance. The more typical reaction to Bible is to see it as containing "a great deal of both theocratic history and myth," and to see its literary and cultural contribution as not meriting distinction from that of Mesopotamian and Egyptian literature.[42]

When teaching the Bible in Western civilization courses, it is common and misleading to refer to its political formulations as "theocratic," meaning here that priestly control is pervasive. With respect to ancient Jewish thought, however, theocracy is consistent with a "republican" form of rule, in which God is the ultimate sovereign authority, and man and his political leaders are constitutionally obligated to follow the precepts of Torah.[43] At no time did priests possess a monopoly of political power, irrespective of the particular regime in question, and independent of whether or not it was politically sovereign. Stuart Cohen has written convincingly about how power was shared among priest, prophet and monarch, all subject to the laws and teachings of Torah which, when understood organically, constitute the basis of the covenantal tradition and its manifestations in political rule.[44] It is important to demonstrate to students that the Jewish tradition of constitutionalism is the beginning of "the rule of law"; no authority, except God himself, is justified, legally, to rule completely over others, God is never expected to behave capriciously or arbitrarily.

* * *

One of the difficulties encountered in introducing biblical and other Judaic material in Western civilization curricula is the general absence of historical knowledge among students. If one examines the Great Books curricula of outstanding American liberal arts colleges such as Columbia College and St. Johns, or reviews syllabi in history or political theory courses, one will find a paucity of thinkers who could be classified as historians. Simply put, the "classics" have not been written by historians. Of course, Thucydides and his monumental work on the Peloponnesian War is taught, in which, undoubtedly, an historical perspective is found. But it is surely not a modern historical awareness, and it is questionable whether the descriptions and speeches of the protagonists are reliable eyewitness replications of the conflict

between Athens, Sparta and the other poleis, as opposed to examples of the artistic-rhetorical mystery and specifically Greek philosophic concerns of Thucydides.[45]

Yet the Bible, as text, is, among its other attributes, a great historical document, in fact, one in many ways unique in the Western tradition. Thorleif Boman, contrasting the Greek and Judaic notions of time and history, states that "God revealed himself to the Israelites in history and not in ideas; he revealed himself when he acted and created."[46] It would be a mistake, however, to assume that the Bible as an historical and theological document is bereft of an intellectual vitality and vision, and programmatically uninterested in ideas. It is difficult to turn the biblical page and not be confronted with, and challenged by, the kind of great issues and ideas that traditionally inform a Great Book curriculum: the biblical narrative's very broad vista includes a continuing analysis of "right and wrong," of obligation, family and community; in general the text is about values, be they political, philosophical, or social. It is difficult to conceive that anyone could read the Bible and find it to be a text devoid of ideas: perhaps "the essential characteristic of the Hebrew mind was that it took itself thus seriously and took its ideas as the ultimate reality...."[47]

Torah is instituted in time: worldliness and the affirmation of the here and now is central to comprehending the Jewish tradition which places great importance on action and the transformation of the world. Soloveitchik states that:

> An individual does not become holy through mystical adhesion to the absolute nor through mysterious union with the infinite, nor through a boundless-all-embracing ecstasy, but rather through his whole biological life, through his animal actions, and through actualizing the Halakhah in the empirical world.[48]

What to Look For in the Bible

The Bible, indeed, is the great historical classic absent from the curriculum.[49] The text chronicles the successes and failures, over time, of the people referred to as "chosen." Its status as a great text, demanding continuing attention, is made even more impressive when one considers the underlying intellectual honesty of the Bible as it chronicles the history of the ancient Jews, describing, in often unflattering terms, their failures as well as their successes. Northcote Parkinson, although he recognizes the origin of political thought prior to the Greeks, is mistaken when he asserts that "books...which supported the losing cause have been forgotten, overlooked, destroyed — or else never published."[50]

In the Bible there are no laudatory perorations on the superiority and accomplishments of the Israelites. Indeed, the people, although ennobled and created in God's image, are continually depicted as fickle, unappreciative, disobedient and unworthy of God's beneficence and forgiveness. The Bible, then, is not only a descriptive narrative about the history of the Israelites; it is, as well, a document fundamental to any study of the philosophy of history. This is not to argue that the Bible is a comprehensive, systematic history of the ancient Israelites. The authors and compilers of the biblical text were, above all, concerned with moral, as opposed to "historiographic," issues[51] and the chronological narrative, as it emerges over time, is preoccupied with the "idea of the Good" (to use the terminology of the Greeks). The specific concern of the biblical narrative is man's correct ethical relationship to man, to his community, and to God. The historians of the biblical narrative were intent to explain man, not only to describe him. In effect, "Hebrew history was primarily a philosophy of history."[52]

The Bible is the one great text in the literature of the ancient world in which one is able to discern distinctive and highly sophisticated perspectives on important historical, philosophical and political concepts like progress, liberty, authority, power, obligation, rights, property, slavery, law, justice and time. Unfortunately, today's university students are ignorant of the richness contained in the Bible, let alone other Judaic materials. The consequence of this lacuna is that students receive an incomplete and distorted idea of Western civilization and its development. As invaluable as the reliance on Athens is for our Western heritage, Jerusalem warrants recognition as a second, prior, and equally important foundation stone of Western politics, society and culture. The Judaic heritage is unique; it cannot be retrieved through Christianity and the latter's impact on Western civilization. And the Judaic tradition, in contradistinction to that of the Greeks, is rooted in a temporal and material framework. Leo Strauss has stated their difference as follows:

> The Greek philosophic view has as its primary basis the simple notion, the contemplation of heaven, an understanding of heaven, is the ground by which we are led in the right conduct. True knowledge, the Greek philosopher said, is knowledge of what is always. Knowledge of the things which are not always and especially knowledge of what happened in the past, is knowledge of an entirely inferior character.[53]

In the Israelite political tradition, the understanding of past, present and future constitutes an integral unity and serves as a guide to correct living. The speculative philosophy of the Greeks cannot be found in the Bible. To the Jewish believer, "God does not, like [the deity] of some philosophers, dwell in sheer transcendence above the empirical,

nor, like that of mystics, in an ineffable inwardness empirically inaccessible."[54]

Judaic thought emerges out of remembering God's past accomplishments and His future expectations of man. It is thus inherently historical. Character and personality develop over time. When Odysseus returns to Ithaca after a twenty-year absence, he thinks and acts as if time had not elapsed. In the Bible, characters grow, develop and change. The text is not only about the history of a people, it also depicts, with considerable drama and detail, the story of "ordinary" individuals who live fragile and flawed lives, so unlike the heroic characters depicted in Homer's epics. Erich Auerbach states that "the representation of daily life, remains in Homer in the peaceful realm of the idyllic, whereas, from the very first, in the Old Testament stories, the sublime, tragic, and problematic take shape precisely in the domestic and commonplace...."[55]

Another comparison worth noting is that "...while the Hebrews rejected reassimilation in the objectified and spatial order of the natural world in favor of participation in the dynamic reality of God which manifested itself in the events of history, the Greeks rejected history as an ultimate order of reality...."[56] The early Greek distanced himself from the "ordered account of the past arranged systematically in time and place."[57] Unlike the Hebrews who retained and "remembered" their past or sought to understand their present and their future within an historical framework, the Greek experienced a "Dark Age" where history, written and oral, "ceased," and "a kind of iron curtain was drawn, therefore, between the classical Greeks and the remarkable Mycenean civilization which lay behind them."[58] It is in such contrasts, and in the unfolding interpretations, between the earliest Judaic and Greek traditions, that Western civilization emerges, and university syllabi used in Western society and culture should reflect, and be designed to reflect, this reality.[59]

For some scholars, the Bible stands as the great "Fatherland of the Jews," or as George Steiner has put it, "Our Homeland, the Text." The Bible in its continuous re-reading and reappraisal represents Judaism in all its vitality and richness.[60] Steiner states that "even the most secular Jew is the explicit creature of his past, of Jewish history."[61] The idea that all Jews share a common identity and values is, in this instance, affirmed by an unlikely ally of Steiner. Rabbi Avraham Shapira, Israel's Ashkenazi Chief Rabbi, in a recent interview stated:

> Even those who do not observe still observe. There are Jewish ethical values. There is Jewish culture, which in Israel is also Torah. And there is no one who is not connected to Jewish culture....It is inconceivable that there is a Jew who is not in some way connected to some kind of ethical precept.[62]

Unfortunately, this does not mean that Jewish academics are aware of their historical antecedents, or, if they are so aware, that they identify positively with Judaism's human and intellectual richness.[63]

* * *

If it is indeed accurate that "the history of European civilization manifests only mixtures and synthesis of the two ways of thinking"[64] [Jewish and Greek], it is imperative to know what is, in fact, the Judaic contribution to this perceived synthesis. The point of this is not to embellish or exaggerate a Jewish past for ideological or sentimental reasons, but to render due consideration and attention to the historical record. True to a long-established written Jewish tradition, this will not inevitably lead to a romantic glorification of past achievement, but to a critical and informed appraisal of Judaic literature. The task would be considered successful if students could make distinctions between Judaic, Greek, Christian and Roman political traditions. One clarification, at least, is in order here: knowledge about the Jewish political tradition must not be confused with a desire to affirm its distinctive contributions, nor should enthusiasm or sympathy be expected, for a range of ideological reasons, from those who identify their Jewishness in the way that would satisfy a Spinoza or an Isaac Deutscher, Jews who reached out beyond, and ultimately rejected the Jewish community, even though they possessed considerable knowledge about their religion and heritage.

Treatment of the Bible in Political Theory Texts

This author has tried to show that a significant amount of previous Bible scholarship, be it in study, teaching or research, is biased or deficient in its representation of Jewish history and thought, and that, in turn, this represents a major problem for academics who wish to retrieve the Judaic tradition in Western civilization courses. A brief perusal of some of the major political theory texts in use over the previous few decades will illustrate that the problem is not confined to biblical scholars, but is characteristic of political theorists and their writing in general.

Gaetano Mosca begins his study of political thought with Egypt, Babylonia, and the social and political attributes of Confucianism and Buddhism. He acknowledges "the rich Hebrew literature" and the importance of the biblical idea of monarchy and prophecy in one page.[65] Charles Howard McIlwain states that "the early political history of the Jews is a subject of great importance for the history of political

thought as a whole." He never, however, proceeds to discuss any aspect of the Jewish political tradition, except to describe it generally as "purely theocratic."[66] Lee Cameron McDonald's only reference to Judaic content is to refer to it as mythological and to indicate that "Moses, Solon and Romulus are the great political founders."[67] John Bowle is one of the few political theorists who begins Western civilization prior to the traditionally-ascribed Greek origins. In a chapter titled "The Temple State and the Sacred City: Middle Eastern Empire," he discusses bureaucracy, law and monarchy, elaborates on Egypt, Mesopotamia and Assyria, but never acknowledges the Bible or the existence of the Hebrews.[68] Amazingly, one scholar, J.B. Bury, completed an entire book on *The Idea of Progress*, and found nothing at all to say about the importance of the Bible and the Judaic contribution to this central Western idea.[69] Several other political theory texts simply ignore the Judaic and biblical heritage.[70] Leo Strauss, capable of precise and skilled biblical analysis, and familiar with the entire range of Jewish thought, including Maimonides, did not see the Bible as appropriate subject matter for the political philosopher. Yet he does, however, distinguish between political philosophy and political thought,[71] the latter being coeval with life and, one assumes, able to incorporate the study of Judaic texts.

Although it has been argued here that the Jewish political tradition and its relevant texts are often ignored in Western civilization and political theory courses, one noteworthy exception is Mulford Sibley's *Political Ideas and Ideologies*.[72] His opening chapter, "Politics and Ethics Among the Ancient Hebrews," places the Hebrews within the historical context of the civilization(s) from which they emerge and begin to be identified as a separate people. He also delineates those areas of thought which are uniquely Hebraic in origin. Sibley's narrative is conceptual and chronological. Following a brief discussion of Abraham, Sibley's historical framework begins with a section "From Exodus to Judges"; this is followed by a discussion of the united, then divided, monarchy, and ends with the second century BCE. Some of the important political issues raised and discussed in his opening chapter include monarchy, constitutionalism, covenant, order, prophecy, confederal alliances, and law. Sibley raises the question of how one is to read the Bible for political content, while separating the political from the "theocratic." In that the religion of the Hebrews manifested itself in daily life, Sibley concludes that other-worldliness did not dominate the Jewish political tradition as it did in Christianity.

This is not to suggest that the Bible and the Talmud are essentially political theory texts, or that they deal systematically with philosophy and political philosophy.[73] However, we should be cautioned against putting ourselves in a methodological straight-jacket by reifying definitions at the expense of the acquisition of knowledge. The

overwhelming percentage of students who should encounter the Bible in the course of their general studies are never going to proceed to graduate school or to vocations where disciplinary subtleties are going to make an intellectual difference in their lives. Their general education demands, however, that they be provided with a foundation and background in Western civilization, which in turn entails reading the Bible (and, ideally, acquiring some sense of its subsequent historical and rabbinical commentaries). The argument here is that the integration of biblical materials into Western civilization courses in general, and in political theory courses in particular, can also be defended on methodological grounds. If "political theory criticizes what is and constructs what should be,"[74] or if its primary purpose is "education,"[75] or if it can be understood "as moral, inclusive, philosophical and general," and not always systematic,[76] the Bible, without question, is a necessary and integral component in studying, teaching and writing about Western civilization.

The integration of the Bible into Western civilization courses can be illustrated by a brief discussion of selected ideas which become important to the development of a democratic tradition. Invariably, an introduction to democratic theory begins with a lecture on Athens in the "Golden Age" of Pericles. One would expect distinctions to be drawn between the theory and practice of classical democracy, comparisons made between Athens and Sparta, a discussion of Athenian Imperialism, the Peloponnesian war and the existence of slavery. If one were to suggest beginning this course with the Bible and the Judaic political tradition, this would for the most part engender a puzzled reaction among students and skepticism from colleagues. To most academics, the Bible represents the antithesis of political theory and the democratic tradition as they are traditionally seen and depicted; the Bible is viewed as the story of an absolute God who is omniscient, omnipotent, harsh, arbitrary, and certainly not open to engaging in philosophical speculation. Although it is the indispensable and irreplaceable founding-text of the Western tradition, the Bible is nevertheless ignored. Yet it is the text fundamental to an understanding of the beginnings of a Judaic political tradition which, in turn, also constitutes the foundation for an understanding of the Western political heritage.

If, of course, one defines democracy as essentially plebiscitary and based on the rule of majorities, there is, of course, no democratic tradition in ancient Judaic thought; nor, applying the same standards, can one trace one's democratic roots to fifth century Athens. Without meaning to slight the participatory and egalitarian attributes of contemporary democratic societies, it is also important to keep in mind those elements of the democratic tradition which cannot be quantitatively understood; specifically, the establishment of a civilized

society where law prevails over arbitrariness and anarchy, where the dignity of man is affirmed and where human beings are not objects to be "possessed."

Here the Greek and biblical attitudes toward labor and slavery provide an interesting and pedagogically useful comparison. In the Bible, slavery is not a relationship based on property rights. It is a six year form of indentured service. The slave, as man, possesses human rights which follow from his dignity and worth before God. The injunction that all are equal under God's law is modified when it comes to the slave. He is, if injured, to be set free immediately; in that the slave's burdens are greater than those of a free man, he is to receive special protections. Greek and Roman literature as well call for proper treatment of slaves, but these are the expressions of a philosophical elite. Their ideas toward slavery

> did not become what they had been in Judaism: the Torah for the whole people. That is why these kindly expressions of Greek and Roman literature could coexist with the horrors and atrocities vented by the idle upon those unfortunate creatures who, according to Jevenal, are "not really human beings...."[77]

Plato felt, in fact, that he had demonstrated the natural slavishness of slaves by virtue of their failure to commit suicide.[78]

Hannah Arendt distinguished between the Old Testament and the texts of classical antiquity by contrasting their attitudes toward labor: to the Greek mind labor was to be avoided; it represented that part of the human condition where man's activities approximate that of animals, while to the Hebrews, to labor is to affirm what God has given to man.[79] The "Allegory of the Cave" in Plato's *Republic* has an interesting parallel in Talmudic literature. R. Simon bar Yohai and his son are compelled to seek refuge in a cave in order to flee from Roman persecution. Twelve years later they return to the outside world where they encounter farmers working the fields. Simon bar Yohai, seeing them, disapprovingly exclaims that the people are too preoccupied "with the life of the moment." This legend concludes with a heavenly voice calling to them: "Have you come to destroy my world? Go back to the cave!" In Plato's allegory, the man who labors resides in shadows; in Judaism, labor is not to be denigrated, nor is it to be separate from the life of the mind.[80]

The biblical narrative is about the liberty and liberation of a people who, metaphorically and literally, learn that their escape from slavery, foreign bondage and oppression is not to be equated with the attainment of freedom, which is a longer, more difficult task. The Theophany at Sinai is too important to be delegated to an oracle, a vision, or a philosopher of exceptional stature and rational genius. This

event, it is told, is witnessed by hundreds of thousands of people, and Moses is instructed to teach *all* the people to follow God's law. Israel is to be a nation where all are priests. Carl Friedrich states that:

> The sanctification of each member of the community who obeys the laws of Yahweh implies an equality of all men. The laws of the Old Testament can be obeyed by anyone who is of good will. This markedly egalitarian spiritual attitude toward the law that one finds in Ancient Judaism stands out in sharp contrast to the legal thought of the Greeks, at least as expressed in the legal philosophy of Plato and Aristotle, which is markedly that of a spiritual elite.[81]

The people, however, possessing free will, are continually disobedient. The desert trek of forty years, in spite of severe setbacks and hardships, will eventually terminate in the promised land of Canaan. But it will be to the next generation, born in freedom, which will inherit the responsibility of creating a national consciousness: ("in those days there was no king in Israel and every man did what was right in his own eyes").[82]

Essential to any tradition of democratic thought is the ability to exercise free will; this involves the education of a society so that its choices, singularly and collectively, go beyond rhetoric and the expression of abstract rights to become concretely meaningful and purposeful alternatives. A democratic tradition is not to be confused with anarchy, or does the idea that man possesses rights mean there are no accompanying obligations. Such a tradition is built upon the idea that human beings are not objects, that they should not succumb passively to an uncritical acceptance of worldly imperfection. In Judaic thought the "ideal is not that of the sage of antiquity who, satisfied with his own wisdom and peace of mind, is no longer moved by the struggles of man."[83] The ideal is that of an informed and educated "polity," doing as well as knowing "the good," and living by the Torah that God gave to man. It is precisely the acceptance of God's power and majesty over man that makes it very difficult for a Jew to accept the arbitrary authority of man over man. Indeed, "there is a tendency to place Israel almost at par with God. Israel is not imposed upon, rather it actually receives the covenant."[84]

* * *

The intellectual Hellenization of Judaic political thought is a two-millennia-old tradition. Indeed, the attractions of the "host" country and the dominant culture have always produced "golden calves." It is not even understandable, for many, why Abraham, evidently

prosperous and established, would want to leave Mesopotamia for Canaan. Attempts to supplement courses in Western civilization with selected Judaic materials will undoubtedly meet resistance from the realities and prevailing wisdom of late twentieth century diaspora Jewish academics. They will tend to see this proposed revision of syllabi and programs as a reversion to Jewish parochialism.

This conclusion, in itself, tells a great deal about the reasons behind the prevailing ignorance of Jewish cultural and political history. As well, "the assimilationist, whether he turns to universalism or to another particular nationalism, rejects every variant of Jewish identification so Jewish political theory is ipso facto ruled out."[85]

It is, in fact, because of a desire to more fully comprehend the richness of Western civilization that many feel the need to address issues and texts which have been ignored or misread for centuries. If Jewish political thought was to be regarded as "text" and general Western political and philosophical history as "context," it would seem that for centuries there has been undue attention given to context and the text itself has been neglected.

In order to retrieve the Jewish past — historical, political and philosophic (and its relation to Western development generally) — pedagogy and scholarship will have to return to its real origins, to the Hebraic texts, history, and oral and written traditions. Undoubtedly, this will arouse opposition from the "secularists," "universalists," "assimilationists" and those who see social science beginning, and sometimes ending, with today's newspaper. In turn, it will be necessary to challenge the perspective of "the dogmatic modernist who asserts that the past can at best only confirm what the present already knows, and that in any conflict between past and present, the present is ipso facto right."[86]

Appendix

In many ways Isaac Deutscher, described by his sister as the "non-Jewish Jew,"[87] represents the most challenging and perhaps the most radical expression of that vision of the Judaic political tradition with which issue is taken. Isaac Deutscher, raised and educated in an Orthodox Jewish home replete with *peyes* and *kapot*, achieved as a child widespread recognition for his extraordinary Talmudic brilliance. In spite of his own opposition, he is sent by his father to study with the Tsadik of Gere, and at the age of thirteen he was ordained as a rabbi by virtue of an outstanding discourse presented at his *bar mitzvah.* Isaac's precocity was such that over one hundred rabbis attended his peroration. Yet just over a year later Deutscher would eat his first ham sandwich with butter, and this on Yom Kippur.[88] This was the beginning of a dramatic transition which would lead Deutscher to Marxism and to his rejection of Judaism, which he termed "the religious reflection of the bourgeois way of thought."[89] A three thousand year old civilization incorporating the Bible, the Talmud and a myriad of classical and sacred texts was thus summarily discarded.

For Deutscher, "the genius of the Jews" and "the message of universal human emancipation"[90] finally fell victim to the Holocaust and the establishment of the State of Israel. Although Deutscher generally rejects nationalism as an historically retrogressive phenomenon, he is nevertheless able at points to see its manifestation, at times, as a "progressive" force against imperialism. Zionism, as the movement of Jewish national liberation, will not, however, receive such understanding consideration. On the creation of Israel, Deutscher's observations are cryptic:

> For those who have always stressed Jewishness and its continuity, it is strange and bitter to think that the extermination of six million Jews should have given such a new lease on life to Jewry. I would have preferred the six million men, women, and children, to survive and Jewry to perish. It was from the ashes of six million Jews that the phoenix of Jewry has arisen. What a resurrection![91]

For Deutscher, Israel remained a "Hebrew mutation of the Jewish consciousness...."[92] Although Deutscher s Marxism may not be as popular today as it once was in North American universities, his rejection of Judaism remains attractive to many self-described secular Jews still searching for an all-embracing and all-encompassing universalism which speaks to the brotherhood of man (even as, often unwittingly, it rejects one portion of this mosaic: his own). It is perhaps more than ironic that classical Marxism and traditional Christian scholarship

here share a vision, that the "God of Judaism is a jealous particularist."[93] It is evidently possible for some secularized Jewish scholars to integrate mutually contradictory and stereotypically hostile and ill-informed perceptions of the Judaic heritage. For example, in *Childhood and Society*, the psychoanalyst Eric Erikson states:

> We may think here of types, such as the religiously dogmatic, culturally reactionary Jew, to whom change and time mean absolutely nothing: the Letter is his reality. And we may think of his opposite, the Jew to whom geographic dispersion and cultural multiplicity have become "second nature": relativism becomes for him the absolute exchange, value his tool.[94]

Erikson dedicates his book to "our children's children"!

Notes

1. Fernanda Eberstadt, "Responding to the Bible," *Commentary*, vol. 85, no. 1 (January 1988):27.
2. Carl Joachim Friedrich, *The Philosophy of Law in Historical Perspective*, second edition, revised and enlarged (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973), p. 10.
3. Eric Voegelin, *Order and History*, 6 vols., *Israel and Revelation* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Press, 1956), vol. 1, p. 430.
4. Herbert Butterfield, *The Origin of History* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1981), p. 177.
5. John Bright, *A History of Israel* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1972), p. 261.
6. Gordon M. Freeman, *The Heavenly Kingdom: Aspects of Political Thought in the Talmud and Midrash* (Lanham, Md. and Jerusalem: University Press of America and Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, 1986), p. 54.
7. David Hartman, *A Living Covenant* (New York: The Free Press, 1985), p. 6.
8. Harry Orlinsky, "Nationalism-Universalism and Internationalism," *Essays in Biblical Culture and Bible Translation* (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1974), p. 88. Joseph Klausner in *From Jesus to Paul* (New York: Menorah Publishing Co., 1979), states that the basic principle of Judaism is "nationality for the sake of universality," p. 536.
9. Deuteronomy 24:18. All biblical citations refer to *The New English Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).
10. Leviticus 19:34.
11. Romans 3:10.
12. Herbert J. Muller, *The Uses of the Past* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1952), p. 68.
13. Matthew 7:12.
14. Where the connection between Leviticus and the Gospels is made, it often becomes expressed in the following stereotypical manner: "It is the noblest single expression of philanthropy to be found in Hebrew law, or anywhere else in the Old Testament. It does not quite rise to the heights of the gospel principle in that in its application it is limited to Jews, while the principle of Jesus took in mankind at large." J.M. Powis Smith, *The Origin and History of Hebrew Law* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931), p. 78.
15. Quoted in Nahum N. Glazar, *Hillel the Elder: The Emergence of Classical Judaism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1970), p. 74.
16. One of the earliest modern examinations of Bible and political theory

states that "legalism finally triumphed over righteousness in official Judaism after the Exile and in the days of Jesus." Paul Ramsey, "Elements of a Biblical Political Theory," *Journal of Religion*, XXIX (1949):278.

17. R. Travers Herford, trans., ed. and commentary, *The Ethics of the Talmud* (New York: Schocken Books, 1962), II.5, p. 45.
18. Matthew 7:1.
19. Emanuel Rackman, *Theocentricity in Jewish Law*, Working Paper No. 13 (Jerusalem: Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, 1986), pp. 11-12.
20. Morris Adler, *The World of the Talmud* (New York: Schocken Books, 1971), p. 19.
21. From *Pesikta Kahana*, 15. Emil L. Fackenheim, *Encounters Between Judaism and Modern Philosophy: A Preface to Future Jewish Thought* (New York: Schocken Books, 1980), p. 53.
22. Aaron Wildavsky, *The Nursing Father: Moses as a Political Leader* (Birmingham: University of Alabama Press, 1984), p. 1.
23. Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, with preface by W. Robertson Smith (Gloucester, Mass.: Meridian Books, 1973), p. 392.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 227.
25. "Biblical criticism had become a department of Protestant dogmatics, and, regardless of what mode of approach was utilized — literary, historical, or cultural — the Christian student was anxious to prove the superiority of Christianity to Judaism and the appearance of Jesus as the greatest event in history." Felix A. Levy, "Contemporary Trends in Jewish Bible Study," *The Study of Bible Today and Tomorrow*, Harold R. Willoughby, ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947), p. 98.
26. Harry M. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint: The Oldest Translation," *Essays*, pp. 380-381.
27. Herbert J. Muller, *Uses*, p. 97.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 79.
29. Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, vol. 1, abridgement by D.C. Somervell (New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1965), p. 360.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 572.
31. Eric Voegelin, *Order*, p. 376.
32. Cited by Butterfield, *Origins*, pp. 76-77.
33. For a more balanced discussion of Judaic notions of "justified violence," see Bradley Shavit Artson, "The Siege and the Civilian," pp. 54-65; and Michael Goldberg, "Jews and Christians on Matters of Life and Death," *Judaism*, vol. 36, no. 1 (Winter 1987):66-73.
34. Professor D.V. Segre states that "in most Israeli universities, political theory is taught from Plato to Marcuse, but any mention of Maimonides or Abarbanel, or of political ideas in the Bible or the

Talmud, is carefully avoided. (Several years ago the Department of Political Studies at the religious Bar-Ilan University introduced a course in Jewish Political Thought into its curriculum, as part of a field of specialization in Jewish political studies which it now offers. It did so against considerable opposition on the part of the various factors of the University.) Although the political components of Jewish culture and tradition are perceptible even in the stories of the Patriarchs, they are ignored in the curricula." D.V. Segre, "Jewish Political Thought and Contemporary Politics," *Kinship and Consent*, Daniel J. Elazar, ed. (Ramat Gan: Turtledove Publishing, 1981), p. 297.

35. Eric Voegelin, *Order*, p. 156.

36. Here "one notes the unlikely confluence of Christian exegesis and literary deconstruction, a school of thought according to which readers are virtually mandated to manipulate texts for their own creative purposes, innocent of anything so transitory or incomplete as authoral intent." Eberstadt, *Commentary*, p. 35.

37. The Athens-Jerusalem axes in Western thought leads Emil Fackenheim to observe that "there is a Greek as well as a Jewish diaspora; but no Greek ever returned to Greece because of the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*." Emil Fackenheim, *What is Judaism* (New York: Summit Books, 1987), p. 85.

38. Adin Steinsaltz states that "it is impossible to arrive at external knowledge of this work...[the Talmud]. True knowledge can only be obtained through spiritual communion, and the student must participate intellectually and emotionally in the Talmudic debate, himself becoming, to a certain degree, a cocreator." Adin Steinsaltz, *The Essential Talmud*, trans. from the Hebrew by Chaya Galai (New York: Basic Books, 1976), p. 9.

39. The study of the Talmud tells us something about the Judaic tradition of debate and questioning. Here "the student is expected to pose questions to himself and to obtain and to voice doubts and reservations...the Talmud is perhaps the only sacred book in all world culture that permits and even encourages the student to question it." Steinsaltz, *ibid.*, p. 9.

40. The by-now extensive scholarship on "covenant" illustrates the gamut of opinions which would either deny the importance of this concept in Western civilization, or would appropriate its significance to earlier covenant typologies in the Near East. Both of these approaches diminish or negate the distinctive biblical idea of covenant. Similarly, MacDonald concluded that "there is even an element of pathos in watching Assyriologists and Egyptologists gathering up the scraps of literature left by those most unliterary peoples and trying to make it rival the literature of the Hebrews....The business papers of a trading firm are not literature; law codes may be venerable but that does not make them literature; arid records of campaigns and victories are not literature....To call these records literature is to debase that word to cover anything in writing....Across the minds of the Hebrews

there came the mystery of creative genius in words, and the things which they so created were of the kind that refuses to die." Duncan Black MacDonald, *The Hebrew Literary Genius* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1933), p. 218.

41. Max Weber, *Ancient Judaism*, trans. and ed. by Hans H. Gerth and Don Martindale (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1960), p. 194.
42. R.G. Colingwood, *The Idea of History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), p. 17.
43. Daniel J. Elazar, *The Book of Joshua as a Political Classic*, experimental edition (Jerusalem: Center for Jewish Community Studies, 1980), p. 19.
44. Stuart A. Cohen, *The Concept of the Three Ketarim: Its Place in Jewish Political Thought and its Implications for a Study of Jewish Constitutional History*, Working Paper No. 18 (Jerusalem: Center for Jewish Community Studies, 1982), pp. 1-40.
45. Thucydides' historical understanding was limited. He states that "the history preceding our own period...looking back into it as far as I can...leads me to conclude that these periods were not great periods either in warfare or in anything else." Thucydides, *The Peloponnesian War*, trans. by Rex Warner with an intro. and notes by M.I. Finley (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1972), p. 35.
46. Thorleif Boman, *Hebrew Thought Compared With Greek* (New York: Norton Library, 1970), p. 171.
47. Duncan Black MacDonald, *Genius*, pp. 11-12.
48. Soloveitchik, *Halakhic Man*, trans. from Hebrew by Lawrence Kaplan (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1983), p. 46.
49. Adler points out that "if the Bible...is revered but not read in Western civilization, the Talmud is neither regarded nor studied. Of all the great classics that the human spirit has produced, it is the least known by the world and exerts therefore the least influence upon the thoughts of educated men. The stimulation it might provide in the area of our major confusions and dilemmas is withheld because the Talmud remains a closed book." Adler, *World*, p. 143.
50. C. Northcote Parkinson, *The Evolution of Political Thought* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966), p. 9.
51. Daniel J. Elazar, *Joshua*, p. 7.
52. William A. Irwin, "The Hebrews," Henri Frankfort et al. *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), p. 322.
53. Leo Strauss, *Interpretation of Genesis*, a lecture in the Works of the Mind series at the University of Chicago, January 25, 1957.
54. Emil L. Fackenheim, *Encounters*, p. 11.
55. Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis*, trans. from German by Willard R. Trask (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), p. 22.

56. John G. Gunnell, *Political Philosophy and Time* (Middleton: Wesleyan University Press, 1985), p. 15.
57. M.I. Finley, *The Ancient Greeks* (London: Penguin Books, 1977), p. 24.
58. Butterfield, *Origin*, p. 122.
59. Greek philosophy and the rabbinic sages did share a belief in the fundamental importance of mathematics. Whereas Plato's Academy purportedly excluded entry to those who were ignorant of geometry, the Gaon of Vilna told R. Barukh of Shlitov, the translator of Euclid's *Geometry* into Hebrew, that "to the degree that a man is lacking in the wisdom of mathematics he will lack one hundredfold in the wisdom of the Torah." Soloveitchik notes, as well, the importance of mathematics to "*halakhic* epistemology." Soloveitchik, *Halakhic Man*, p. 57.
60. George Steiner, "Our Homeland, the Text," *Salmagundi* 66 (Winter-Spring 1985):11.
61. George Steiner, "The Long Life of a Metaphor," *Encounter*, vol. LXVIII, no. 2 (February 1987):55. Readers of Steiner are undoubtedly aware that his purpose here is to diminish the national-territorial component of Judaism and assert instead his notion of "Jewish cosmopolitanism."
62. "In Conversation With Israel's Chief Rabbis," interview with Edwin Black, *Moment* (March 1987).
63. It is interesting that the search for Jewish "authenticity" among affluent middle-class New York Jewish professionals increasingly includes a return to the synagogue; however, the traditional idea of the synagogue as a house of study may not be making that much headway. One Wall Street lawyer proclaims that "My interest is in traditional Judaism; I really do feel more comfortable in an Orthodox synagogue. I don't have one of those restless natures. It's like, if you find a good Chinese restaurant, you stick with it." Jan Hoffman, "Back to Shul," *Village Voice* (21 April 1987), p. 17.
64. Thorleif Boman, *Hebrew*, p. 12.
65. Gaetano Mosca, *A Short History of Political Philosophy*, trans. by Sondra Z. Koff (New York: Thomas Y. Crowall, 1972), p. 11.
66. Charles Howard McIlwain, *The Growth of Political Thought in the West* (New York: Macmillan, 1960), p. 147.
67. Lee Cameron McDonald, *Western Political Theory* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968), p. 1.
68. John Bowle, *Western Political Thought* (London: Methuen and Co., 1961), pp. 15-131.
69. J.B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress* (New York: Dover Publications, 1960), *passim*.
70. These texts include George H. Sabine and T.L. Thorson, *A History of Political Philosophy*, 4th ed. (Hinsdale: Dryden Press, 1973); Phyllis Doyle, *A History of Political Thought*, London: Jonathan Cape, 1949)

— some reference to Bible as it relates to Christianity; R.N. Berki, *The History of Political Thought* (London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1977); and Sheldon S. Wolin, *Politics and Vision* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1960). As brilliant as Wolin's book is, he is able still to write that "prior to the development of Greek philosophy in the sixth century BC, man had thought of himself and of society as integral parts of nature, as subject to the same natural and supernatural forces. Nature, man and society formed a man, and society formed a continuum." (pp. 28-29.)

71. Leo Strauss and Joseph Cropsey, *Political Philosophy* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964), p. 1.
72. Mulford Q. Sibley, *Political Ideas and Ideologies* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), pp. 11-29.
73. Daniel Elazar has argued that biblical thought is systematic, albeit differently than that of the essentially syllogistic Greek philosophical tradition; which is in nature; in contradistinction, the "midrashic method" of understanding Bible proceeds through "the explication and harmonization of texts." Daniel J. Elazar, *The Covenant Idea in Politics*, Working Paper No. 22 (Jerusalem: Center for Jewish Community Studies, 1983), pp. 11-12.
74. Elizabeth M. James, *Political Theory: An Introduction to Interpretation* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976), p. 2.
75. Thomas P. Jenkins, *The Study of Political Theory* (New York: Random House, 1967), p. 2.
76. George Kateb, *Political Theory* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1968), *passim*.
77. Leo Baeck, *The Essence of Judaism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1978), p. 203.
78. Plato, *Republic*, trans. by G.M.A. Grube (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co., 1974), p. 56.
79. Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1959), p. 74.
80. Shabbat 33b, cited by Salo Wittmayer Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, vol. 1, *To the Beginning of the Christian* Era, 2nd. ed. (New York: Columbia University Press and the Jewish Publication Society, 1972), pp. 9-10.
81. Friedrich, *Philosophy*, p. 9.
82. Judges 21:25.
83. Leo Baeck, *Essence*, p. 203.
84. Gordon Freeman, *Heavenly*, p. 38.
85. Bernard Susser and Eliezer Don-Yehiya, "Prolegomena to Jewish Political Theory," *Kinship and Consent*, edited by Daniel J. Elazar (Ramat Gan: Turtledove Publishing, 1981), p. 104.
86. Fackenheim, *Encounters*, p. 173.

87. Isaac Deutscher, *The Non-Jewish Jew and Other Essays*, ed. with introduction by Tamara Deutscher (New York: Hill and Wang, 1968).
88. *Ibid.*, pp. 1-24.
89. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
90. *Ibid.*, p. 41.
91. *Ibid.*, p. 50.
92. *Ibid.*, p. 56.
93. Emil Fackenheim, *God's Presence in History: Jewish Affirmations and Philosophical Reflections* (New York: New York University, 1970), p. 57.
94. Eric H. Erikson, *Childhood and Society* (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1963), p. 355.