What’s New About What’s Old?


In the early decades of critical Biblical studies during the 19th and early 20th centuries, scholars dated Biblical books, or parts of them, after considering many hints within the text: reference to historical events or allusions to them dated securely by external sources, references to singular events for which archaeology had ostensibly provided dates, and the religious/cultic/philosophical ideas expressed in the texts. The tendency among critical scholars then was to date books slightly before but mostly after the exile of 586 BCE.

By the middle of the 20th century, Biblicalists had gained access to mythic, literary, and historical texts written in Egyptian and Akkadian, to the recently discovered texts in what appeared a Hebrew-like language from Ugarit, and to Hebrew inscriptions and letters from the time of the monarchy discovered in excavations. Comparing the literary genres and language of the Bible to what was found in these ancient languages convinced many that the Bible used genres that were well-developed in the ancient Near East even before Israel emerged as a historical people. Umberto Cassutto was even able to declare on the basis of his comparisons between Biblical and Ugaritic poetry that the Canaanites taught Israelites how to sing. These discoveries led scholars, mainly in the US under the influence of William Foxwell Albright (Johns Hopkins) and H. L. Ginsberg (Jewish Theological Seminary) and their students, and in Israel under the influence of Benjamin Mazar (Hebrew University) and his students to re-date Biblical books closer to the events that they portrayed.

Linguists, considering Ugarit a sort of pre-Hebrew Hebrew and Tannaitic Hebrew of the Mishna the final evolutionary stage of living Hebrew in antiquity, and filling in some blanks with the Gezer calendar dated to the 10th century, the Siloam Tunnel inscription and Lachish Letters dated to the very end of the 8th, and the Dead Sea Scrolls dated to the 1st century BCE, considered it possible to

*Continued on next page...*
write a history of Hebrew. This research convinced many that Biblical Hebrew could be divided into three historical periods: Early Biblical Hebrew preserved in the oldest poems of the Bible, such as Exod 15 and Jud 5, which contain patterns of repetition reminiscent of Ugaritic poetry, Standard Biblical Hebrew preserved in large parts of the Torah, former and latter prophets, and Late Biblical Hebrew from the Persian period reflected in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles that betray the influence of Aramaic, the official language of the Persian empire. The dating of the language followed the dating of the book or whatever part was being investigated. For example, Isa 1-39 was considered a late 8th-early 7th century book in the main while Isa 40-66 a late 6th century one, and Ezra-Nehemiah a 5th century one.

Hurvitz and Polzin asked an interesting question: Given that philologists using their standard methods have been unable to date parts of the Bible such as the books of Jonah, Kohelet and Song of Songs, cultic laws in the Torah associated with the Priestly source, as well as most of the psalms, is it possible to use the language of these compositions to reveal the linguistic period during which they were authored? Both answered in the affirmative. Hurvitz, working mainly on lexical features, and Polzin, concentrating on syntactic ones, created historical linguistic profiles of selected features and used them to date texts undated heretofore. For the last 40 years, most research into the history of Biblical Hebrew and the dating of texts has become more subtle and nuanced, much more sophisticated, but has essentially followed their methodologies.

In 2009, an international troika—Ian Young from Australia, Robert Rezetko, then of Mexico but now the Netherlands, and Martin Ehrenswärd of Denmark—argued in a two-volume book that the historical approach is seriously flawed and as a consequence all of its claims about dating texts linguistically are incorrect. The best-known claim of their *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts* is that what scholars had previously identified as Standard Biblical Hebrew (SBH) and Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH) were two styles of writing accessible to authors of the Persian period and to chronologically later scribes who copied their compositions and changed both words and syntax randomly.

Their book, needless to say, is not particularly popular among those who work in linguistic dating or who depended on its results when working on historical problems. One implication of their conclusion is that although the books from Joshua through II Kings, were composed in the SBH style, they were authored during the Persian period. Since they were written long after the purported events that they claim to describe, there can be little of historical worth in them. So too, all that is narrated in the Torah.

Appropriately postmodern, one could say that there is no history in the history because the appearance of history writing conceals essentially fictional narratives that may contain accurate information only here and there. If correct, the historically minded scholar must address the following question: Why would people in Persian period Yehud have generated such a collection of books and what did it mean for them in the Persian period? This is very different from the reception-history question: How did people in the Persian period interpret book X written three (or four or five) centuries earlier?

Their book, however, has its defenders among small groups of Biblicists in North America and Europe, scholars who dated almost the entire Bible to the Persian period on non-linguistic grounds even before its publication. These find its conclusions amenable to and supportive of their approach.

*Linguistic Dating* precipitated two NAPH sessions at the NAPH/SBL sessions in 2009 and three at the 2010 meeting in Atlanta. The objectives of these sessions are to advance the historical study of Biblical Hebrew while considering the relevant critiques of its methods and of many of its foundational studies advanced in *Linguistic Dating*. The three authors of *Linguistic Dating* are participants in the 2010 sessions though almost all of the others reject their methodological assumptions, their analyses of data, and their historical conclusions in part or in toto. A volume of papers from these sessions as well as some invited for the book, edited by Cynthia Miller (University of the Free State) and myself will be published by Eisenbrauns in 2011.

*Continued on next page...*
Aftermath from an E-mail

In a letter that addressed members of NAPH boards during June, I raised the following ideas and concerns:

1. Given the composition of NAPH membership, conference participants, and contributors to our journals, the name of the organization should be changed to International Association of Professors of Hebrew, i-NAPH (eye-naff) for short.

2. Is it worthwhile to consider a new look for Hebrew Studies, a redesign of its cover and interior (—not its contents or editorial policies)?
   (About ten years ago, while editing HS, I explored the matter with Rick Painter [Urban Bible College], our managing editor. After exploring a few possibilities, we moved the Table of Contents onto the front cover, but decided not to change anything else. Although “improvements” might have resulted in the introduction of font shapes and sizes that may have looked more “modern,” and “cutting edge,” mock-ups proved to be less legible to an unscientific sample of my students, colleagues, and personal friends. Much has changed in the last decade and perhaps it is worth revisiting the “look.” Perhaps not.)

3. It is important that we consider how our journal, Hebrew Higher Education can be reinvigorated or repurposed. Adina Ofek, who has resigned as editor, published a pessimistic “Editor’s Note” on p. 3 of the last volume that strikes me as realistic.

4. I also expressed a concern about how our organization can help advance Hebrew literature in translation into the standard curricula of comparative literature courses. (I refer here to Modern Hebrew Literature. The Hebrew Bible made the cut long ago.)

The flurry of emails in which colleagues shared opinions—some circulated generally and some directed to me individually—were quite conclusive. On the idea of changing NAPH to iNAPH, the response was a resounding, 100% thumbs down. Vox populi vox dei! On a new look for Hebrew Studies, there was silence. Against the wisdom of a Hebrew expression that silence should be interpreted as assent, I take it to mean something like “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it!” Neither of these responses is discomforting, but the lack of concern about HHE is.

In her email response, Nancy Berg (Washington University) pointed out that there are a number of ways to promote the inclusion of Hebrew Literature: grants, subventions and/or prizes for translations. From her list I select the following: providing resources such as sample syllabi for people not in the field; recruiting scholars to write articles of the type that would be useful for instructors on themes or writers or the like. I like what she wrote because it stimulated thinking about the third issue that I had raised.

Is promoting this impressive body of fine literature, much of which is available in translation, a worthwhile undertaking? An academic project? And, if so, can/should a repurposed (and, perhaps, renamed) HHE be used as a vehicle to help achieve this?

May I suggest a name-change for HHE, something along the lines of Hebrew Language and Literature in Higher Education?

This name is purposely ambiguous, because I would like to see the journal maintain its interest in language instruction and Hebrew pedagogy based on linguistic studies. NAPH has a number of members who have written instructional textbooks and grammars for both Classical and Modern Hebrew, and NAPH sessions on the topic have attracted large crossover audiences from the SBL at the November meeting.

Continued on next page...
Thinking about these matters, I thought to inquire into the state of Hebrew language instruction in the United States. Our colleague Shmuel Bolosky (University of Massachusetts) provided me with some data with which to start.

What I discovered is that there is much incomplete, raw data. What I failed to discover in the course of preliminary research during May-June was reliable analysis.

We do not have reliable, quantitative information about the number of students who start Modern Hebrew in American and Canadian colleges and universities from scratch as opposed to those who coast on basic (or not so basic) knowledge in such courses to fulfill mandatory language requirements while garnering an easy A. How many continue through a second year and on into Hebrew literature in Hebrew? (How many courses of study covering “first year level” are three-semester sequences?)

We do not know how many students studying Biblical Hebrew in universities and seminaries continue after a mandatory one or two semester sequence to achieve competency (however defined), even though they constitute the overwhelming majority of Hebrew students in the US. We do not know how much Modern Hebrew is taught using a “second language” approach rather than a “foreign language” approach. We do not know who teaches. We do not know how what we do in Hebrew differs from what is done in German or French or English or in, what many experts consider the most difficult of foreign languages to teach, Korean. We lack shared definitions of what behaviors characterize “competence” at any given level in any given skill. As a consequence, every program is successful and if Lake Woebegone College is typical, all of our students are a little above average.

NAPH members, chairs of foreign language departments, and the US Department of Education could provide a wish list of questions whose answers they would like to know. Are there any scholars in NAPH working in an institution with smart social science and/or education researchers who could design a project to ferret out such useful and important information? What I suggest is a 2-4 year research project that to be funded by a federal or private agency; that would have access to self-studies by all institutions of higher learning filed with accrediting agencies, that would generate its own surveys and interview material. It could be supported and encouraged by NAPH and its results published in our journals.

Ziony Zevit, American Jewish University: zzevit@ajula.edu

Editor’s Note:

We appreciate Ziony Zevit’s maiden presidential perspective on the state of affairs of NAPH. His assessment and suggestions are thoughtful and, for the most part, achievable. Group self-evaluation is healthy. Halevai it should concurrently enrich the old and establish new wellsprings of Hebrew learning, research, and teaching. Feedback is called for. To that end, the views of several e-mailers follow; in addition, three former presidents and vatikim of NAPH responded by invitation.

Zafrira Lidovsky Cohen

Most of my concerns lie with the future of HHE. My feeling is that it has real virtue on its own, that it should be continued, and that it should not be combined with any other periodical. Also, to make it au courant and effective it must become a e-journal with talk-back capacity and/or blogs in order to create what most Hebrew language instructors need most: an open forum for exchange of thoughts and ideas. This should possibly be considered with an upgrade of NAPH's website and making it a place professionals visit frequently for updates.

Zafrira Lidovsky Cohen, Yeshiva University: lidovsky@yu.edu
Vered Shemtov
  HHE will get a better exposure and will gain much from having also an online version. I can't think of any major respected American journals in the Humanities and Sciences that do not have some online version, some through project MUSE, or similar projects and some directly on their website.

  Vered Shemtov, Stanford University: vshemtov@stanford.edu

Marvin A. Sweeney
  I agree that we should not change the name of NAPH. ASOR and AOS have done just fine with international members, but without changing their names.

  As for HHE, it does need a shot in the arm. Teaching Hebrew literature in English translation is an element of Hebrew pedagogy, and should be considered as an element of the journal. Do we have a potential editor to take on such a task? As for making efforts to encourage the study of Hebrew literature as part of the larger university curriculum, an anthology published under NAPH auspices would be in order together with changes in HHE. Again, who would be a good editor for such a project? Someone with good connections with a trade publisher I would imagine.

  Marvin Sweeney, Claremont School of Theology: msweeney@cst.edu

Pamela Scalise
  NAPH has a good name and reputation. The monetary and intangible costs of changing the name of the Association may exceed the unknown value of a new name.

  A new logo could address Ziony’s first and second concerns. The logo could communicate the demographic makeup of the Association. It could also freshen the look of Hebrew Studies and Higher Hebrew Education.

  The methodology session of the fall conference (at the SBL annual meeting) and Higher Hebrew Education would benefit from a closer collaboration. Many papers that have been presented at the November meeting would have been appropriate for publication in HHE, but the authors chose to submit their work to journals with more predictable publication schedules. Other sessions have included demonstrations and discussions of classroom materials and techniques. This content is better suited for sharing on a website. I would like to be able to recruit papers on a particular topic for the fall conference that could be published within the year in HHE. Papers on the same topic from the spring conference could also be included. (One possible topic would be issues involved in teaching Hebrew as a third language to students for whom the language of instruction in the classroom and textbook is a second language.)

  I believe that there would be considerable interest in two regular “columns” in HHE. One column would communicate recent advances in the understanding of Hebrew grammar and linguistics while the other column would do the same for theories of second language acquisition. Writing these “columns” would be a true service to the cause of higher Hebrew education since they would not be the type of expert-to-expert writing that earns academic promotion.

  Pamela Scalise, Fuller Theological Seminary: pscalise@fuller.edu

Shmuel Bolozky
  On the matter of HHE, there is no doubt that the journal has been gaining in reputation with the
years, in spite of delays in publishing (Adina Ofek bore the brunt of the work; help from colleagues like Edna Coffin, Nancy Ezer and Moshe Pelli was welcome, but it was still a heavy load), and slow flow of incoming worthy articles. At the business meeting of the NAPH conference in NYC we discussed the situation at length. With more members today who are well versed with applied linguistics and who conduct actual experiments to test theories of second (and foreign) language acquisition and the efficacy of various teaching methodologies, some colleagues undertook to strengthen the pedagogy/methodology sections at NAPH conference(s), and to further improve the quality of HHE, possibly as an online publication.

Ziony’s call for research on the status of the teaching of Hebrew is appropriate and timely. The National Middle East Language Resource Center (NMELRC), in which I have served as Associate Director, conducted some general surveys in the past, mostly based on MLA figures, and in part by distributing questionnaires. Response to the latter has been insufficient (in my opinion, mostly due to the absence of funds for active follow up), and in any case never achieved the depth suggested by Ziony. Perhaps the NAPH should collaborate with the NMELRC on a more serious, updated research project, planned – as Ziony suggests – by experts with background in the social sciences. The real problems, I would predict, would again be insufficient response rate (unless active follow up is properly funded), and basic unwillingness on the part of many departments, Hebrew language coordinators and the teachers themselves to admit how little is done in most Hebrew programs in America (as well as in Israel and elsewhere) to seriously adopt proficiency-based type of teaching, as well as proficiency-based assessment tools. There has been some positive progress in that direction, but the “independent spirit” of the typical Hebrew instructor still regards standard assessment tools with suspicion. A solid piece of research on what is happening in the field will undoubtedly contribute to improvement – and standardization – of proficiency evaluation methods.

Shmuel Bolozky, University of Massachusetts Amherst: shmuel.bolozky@judnea.umass.edu

Frederick E. Greenspahn

Many of us have witnessed efforts at institutional rebranding in recent years. As much as these cause me dismay, I have absolutely no competence in assessing the impact of organizational names and journal design, which might benefit from the advice of marketing experts. However, I have seen both Coca-Cola and Toyota undermine their credibility by failing to honor their history and their image. That suggests that organizations do best by building on their strengths, which require recognizing what those strengths are.

One of the most salient features of NAPH is its diverse and well defined constituencies. In addition to Iggeret, we publish 2 journals and hold 2 annual conferences for very separate groups who rarely interact directly. Since our primary goal is to serve existing members and promote our field, we might consider turning that diversity into a resource. I believe that increased communication enriches us all: We grow when we define our field broadly; we attract more students when we appeal to a wider base than our own individual constituencies; and we become better teachers when we learn from those with different perspectives.

I raise this by way of suggesting the possibility of merging our two journals (Hebrew Studies and Hebrew Higher Education). The monumental efforts of its most recent editors have resulted in Hebrew Studies’ stunning expansion. That may make it feasible to consider publishing it more often. Combining it with Hebrew Higher Education in a way that acknowledges different “departments” (linguistics, Bible, modern literature, pedagogy, etc.) could take advantage of that accomplishment while alleviating some of the pressure experienced by the latter journal. To be sure, most of us would probably pick and choose which sections to read, but we already do that. Combining the two could enable the organization to be in
touch with its members more frequently while attuning us issues in other parts of our field, much as the journals published by other organizations, such as the Society of Biblical Literature, American Academy of Religion, American Oriental Society, and Association for Jewish Studies, do.

In order to encourage the incorporation of Hebrew literature in broader courses, the journal could publish bibliographies of translations of the works of various authors or periods or genres in much the way that it now lists the contents of recent journals. Other information, such as the surveys on the status and background of Hebrew instructors, their academic location, how they are supervised, how their courses are structured, and what textbooks they use, might fit better in Iggeret. It could also publish dialogues between specialists in parallel areas, such as linguists who deal with ancient and modern Hebrew or pedagogical techniques for teaching biblical and modern Hebrew.

Exposure to perspectives different from my own has often given me tools and insights with which to strengthen my own work, both intellectual and pedagogical. Consolidating our resources could be an effective way to provide our members with resources and information they might not otherwise encounter.

Frederick E. Greenspahn, Florida Atlantic University: grenspa@fau.edu

Gilead Morahg

Following the discussions at the 2010 NAPH conference, Adina Ofek agreed to continue to serve as HHE editor until a successor is found. Given the slow flow of articles into HHE, the journal will be published in an electronic version only with individual articles sent out to members by email in pdf format as they become ready for publication. Indexed HHE articles will also be available on the NAPH website. The interest in issues of teaching of Hebrew literature in translation was also discussed. Future NAPH conferences will invite sessions on this topic with the intent of advancing the teaching of Hebrew literature in translation in Jewish Studies courses as well as in world literature courses. Many thanks to Ziony for initiating the discussion on these and other matters.

Gilead Morahg, NAPH Executive Vice President, gmorahg@wisc.edu

Notes From Here & There

I. SBL Brew and Hebrew

The Society of Biblical Literature, founded in 1880, is recognized in the Academia as the primary scholarly address for the study of the Jewish and Christian scriptures. Certainly, its longevity is a telling sign of its mandate and success. That is to say, interpret the Holy Writ objectively, insightfully, critically, creatively, theologically, and respectfully. For better not for worse, controversy permeates the rooms and conferences of the SBL annual meetings (and its publications) as divergent positions and persuasions are Solomonically argued. And for the most part harmony in diversity prevails under the tent of Sinai and Calvary…

In the summer of 2010, however, a tearing occurred. Prof. Ronald S. Hendel (UC Berkeley) published an opinion piece, “Farewell to SBL: Faith and Reason in Biblical Studies” (Biblical Archaeological Review 36.4 [July-August 2010] pp. 28 and 74), where he critiqued the inability of SBL to separate effectively faith and reason from its current direction and affiliate organizations and thus falling into “dissension and hypocrisy.” SBL responded to this charge (and others, including, covert proselytizing activity and supersessionist scholarship) that to the best of its knowledge and ability, it stimulates the critical investigation of biblical literature and encourages critical biblical scholarship, inquiry and
discussion. Further, it welcomes confessional-based Affiliates that endorse humanities-based scholarship. SBL has referenced Hendel’s article and discussion on faith and reason on its web site. Go to www.sbl-site.org, and link to Society News.

The current state of affairs in NAPH is discussed in the Presidential Perspective and feedback. Revelation and Reason are not an issue. NAPH sessions at SBL focus on Biblical Hebrew linguistics and methodology. Thought sessions permeated by traditional exegesis benefit by encountering rationalist thinking and modernist categories of thought. When biblical exegesis and rabbinic eisegesis encounter Western modes of thought, holistic learning transpires. And isn’t that what it is all about? Nonetheless, in the vineyard of NAPH, a fissure of geographical, seasonal, thematic, and human proportions is detected. For the most part, Fall NAPH Annual Meetings relate to Scriptures cum Rabbinics, with American and European scholars presenting in English. Spring NAPH Language and Literature Conference is primarily conducted in Hebrew with many Israelis presenting and in attendance, Yesh va-Yesh: frustration of the non-Israeli among the Israelis. A “Hebrew” in the concoction. Fortunately, an administrative solution is in the making. Hopefully, at the end of the tribulation, may we raise our Hebrew chalice to NAPH triumphant –– Yesh.

II. Passing in Jerusalem

Two giants of the Hebrew Bible passed in the city of Jerusalem within weeks of each other. Rabbi Professor Moshe Greenberg (1928-2010) died on May 15, 2010 after a long illness, and Rabbi Professor Jacob Milgrom (1923-2010), died from a brain hemorrhage related to a fall on June 5, 2010. Longtime friends and ordained Conservative Rabbis at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Greenberg and Milgrom were among the first generation of Jewish scholars to teach biblical studies at secular universities in America --- Greenberg at the University of Pennsylvania (1954-70) and Milgrom at the University of California at Berkeley (1965-1993).

Both professors were master teachers, prolific scholars, and giving human beings. Greenberg has written widely on biblical law, prayer and religion and the role of the Bible in Jewish thought. A sampling is found in his Studies in the Bible and Jewish Thought (Jewish Publication Society, 1995). His noteworthy early efforts, namely, The Hab/piru (American Oriental Society, 1955, originally his doctoral dissertation), and his abridged English translation of volumes 1–7 of Yehezkel Kaufmann’s Toldot ha’Emuna ha-Yisre’lit (published as The Religion of Israel [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960]), showed his expertise to contextualize and critically interpret Israelite religion and mores in the setting of the ANE; and brilliantly sustained in his “holistic” commentary (total traditional text [peshat im-midrash] critically analyzed) on Exodus (Behrman House, 1969) and Ezekiel (Anchor Bible, 1983). Noteworthy was his pedagogical service to the public at large: co-editor (with Jonas Greenfield and Nachum Sarna) of the translation of the Ketuvim for the JPS Tanakh (1966-1982), and co-founder (with Shmuel Ahituv) of Mikra le-Yisrael scholarly commentaries on the Hebrew Bible, written in Hebrew for the Israeli public. In 1994, the State of Israel awarded him Pras Yisrael (the Israel Prize) in Bible. Milgrom’s forte was levitical purity laws, cultic practices, theology and terminology, so established by his extensive commentaries on Leviticus (three volumes, Anchor Bible, 1998-2000) and Numbers. (The JPS Torah Commentary: Numbers, 1996) and his two hundred plus articles on Jewish and Ancient Near Eastern temple practices, ritual, law, and literature. Before his death, Milgrom had recently completed a commentary on the final chapters of Ezekiel, as part of an effort to complete the work of his friend and neighbor, the late Professor Moshe Greenberg.

I was neither a student of Moshe Greenberg nor Jacob Milgrom but feel an affinity to their scholarship and kindness. The sheer pleasure of teaching Beginning Hebrew from Greenberg’s textbook Introduction to Hebrew (Prentice-Hall, 1965) in my Teaching Assistantship in the NEAL Department at UCLA under the supervision of Wolf Leslau and Jonas Greenfield. Utilizing in multiple occasions
(college class, camp, community) Milgrom’s essays on the philosophy of Kashrut and his writing on tsitis. Encountering at AAR-SBL annual meetings both scholars, and remembering personal gratitude from Jacob in a session of AAR (Atlanta, 1986) that discussed my first published book, Methodology in the Academic Teaching of Judaism (UPA, 1986), which includes an essay by Jo Milgrom, Jacob’s widow, on teaching the Genesis Creation story by visual art. Walking Hezekiah’s tunnel with Greenberg and Greenfield; breaking bread with the Milgroms at Camp Ramah in Ojai, CA or an invited Shabbat meal at their Berkeley earthly Garden of Eden, and so forth. The memories are lasting, and for this I am grateful and can say, anakim, ba’alei torah ve-chayei ha-ruach, hayu ba-aretz.

Yehi Zichram Barukh

III. The Gift

I received on the eve of Passover 5770 (2010) this e-note from Sybille Baroness Von Sell, widow of Pastor Martin Niemoeller, and convert to Judaism, who is Sarah.

Todah raba, dear Zev, for your gift that arrived yesterday - was awaited with much anticipation. So good to see you at St. Joe's.* Your gift from me will be sent off this coming week, hope you enjoy it. Sarah

(*The 40th Annual Scholars Conference on the Holocaust and the Churches, St Joseph’s University, Philadelphia, March 6-8, 2010)

I have published on M. Niemoeller's Exile in the Fatherland: Letters from Moabit Prison for Reference Guide to Holocaust Literature (2002) and wrote the interview with Sarah depicting her thoughts on her famous husband published in Shofar 22.2 (Winter, 2004) and reprinted in Z. Garber and B. Zuckerman, Double Takes (UPA, 2004). Also, I have read Sarah's English autobiography, which at my encouragement is being considered for publication by Purdue University Press.

The Maven (Garber Festschrift) volume is my gift. Martin Niemoeller's smoking pipe is hers (“O’ Zev, you do smoke, don’t you?”)

Strange how incidents are. Sarah as the infant Sybelle (Prussian aristocratic stock, born on April 10, 1923 in Potsdam, the cradle of Prussian militarism) was bounced on the knees of Adolph Hitler, yemach shemo. Her youth minister becomes her husband after the war, and her life as a fugitive of the Nazis is a real life plot of Inglorious Bastards. And this traditional observant Jew will share with awe the smoking instrument of the Pastor Martin Niemoeller, the quintessential leader of the German anti-Nazi Bekennende Kirche (“Confessing Church”), who lived and survived seven years of Nazi camp solitary confinement as Hitler's personal prisoner. Was wuerde Jesus sagen?

IV. Biannual Passage

It feels like yesterday that Professor Moshe Pelli was installed as President of NAPH. A hearty todah rabba for his wisdom and direction. A maskil in the finest degree. We extend a hearty baukh ha-ba’ to Professor Zony Zevit, to serve and lead. His Presidential Perspective suggests leadership not as usual. Refreshing.

Zev Garber, Los Angeles Valley College, zevgarber@juno.com
Meetings and Conferences
NAPH Annual Meeting in Conjunction with AAR/SBL

Minutes of the 2010 Annual Meeting of NAPH Officers
Atlanta
November 21, 2010


Zevy Zevit, NAPH President, opened the meeting, welcomed participants, and noted the association’s ongoing successes in its publications, conferences and other activities.

Gilead Morahg, NAPH Executive Vice President, presented the following report:

The Association is continuing to do well. Following the slight decline in individual membership last year, we conducted a new membership drive directed at colleagues who are active in the field but have not joined NAPH. This resulted in an increase of membership from 406 members in 2009 to 455 (+21%) members in 2010. Of these 101 (22%) are international members. The number of NAPH Institutional Members, has grown to 19. The annual institutional membership fee is $500. Proceeds from this fee are intended to support the NAPH summer conference and to provide travel grants to graduate students who are presenting papers at the conference.

Income from membership dues and Hebrew Studies subscriptions keeps NAPH operating in the black. Hebrew Studies is also supported by a grant from the Littauer Foundation. This year we shifted to electronic dues notification and collection. This is an experiment intended to cut costs and increase efficiency. So far, there has been no decrease in the amount of 2011 dues paid compared to this time last year.

Iggeret will come out in December, as scheduled. It, too, will be distributed to members electronically, in addition to being posted on the NAPH website. We continue to be grateful for Zev Garber’s diligent work on the newsletter and on the program for the NAPH sessions at the SBL meeting. Volume 51 of Hebrew Studies has come back from the printer and is being sent to members and subscribers. It is another wide-ranging, well balanced, high quality volume and a true tribute to the initiative and effectiveness of its editor, Marvin Sweeney, and the fine editorial board he has put together. Marv will present his report soon. A new editor is being sought for Hebrew Higher Education (HHE). Adina Ofek has agreed to stay on as editor until a replacement is found. HHE will be published as an electronic journal from now on. The deadline for submitting articles for the new volume is February 30th, 2011.

Jared Henson, who served as our office manager for the past several years, has been appointed Associate Director of NAPH. He will continue carrying out his duties from his new location in North Carolina. He will be assisted by Lance Hawley at the Madison Office.

Esther Raizen, the NAPH Conference Coordinator, once again did an outstanding job in putting together the program for the 2010 summer conference, which was held at Stern College for Women of Yeshiva University, New York, on July 6-8. She was assisted by the chairs of the conference professional subcommittees, Shmuel Bolozky, Hannah Naveh and Renana Schneller and their respective committee members. Nancy Berg recruited and coordinated the session chairs. The conference was chaired by Zafrira Lidovsky Cohen, who proved to be a superb organizer and a most gracious host. Stern College provided excellent facilities and generous support for the conference. There
were 219 participants in the conference, which made it the largest and richest of the 28 conferences we have held. The schedule for future summer conferences is: 2011, June 28-30 CollegePark, Maryland, hosted by the University of Maryland, chaired by Eric Zakim; 2012: Los Angeles, hosted by UCLA, chaired by Lev Hakak.

**Marvin Sweeney, Hebrew Studies** editor, described the contents of the 2010 volume and expressed his satisfaction with it. It is a large issue with a fine balance of articles on Hebrew language and literature from the biblical and modern periods. Marvin paid homage to the outstanding work of the journal’s Associate Editor, Smadar Shiffman, its book review editors, Pamela Barmash and Shachar Pinsker and its managing editor Rick Painter. He reported that work on Volume 52 is proceeding apace and six new articles have already been accepted for publication.

**Zev Garber** described the process of editing the Iggeret newsletter and expressed his satisfaction with the columns contributed by various members, including the new feature of “Views from the Field.” He also reported that the number of NAPH sessions at the SBL conference is larger than usual and that, for the first time, we have had to conduct parallel sessions.

**David Baker**, Eta Beta Rho Coordinator, reported that no new EBR chapters were established in 2010. It was decided to post a call for establishing new chapters on NAPHNET.

The NAPH Nominating Committee submitted its slate of nominees for the new NAPH Advisory Council. Gilead Morah moved that the slate be accepted by the officers. Zev Garber seconded. The motion passed. The slate of the 2010-2012 NAPH Advisory Council is posted below.

**NAPH Advisory Council 2010-2012:**

**Pre-Modern Division**
Gary Arbino, Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary  
Bill Arnold, Asbury Seminary  
Helene Dallaire, Denver Theological Seminary  
Carl Ehle, Jr., Berkshire Institute of Christian Studies  
Eugene Fisher, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops  
Michael Fox, University of Wisconsin-Madison  
Edward Goldman, Hebrew Union College  
Frederick Greenspahn, Florida Atlantic University  
Harris Lenowitz, University of Utah  
Cynthia Miller-Naudé, University of the Free State, SA  
Pamela Scalise, Fuller Theological Seminary  
Bruce Zuckerman, University of Southern California

**Modern Division**
Shmuel Bolozky, University of Massachusetts  
Rivka Dori, HUC-JIR (Los Angeles) and University of Southern California  
Nancy Ezer, UCLA  
Chana Kronfeld, University of California, Berkeley  
Zafrira Lidovsky Cohen, Yeshiva University/Stern College  
Alan Mintz, Jewish Theological Seminary  
Hannah Naveh, Tel Aviv University  
Esther Raizen, University of Texas at Austin  
Renana Schneller, University of Minnesota  
Yigal Schwartz, Ben-Gurion University  
Vered Shemtov, Stanford University  
Eric Zakim, University of Maryland
Nominating Committee
Shmuel Bolozky
Frederick Greenspahn
Gilead Morahg
Moshe Pelli
Ziony Zevit

Minutes prepared by
Gilead Morahg
NAPH Executive Vice President

NAPH 2010 Annual Meeting

The NAPH 2010 Annual Meeting was held in conjunction with the annual meeting of SBL in Atlanta, GA. Sessions of the 2010 NAPH Meeting are below …

Atlanta, GA--- November 21-22, 2010
Sunday, November 21

NAPH 21-101

National Association of Professors of Hebrew
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM
11/21/2010
Room TBD
Annual Breakfast and Business Meeting

Gilead Morahg, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Presiding (120 min)

NAPH 21-133

National Association of Professors of Hebrew
9:00 AM to 11:30 AM
11/21/2010
Room TBD
Theme: Exodus, Then and Now

Zev Garber, Los Angeles Valley College, Presiding (5 min)

Hajime Murai, Tokyo Institute of Technology
The Parallel Concentric Structures within Exodus (25 min)

Deborah Gordon Friedrich, Independent Scholar
The Song at the Sea in Comparative Cultural Perspective (25 min)

Edward Goldman, Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion

The Exodus of the Rabbis (25 min)

Zev Garber, Los Angeles Valley College

Reading Exodus by Way of the Passover Haggadah (25 min)

Discussion (20 min)

NAPH 21-134

National Association of Professors of Hebrew

9:00 AM to 11:30 AM

11/21/2010

Room TBD

Theme: Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew I

Ziony Zevit, Presiding (10 min)

Elitzur Bar-Asher Siegal, Hebrew University of Jerusalem

The History of Reciprocal Constructions in Hebrew (25 min)

Martin Ehrensvärd, University of Aarhus

Discerning Diachronic Change in the Biblical Hebrew Verbal System (25 min)

Roger Good, University of California-Los Angeles

Linguistic Archaeology: What the Translation of Chronicles Tells Us about Hebrew Verbs in the Second Century BCE (25 min)

Tania Notarius, Hebrew University of Jerusalem

The Archaic Type of the System of Verbal Tenses in "Archaic" Biblical Poetry (25 min)

Discussion (30 min)

NAPH 21-225

National Association of Professors of Hebrew/Applied Linguistics for Biblical Languages

1:00 PM to 3:30 PM

11/21/2010

Room TBD

Theme: New Biblical Hebrew Grammars

Pamela Scalise, Fuller Theological Seminary, Presiding (5 min)
Brian L. Webster, Dallas Theological Seminary
*The Cambridge Introduction to Biblical Hebrew* (20 min)

H. Daniel Zacharias, Acadia Divinity College
*NAPH: Hebrew Grammars* (20 min)

Jo Ann Hackett, University of Texas at Austin
*Celebrating "A Basic Introduction to Biblical Hebrew"* (20 min)

Discussion (10 min)

Martien Halvorson-Taylor, University of Virginia
*NAPH: Hebrew Grammars (Hackett, A Basic Introduction to Biblical Hebrew)* (20 min)

Vivian L. Johnson, United Theological Seminary
*NAPH: Hebrew Grammars Panel* (20 min)

Theodore Hiebert, McCormick Theological Seminary
*NAPH: Hebrew Grammars* (20 min)

Discussion (10 min)

---

**NAPH 21-332**

*National Association of Professors of Hebrew*

4:00 PM to 6:30PM
11/21/2010
Room TBD

Theme: Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew II

John Huehnergard, University of Texas at Austin, Presiding (5 min)

Robert Rezetko, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen
*Reflections on the Linguistic Dating of Biblical Hebrew Texts* (25 min)

David Emanuel, Nyack College
*The Relative Sequencing of Psalms 134-136* (25 min)

Yigal Bloch, Hebrew University of Jerusalem
*The 3 m. pl. suffix -mw and Its Implications for Dating Biblical Hebrew Poetry* (25 min)

Harold R. (Chaim) Cohen, Ben Gurion University
*Diachrony in BH Lexicography and Its Ramifications for Textual Analysis* (25 min)

Discussion (30 min)
Monday, November 22

NAPH 22-130

National Association of Professors of Hebrew
9:00AM to 11:30AM
11/22/2010
Room TBD
Theme: The Future of Biblical Studies

David Baker, Ashland Theological Seminary, Presiding (10 min)

Joel S. Baden, Yale University
Back to the Sources: The Revitalization of the Documentary Hypothesis (25 min)

William A. Tooman, University of St. Andrews
Allusion as Oracle: Textual Authority and Scripturalization in Ezekiel 38-39 (25 min)

Lauren A. S. Monroe, Cornell University
Reconsidering the Ideology of Centralization in the Deuteronomistic Account of Josiah’s Reform (25 min)

Serge Frolov, Southern Methodist University
Meaning out of Chaos: Biblical Interpretation as a Dissipative System (25 min)

Peter Machinist, Harvard University
Response to The Future of Biblical Studies (25 min)

NAPH 22-327

National Association of Professors of Hebrew
4:00 PM to 6:30 PM
11/22/2010
Room TBD
Theme: Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew III

Cynthia Miller-Naudé, University of the Free State, SA, Presiding (10 min)

Na'ama Pat-El, University of Texas at Austin
Syntactic Aramaisms as a tool for internal Biblical Chronology (25 min)

Ian Young, University of Sydney
Text Critical Observations on the (Im)Possibility of Linguistic Dating of Hebrew Biblical Texts (25 min)
Notes on Diachrony in Assyrian Akkadian (25 min)

The “Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts” – Comments on Methodological Guidelines and Philological Procedures (25 min)

Discussion (30 min)

2011 NAPH Annual Meeting

The 2011 Annual Meeting of NAPH will be held in San Francisco, CA during the annual meeting of AAR-SBL, November 18-22, 2011. Members in good standing are invited to submit titles and abstracts of papers to be read at the meeting. Papers must be in the area of, or have a bearing on, Biblica, Hebraica, or Hebrew teaching methodology. The length of the paper should be 20-25 minutes. If you propose to read a paper, send the title and a summary of 100-150 words after January 1 but no later than March 1, 2011, to: Professor Zev Garber, Program in Jewish Studies, Los Angeles Valley College, 5800 Fulton, Ave., Valley Glenn, CA 91401-4096. Phone, (818) 947-2384; Fax, (818) 947-2620; e-mail: zeygarber@juno.com.

Hebrew Language, Literature and Culture Conference

2011 Summer Conference on Hebrew Language and Culture

The 2011 NAPH International Conference on Hebrew Language, Literature and Culture will be hosted by the University of Maryland, College Park. It will be chaired by Eric Zakim. A Call for Papers will be sent to all NAPH members and posted on the NAPH web-site.

REPORT OF THE 2010 INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HEBREW LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, AND CULTURE

Stern College for Women, Yeshiva University, July 6-8, 2010

NAPH’s 28th International Conference on Hebrew Language, Literature, and Culture was held at Stern College for Women of Yeshiva University on July 6-8, 2010. Planned and chaired by Dr. Zafirra Lidovsky Cohen, the conference provided three full days of sessions, with plenty of opportunities to explore bustling Manhattan and enjoy the city of New York, which extended to NAPH participants a very hot welcome. The conference was organized in twelve sessions, with some hundred and forty talks on different topics in pedagogy, language, linguistics, biblical studies, rabbinics, medieval and modern culture, film, drama, and literature. It drew close to 220 participants, and was probably the largest conference held by NAPH to date. The first day of the conference ended with a festive dinner at the
Yeshiva University Museum, during which participants were greeted by Karen Bacon, The Dr. Monique C. Katz Dean, Stern College for Women; Asaf Shariv, Consul General of Israel in New York; Zafirra Lidovsky-Cohen, Hebrew Department Coordinator, Stern College for Women and Conference Chair; and NAPH’s Executive Vice President Gilead Morahg. They were treated to poetry reading by Stern College Professor Penninah Schram, and a presentation by Jacob Wisse, Director of the Yeshiva University Museum. Wisse was introduced by Steven Fine of Yeshiva University’s Center of Israel Study, and spoke about Hebrew Manuscripts and the Art of Liberation. Following the presentation, participants enjoyed an exciting private tour of the museum galleries, featuring Highlights from the Braginsky Collection of Hebrew Manuscripts and Printed Books.

The next two days were packed with lectures, organized in three to five parallel sessions, a format which created some anguish about choices that had to be made but was necessitated by the large number of presenters, especially in the field of modern Hebrew literature. A business meeting held on Wednesday morning focused on the mission and format of our journals Hebrew Studies and Hebrew Higher Education, and on ways in which we can strengthen the pedagogy component of the conference in the fields of language, linguistics, and literature. Wednesday’s plenary session was chaired by Ephraim Kanarfogel of Yeshiva University, and featured Richard Steiner of Yeshiva University who spoke about Linguistic Ambiguity in the Bible from the Viewpoint of the Sages and the Medieval Exegetes. The conference closed with a panel on Center and Periphery in Modern Hebrew Literature, with Gilead Morahg (University of Wisconsin-Madison) as chair; Shimon Adaf (Ben Gurion University of the Negev); Nili Gold (University of Pennsylvania); Alan Mintz (Jewish Theological Seminary of America); and Yigal Schwartz (Ben Gurion University of the Negev).

Congratulations, Zafi, for a flawless and exciting conference, and many thanks for your hospitality and resourcefulness! Kudos to your staff.

The conference committee for 2010 included Ruth Adler-Ben Yehuda (Brown University), Emanuel Allon (Beit Berl College), Nancy Berg (Washington University at St. Louis), Shmuel Bolozky (University of Massachusetts at Amherst), Nancy Ezer (University of California, Los Angeles), Benjamin Hary (Emory University), Gilead Morahg (University of Wisconsin-Madison), Hannah Naveh (Tel Aviv University), Adina Ofek (State University of New York, Binghamton), Miriam Petruck (University of California, Berkeley), Esther Raizen (University of Texas at Austin), Vardit Ringvald (Brendeis University), Renana Schneller (University of Minnesota, Minneapolis), Vered Shemtov (Stanford University), and Eric Zakim (University of Maryland). Nineteen institutional memberships allowed NAPH to support graduate student travel to the conference, and generous support from the Jacob Kabakoff Memorial Grant allowed us to fund the participation of newly-appointed faculty.

The 2011 NAPH Conference will take place at the University of Maryland on June 28-30, hosted by Eric Zakim.

Esther Raizen, The University of Texas at Austin, raizen@mail.utexas.edu, Conference Organizer

News From Our Members

Recent Publications

Shaffer’s Amadeus (Or, Saul and David in Eighteenth-Century Vienna).” *Comparative Drama*, 44:1 (Spring 2010), 45-62.


David Petersen (Nashville: Abingdon, 2010), 529-539; "The Yale Bible Study: Second Isaiah," no pages, eight 15-30 minute online video conversations with Robert R. Wilson of Yale University supplemented with a series notebook containing an introduction, interpretation essays, and supplemental materials (February 2010), Yale Bible Study Homepage, online: http://www.yale.edu/yalebiblestudy/; Video Resources by Cook and Wilson: http://www.yale.edu/yalebiblestudy/videos/isaiah_index.shtml; Print Materials by Cook and Wilson: http://www.yale.edu/yalebiblestudy/print/isaiah_index.shtml. To see the videos on Yale University's YouTube Channel, go to http://www.youtube.com/user/YaleUniversity#p/u/7/QcsJL7SY4gQ.


Rahel Halabe, independent scholar: Hinne - Biblical Hebrew the Practical Way, Volume 1 (self published, 2010). A textbook for the introduction of Biblical Hebrew. Volume I presents the basic grammatical subjects not conditioned by the verb, as well as the prefix and suffix forms of the qal stem in different root groups. Volume II (will appear by end of 2010) presents the other qal forms, and proceeds to introduce the remaining verb stems.


Rena Lee Kofman, Queens College, CUNY: Pe’hayam Ana Yelek ("And the Sea Where Can It Go?") (Jerusalem: Carmel Publishing House, 2010). Written under her pen name, Rena Lee, this comprehensive volume reflects 50 years of Lee’s poetry.

Yair Mazor, University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee: The Cryptic Bible: The Bible Surrenders its Aesthetic Secrets (Madison: Maven Press, 2010)


Current Research in Progress

Yair Mazor, University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee, Like a Broken Twig: The Poetry of Dalia Ravikowitch is forthcoming from Maven Press.

Moshe Pelli, University of Central Florida, continues his research on Hebrew Haskalah periodicals Bikurut Ha’itim, Hachadashim, Bikurei Hashanah, Sefer Bikurei Ha’ittim, Bikurim in his series of monographs and annotated indices. His research on the Haskalah library includes the early periodicals of the Hebrew Haskalah – inventory, availability, and problems in indexing.

Recent Promotions or Change in Position

Wido van Peursen, Leiden University, has been appointed as Associate Professor of Old Testament at the Leiden Institute for Religious Studies (from 1 July, 2010).

Curriculum Innovations and Awards

Yael Feldman, New York University, will be a Visiting Scholar at Wolfson College, Cambridge UK in Fall 2010; a Lady Davis Fellow at the Hebrew University in Winter 2010-11; and a Research Fellow at Yad Vashem in Spring 2011.

Zev Garber, Los Angeles Valley College, was honored at a plenary three hour session at the Western regional meetings of AAR, SBL, and WJSA held at Arizona State University in Tempe, March 14, 2010. The Symposium on his work has recently come out in Hebrew Studies LI (2010) 351-383.

Shiri Goren, Yale University, has been awarded The A. Whitney Griswold Faculty Research Grant (2010-2012) in support of her research on David Fogel. In addition, she currently develops two new courses to be offered in Spring 2011: a seminar on Israeli Novels and an advanced Hebrew class “Conversational Hebrew: Israeli Media.”

Lily Kahn, UCL (University College London), has been awarded a 3-year British Academy Postdoctoral Fellowship in order to conduct a research project entitled ‘The Grammar of the Hasidic Hebrew Tale 1864–1914’.

Wido van Peursen, Leiden University, has been awarded an Investment grant from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) for the project Bridging Data and Tradition. The Hebrew Bible as a Linguistic Corpus and as a Literary Composition (application together with Prof. E. Talstra); matching funds were provided by the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and Leiden University. This concerns a four-year research project on the computational analysis of the Hebrew Bible. He has also been awarded a grant from the Leids Universiteits Fonds (LUF) for the pilot project ‘Digital Text Comparison between Computation and Philology’, which concerned a computational comparative analysis of Judges 4 and 5 in Hebrew, Aramaic and Syriac.
Eta Beta Rho news: We welcome to the slowly growing roster of chapters of the National Hebrew Honor Society a chapter at Colorado Christian College with faculty sponsor Dr. Kyle R. Greenwood. We urge other institutions with an active Hebrew program to consider forming a chapter as a way to encourage students to excel in their studies. Information on chapter formation is available at http://vanhise.lss.wisc.edu/naph.

David W. Baker, Ashland Theological Seminary: dbaker@ashland.edu

ETA BETA RHO

National Scholastic Honor Society for Students of Hebrew Language and Culture

Chapters

(* = inactive or non-responsive)

1. Alpha  *Hunter College
2. Beta  *New York University
3. Gamma  *Butler University
4. Delta/Dalet  University of Maryland, Nili Levy (nlevy@umd.edu)
5. Epsilon  *Temple University
6. Zeta  *Rutgers University
7. Eta  Wheaton College, Illinois, Michael Graves (michael.w.graves@wheaton.edu)
8. Theta  *Immanuel School of Religion, Milligan College
9. Iota  *Lehman College, Zelda Newman, (ZELDA.NEWMAN@lehman.cuny.edu)
10. Kappa  *Los Angeles Valley College
11. Tav  *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Bruce Rosenstock, (brsnstck@uiuc.edu)
12. Mu  *Western Conservative Baptist Seminary
13. Nu  *University of Wisconsin
14. Heh  *Cincinnati Christian Seminary
15. Vav  *Yeshiva University
16. Zayin  *Florida Christian College
17. Heth  *Sterns College
18. Chi  Indiana University, Steven Katz (katzs@indiana.edu)
19. Tet  *Columbia Bible College and Biblical Seminary
20. Yod  Bethel Theological Seminary, Paul Ferris (paul-ferris@bethel.edu)
21. Kaph  Ashland Theological Seminary, David Baker (dbaker@ashland.edu)
22. Lamed  University of Utah, Harris Lenowitz (kathar7@comcast.net)
23. Mem  *Brigham Young University
24. Nun  Bluefield College, Timothy Crawford (TCrawford@bluefield.edu)
25. Samekh  *Cumberland College
26. ‘Ayin  University of Arizona, J. Edward Wright (edwright@email.arizona.edu)
27. Peh  Brandeis University, Vardit Ringvald
28. Tsadeh  Washington University, St Louis, Martin Jacobs (mjacobs@wustl.edu)
29. Qoph  University of Minnesota- Twin Cities, Bernard Levinson (levinson@tc.umn.edu)
30. Resh  Asbury Seminary, Bill Arnold (Bill_Arnold@asburyseminary.edu)
Notes From the Field

The Emergence of Modern Hebrew Creativity in Babylon from 1735-1950

I am working on preparing for publishing a new edition of a book that was authored by a Babylonian Rabbi, Sason Mordekhai Moshe (1747-1830), in 1796. The book, *Sefer Kol Sason*, was published for the first time in Livorno in 1859, and later on several times. This is a book of moral reproof that each one of its forty three chapters focuses on another subject, such as modesty, patience, love, hatred, slander, peace and dispute, generosity and greed, arrogance, anger, and more.

Each chapter includes one parable or more that illustrate the ideas expressed in the chapter; and a poem or poems that are poetic expressions of the parables. Therefore each chapter has moralistic reproof in prose, one parable or more and one poem or more.

In my introduction, I write about the author, the Jewish community in Babylon at his time, Jewish sages and community leaders in Babylon at his time, the various books this author wrote, his manuscripts, the various themes in this book, the poetics of the author, the structure of the chapters, the style of the author, his parables, and I closely read some of the poems in the book. At the end of the original book there is a collection of poems of the author, unlike in my book they appear in the original edition in long, prose lines, without titles and unvocalized.

Here are some of the changes I made in comparison with the original edition: the poems in the original edition are not vocalized, in my edition they are vocalized; I added hundreds of sources which the author quotes; I added a summary for each chapter; my edition includes a list of abbreviations that are used in the book; the collection of poems at the end of the book appears with poetic graphic, it is vocalized and I added clarifying titles to the poems.

This project is part of my project taking place in a series of books that I published in this area since 2003. In this project, I researched the existence of Modern Hebrew creativity from 1735-1950 in Babylon, the country that was the spiritual-religious center for Judaism for more than a thousand years. The questions that I asked were: Did the Jews of Iraq write secular Hebrew literature in modern times? If the answer is in the affirmative, what was that literature? How should it be evaluated? Why wasn’t it part of the history of Modern Hebrew literature?

My first book in this area was *Nitsaneh ha-Yetsira ha-Ivrit ha-Hadasha be-Bavel* (The Babylonian Jewry Heritage Center, Research Institute of Babylonian Jewry, 2003, 380 pp). In this introductory book I presented secular poetry, stories, articles, journalistic articles, epistles, literary research, periodicals, a play, folktales and textbooks all in Hebrew, published by Babylonian Jews in the years 1735-1950.
The second book in my current project was *Iggerot ha-Rav Shelomo Bekhor Hutsin* (Hakibbutz Hmeuchad, Sifriyyat Helal Ben Hayyim, 2005, 281 pp). In this book I collected the essays of Rabbi Shelomo Bekhor Hutsin published in 1843-1892 in periodicals such as *ha-Maggid, ha-Levanon, ha-Tsefira, he-Havatselet*. In my introduction (pp. 12-104) I described the cultural-spiritual environment in which these essays were written, the various intellectual activities of the author, his printing house, the way he related to Jews in Europe and to the ideas of the Enlightenment, his style, his poems, and more. This book can serve scholars for various pursuits – for its language, historical facts and more.

My third book in this project is *Hasid Mul Hotaim: Sefer ha-Tokhahot shel Ezra ha-Bavli* (Hakibbutz Hmeuchad, Sifriyyat Helal Ben Hayyim, 2008, 215 pp). This is a book of moral reproof published in 1735 by Ezra ha-Bavli from Baghdad. His poetic abilities make him a giant poet. In my introduction (pp. 9-105) I wrote about the author and the Jews of his time in Babylon, the structure of his poetic reproofs, his poetic devices, his style, etc. My edition includes corrections of printing errors, vocalizing the poetic texts, adding sources in footnotes and more.

The fourth book was *The Emergence of Modern Hebrew Creativity in Babylon, 1735-1950* (Purdue University Press/West Lafayette, Indiana, 2009, 258 pp.). It is a version of my introductory book above mentioned, keeping in mind the Western reader, deleting, modifying and adding texts for this purpose. For example, I added a chapter about the history of Babylonian Jews and a chapter of translations of folktales.

While I am not claiming that the poets presented here produced Hebrew poetry of higher aesthetic accomplishment than that of their contemporaries in Europe, I am suggesting that they should be recognized and made part of the history of Hebrew literature of their time. The exploration of Hebrew creativity in various countries has to continue, and especially in the Near Eastern countries, where there has been considerable Hebrew culture that has been neglected. Until this is done, the mapping of Hebrew literature in modern times will be lacking.

Lev Hakak, UCLA, hakak@humnet.ucla.edu

**Uniting Contradictory Layers is the Name of Literary Analysis**

Thirty five years is a long period of time. Indeed, a very long period of time. I am still astounded that my academic career (first in Israeli universities and later in North American universities) was launched thirty five years ago. Such a long period of time enables one to conduct variegated scholarly research and publish prolifically in diverse fields of study. During those thirty five years, I have yielded and published 20 books and over 220 articles in the following fields of study: modern/contemporary Hebrew/Israeli poetry and prose fiction; Hebrew Enlightenment/Haskalah literature in Russia towards the culmination of the 18th century and at the commencement of the 19th century; biblical literature (approaching the biblical text from an aesthetic/structuralist perspective); comparative literature; theory of literature; Scandinavian literature (notably the influence of August Strindberg and Knut Hamsun on Agnon); Hebrew children's literature; and Hebrew Holocaust poetry. Nevertheless, during the last decade or so, I primarily focused on biblical literature and modern/contemporary Hebrew/Israeli poetry.

During the last two years, I published the books *Who Wrought the Bible? Unveiling the Bible’s Aesthetic Secrets* (Wisconsin University Press) and *Love in the Back Seat: Contemporary Hebrew Poetry* (Zmora Bitan Press). I also published the books *Poetic Acrobat: The Poetry of Ronny Someck* (in both English and Hebrew versions by Zmora-Bitan Press and Goblin Fern Press) and *Like a Whistle in the Dark: The Lyrical Novel by Amos Oz* (Keter Press). However, despite the diversity in my fields of scholarship, they actually share a leading common denominator. The latter enables me to maintain a
required scholarly focus and lucidity while “leaping” through ramified fields of study which are evidently distanced from each other.

Paradoxically, on the one hand, I treat the “epidermal” or surface layer of the text as a metaphorical camouflage that conceals the latent, “cryptic” texture of the text. It is there that its most substantial structure and meaning are “inlaid.” On the other hand, I treat the upper “embroidery” of the text as a hidden cluster of instructions. Once unveiled and deciphered, it will lead to the text's most inconspicuous layers, structures and meanings. Indeed, the comprehensive aesthetic structure and meaning of the text does consist of a reciprocal dialogue and a complementary interaction between the surface strata of the literary text and the dormant strata of the literary text.

Yet more than once, it appears that there is an unbridgeable gulf between the surface layer and the latent layer of the literary text. Indeed, that seemingly yawning gap is nothing but a deftly executed aesthetic device. Once the nature of the latter is unearthed and elucidated, then the literary critic will possess the ability to realize that the seeming discrepancy between the surface and the latent layers is actually a shrewdly sculptured aesthetic technique: one that glues and welds the two seemingly contradictory trends which “populate” the surface and the latent strata of the literary text under consideration. See, for instance, Nathan Zach's poem “Against Separation” (which I analyze in my book, *Israeli Poetry of the Holocaust* [Fairleigh Dickinson University Press] under the title "My Tailor, My Tailor, Why Had They Forsaken You? The Poem ‘Against Separation’ by Nathan Zach").

KINDLY NOTE: the following brief discussion is far from being a comprehensive interpretation. Rather, it is a sample of this process and of the poem itself. Despite the poem's peculiar character, its Holocaust characteristics are very evident indeed:

“My tailor is against separation….”

................................................

“Once he parted from his wife whom
He has never seen since (Auschwitz). He parted
From his three sisters whom as well
He has not seen since (Buchenwald).”

Nevertheless, the Holocaust surface layer of the poem unexpectedly withdraws while shifting to the poem's latent layer, the one that focuses on the tailor's father (as well as on the narrator’s father, which will be unearthed later in the poem):

“He parted from his mother “his father died
In good old age). Now he is against Separation.”

The enigmatic destiny of the tailor’s mother "blazes the trail" to the surprising death of his father: unlike all those who perished in the Holocaust, his father enjoyed long life. That and more. His father, apparently, enjoyed more than long life:

"In Berlin he [the tailor's father] was
My father's acquaintance and friend. They had a good time...."

This unexpected transition from the narrator's tailor's somber losses in the Holocaust to the tailor's father's long, good life transmits the poem from its Holocaust surface layer to the latent layer. There, the narrator unfolds his animosity towards the father figures who enjoyed “the pampered life,” one of leisure and idle comfort, while others were butchered by beasts of prey. Hence, the narrator amalgamates the two fathers -- the tailor’s and his own father. At the same time, in this way, he is enhancing his recoil from the father figure who enjoyed a long and good life, while everybody else was sentenced to his/her abysmal doom. And by this device, the poem opens an aperture for the reader through which the transition from the surface layer to the latent layer is unveiled. That is to say, it traverses from the surface layer of a Holocaust poem to a latent layer of bitterness and resentment felt by the narrator towards a father figure (both the tailor’s and the narrator’s).

The reference to the tailor's three sisters, from whom he sadly parted as well, alludes to Chekhov's acclaimed play, Three Sisters. Ironically, however, those three sisters desired to separate, but encounter scalding failure in doing so, while the tailor's three sisters were apparently forced to separate. Enlisting an allusion to Chekhov in this poem seems to bestow upon it an atmosphere of tenebrous desolation. It also serves to weld the poem's two parts, the surface one and the latent one: undesirable separation (due to the murderous Holocaust) in the poem's upper part and desirable separation in the poem's latent part (the fathers gladly separate themselves from the horrendous end of those who met their murky, bleak fate in the Holocaust).

The fact that the poem's narrator lets his tailor be the leading character (notably a tailor is in a nonintellectual profession) has a specific purpose. It enables the narrator to maintain a distance from the poem's dreary occurrences (the poem's surface layer) as well as from his blatant enmity towards the fathers (the poem's latent layer). That distance is an adroitly executed rhetorical device which confers a touch of irony upon the text. Correspondingly, it avoids an undesirable "dose" of over-emotionality, notably in a poem that introduces themes which are "saturated" with piercing emotionality. Hence, the seemingly two conflicting layers of the poem - the surface one and the latent one – are discovered to be dexterously forged together while prudently complementing each other.

Yair Mazor, University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee: ymazor@csd.uwm.edu


In October 2010, I began a 3-year British Academy-funded postdoctoral research project on the grammar of the Hasidic Hebrew tales produced in Eastern Europe between 1864 and 1914. This Hasidic idiom is noteworthy because it is one of the only sources of traditional, rabbinic-based, narrative Hebrew from early modern Eastern Europe, in contrast to the ideologically non-traditional and consciously biblicising narrative prose of the contemporaneous Maskilim. The bulk of this Hasidic literature most likely derives from tales transmitted orally in Yiddish. The first two published collections of Hasidic Hebrew tales were Shivḥe haBesht (In Praise of the Ba’al Shem Tov) (1814) and Sippure ma’asiyot (The Tales of Naḥman of Braslav) (1815). These two collections served as the literary model for subsequent works in the genre. Although no further Hasidic Hebrew tales were published between 1815 and 1864, the genre became extremely popular by the late 19th century and grew into a substantial corpus of hundreds of texts. It continued to proliferate into the 20th century; however, with the First World War its centers of production shifted from Eastern Europe to Palestine and North America, and its language became increasingly integrated with revernacularised Israeli Hebrew.

This research project was inspired by a previously conducted pilot study of selected grammatical features exhibited in the two formative collections of early Hasidic Hebrew tales Shivḥe haBesht and
Sippure ma’asiyot. The pilot study investigated morphological and syntactic features characteristic of these tales and found that, in contrast to the common view that their language comprises a blend of ungrammatical Rabbincic Hebrew and Yiddish, its grammar actually exhibits a more nuanced synthesis of Biblical Hebrew, Rabbincic Hebrew, Medieval Hebrew, and Yiddish components. The texts display a striking mix of Biblical and post-Biblical Hebrew elements: for example, biblical features such as the qal infinitives לדע and לשת, the particles כשא and כש, and the wayyiqtol, commonly appear side-by-side with their post-biblical counterparts לידע and לישא, כש and -ש, and narrative qatal chains. The corpus additionally includes a large number of Yiddish lexical items and some Yiddish-influenced syntactic features, including a phenomenon whereby the definite article in construct chains is prefixed the construct noun rather than on the absolute one (e.g. נב חל). An article based on the pilot study, entitled ‘The Grammatical Composition of the Early Hasidic Hebrew Tale’, is currently in press with the Journal of Semitic Studies.

The pilot study will serve as the methodological foundation for a similar examination of the Hasidic Hebrew tales published between 1864 and 1914 that used Shivhe haBesht and Sippure ma’asiyot as their model. The final output of the project will comprise a book-length grammar of the language used in these texts, including sections on orthography, morphology, syntax, and lexis.

A grammatical analysis of these tales will contribute to the diachronic study of Hebrew in several ways. Firstly, it will clarify how Hasidic Hebrew utilizes elements drawn from earlier canonical Hebrew sources. Secondly, it will reveal the degree to which this literature exhibits linguistic features not found in earlier forms of Hebrew. Moreover, the study will help pinpoint Hasidic influences on contemporaneous and subsequent forms of Hebrew. This issue requires examination because by the mid-19th century a large proportion of Eastern European Jewry had embraced Hasidism, and as former Hasidim were drawn to Zionism in the late 1800s and pioneered the revernacularisation of Hebrew in Palestine, some elements of Hasidic Hebrew may have contributed to Israeli Hebrew. Finally, the project will be the first to examine the extent to which Yiddish informed early modern Hasidic Hebrew. As the authors of the tales were all native Yiddish speakers and many of the texts under examination are likely to have originated in oral Yiddish tales, the Yiddish component of this Hasidic Hebrew idiom is worthy of serious investigation.

Lily Kahn, University College London, uclhlok@ucl.ac.uk

Cooperation with ‘Agudat Hasofrim’ in Israel

“American Friends of the Israel Hebrew Writers Association” is a new collaboration between the US Jewish organizations and the Hebrew Writers Association in Israel (“Agudat Hasofrim”) along with its subsidiaries, Genazim Bio-Bibliographical Institute (“Genazim”), Writers House (“Beit Hasofer”), and its literary journal Moznaim.

Close cooperation between Agudat Hasofrim and NAPH is one of the goals of this new organization. We will be most happy to organize groups and involve NAPH members in joint literary projects, open discussions on new ideas, and look for fundraising for such projects.

Groups of professors can be organized for support of literary projects at "Beit Hasofer." There is an array of worthy projects. For example: To establish the Shaul Tchernichovsky Museum at Beit Hasofer. We have the room in which Tchernichovsky worked both as a poet and writer and as a physician, and his materials are stored in the Genazim offices. Since there is already existing space in our building appropriate for this project, we can jointly establish a museum that can become a lively meeting ground for the culturally-minded public as well as for school and youth groups. The museum can become a cultural attraction in Tel Aviv. Contributions toward achieving this goal will of course be
given due acknowledgement through the memorializing of loved ones and acknowledging donor universities and colleges and Jewish institutions.

Another important activity would be to support Genazim. As you know, Genazim is the most significant and the most extensive Hebrew literary archive in the world. It contains manuscripts, correspondence, and other materials of modern and contemporary Hebrew literature, from Leah Goldberg to Dahn Ben Amotz, from Nathan Yonathan to Orly Castel-Bloom.

The most pressing task right now is to launch a subscription drive on Moznaim, the literary organ of Agudat Hasofrim. Founded by Haim Nachman Bialik, Moznaim is the oldest Hebrew literary journal. You are also invited to send literary material to Moznaim.

We appeal to the membership of NAPH to subscribe to Moznaim now and also arrange for your university library to subscribe as well. The journal appears six times a year. Please send your mail to oumeir@gmail.com and we will send you the subscription form for Moznaim.

**Meir Ouziel**, Literary Projects and Artistic Director, Agudat Hasofrim, oumeir@gmail.com

---

### TECHNOLOGY וּהָבֲרָרִים

**Technology and Hebrew in NAPH Conference 2010**

In the NAPH conference which was held in Stern College (Yeshiva University) in NYC there were several presentations which focused on the use of technology in teaching the Hebrew Language. It is encouraging to witness the growth of this trend in spite of the technological challenges in this field.

*Rivka Weiner* from Stern College spoke about "The Teaching of Hebrew in a Technology Enhanced Environment"; she demonstrated the advantages of using technology in teaching a Hebrew text. She observed that her students were getting bored with the texts which she was teaching and were not enthusiastic to learn them. In order to motivate them she enhanced the learning process by engaging technology. Rivka explained new vocabulary by using images, animations and audio. She created computerized games (like Memory game) using an internet based software (http://www.gamemaker.com). She downloaded existing animations and edited them using a relevant text (http://www.toondoo.com).

*Ouzi Rotem* from Tel-Aviv University spoke about "Synchronous Online Learning of Hebrew as a Foreign Language." Ouzi demonstrated how to teach a distance learning unit in Hebrew based on a synchronous method. In a synchronous Distance Learning lesson all students participate at the same time via a virtual classroom. The virtual classroom software which Ouzi demonstrated is the same one used by E-Teacher group: (http://eteachergroup.com/). This is a commercial company which offers Distance Learning courses on several subjects. In the virtual classroom, the teacher can speak to the students and also hear the student speaking in return. The virtual classroom has a whiteboard with all traditional functionalities and students can participate in the lesson by “raising their hands,” by asking questions and by giving feedback. The teacher can present the text and the learning materials via presentation software (like PowerPoint). To read more about the on-line Hebrew courses please go to http://hebrewonline.com.

*Rivka Halperin* from Torun Poland spoke about "The Use of You-Tube Videos in the Service of Hebrew Instruction." She demonstrated a learning unit about the Shtetel in Eastern Europe using a colorful video which she had downloaded from You-Tube. With the help of this video, students learned about the life in the Shtetel in East Europe; its people, streets, houses and its different craftsmen.
Ilona Ben-Moshe spoke about "Shooting Short Hebrew Films." Ilona described a final project which she had assigned her Hebrew class; each group of students had to produce a short movie (8-10 minutes) in Hebrew. They had to write their own Hebrew script using the vocabulary which they had learned during the semester. The students were responsible for shooting the film as well as editing it.

Rutie Adler from UC Berkley spoke about “Teaching Hebrew through Film Clips.” She had created a site which has several movie clips. The clips were divided into several categories such as: family, politics, meeting, culture, etc. Each category had two intermediate levels. Each clip had Hebrew subtitles and a button to access the textual rendition of the text in Hebrew. Clicking on a word in the text linked it to the translation in Babylon. The clips were created from ripping an available movie and editing it. Please note: the site is still under construction and is not available to the general public.

Hadassah Nemovicher, Jewish Theological Seminary of America: hanemovicher@jtsa.edu
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