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Abraham Joshua Heschel (1907–1972): Theologian and Scholar

Abraham Joshua Heschel died on December 23, 1972, just five days after he had handed the completed manuscript of his last book to his publisher. When his first major work in English appeared in 1951, his name was practically unknown outside the circle of professional Jewish scholars. Reinhold Niebuhr's prediction that he would soon become "a commanding and authoritative voice not only in the Jewish community but in the religious life of America" sounded more like a pious wish than a realistic expectation. Two decades later Heschel had emerged as the outstanding Jewish thinker of his generation, a major spiritual force in contemporary America and a recognized spokesman for Judaism among theologians and informed laymen. At memorial services held all over the American continent, in Israel and South Africa, Orthodox, Reform, and Conservative Jews, Hasidim, Protestant Bible scholars, Catholic theologians, and Israeli diplomats all paid tribute to a man whose interpretation of Jewish faith had touched their lives. In the words of the Protestant theologian John C. Bennett, Heschel "belonged to the whole American religious community," and although "he was profoundly Jewish he was yet a religious inspiration to Christians and to many searching people beyond the familiar religious boundaries."

His Life

Heschel was the joint product of the traditional, self-contained universe of the Eastern European Jewish piety in which he grew up and the secular world of modern scholarship and philosophy into which his search for knowledge led him later. He was born in Warsaw on January 11, 1907, to Rabbi "Moishele" Mordecai, the Peltzovizner rebbe, and Reisel (Perlow) Heschel. Among his paternal ancestors he counted Rabbi Dov Ber of Mezeritch, "the Great Maggid"; Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel, the Apter rebbe, and Rabbi Israel of Rizhyn. On his mother's side, he was descended from Rabbi Levi Isaac of Berditchev and Rabbi Pinhas of Koretz. Growing up in the self-contained world of hasidic piety and learning, he devoted his early years to the study of rabbinical literature, and at the age of ten he not only was at home in the Talmud, but had also been introduced to the world of Jewish mysticism, the Kabbalah. Among his teachers was the well-known talmudic scholar Rabbi Menahem Zemba of Praha.

In later life Heschel attributed his abiding dedication to Judaism not just to
the thorough exposure to traditional studies in his youth, but also to the effect of a life lived among people who "were sure that everything hinted at something transcendent," where the presence of God was a daily experience and the sanctification of life a daily task. His book, *The Earth Is the Lord's: The Inner World of the Jew in Eastern Europe* (1950), is an attempt to evoke the memory and the values of this world which was so soon to be annihilated in the Nazi holocaust.

Eager to acquire a modern education, Heschel enrolled at the secular Yiddish "'Realgymnasium'" in Vilna, where he graduated in July 1927. During his stay in Vilna he developed literary interests, joined a students' literary club, and became a cofounder of the "'Yung Vilne'" movement of writers and poets. In the fall of 1927 he moved to Berlin where he enrolled at the Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums and the university. Although he developed an interest in subjects ranging from the history of art to psychology, his university studies were mainly concentrated in the fields of Semitics and philosophy. In February 1933 Berlin University awarded him the doctoral degree for his dissertation on prophetic consciousness (*Die Prophetie*). The Hochschule appointed him a lecturer after his ordination in 1934. In 1937 Martin Buber chose Heschel to be his successor at the Central Organization for Jewish Adult Education and the Jüdisches Lehrhaus in Frankfurt am Main. Having been deported in October 1938, together with the rest of Polish Jews then resident in Germany, he taught for eight months at the Institute for Jewish Studies in Warsaw.

A call to join the faculty of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, received in April 1939, enabled him to leave Poland before the Nazis overran that country. In July 1939 Heschel reached England, where he founded the Institute for Jewish Learning in London. In 1940 he arrived in the United States, to serve as an Associate Professor of Philosophy and Rabbinics at the Hebrew Union College for five years. In 1945 he joined the faculty of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York, where he subsequently held the title of Professor of Jewish Ethics and Mysticism. It was here that Heschel taught until the time of his death and where he influenced a generation of rabbis and educators in the Conservative movement.

Besides being a scholar, Heschel became a sought-after lecturer throughout America. He also held visiting professorships at a number of universities, and in 1965-1966 became the first Jewish theologian to be appointed the Henry Emerson Fosdick Visiting Professor at Union Theological Seminary in New York.

**Social and Religious Concerns**

Heschel's involvement in the civil-rights movement led to a friendship with Martin Luther King, Jr., and his opposition to the war in Vietnam led him to
take an active role as cochairman of Clergy and Laity Concerned About Vietnam.

On September 4, 1963, Heschel addressed a convocation of the Rabbinical Assembly at the Jewish Theological Seminary. At the urging of his close friend, Rabbi Wolfe Kelman, he utilized this platform to call the attention of his audience of over two hundred rabbis to the plight of the Russian Jews. His passionate plea for massive public action received wide publicity in the press and led to the subsequent formation of the American Conference on Soviet Jewry.

Heschel's first major involvement in the world of public affairs occurred when he took an active part in the delicate negotiations between Jewish groups and the Catholic Church before and during Vatican Council II. In 1960, when Pope John XXIII planned to convene an Ecumenical Council, the American Jewish Committee established communications with the Vatican to set out the facts of Jewish-Christian relationships and to recommend plans for eliminating antisemitism from the Church's teachings. They maintained contact with Augustin Cardinal Bea, who headed the Secretariat for Christian Unity, and submitted two memoranda to his office. Other Jewish organizations also entered the arena, and in 1961-1962 the leaders of B'nai B'rith and the World Jewish Congress submitted to the Church authorities memoranda dealing with the problem of antisemitism and Jewish-Christian relationships as social problems.

The American Jewish Committee, however, convinced that since the Church's attitude toward Jews was inextricably connected with basic questions of theology, decided to make use of the services of a qualified theological scholar who would be able to speak to the Church authorities in terms of their own religious concerns. Thus, at the initiative of Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, national director of interreligious affairs at the American Jewish Committee, Heschel traveled to Rome in December 1961 and met with Cardinal Bea. This led to a friendship between the two men who spoke the same language in more than one way: Cardinal Bea, the Jesuit Bible scholar and theologian, and Heschel, the Berlin-trained theologian and author of Die Prophetie, conducted their conversations in German and shared a deep appreciation for the message of Israel's prophets. The Bavarian-born Cardinal, in his confrontation with the Jewish scholar from Poland, was acutely aware of the part anti-Jewish teachings had played in making possible the murder of European Jewry by Nazi Germany.

Bea asked Heschel to submit suggestions for the Ecumenical Council to improve Catholic-Jewish relations. Heschel's memorandum, prepared in cooperation with the American Jewish Committee, made three important recommendations. It urged the Council "to reject and condemn those who assert that the Jews as a people are responsible for the crucifixion . . . ." It suggested that the Council "acknowledge the integrity and permanent preciousness of Jews and Judaism" so that the Jews be accepted as Jews. This
meant that the Church would reconsider its missionary attitude and refrain from regarding Jews primarily as potential converts. And finally, it called for programs "to eliminate abuses and derogatory stereotypes" by promoting scholarly cooperation and the creation of church agencies to combat religious prejudice.

In March 1963, on a visit to the United States, Cardinal Bea met Rabbi Tanenbaum and Dr. Heschel at the chancery of Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, and told them confidentially that he had been asked by Pope John to share with them the information that the Pope was exploring the establishment of formal diplomatic relations between the Holy See and the State of Israel. The Pope wanted to learn what the possible effect of this action would be, and both Heschel and Tanenbaum strongly encouraged this course of action. On March 31, 1963, Cardinal Bea addressed a meeting of Jewish leaders, who included Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbis, under the chairmanship of Dr. Heschel.

On September 3, 1964, a year and three months after the death of Pope John, a watered-down version of the original statement on the Jews—it reintroduced the hope for their ultimate conversion—appeared in the press. Heschel immediately issued a public statement in which he said: "As I have repeatedly stated to leading personalities of the Vatican, I am ready to go to Auschwitz any time, if faced with the alternative of conversion or death." On September 14, 1964, on the opening day of the Council's third session, Heschel, accompanied by Zachariah Shuster of the American Jewish Committee, was received in a special audience by Pope Paul VI and pleaded for a strengthened declaration. Although the final Council statement on the Jews, proclaimed by the Pope on October 28, 1965, was a compromise document which did not fulfill Heschel's original expectations, he nevertheless felt that it was a landmark in Jewish-Catholic relations and opened the path for a new era of better understanding and mutual respect. This view was echoed in a letter which Cardinal Bea addressed to Heschel on February 8, 1966:

I am glad about the opinion you expressed about our Conciliar decree concerning the Jews. Certainly not everything is as perfect as one might have wished; but as the old German proverb says: "The better is the enemy of the good." We are satisfied that something good has been accomplished and hope that it will be the basis for a trustful, fraternal cooperation, especially in those areas which we both have in common.

**His Work**

Although Heschel was a teacher, lecturer, and a man active on behalf of causes he considered important, he devoted most of his waking hours to study
and writing. His published work has established his reputation as a scholar and thinker, and it constitutes his enduring heritage to future generations.* In an age of extreme specialization, when "scholarship" frequently means that one knows more and more about less and less, the range of his achievements is truly amazing. His books and monographs deal with biblical prophecy, medieval philosophy, the lives of Maimonides and Abravanel, Jewish mysticism and ancient rabbinic theology, East European Jewry and the Sabbath, prayer and symbolism, the State of Israel, applied religious ethics, the history of Hasidism, and the nature of man. But this variety of subjects does not bespeak mere eclecticism.

Heschel's work can perhaps best be understood as an attempt to achieve a synthesis between the two different worlds in which he lived before he came to America. He experienced the clash between the claims of ancestral piety and the demands of modern secularism with full force:

I came with great hunger to the University of Berlin to study philosophy. I looked for a system of thought, for the depth of the spirit, for the meaning of existence. Erudite and profound scholars gave courses in logic, epistemology, esthetics, ethics, and metaphysics. Yet in spite of the intellectual power and honesty which I was privileged to witness, I became increasingly aware of the gulf that separated my views from those held at the university. To them, religion was a feeling. God was an idea, a postulate of reason. They granted Him the status of being a logical possibility. But to assume that He had existence would have been a crime against epistemology.

The result of this confrontation was Heschel's attempt to examine the classical documents of Judaism anew in order to discover their relevance for contemporary man. In this enterprise he made use of the conceptual tools of academic philosophy, especially the techniques of phenomenology. But he was careful to refrain from forcing upon biblical thought categories derived from Greek metaphysics and neo-Kantian philosophy, which in his opinion distorted the meaning of the biblical message. In his dissertation he developed a novel conceptual framework that became the nucleus of his later philosophy of Judaism.

Heschel saw the task of the religious philosopher neither as the construction

---

of a "religion of reason" drawing upon the Jewish tradition, among other sources, nor as the analysis of "religious experience." The first substitutes philosophy for religion; the second tends to replace it with the psychology of religion. Heschel's own writings attempt to penetrate and illumine the reality underlying religion, the living and dynamic relationship between God and man, through the objective, yet sympathetic, understanding of the documents of Israel's tradition and of the life and experience of the pious Jew.

There are three starting points of contemplation about God; three trails that lead to Him. The first is the way of sensing the presence of God in the world, in things; the second is the way of sensing His presence in the Bible; the third is the way of sensing His presence in sacred deeds... These three ways correspond in our tradition to the main aspects of religious existence: worship, learning, and action.

Although he brought to this task the tools of philosophy, he pointed out repeatedly that no amount of rational analysis alone can ever exhaust the richness and fullness of this reality. He therefore emphasized that reason itself discloses its own limits and that the ineffable quality of the divine cannot be reduced without remainder to any scheme of conceptual categories: "We apprehend more than we can comprehend."

Heschel's lifework can thus be seen as consisting of two parallel strands: his studies and interpretations of the classical sources of Judaism and his endeavor to offer to our generation an authentic theology, resulting from the application of the insights gained from these classical sources to contemporary problems and perplexities. Thus he started out with his book on prophecy, Die Prophetie (the basis of his expanded work in English, The Prophets), in which he presented a phenomenology of prophetic consciousness in the Bible, and followed it with his interpretation of Maimonides' life and thought, Maimonides: Eine Biographie, where the confrontation of scholastic Aristotelianism with rabbinic Judaism is examined. Articles on medieval philosophy, Kabbalah, and Hasidism continued this enterprise. Since 1962 two volumes of a major study (in Hebrew) of two great trends in talmudic thought concerning the nature of the Torah and revelation have appeared under the title, Torah min ha-shamayim ba-ispaglaryah shel ha-dorot, with a third volume in manuscript. The two-volume Yiddish study of the thought of Rabbi Menahem Mendel of Kotzk, completed in 1972, appeared a few months after the author's death.

**Philosophy of Judaism**

The results of some of these and similar researches are utilized in the formation of Heschel's original philosophy of Judaism, which has found its chief expression in two books: Man Is Not Alone: A Philosophy of Religion
and its successor volume, *God in Search of Man: A Philosophy of Judaism* (1955). Religion is there defined as an answer to man's ultimate questions. Since modern man is largely alienated from the reality that informs genuine religion, Heschel is not content to present the traditional answers but tries above all to recover the significant existential questions to which Judaism offers answers. This leads to a theology which, by going below the surface phenomena of modern doubt and rootlessness, tries to confront the reader with the living God of the Bible. In expounding the various approaches that lead one to an awareness of God's reality, he repeatedly stresses that we cannot prove the existence of God:

In the depth of human thinking we all presuppose some ultimate reality which on the level of discursive thinking is crystallized into the concept of a power, a principle, or a structure. This, then, is the order in our thinking and existence: the ultimate or God comes first and our reasoning about Him second.

God to the religiously sensitive man is an "ontological presupposition" rather than the conclusion of a logical statement.

Heschel describes three ways in which man can come to an awareness of God. The first is by going, through wonder, beyond the mere givenness of the facts to awareness of the grandeur and mystery of reality. Such wonder can take different forms: as curiosity it can become the starting point of science, which looks beyond given facts to the laws they exemplify; as radical amazement it can point beyond fact to the ground and power that stand behind all fact and perceptions of fact.

To the Biblical man, the sublime is but a form in which the presence of God strikes forth.

This evocative approach yields a panentheistic outlook: through created things man reaches an awareness of God, who is within but also beyond all finite existence.

In the second way, man reaches an awareness of God by delving into the recesses of his own being, thus realizing that he is not an independent and self-sufficient entity, but part of something greater and more encompassing than his individual ego. The fallacy of assuming that the self is a discrete isolated subject which can find God as another isolated object of cognition is shattered once the awareness is gained that the conscious self is itself the expression of something never fully expressed and that life and time are not our property but a trust.

This second way tends to a quasi-mystical world view. But it stops short of the danger of mystical absorption and annihilation in the Godhead by its articulation of God as the subject of all reality and man as the object whose dignity and worth are founded in his very consciousness of being the goal of
divine concern and expectation. In principle any moment of life and any experience can be regarded by the sensitive believer as such divine address and summons. But in fact this awareness is felt only rarely in a clear and unambiguous manner.

In the third way, man becomes aware of the voice of God. The "holy dimension" of harkening to the voice and acting responsively and responsibly characterizes the biblical view of man as the recipient of divine revelation. It is in facing the transcendent God and His demands that one becomes a moral agent. The dichotomy of faith and works was never a real issue in Judaism since the two are not inimical but inherently complementary. By doing the mitzvot the Jew enters the holy dimension of God's challenge and guidance, and by obediently responding to the divine demand he experiences himself as the object of God's address and concern, thus gaining faith in the Author of the Law by responding to His voice.

The God of the Bible

Heschel's emphasis that faith is not so much assent to a proposition as an attitude of the whole person, an engagement and attachment to God's demands, is not only important for his understanding of the significance of halakhah ("law") but is also crucial for his interpretation of God as personal concern and for his critique of the main trends of philosophical theology that have tried to assimilate the living God of the Bible to impersonal categories of Greek ontology or modern process philosophy. While the medieval tendency was in the direction of describing God as Being Itself, the modern inclination has been to raise the concept of God from the level of crude anthropomorphism by describing the Deity as the power that makes for goodness, the underlying structure or nisus of the universe, the moral dimension of reality, etc. This, however, is not only detrimental to religious life, but also in conflict with the biblical and rabbinical outlook. Heschel tries to do justice to the experience of the living God who stands in a dynamic relationship to man and who is influenced and affected by human actions. Hence he stresses the divine concern of the personal God as the most essential category for an adequate Jewish theology.

If God is merely a thing among things, even though the most powerful one, He is not truly God. If He is a general principle of power, then He is an abstraction lacking religious availability. Therefore Heschel develops his doctrine of the divine pathos. The God of pathos, described in analogy to the human personality, is never exhausted in any of His particular manifestations. God cares for and is interested in all His creatures. Indeed, creation as a religious concept points at the divine care and concern for that which is to receive the gift of existence by the divine fiat. The doctrine that God shares in the joys and sufferings of His children and that their actions make a difference
to Him is the prerequisite for relationship between creator and creature. As the rabbinic phrase puts it, “man is the partner of the Holy One, blessed be He,” and what we do here and now is of cosmic importance. By doing the mitzvot—ceremonial as well as ethical—and thus cooperating in the building of the Kingdom here on earth, man finds his true vocation and develops his true humanity. Far from being a preordained process reducible to a scientific formula, life becomes a drama in which the unexpected, the novel, and the unique can always happen again. The universe is not closed; the horizon is always kept open to new incursions of divine challenges and freely given human responses.

The idea of the divine pathos must not be confused with the apparently similar view of paganism. While pagan gods were also personal, they acted in unpredictable, capricious, and selfish ways. Judaism, however, teaches that there is no dichotomy between a personal living God and the universal canons of ethics. “God’s pathos is ethos.”

To say that God is personal may, of course, be courting the danger of anthropomorphism. But to speak of Him as mechanical or abstract compounds the danger, since it makes Him subhuman rather than superhuman. To affirm that God is always the subject and never the mere object of religious experience and thought guards only partially against this error. Although His essence is incomprehensible and He is known only by His acts and expressions, human language must take the risk of referring to Him as a person: the closest analogue to the prophetic encounter with the Deity is the encounter that takes place between human persons:

The Bible speaks in the language of man. It deals with the problems of man, and its terms are borrowed from the vocabulary of the people. It has not coined many words, but it has given new meaning to borrowed words. The prophets had to use anthropomorphic language in order to convey His non-anthropomorphic Being. The greatest challenge to the Biblical language was now to reconcile in words the awareness of God’s transcendence with His overwhelming livingness and concern.

The Task of Man

The assertion that God shares in the mystery of personality must not be misunderstood as an attempt to reduce Him to human scale. On the contrary, it indicates that man’s ability to act with compassion, sympathy, and concern is the sign that he was created in the imago Dei, and that man’s true fulfillment is found in imitatio Dei. Man leads the good life not only by following general rules as codified in the Bible and in tradition, although these rules are an indispensable part for the business of living. He must, in addition, respond individually and spontaneously to the demands of God in each new and concrete situation. This is the reason why scholars and saints are never done
with the task of determining the divine intention for changing times and circumstances throughout Jewish history. The tension of fixed pattern, qeva', and inner spontaneity, kawwanah, is a pervasive trait of Jewish life. Though never completely solved by an individual, its resolution is an ideal toward which every Jew should strive: joy and discipline; regularity and spontaneity.

The doctrine that actions teach and that religion cannot be acquired merely by cognitive endeavor has led Heschel to the view that Judaism requires the "leap of action" rather than the Kierkegaardian "leap of faith." Judaism demands the willingness to learn by doing, by participating actively in performing God's will, to appreciate and to be enriched by an experience that touches the whole of man and goes beyond the mere analysis and reinterpretation of what we already knew beforehand. In doing, we go beyond ourselves; we surpass ourselves and become co-workers in the task of redemption. It would be a mistake to take this, as some critics have done, as an abdication of reason and advocacy of religious observance as a substitute for intelligent and critical examination of one's religious heritage. The leap of action is no more a denial of reason than the advice to gain an appreciation and understanding of music by not merely studying its theory but also by listening to and, if possible, performing great works of music.

"Depth Theology"

All this is clearly presented in Heschel's writings. But whoever wants truly to come to grips with his basic outlook must read him searchingly. Beneath the peshat, the plain sense, he must delve into the "depth theology." The key to Heschel's thought is found in the concept of personal concern. The Ultimate is not Being but concern, or "directed attention." Few of Heschel's readers are aware that he has propounded a truly revolutionary doctrine, challenging the whole venerable tradition of Jewish and Christian metaphysical theology from Philo, Maimonides, and Thomas Aquinas to Hermann Cohen, Étienne Gilson, and Paul Tillich. He proclaimed that the Greek category of "being" and eternally frozen perfection is inadequate to Judaism and must be replaced by a new set of categories derived from biblical thinking. Aristotle's Unmoved Mover must give way to the Bible's Most Moved Mover, the God of pathos and transitive concern, who stands in a dynamic and reciprocal relationship to his creation. "Being through creation," through the divine act of freedom, expresses in symbolic form that reality is not a self-sufficient, fixed, mechanical order. It is a process in which responsible man freely reacts to the challenges of his life and in which surprise, novelty, and unexpected creative possibilities always exist. Through sympathy, compassion, and sensitivity to the divine concern man can overcome his egocentric predicament and can fulfill his true potential.

The denial of fixed being and substance as the ultimate building block of the
universe opens new possibilities, not only for religious thought but also for
philosophy. The parallel to modern physics, which sees reality as a field of
forces rather than a collection of moving billiard balls, is obvious. Future
researchers would be well advised to probe the connections and parallels
between Heschel’s biblical philosophy and process philosophers (e.g.,
Whitehead and Bergson) and existentialists (e.g., Heidegger, Jaspers, and
Marcel). In ethics the idea of concern helps to explain the ideal of care for the
fellow creature; in the theory of knowledge it helps to overcome the paralysis
of the cognizing subject locked in the magic circle of Kant’s epistemology. In
exploring basic human attitudes, it enables us to overcome routine dullness
and alienation by reminding us that man is the being who always is beyond
himself, in ek-stasis, transcending his loneliness and isolation in knowledge,
action, art, and worship. Space and time take on a new meaning in Heschel:
things are merely frozen processes; life itself is a process gathering the past
into itself, reaching out into the future. Reality is not like a stone sculpture,
but like a symphony. The Sabbath is to Judaism an edifice in time, a cathedral
of the spirit.

Beyond Tragedy

One may be tempted to think that Heschel’s lifework and philosophy
constitute a harmonious, well-planned whole; that he has fashioned a grand
synthesis of Judaism for our age. But this impression, plausible as it may
seem, is deceptive. His thought bears witness to a deep awareness of the
tragic, fragmented character of reality. Although inspired by the ideal ‘alma
de-yihuda, the world of unification, he knew that we still live in the ‘alma
de-peruda, the world of separation. His thought abounds in polar concepts
and the fields of forces created by them: qeva’ and kawwanah, mystery and
meaning, God’s self-disclosure and His hiding His face, faith and reason,
grandeur et misère de l’homme. Heschel often used the language of paradox,
not because he denigrated logic and reason, but because reality is too complex
and subtle to be caught in univocal concepts. He was not a simple person, and
his religious thought is not a simplistic philosophy. He felt the claims of
natural and of crisis theology, of sacramentalism and of utopianism.
Everywhere we walk is holy ground; but everywhere we go, truth is buried
and horror lurks.

Heschel told the midrash of how Abraham arrived at the certainty that there
is a God who is concerned with the world. Abraham may be compared to a
man who, traveling from place to place, saw “birah doleqet,” a palace all
ablaze. “Is it possible that there is no one who cares for the palace?” he
wondered—until the owner of the palace looked on him and said: “I am the
owner of the palace!” Similarly, Abraham, our father, wondered: “Is it
conceivable that the world is without a guide?” The Holy One, blessed be
He, looked out and said: "I am the guide, the sovereign of the world." (Genesis Rabbah 39, 1). The Hebrew word "doleqet" can mean "illuminated" and it can mean "in flames." We come to the awareness of God through the glory and beauty of the world, the "palace full of light," and we also come to Him when, seeing the world in flames, we ask: "Is there no One who cares and guides?"

But beyond crisis and the absurdity of evil, Heschel taught us to see goodness and meaning. Significantly, the work he finished a few days before his death dealt with the Ba'\'al Shem Tov and Rabbi Mendel of Kotzk. The first saw the divine in everything and celebrated in ecstasy the joyous feeling of "let atar panuy minneh"—no place is empty of God. The second faced with radical honesty the absurdity, horror, and tragedy of existence.

Fully aware of the tension, Heschel taught us not to deny the mystery but to have faith in an ultimate meaning beyond it. With the Bratzlaver rebbe he asserted defiantly: "Despair does not exist!" In prayer and celebration the tasks of the religious thinker and the poet merge. In praising God we restore our health. We learn to appreciate the privilege and glory of existence and attain a taste of messianic fulfillment.

Fritz A. Rothschild
Maurice Samuel (1895–1972)

The headline of the New York Times obituary notice referred to Maurice Samuel simply as "Jewish Writer." The knowledgeable reader instinctively felt that the classification was not quite a felicitous one. It was not calculated to make one’s hackles rise, but it was not completely accurate either. Yet the reader himself might have a difficult time describing Samuel more satisfactorily. In Allen Guttmann’s wide-ranging 1971 survey entitled The Jewish Writer in America (which concerns itself with the field generally known as American-Jewish letters), the name of Maurice Samuel is not even mentioned. That is one indication of the difficulty of categorizing him.

Though he was clearly a personality of national and even international repute, its source was not some single and signal accomplishment which at once leaped to the hearer’s mind when his name was mentioned, but a diversity of associations based on his activities in a number of related fields. The general reader who recognized his name probably connected it with his book The World of Sholom Aleichem, which appeared in 1943 and was the most commercially successful of his twenty-five books. That even this volume, however, though it was reprinted every two or three years, was no phenomenon of the market place is indicated by the fact, noted in his autobiographical "reflections and recollections" which he called Little Did I Know, that twenty years after its initial publication it had not yet sold thirty thousand copies.

He was also known to many American radio listeners for his regular colloquies with Mark Van Doren on the subject of the Bible, broadcast throughout the United States for many years every Sunday morning on the program, The Eternal Light (sponsored by The Jewish Theological Seminary of America), and for his occasional appearances on another national radio program, Invitation to Learning.

Perhaps best of all, he was known to lecture audiences in every section of this country and in many other parts of the world. In fact, as he wryly confessed in his memoirs, though the greatest part of his energy, thought, and ambition went into his writing, it was the income derived from his lectures that paid most of his bills. He was a forceful and witty speaker, who was extraordinarily popular with Jewish audiences that invited him to return year after year to tell them something about the new subjects that continually engaged his attention.
In a Class by Himself

On one occasion, he made an attempt briefly to characterize his own activities in ironic fashion: "I am a professional Jew, in a class with rabbis, fund raisers, Hebrew teachers, executives of Jewish institutions and the like, but while they are on regular salaries I peddle piecework." The concealed thrust here derives its force not (as the humorless may have thought) from the manifest injustice of his self-denigration as "a professional Jew," but from the implicit bland denial of a fact evident to the least observant, namely, that he was in a class by himself. He was so irrepressibly and incurably individualistic that it was hard to compare him to anyone else. Perhaps he could best be described as a puzzling but viable paradox—one who was at the same time "his own man" and a representative Jew of our time.

To some extent, he was both a world figure and a worldly one, in the best sense. He was an eminently civilized man, who knew half a dozen languages well (French, German, Italian, Hebrew, Yiddish, and English) and had a subtle and sensitive appreciation of what constituted elegance of style in all of them. He translated some of Bialik from Hebrew, Kayserling from German, Edmond Fleg from French, and Peretz, Asch, the Singer brothers, and others from Yiddish. He was, by almost universal consent, the most gifted translator into English that the Yiddish language has ever had (making ingenious discoveries of simple and equivalent locutions which escaped the laborious efforts of less talented translators), but he came increasingly to feel the insufficiency of even the best translations to convey the hidden merits of Yiddish to the uninstructed. In his book Prince of the Ghetto he tells us:

It is useless to present the reader with a body of translation and say: "There you have the man. Judge him for yourself." The most characteristic of Peretz cannot be translated outright. Honest attempts have been made—again as in the case of Sholom Aleichem—and they may be read for what they are worth. These men must be interpreted. One must talk about them, and around them, and around their people and its problems; one must retell their stories, one must hint and allude, interpolate, digress, find analogies; their work must be introduced as it were incidentally and by way of illustration even though it is actually the purpose, and constitutes the bulk of the enterprise.

He has been called a man of letters and was certainly a lover of letters, in the traditional sense. This old-fashioned love—though the Bible was pretty close to the heart of it—was by no means confined to books by Jewish authors. To the end of his life, he could recite from memory long passages of Proust and of the historian Gibbon, giving visible evidence as he did so of the keenness of his appreciation of their distinction of style. He was thoroughly conversant with much of the work of Thomas Mann and of James Joyce, and
in the last year of his life, when he was already in the grip of his final illness, he was tremendously excited to discover for himself the genius of the Triestan master, Italo Svevo, one of the luminaries of the modernist literary firmament. Among Jewish contemporaries who, like himself, wrote in English, he was particularly responsive to the work of Saul Bellow, in part perhaps because of their shared taste for Yiddish literature (Bellow translated into English I. B. Singer's "Gimpel, the Fool"), and for Joyce. He had some good words to say, too, for the talents of Ludwig Lewisohn and for those of the Canadian poet A. M. Klein. Some of his long and thoughtful literary articles on Proust ("The Concealments of Marcel") and on Bellow ("My Friend the Late Moses Herzog") deserve to be exhumed from the periodicals in which they appeared (Commentary, Midstream) and given a more permanent place among his books.

**Patriotic Englishman**

Maurice Samuel was born in Macin, Rumania, on February 8, 1895. In his book *I, The Jew*, he tells us that he could trace his line back to his great-grandfather, who had moved to Rumania from Poland. His family emigrated during his childhood to England, by way of Paris (where he spent the fifth and sixth years of his life and laid the basis of his excellent knowledge of French, which was to prove important in his life when he came back there as a soldier in the American Expeditionary Force), and he was educated in the schools and University of Manchester. He was an exceptionally able student and won a number of competitive scholarships. Among his teachers at Manchester were the Nobel Prize-winning physicist Ernest Rutherford and the chemist Chaim Weizmann, with whom Samuel was to form an intimate personal and literary relationship later on when he became a Zionist.

He was very far from being a Zionist at that time, however. He had begun with a patriotic feeling for the adoptive country of his parents: "England was my nurse, my cradle, my home. I appropriated my surroundings as my natural right. English games, English moral slogans, English institutions—all were mine. English heroes, in all the changes through which my perception of heroism passed in my boyhood and youth, were my heroes. . . . When my awakening taste for literature asked for something more than simple epic narrative, it was Chaucer, Malory, Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, Byron, Shelley, Keats, Browning—down to Thomas Hardy and a host of moderns."

**Internationalist**

This phase was followed by an internationalist one in which he became, in his own words, "a Socialist and atheist around the age of thirteen," and enthusiastically began (when he was somewhat older) to make active
propaganda for his beliefs among English working-class audiences. It seems as if it were at this time and in this context that he became increasingly aware (at first disconcertingly) of himself as a Jew whose background separated him by a wide gulf from the crowds of born Englishmen he addressed, no matter how uneducated or humble their social station might be. Though his autobiography indicates that his Socialist beliefs passed away in time, he continued to remain grateful for the kind of deepened insight into human affairs which he had achieved during that period.

In the summer of 1914, at the age of nineteen and after three years at the University of Manchester, he left home for Paris and found himself there at the critical turn of European history. After the outbreak of general war in August, he returned to Manchester for a few months and then sailed to the United States in November. His initial intention was to stay "for a few months, a year at the outside," but (to quote Robert Frost) "way leads on to way" and eventually he was to make his new home here. His interest in Jewish affairs continued to grow in the new world until the time he went to serve as sergeant in the United States Army in France from 1917 to 1919. His conversance with the French language led to his assignment to intelligence work in Bordeaux and, after the signing of the armistice, to Paris "during and following the negotiations of the Versailles peace treaty from 1919 to 1920." During part of this time, Samuel found himself serving for two months in the summer of 1919 as secretary and interpreter (from the Yiddish) for the Morgenthau Pogrom Investigation Commission to Poland. This proved to be a brief but intense experience which "had a permanent effect on my already developed Jewish interests." His observations during this period also made him a strong public critic of the elder Morgenthau, who had once been President Wilson's emissary to Turkey.

**Zionist**

On his return from Europe, Samuel was naturalized as an American citizen in 1921. That this commitment remained most important to him we surmise from a comment made in his autobiography more than forty years later: "I would like to write a long essay on my relations to America, the country without which there would hardly be a Jewish people today and therefore no Jewish homeland."

During the 1920s Samuel was an employee of the Zionist Organization of America for seven years, quitting his post in 1928, a short time before the Great Depression hit the country (which, he tells us ruefully, might have made him reconsider his decision had he anticipated it). He remained, however, an ordinary member of the organization to the end of his life, and it was no disagreement with its basic principles that led to his resigning his job in order to take up the riskier vocation of a free-lance writer and lecturer.
Samuel sums up his reason for taking the step in a single sentence: "If there is anything I am supremely unfitted for, it is day-to-day political work." Up to that time he had been a member of the American Zionist administration and for a year served on the Actions Committee of the World Zionist Organization.

In spite of this, he was the very antithesis of the Organization Man and seemed in general so independent and outspoken that he was virtually compelled to be self-employed. His insight into his own character led him to a clear realization of his limitations from a conventional point of view: "There are many kinds of work I am not fitted for. I would fail as a teacher because I would play up to the good students and neglect the poor ones. I cannot endure editorial work; straightening out and polishing another man's sentences is my idea of intellectual slavery. As reader and adviser in a publishing house I would miss all the best sellers."

Lecturer and Writer

Nevertheless, he had the temperament and capabilities of a fine teacher. The impression one got from hearing him was that he was hardly exaggerating when he said in his autobiography:

If I did not have to lecture for a living I would be running around offering to do it gratis. I still love with all the passion of my boyhood the feel of an audience and the challenge of oral exposition. I still cannot come across an interesting idea without wanting to tell everyone about it . . . and it has been my wild good fortune that, unlike most compulsive talkers, I have found people willing to pay to listen to me. If I had to stay on at a regular job, with regular responsibilities, I would have gone to pieces under the pressure of my primary compulsion, that of the writer.

The facility with which he wrote and the variety of the topics to which he addressed himself made many people think of him as little more than a journalist, but he was far from being superficial. He set high standards for himself, and he was hard-working and well-prepared on whatever topic he chose to write or talk about. His account of the origins and development of modern Zionism in his book Harvest in the Desert, written in the 1940s, is still one of the most penetrating and readable introductions to the subject. His polemic against Toynbee's interpretation of history (as it relates to the Jews) in his book The Professor and the Fossil is effective precisely because of the scholarly care which went into its preparation. His detailed history of the case of Mendel Beiliss in Blood Accusation was meticulous enough to have won the admiration of such men as George Kennan and Louis Fischer. This book, by a strange coincidence, appeared during the same publishing season as Bernard Malamud's novel The Fixer (which dealt freely with the same subject), and to some readers at least it held its own so successfully in the
unavoidable comparison that it seemed to indicate the limitations of all but the highest type of imaginative literature, when measured against the interest excited by excellent works in the humbler field of reporting history. In Samuel's own historical novels—such as *Web of Lucifer* and *The Second Crucifixion*—the author's vast erudition was generally admired even by those readers who found his powers of dramatization wanting. There is little doubt that he possessed a scholarly potential of a high order which, if it had been concentrated on a smaller area, might have taken him far in some traditional field of academic learning. In fact, some of his books—such as *The Gentleman and the Jew*—are more or less systematically developed dissertations defending a controversial or provocative thesis, differing little (unless it is in superior readability) from many of the works submitted routinely in course each year to satisfy the requirements of advanced degrees.

Samuel himself finally seemed to regard formal academic scholarship with some of the same suspicion with which he regarded other occupations that fitted into familiar rubrics. For the humanist, they were temptations to be resisted. In the final analysis, his real vocation was that of the leisurely essayist. Despite his contention (supported by a scaffolding of elaborate rationalization) that the category of "gentleman" was at odds with that of "the Jew," he combined the attributes of both in his own person. His attitude was that of a free man, as defined by Socrates in one of the Platonic dialogues, "a gentleman of letters," who would never let himself be enslaved by the demands of a fickle audience in the marketplace. His points of distinction from run-of-the-mill writers lie, generally speaking, in the unexpected flashes of humor and poetry, which transfigure a surprising number of his pages and which his audience came to look for with anticipation and delight.

It is no accident that his best-known book expounded the humor of Sholom Aleichem, since he had so rich a vein of the same quality in himself. His exposition of the wit displayed by the author in Tevye's characteristic misconstruction of quotations from the Hebrew (by way of an analogy with what might happen if a semi-literate user of English insisted upon sprinkling his conversation with Latin tags, which he tried to translate into the vernacular) is little less diverting than the original text it is designed to explain. In *The Gentleman and the Jew*, his parody of the type of nugatory scholastic ingenuity displayed in some traditional midrashic exegesis of a biblical text is an example of the same kind. It is satiric in intention, but the satire is of that good-natured variety which (like Alexander Pope's mock-epic *The Rape of the Lock*) springs from genuine affection for its subject rather than from revulsion or "savage indignation" at it.

His account in his autobiography of some of the contretemps encountered in his lecture-travels around the world is hilarious. But even when he is not being intentionally and sometimes outrageously funny, there is often a wry edge of sophisticated amusement in his running commentary on some of his
favorite subjects, as in the following passage: "The compilers of Proverbs, and ben Sirach after them, were excessively occupied with the dangers of women and of politics, but especially of women. The one famous passage in praise of a woman presents her as a formidable combination of go-getter and home-factory foreman. Otherwise she is a snare, a corruption, a torment, and a calamity generally. A wise man keeps away from women and from revolutionaries: 'My son, fear thou the Lord and the king, and meddle not with them that are given to change.'"

The complement of his humor is a stirring and unaffected eloquence which aspires to and sometimes attains to the sublime plane of the poetic. Here, for example, is the beginning of a passage narrating part of his first voyage to Palestine under the British Mandate in 1924:

Late one night an intermittent glimmer rose below the rim of the faintest stars ahead of us and to the left, and grew slowly into the regular alternating flash of a lighthouse. It was Cape St. Vincent, the furthest outpost of the Iberian peninsula, known to the ancient Greeks as the Hesperides, the lands of the sunset, to the Hebrews as Sepharad, and to us as Spain and Portugal. In the full darkness there was nothing visible but the circling light, which is set there as a warning to ships, but which for me, there and then, shone like a memorial and a sign. For I thought then that Sepharad was sunk in the sea, and I remembered the story of hope and disillusionment, of momentary splendor and swift decline, the story which is wholly Spain's and partly ours. . . .

"Jewish Self" vs. "World Self"

The problem of problems for Samuel himself (and he thought of it as something greater than a merely personal problem) was to find a balance between what he called his "Jewish self" and his "world self." It was a problem to which he returned again and again. It was present for him in the paradox that the most universal and humane of messages always had to be delivered in particular languages of particular nationalities. The more he thought about this, the less fortuitous or accidental it seemed to him to be. It was not those who arbitrarily constructed an artificial, utopian language like Esperanto, but a writer like Plato, using an already existing one so beautifully and clearly as to attract all civilized men into wishing to learn it, who came closest to the ideal of creating an absolutely lucid medium of verbal communication. Or, as Samuel himself put it, "the more obvious the extrusion of the infinite, the more intimate was the approach to the infinite."

The same challenge confronted him in trying to reconcile his nationalism with his internationalism—a reconciliation which he always deemed essential to "the proper balance" he sought to achieve.

Though he meditated long and hard on the problematic and even
paradoxical relationship between the parochial and the universal, he never succeeded in formulating what, to his own mind, was a wholly satisfactory and memorable solution to it. The best he felt capable of doing was to convince people of the immediate reality and importance of the problem to them. That was perhaps why, in his autobiography, he described himself as a mere "maggid" (the Hebrew-Yiddish term for "preacher" which, like "melammed"—or the word preacher itself, for that matter, in English—has a slightly derogatory connotation and nuance). As he grew older, he increasingly sensed, despite his contemporary renown in broad circles of Jewry in different lands, what he called "the oblivion awaiting my name" and resigned himself to it with philosophic calm. He was not haunted at the end by the vain regrets visited upon those who, through spiritual indolence or at least lack of diligence, feel that they have not striven fully to develop all the talents with which they had been endowed.

In retrospect, it seems possible that the best of his work (which different readers may choose differently) will survive longer than he thought. Regardless of his personal fate, however, he derived satisfaction from two achievements which he had, by more than fifty years of literary and other labors, contributed in some measure to bring about: first, the establishment and preservation of the State of Israel for nearly a quarter of a century before he died, and, second, the recognition of the study of the Yiddish language and literature as a respectable and indeed almost fashionable field of academic endeavor in a number of universities in the United States and in Israel.

For those who knew him in any way, the flavor of his personality and work seems to come through in two brief passages. Both touch upon the relationship between the future and the past. "There is much talk today," he says in his autobiography, "of the decline and approaching death of Yiddish; it is, I think, exaggerated, but whenever I hear it I think with a pang of the lovelinesses that must be locked away forever in forgotten languages." Samuel himself did what he could to stem the tide, not only in the books already mentioned but in the last one that he published not long before his death, In Praise of Yiddish.

The second quotation deals with the Bible (about which, incidentally, he wrote what might be called a series of midrashim for the modern reader, entitled Certain People of the Book):

"Whatever lives," says Goethe, "deserves to die." This is as true of the Jewish people as it is of every other. But the Jewish people does not die. Its refusal to die is bound up with an obstinate principle of search which keeps on triumphing over successive failures. Somewhere in the folk, even when the largest part of it has fallen away, the principle reasserts itself and maintains the line. It is as though the folk-soul were saying to itself: "I am not going to die until I have found out what this is all about." The principle which runs through the Bible and gives a special meaning to its monotheism, making it infinitely more than a single flash of
intellectual insight, runs also through the later history of Jewry; the story continues with a consistency that reflects a convincing verisimilitude back on the Bible narrative, and we shall see that while the Bible has given that principle classical expression, it has not exhausted its operation.

Samuel was the recipient of the Stephen Wise Award, of the B’nai B’rith Heritage Award, of an award from The Saturday Review of Literature for The World of Sholom Aleichem, and of an honorary degree from Brandeis University. Shortly before he died, he was notified of the award to him in Israel of the Manger Prize for his last and not least distinguished book, In Praise of Yiddish. He was too ill to receive it personally, but it was conferred posthumously upon him at a ceremony in the Habimah Theater of Tel Aviv, at which an address on the subject of Samuel’s work was given by Israel’s President Zalman Shazar.

Milton H. Hindus
Necrology: United States


CARMELY, HAROLD W., org. exec., Zionist leader; b. Wolkowsy, Poland, Jan. 29, 1899; d. N.Y.C., Feb. 20, 1972; in U.S. including Jewish residents of the United States who died between January 1 and December 31, 1972; for meaning of abbreviations, see p. 563.


GROSSINGER, JENNY, resort hotel owner; b. Vienna, Austria, June 16, 1892; d. Grossinger, N.Y., Nov. 20, 1972; in U.S. since 1900; operated Grossinger's Country Club since 1914; co-chmn. Albert Einstein Coll. of Med., Catskill region, 1943-48; Beth Hamedrosh Hagadol Synagogue; awards: B'nai B'rith "Man or the Year," State of Israel Bonds.
Jews in Nazi Germany (1933); This is Judaism (1944); The Jewish Jesus and the Christian Christ (1950); A Rabbi With the American Red Cross (1958); contrib. to Jewish journals.


NEWMAN, LOUIS I., rabbi, au.; b. Providence, R.I., merchant; philan- 
OHRBACH, NATHAN 
NIRENSTEIN, BLANCHE; communal leader; b. 1951; Pres. Harry 
S. Truman village, 1952; honored by David Ben Gurion, 1950. 

NEWMAN, LOUIS I., rabbi, au.; b. Providence, R.I.; Dec. 20, 1893; d. N.Y.C., Mar. 9, 1972; rabbi: Cong. Rodeph Sholom, N.Y. 
radio, TV programs, Cal., N.Y.C.; co-fdr. San Francisco, 1924-30; conducted rel. 

ROSENBERG, ALEXANDER S., rabbi; b. Bazin, 
S., rabbi; b. Pod- 
RUBIN, JACOB A., journalist, au.; b. Pod- 

nations; au.: Studies in Biblical Parallelism (1918); Jewish Influence on Christian Re- 
form Movements (1924); The Eternal Temple (1942); Chief Rabbi of Rome 
Becomes a Catholic (1945); Prayer in Our 
Times (1947); The Miracle of the Scrolls 
(1947); No Alternative (1949); Son of His 
Generation (1950); Daughter of the Queen 
(1954); Pangs of Messiah (1958); Woman 
at the Wall (1958): The Little Zaddik (1961); 
Jewish People, Faith and Life (1965); books of praise; co-au. of anthologies; awards: 
2nd prize, B'nai B'rith Nat. Play Contest, 1944; 2nd prize, ZOA Nat. Play Contest, 
1950. 

NIRENSTEIN, BLANCHE; communal leader; b. 
(1885); d. N.Y.C., Sept. 3, 1972; fdr. 

OHRBACH, NATHAN M., merchant; philan- 
thropist; b. Vienna, Austria, Aug. 31, 1885; 
d. N.Y.C., Nov. 19, 1972; in U.S. since 
1887; treas. Am. Jewish Com., 1945-49; a 
frdr. Albert Einstein Coll. of Med.; former 
trustee Fed. of Jewish Philanthropies for 
more than half a century; v. pres., bd. mem. 
Montefiore Hosp. & Medical Center; trustee 
Fed. of Jewish Charities; chmn., v. pres. 
Greater N.Y. Councils of Boy Scouts of Amer.; au.: Getting Ahead in Retailing 
(1935); awards: Statesman of Industry, 
1947; Man of the Year in retailing, L.I.U., 
1951; Boy Scouts of Amer. awards; Knight 
and Companion of Cross of Order of 
Lorraine, 1951; Chevalier, Legion of Hon- 
1952, France; Star of Solidarity, Italy. 

ROSENBERG, ALEXANDER S., rabbi; b. Bazin, 
H., Dec. 20, 1893; d. Jerusalem, Israel, 
Sept. 24, 1972; in U.S. since 1921; Rabbi: 
Cong. Ohab Zedek, Yonkers, N.Y., 
1925-72; fdr. dir. Ohab Zedek Acad., 
Yonkers; chaplain Yonkers Fire Dept., since 
1939; rel. dir. JDC in Germany, 1945-47, 
liason rep. SCA to military govt. of 
Germany, 1947; UOJCA kashrut adminis- 
trator, 1950-72; mem. exec. com.: Union of 
Orthodox Rabbis of U.S. & Canada, RCA. 

ROSENBERG, MICHEL, actor; b. Warsaw, 
Poland (?), 1901; d. Miami Beach, Fla., 
Nov. 18, 1972; appeared with Maurice 
Schwarzh's Yiddish Art Theater; in Borscht 
Capades, 1968 and as Mottel in Yiddish 
movies: The Goldbergs; starred in Yiddish films 
Mirele Efros, Cantor's Son in U.S. and 
Uncle Sam in Israel and Highway Robbery 
in Israel. 

RUBERT, SAMUEL R., phys.; surgeon; b. 
N.Y.C., July 7, 1906; d. Lincolnwood, Ill., 
Sept. 2, 1972; trustee Temple Beth El, 
Chicago; hon. pres. Lincolnwood B'nai 
B'rith; chmn. admin. council, Chicago 
ZOA; past pres. Chicago Men's ORT; mem. 
bd. of dir., nat. scholarship chm. Am. ORT 
Fed.; alternate bd. mem. central bd. World 
ORT Union; assoc. chmn. synagogue div., 
speakers' bureau State of Israel Bonds; past 
gen. chmn. Capital for Israel; awards: 
"Man of the Year," State of Israel Bonds, 
1961; Am. ORT Fed., 1970; Chicago Men's 
ORT, 1971. 

RUBIN, JACOB A., journalist, au.; b. Pod- 
wolezyska, Poland, July 1, 1910; d. Lincolnwood, Ill., 
Sept. 2, 1972; trustee Temple Beth El, 
Chicago; hon. pres. Lincolnwood B'nai 
B'rith; v. chmn. admin. council, Chicago 
ZOA; past pres. Chicago Men's ORT; mem. 
bd. of dir., nat. scholarship chm. Am. ORT 
Fed.; alternate bd. mem. central bd. World 
ORT Union; assoc. chmn. synagogue div., 
speakers' bureau State of Israel Bonds; past 
gen. chmn. Capital for Israel; awards: 
"Man of the Year," State of Israel Bonds, 
1961; Am. ORT Fed., 1970; Chicago Men's 
ORT, 1971.
Meeting the Communist Challenge (1970); True False About Israel (1972); other works in Hebrew; contrib. to several encyclopedias and other publications, also in Polish, Yiddish, and German languages; awards: Republican Nat. Com. Presidential Campaign medal, 1972; North Africa Star and Italian Campaign Star of Gt. Britain.


