Statement by Referee of Senior Thesis

The Senior dissertation entitled:

"A Dynamic Study of the Family in Judaism"

written by Jason Z. Edelstein
(name of student)

1) may (with revisions) be considered for publication: (✓)

cannot be considered for publication: ( )

2) may, on request, be loaned by the Library: (✓)

may not be loaned by the Library: ( )

Robert L Katz
(signature of referee)

Dr. Robert L. Katz
(referee)

March 1958
(date)

INSTRUCTIONS TO LIBRARY

Statement by author:

I hereby give permission to the Library to circulate my thesis

✓ (yes) ____ (no)

The Library may sell positive microfilm copies of my thesis

✓ (yes) ____ (no)

Date May 12, 1959 Jason Z. Edelstein (signature of author)

Library record

The below-named thesis was microfilmed on May 15, 1959 (date)

For the Library [signature] (signature of staff member)

AUTHOR Edelstein, Jason Z.

TITLE A Dynamic Study of the Family in Judaism

A DYNAMIC STUDY OF THE FAMILY IN JUDAISM

---

by

Jason Z. Edelstein

Thesis Submitted
In Partial Fulfillment of
Requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College
Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio

1958

Referee, Professor Robert L. Katz

D I G E S T

This investigation of the dynamics of the traditional Jewish family was undertaken to determine the psychological impact of family life on the development of Jewish consciousness in the Jew. The general hypothesis of the study is that the family is the basic institution of Judaism because it has the power to mold permanent identification patterns. This enables it to build into the personality of the individual a core of Jewishness which subsequently may be reinforced by secondary social institutions such as the school and the synagogue.

In analyzing the character of the Jewish Family three central ideals were found to be basic. These are goals toward which family patterns are directed; the inculcation of an awareness of individual and collective responsibility, the development of the view that study is the most important work, and that spirituality is the highest attainment.

The psychology of Jewish family living is best understood from an analysis of the role structure of the family, the opportunities for the satisfaction of the individual needs of its members, and the patterns of interaction operating within the household. Religion exercised a highly significant influence in molding these three aspects of family life. It reinforced by purposeful regulation the natural interdependence of parental roles, and fixed the husband-father figure and the wife-mother figure as the frame of reference for role development among the children. It also provided

means of attaining the satisfaction of individual psychological needs. In addition it helped to develop certain acceptable means of dealing with the tensions and conflicts of group life. Above all it fixed certain patterns of interaction between the parents and the children by regulating the sphere of male-female relationships and by intruding ritual and custom into everyday life.

The general conclusion derived from this study is that the Jewish family pattern was in its psychological makeup certain to instill a strong sense of Jewish identity in its respective members.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the dynamics of the Jewish family in relation to the individual and to his identification with Judaism. It is to be noted that the designation "Jewish family" as employed in this investigation refers to the observant family or the family which considered itself bound by Jewish law and tradition. The major frame of reference utilized is that of Rabbinic Judaism. The Bible is also a source but more emphasis is placed on the rabbinic conception of marriage and family. Hence, references from the Talmud, Midrash, and especially the Schulhan Aruch are used as a basis for discovering the traditional foundation of family life. A further primary source of data is the study reported in Life Is With People by Mark Zborowski and Elizabeth Herzog. This recent anthropological investigation represents, from the standpoint of scientific technique, a valid method of determining the Jewish family pattern of the Eastern European Jew. Since this family pattern was traditional in nature, the study qualifies as a primary source for the examination of the general characteristics of Jewish family life. Secondary sources in the present investigation are employed chiefly in the service of amplifying the main trends cited in the major sources.

The historical scope embraces material from the Biblical period to an uneven terminating line stretching from the seventeenth century to somewhere in the nineteenth century. The point at which family life changed cannot be fixed because the pre-emancipated or observant Jewish family disappeared in stages.

In this day of crisis for the family of Western culture, there is need on the part of the Jew to evaluate his place in the modern era, to examine his family background of the past against the family trends of the present. Because the family molds the personality of the Jew it serves as the guardian and transmitter of the Jewish heritage. This factor alone is of such great import that any threat to the Jewish family must be considered a threat to Judaism itself. Hence it is a matter of such grave concern that a modern social scientist states that,

> The Jewish family is today subjected to all the strains which affect family life in general in a sick society, plus those which come from identification with victims of extermination or which arise from increasing discrimination.[1]

But the full significance of this statement for Judaism cannot be appreciated without first becoming familiar with a former time in which the health and well being of the Jewish family was an unquestioned reality.

Assumptions underlying the Approach of the Study

The roots of the Jewish family are intertwined with the roots of the religion of the Jew. From the Biblical

account of the patriarchs it has been noted that, "The tribal organization which is described to us in the records of early Hebrew life is firmly founded upon the patriarchal family."[2] The so called "chain of tradition" which has become a symbol of religious authority and authenticity originates in the familial tie of the father to the son. The destiny of an entire people and its future promise is contained in the father's blessing to his son reflected in Isaac's statement to his son Jacob,

> And God Almighty bless thee, and make thee fruitful and multiply thee, that thou mayest be a congregation of peoples; and give thee the blessing of Abraham, to thee, and to thy seed with thee; that thou mayest inherit the land of thy sojournings, which God gave unto Abrhaham. (Genesis 28:3,4)

In fact an understanding of the whole fabric of early Hebrew society is not possible apart from a clear concept of the patriarchal family.[3] Hence, the basis for the interlocking relationship of religion and family is as ancient as the Hebrew people itself.

The father was the central figure in the patriarchal family and it was he who assumed the responsibility for the worship service on behalf of his wife and children (Genesis 8:20; 13:4; 22:13,14; and Job 1:5). He also determined the standards of right and wrong for the family group and by his power insured the supremacy of family authority. This stress on the power of the home is best illustrated by the closing verses of the Book of Malachi in which it is prophesied that

Elijah will be sent, "Before the coming of the great and terrible day of the Lord. And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers."

The significance of the family for Judaism became a matter of vital concern from the founding of the theocracy. Paul Schrecker[4] in an essay entitled The Family: Conveyance of Tradition states,

> A patriarchal theocracy like ancient Judaism was naturally led to emphasize the family conveyance of traditions and to surround it with the strongest possible protective sanctions. Since in a theocracy all patterns of civilization are principally determined by the norms issuing from revelation, and all traditions therefore became religious traditions--since, moreover, in the then prevailing state of society the family still remained the sole institution to which the transmission of traditions could be entrusted--its authority and fitness for this task had to take precedence over all other considerations.

The protective sanctions surrounding the family took the form of a definitive set of regulations governing the family life pattern. The regulations were devised by the rabbis who based their action on the material relating to family already present in the Bible. Since religious authority was the rationale for such regulation, the pattern of family life was determined by the religious injunctions of Torah. This hallowing of the Jewish home was a notable factor in the fostering of Judaism after the Babylonian Exile.[5]

The resultant forms and traditions surrounding the home became fixed as solidly as the Torah itself in ordering the course of Jewish life. Hence, it appears reasonable to

assume that any Jewish family which could be designated pre emancipated (considered itself bound by the "yoke" of Jewish law) would in its main characteristics reflect a single pattern regardless of the period in which it existed. A related assumption which would give further support to the idea of the universality and constancy of the Jewish family pattern concerns the minority status of the Jew. The assumption is that the Jew's wish to remain separate and distinct from the majority tended to block majority cultural influences from modifying the basic characteristics of the Jewish family. In support of this assumption is the sociologist's statement that the less a group "participates in the institutions of the host society designed to transmit the traditions of the majority, the more will it be led to foster and strengthen its native family conveyance."[6]

It hasalready been stated that from the earliest period of Jewish history there has existed a close relationship between religion and family. This alliance between two major social institutions must have been essentially natural for the relationship to persist down to the modern period. If this assumption is correct, then a high degree of compatibility should exist between family values and religious values. In the discussion to follow an attempt will be made to prove the foregoing hypothesis by an examination of Jewish attitudes toward family. Following this, by way of contrast, the alliance of family and religion in Christianity will be cited as illustrative of a more artificial relationship between these two institutions.

Jewish and Christian Views of Marriage and Family

The basic rationale for Jewish marriage is religious. It is the expectation of the Deity that man and woman shall be joined in wedlock:

> And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from the man, made He a woman, and brought her unto the man. And the man said: 'This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh. (Genesis 2:22-25)

The primary motive for marriage is propogation. Thus Jewish law states that, "A man is duty bound to take unto himself a wife in order to fulfill the precept of propogation."[7] The source for this law is the statement in Genesis 1:28 which commands man to "be fruitful and multiply."

Abrahams[8] notes, "The Scriptures had used the relation of husband to wife as a type of God's relation to His world. Jewish mystics of the Middle Ages compared a man's love to God with a man's love for his wife. If the first duty of a Jew wasto beget children, his religion gave the sanction to the obligation and idealized it." The children born of the marital union were treasured as highly valued possessions and though there is a distinct preference for sons because of the high position accorded the male, "nevertheless daughters are cherished if to a rather lesser extent than their brothers."[9]

Although the basic meaning of "Kiddushin," the rabbinic term for marriage, is the act of distinguishing the wife as possessed and hence tabooed to other men, the word became

invested with the idea of ethical and religious consecration.[10] Thus the bond of wedlock became associated with the idea of holy, not in the sense of the sacrament, but in the sense of the good and the ethical. In other words, marriage was looked upon as a natural blessing in life in much the same way that the availability of food and other necessities of life are considered blessings graciously provided by an all wise and merciful deity. Thus, "once that in which the family is rooted is owned as being blessed of God, the religious nature of family life follows naturally and inevitably. Children are the divine gift, their upbringing a delegated trusteeship from the Creator."[11] Yet marriage in the thinking of Judaism was not solely for the purpose of procreation, but the state itself, apart from its relationship to family, was considered natural and basically good. The sex act between husband and wife was not only a means to an end but in part constituted an end in itself. Hence, Jewish law states that, "even if propogation is not possible still a man should marry."[12] Thus in Jewish life marriage and family with their respective patterns of sexual behavior, companionship, love, and responsibility are fully endorsed by Jewish religious teachings. Consequently there is no basis for conflict in the alliance of religion and family in Judaism.

It has been suggested that religion was characteristically interlinked with family in the older society in contrast to the conditions of today. Reuben Hill[13] in his revision of

Waller's work on the family notes that during the earlier period, "the thread of religious life wove through family" and that religion was a significant integrating force in strengthening the family. The implication of this thinking is that an alliance likewise existed between religion and the Christian family which would appear to suggest that there is nothing unique about the religious link with the family in Judaism. However, a brief examination of Christian thinking on marriage and family reveals attitudes which are incompatible with Christian religious views.

The most striking example of this inherent conflict between family and religion is contained in the basic source of Christianity, the New Testament. Thus Jesus is quoted as having said:

> For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law: and a man's foes shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. (Saint Matthew 10:35-37)

Therefore the relationship of religion and family as referred to by Hill seems explainable in terms of a more artificial and certainly less vital institutional alliance in Christianity than is the case in Judaism. This conclusion seems inescapable in view of the fundamental conflict in Christian thought between the sex-love-marriage bond and the church.

Professor Roland H. Bainton[14] of Yale University Divinity School in discussing Augustine's view of the sacrament of

marriage reflects this basic conflict.

> 'If we could have children in any other way we would refrain entirely from sex. Since we cannot, we indulge regretfully.' Augustine almost voices the wish that the creator had contrived some other device. If we are to fulfill His will we are inevitably placed in the position of being constrained to sin. This sin, however, is covered by the sacrament of marriage to the degree that that which, outside of marriage, would be a mortal offense, within marriage is only venial. The same point applies to relationships within the marriage bond for satisfaction rather than for progeny. The practise is condemmed. Yet no married couple will profess to have confined itself to the needs of procreation. The offense again is covered by the sacrament.

The sharpness of the contrast between this view and the Jewish view is best illustrated by such statements in the Talmud as, "He who has no wife is not a man for does not Scripture say 'male and female He created them ... and call their name Adam." (Yeb. 63a) and, "God waits impatiently for man to marry." (Kid. 29b).

Mace[15] in his comparison of the attitudes of Christianity and the Old Testament toward marriage writes,

> It is a great pity that the inhibited Christian mind has obscured for us all too often those wholesome features of Old Testament marriage. Some of the statements of the Early Fathers, with their implications concerning the unspiritual and even unwholesome nature of the appointed means of human generation, would have sounded gravely heretical in Hebrew ears.

Indeed to imply that sexual union which "was not only blessed of God, but given by Him as a good thing to be enjoyed, might be sinful or in some way tainted, would for the Hebrew mind have implied dishonoring the creator."[16]

In Christianity the way to serve the Deity wholeheartedly is through celibacy since virginity is the preferred state,[17] it being the assurance of freedom from the sin of the sex act. In Judaism it is through marriage that one can serve the Deity most fully. For example, in the period of the Temple, marriage among the priests was the accepted norm and extended even to the high priest (Yoma 1:1). Succeeding religious leaders, including the rabbis, were also expected to marry. Abrahams[18] notes that, "The fact that the Rabbi, unlike the priest, was not only permissibly married, but was expected and even compelled to take a wife, worked powerfully towards the elevation of the married state." The Talmud itself states that it is the law that a man shall marry first and then pursue the study of Torah (Kiddushin 29b).

It naturally follows from the preceeding discussion that the rapport between religion and family in Judaism is a fundamental characteristic of Jewish life dating as far back as the Biblical period. Furthermore the alliance of these two institutions is no reflection of a particular period nor is it a temporary arrangement, but it arises out of the fact that the sex-love-marriage bond is religiously commanded.

The General Hypothesis of the Study

It is the general hypothesis of this study that the family is the basic institution of the Jew since it surrounds him with attitudes and patterns of action which inculcate

that complex culture frequently termed the Jewish heritage. It is through family living that the Jew becomes aware of and irreversibly identified with Judaism as "a way of life." It is only subsequent to this attitude formation that an extension of the implications of this life and an emphasis on certain values within it can be achieved. These latter functions are assumed by the school and the synagogue which are secondary to the family in their influence on the individual.

Outline of the Thesis

Chapter 2 - A psychological analysis of the significance of the family in the communication of values and ideals to the individual and an examination of its role in influencing character formation.

Chapter 3 - An examination of the values and ideals which constitute the character of the Jewish family and which consequently reflect the background for its interactive pattern.

Chapter 4 - An examination of the roles of the Jewish male and female against the background of religious influences.

Chapter 5 - An analysis of the opportunities for the satisfaction of individual needs in the family setting with attention to the relationship between need satisfaction and religious factors.

Chapter 6 - An examination of the family interaction pattern and its relationship to religious factors.

Chapter 7 - A statement of the conclusions and implications of the study with emphasis on the significance of these for the present day Jew.

CHAPTER II

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FAMILY

In this chapter the psychological significance of the family will be discussed in relation to certain concepts of dynamics. This material will constitute the psychological framework for the analysis of Jewish family patterns treated in succeeding chapters. Therefore it is important to define clearly the concepts to be employed in the later analysis and to demonstrate the interrelationship of these concepts.

Definition of Terms

The family is an institution which reflects the individual as well as the social character of the human species. It is within the family that one can best observe the process of socialization and self realization operating in concert for the benefit of the individual and for the welfare of society. This dual character of the family necessitates the employment of concepts which apply especially to its social features and other concepts which pertain fundamentally to the individual within the family.

Before proceeding to elaborate upon each system of concepts and the interaction of the two systems, certain basic terms must first be defined. The family is a group by definition since the social psychologists define group as referring to, "two or more people who bear an explicit

psychological relationship to one another."[1] The family is one of the basic groups in society and has consequently been termed a primary group which usually connotes a husband, wife and their children. It is through the kinship system that there occurs a vertical extension of these primary groups through generations with a continuity in time and a lateral extension of these primary groups through the collatoral relatives of an existing generation.[2]

The term dynamics refers to the combination of forces and determinants which influence the individuals within the group. Hence the dynamics of the family as treated in this thesis relates to the primary group interaction of father, mother and sibling.[3] It has been noted that, "the family is the extreme example of the primary group, one of the purest types available. No primary group is more intimate, more informal, more spontaneous or more clearly face to face in structure."[4]

The full significance of family life to human development is still not completely understood nor appreciated. This is true in spite of the fact that extensive observation and study in the field of human behavior has definitely indicated that the family milieu permits more emotional interaction than any other aspect of the environment. A full and thbrough analysis of all of the subtleties of this institution must await the development of more advanced conceptual thinking from the combined disciplines of sociology,

anthropology, psychology, and psychiatry. Nevertheless, there are available even at the present time methods and concepts which afford the investigator an opportunity to study the family as an organism. This approach is in marked contrast to the past in which there has been a "tendency to regard the family as a static entity and to relate an abstract conception of the family to an abstractly conceived society."[5] In the thinking of our own day we see that, "a family is a number of human lives not only mixed together but compounded with one another. This is the true meaning of the family as primary group, the sentimental interdependence of family members, the synthesis and concretion of mind and flesh."[6]

Family Character or Value Orientation

The family, like any other organization of people, is governed by certain principles and values. It has a system of values which in their totality formulate the character of the group. An investigation of these values is essential for an understanding of the character of the family, which in turn is intimately associated with the psychology of its life pattern. In attempting such an understanding of the character of family, a first challenge for the objective investigator is to deal with the matter of cultural differences in the family depending upon the particular period and the particular society in which any given family is situated. However, this need not be a bar to the study of family character structure provided that certain universals and constants can be

postulated as applying to any family in all periods and in all societies. A frame of reference which suggests a formulation of such universals is offerred by Florence Kluckhohn and John P. Spiegel in their report on Integration and Conflict in Family Behavior sponsored by the committee on the family of the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry. They postulate the following assumptions in approaching an understanding of value orientation in the family:[7]

> 1. There is a limited number of common human problems for which all peoples at all times and in all places must find some solution.
>
> 2. While there is variability in solutions of the problems, it is neither limitless nor random but is instead a variability within a range of possible solutions.
>
> 3. All variants (all alternatives) of all solutions are in varying degrees present in the total cultural structure of every society. There will be, in other words, in every society not only a dominant profile of value orientations, which is made up of those orientations most highly evaluated, but also variant or substitute profiles of orientations.

The term value orientation as utilized in the present study is considered analogous to the expression "character" of the family.

> A value-orientation may be defined as a generalized and organized conception, influencing behavior, of nature, of man's place in it, of man's relation to man, and of the desirable and non-desirable as they relate to man--environment and interhuman relations.[8]

The value orientation of a family at any period in man's history will be based on the responses to five crucial questions which are common to all human groups. The questions are the following:[9]

1. What is the character of inate human nature? -- The type of response given by the family to this question will help mold social attitudes toward one's fellow man and toward mankind in general. The family may conceive of man as inherently evil, inherently good, a mixture of both good and evil or being neither good nor evil. The type of discipline employed by the parents in rearing their siblings will likewise be influenced to a very great extent by what conception of human nature they hold.

2. What is man's relationship to nature? -- The family might train its members to look upon themselves as subjugated by the forces of nature to the end that one is taught to accept without question the supreme dominance of natural events. A contrasting attitude toward nature, that of conquest of and mastery over, is associated with training which encourages the individual members of the family to view nature as a force to subdue and to rule. A third and final alternative attitude is the harmonization of man and nature, an outlook which contends that man and nature are one unity.

3. What is the temporal focus of human life? -- This question relates to the amount of emphasis which is placed on a particular time orientation. Although in every society there is concern with the past, the present and the future, it is the period upon which the greatest amount of emphasis is placed that constitutes the temporal focus. The matter of temporal focus within the family is important in

understanding the goal behavior of the individuals within the group and the amount of change or lack of it within the family life pattern.

4. Whatis the modality of human activity? -- The family, because it is a collection of individuals with varying needs, must develop some basic approach to the self concepts of its several members. The amount of concern for the development of the concept of self which the family may hold will be reflected in the scope of psychological growth permitted to the individual. If attention is focused on the "being" range of activity then the individual within the family will be taught to be spontaneous in his self expression. The emphasis here is on self acceptance. If attention is focused on the "being-in-becoming" range of activity the spontaneous self expression is linked to creative activity and its goal is the integration of the complete self as a whole. A third possibility is the "doing" range of activity which is concerned primarily with achievement, producing measurable accomplishments and hence making the actor subordinate to the action. Irrespective of the dominance of any one of these modes of activity, there is the social code of the family which governs the extent to which individual movement is permitted. Self expression at any one of these levels is subject to the overriding concern of the family for its own integrity and well being.

5. What is the modality of man's relationship to man? -- The family's response to this question governs its allegiance pattern. Although to some extent every family will focus attention on its lineal relations (ancestors) its collateral relations (present relatives) and on the individual family member, a dominant emphasis of family thinking will frequently emerge. The relational orientation defined by the family will influence the types of identification made by the individual members of the group and will likewise influence their behavior. The continuity of institutional patterns within the family will also be very much affected by the relational orientation of its members.

The answers to these five crucial questions dealing with the family's view of man's inherent character, his relationship to nature, his orientation in time, his mode of activity and his relationship to other men can provide a frame of reference for understanding the value orientation of a particular ethnic family. It should be noted, however, that these five areas represent only a conceptual scheme for the purpose of understanding the value system of the family. The use of this scheme is justified on the basis of the vital information it may yield regarding the Jewish family. It is not implied that this approach is a scientifically validated method which has been found to be reliable. However, precedents exist in the field of the social sciences where methods which have not been scientifically validated have

yielded considerable insight to our understanding of human behavior. The most notable example of such a precedent is the application of psychoanalytic theoretical concepts to many areas of human behavior. If the method of analyzing the value orientation of the family as exposited above contributes to a general understanding of the character of the Jewish family then its use will have been justified.

The Concept of Interaction

The family has already been defined as a group. The individuals within this group, by virtue of their interdependence, constitute its essence as a "dynamic whole."[10] The use of the term dynamic suggests an interlocking relationship among the various persons comprising the family unit. On the operational level this implies that any action by any one member of the family group has an effect on every other member of the group. Since reference has already been made to the fact that the family constitutes an intimate primary group, the concept of interaction as here defined is of particular significance. The importance of interaction in the family setting is related to the principle that the more intimate the group the greater the impact of the action of any one of its members on every other member. This interactive process contributes to the creation of group values and permits the transmission of these values to the young.

An essential requisite for such interaction is a certain degree of adjustment between the individual and the group.

The late Kurt Lewin, one of the founders of group dynamics research, discussed this adaptation in an article entitled The Background of Conflict in Marriage. He stated that,

> Belonging to a certain group does not mean that the individual must be in accord in every respect with the goals, regulations, and the style of living and thinking of the group. The individual has to a certain degree his own personal goals. He needs a sufficient space of free movement within the group to pursue those personal goals and to satisfy his individual wants.[11]

In other words, there must be an opportunity for the satisfaction of the individual's own need systems which in their totality constitute his personality integrity before he can be expected to function interactively for the benefit of the group's integrity.

An analysis of the individual's psychological relationship to the group requires that some attention be given to the general concept of character structure. Henry A. Murray, one of the foremost experts in the development of personality theory, hasgiven an excellent definition of needs and their systemization. He suggests that the living process requires the organism to constantly strive for equilibrium because of disturbing conditions which are created by internal and external factors. The needs are the disturbances which through coordination and direction seek to reestablish the equilibrium. These needs are of two types: physical and psychological.[12] The need in its basic essence is a kind of tension state which stimulates action. However, social

and cultural factors modify primitive needs into a developed need system. The developed need is something more than the vague tension of the raw need, since it becomes linked with a particular means of satisfaction. When a distinct preference for this satisfaction occurs to the exclusion of other satisfactions, then the need hasbecome linked to attitudes and habits. Hence the habit is a repetitive behavior pattern designed to satisfy certain developed needs. The final result of the need-habit bond is the development of character. "Character arises from the action of habits and of habit systems upon one another: it may be defined as the interpenetration of habits."[13] As in the case of the developed need, habits are also culturally conditioned so that inevitably social attitudes become embedded in the very character structure of the individual. The full significance of this social influence is demonstrated by the fact that a philosophy of life held by an individual is a consequence of and not the determinant of habits.[14]

Having thus far defined the structural features of character formation beginning from the idea of need, it may now be helpful to examine the process of formation and the part cultural attitudes play in it. An essential link with the previously discussed material is the concept of role. The formal definition of the concept is as follows: "A limited set of behaviors tied together by a common understanding of the functions of a position."[15] Roles and

habits and hence are related to needs.[16] It is through the mechanism of the role that the individual establishes his relationship to the group. This is due to the fact that,

> Role behavior on the part of two or more individuals involved in reciprocal transaction both defines the situation and regulates it. The regulation is established in two ways: first, by the effect of the sanctioning function implicit in the counter-role response; second, through the functioning of the shared system of meanings and values which orient the actions of the participants.[17]

It is through the shifting of roles among the family members that common values and attitudes are developed and transmitted. This shifting of roles or role playing is a constant process in which all people become involved. It is a form of communication and "as such, it is dependent upon a system of cues, signs, symbols, meanings and values shared by the participants in the situation," while its reciprocal character stems from the fact that responses in turn stimulate additional role playing in the originator.[18] As a result of continuing role playing from the earliest period in life, certain central trends of development are established which, "contain the ultimate unanalyzable and unquestionable values" which form the basis of character. These values by the very nature of role behavior are socially conditioned. They also represent the chain which links the integrity of the individual with the integrity of his family. Role playing is the key to an understanding of family interaction and the process of character formation.

The Child - Inheritor of Family Values and Product of the Interactive Process

> The social organization which supports the species, requires for its perpetuation that the new members be recruited in an orderly and systematic fashion. There is no doubt that every society universally ascribes a rank order--a destiny--to its children at the moment of birth through the mechanism of the family. Children cannot be potentially anybody with a perfectly random, anything-is-possible kind of future ahead of them. In order that the structure and function of the social system be maintained children have to be introduced into it with an ascribed social status--a place to begin, and a range of selection of future goals from out of the myriad of possibilities.[19]

The "future" of the child as determined by the family is actualized in proportion to the family's ability and willingness to satisfy his numerous and shifting needs. It is the child's long term dependence on others and his relatively slow emotional development which permits the family to help fashion his concept of identity and status. His most basic need is to be loved in order that he may feel the emotional security necessary for the development of the self concept. The chief supplier of this love is the mother.

> The more parasitic the infant, the more giving must be the mother; the more helpless the child, the more protective must be the parent. The child sucks up energies, for its goal is its own growth and development. The mother pours out energies, for her goal is now to assure the best development of her offspring.[20]

Once the physical necessities of life are reasonably assured and the child builds up an association bond between mother and food, there is a relaxation of sustenance anxiety. Thus the extreme dependency needs of the child in the course

of time are satisfied and new emerging needs cause movement away from the exclusive figure of the mother and bring into focus the father and other members of the primary family group.

With the passage of time the infant begins to discover his environment and eventually a concept of his own person.

> It is difficult for an adult to imagine the experiences of an infant--just feelings, devoid of perception, memory, or understanding. Gradually they are tied together by conditioning; habits are established, patterns are perceived, and derivations from the usual are recognized. The year-old infant does not distinguish his body from the rest of the environment. Feeling an ear or a toe produces double sensations, but so too does sucking a rattle held in the hand. Some parts of the body may not be discovered until the child is two or three years old, and the more detailed discrimination of feelings comes later with a widening range of experiences.[21]

From the discovery of his own body the child moves on to learn through his sex identity, through seeing his image in a mirror, and through being scolded for wrong actions that he constitutes a unitary self.[22]

The part played by authority in this process is vital since it conveys to the child the demands of the group to which he must adjust himself. It hasbeen stated that, "in the family children learn through frustrating experiences the reality of authority, the limitations on their rights and privileges, identifying in the process their parents as symbols of authority. From these experiences, patterns of reaction to all symbols of authority are constructed."[23]

The family environment constitutes the child's chief source of information about reality, himself and the world.

> In his relations with his parents the child plays the role of the child, but he imaginatively participates in the role of the parent. When he succeeds to the role of the parent, it is easy for him, because he has already played it in his imagination. He merely shifts from one side to the other of an already established interaction pattern.[24]

The extent to which the child is the inheritor of family valuesand the product of the interaction process is best illustrated by the following quotation from the article on Integration and Conflict in Family Behavior which has been referred to earlier.

> Because our children bring so little pre-determined behavior into the world with them and have so much to acquire, they need a great deal of time to learn how to play their roles in life. By the same token, they can be taught a wide variety of behavior, and since much of it is mutually exclusive, once it has been learned, it cannot easily be unlearned or relearned, or transferred to a different kind of social system.[25]

Summary

In this chapter the family has been defined in terms of its group character with some attention given to the need for a certain absolute minimum of freedom for individual movement within the group. It has been emphasized that family patterns reflect both the individual and social character of the human species.

In succeeding chapters the concepts and terms defined herein will be applied to the patterns of the Jewish family.

CHAPTER III

THE CHARACTER OF THE JEWISH FAMILY

The study of the dynamic interaction process is not possible without some understanding of the cultural background against which the dynamic forces operate. The family's interaction pattern reflects those ideals and values which the culture has infused into the character of the family group. In this chapter the discussion will focus on the concepts ideals and values which constitute the character of the Jewish family.

Kluckhohn and Spiegel[1] have suggested five crucial areas which in their totality reveal the value orientation of the family. These are the attitude toward human nature, man's relationship to nature, the time focus of life, the character of man's activity in life, and the relationship of man to his family. In the material to follow these five areas will be examined with the intent of describing the value orientation of the Jewish family.

The Jewish View of Man

Human nature as described in Jewish literature is basically good not evil.[2] The essential purity of man is a theme found in the daily prayers[3] of the Jew who addresses God as follows:

> My God, the soul which thou has placed within me is pure. Thou hast created it; thou hast formed it; thou hast breathed it into me. Thou preservest it within me; thou wilt take it from me and restore it to me in the hereafter.

A conception of man which would propose that he is inherently evil would be to suggest that God Himself is also evil, since in Genesis 1:27 it states that, "God created man in His own image" and emphasizes this by restating that, "in the image of God created He him." This view of man, however, does not imply that he is entirely free of negative influences. Man can and does rebel and this constitutes his sin against God's majesty.[4] The source of this rebellion is the Yezer Hara, the so called evil yezer which is frequently termed the leaven in the dough. "But the leaven, evil as it is, has, according to the Rabbis, its good purpose and its proper place in the universe, as anything created by God, indeed, cannot be entirely evil."[5] Actually the Yezer Hara appears to be synonymous with the human passions which are considered necessary and constitute evil only when they become uncontrolled and abusive.

In the Jewish family, then, there was a fundamental requirement of respect for each member of the group, since every human is made in the image of the Divine. The newly born child entered the world with a pure soul. However, it became the responsibility of the parents to insure that the Yezer Hara did not gain mastery over him. This meant that the child had to be taught to control his impulses and consequently discipline became a vitally important matter. If the child was not disciplined then he might be led to sin because of his unrestrained Yezer Hara. Nonetheless, the

divine aspect of the human also acted as a restraint against the infliction of too severe discipline. Punishment was considered essential but was to be used with moderation. This attitude is expressed in the Biblical statement, "He that spareth his rod hateth his son; But he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes" (Proverbs 13:24).

The problem of the Yezer Hara involved everyone in the family; all had to be concerned with self discipline. Man was thought to have a unified personality but its component parts had both the characteristics of that which is earthly and that which is heavenly (Genesis 2:7). Consequently it was the duty of every Jew to conduct himself in such a fashion that he would not become subjected completely to the terrestrial side of his nature. Hence in the family life pattern it was expected that precautions against unsuitable behavior were needed and executed.

The Jewish Attitude toward the Environment

The Jewish concept of man's relationship to nature, or to restate this in a broader context, the relationship of man to his environment, was closely associated with the character of family living especially in regard to the Sabbath. The definition of man's relationship to the environment is given in the Bible. In Genesis 1:28-29 man is commanded to subdue the earth and is given dominion over all its animals and plant life. However, after Adam's expulsion from the

Garden of Eden the Deity ceased to assume responsibility for man's life needs and he was sent forth to struggle with the environment and to wrench from it his sustenance.

> Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in toil shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life. Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground;"[6]

The link which connected these two passages, one demonstrating that man was the Deity's appointed agent sent to subdue the earth and the other demonstrating a loss of this privileged position, was the concept of Sabbath. The Sabbath represents the harmonization of the Deity, man, beast and nature into one serene universe. The Sabbath provided man with the opportunity to regain his former security in the Garden of Eden. It was the day of rest, but more essentially it was the commemoration of creation, the time before man was condemmed to toil for his bread. The Sabbath provided the Jew with the contrast between his labor of the week and his rest on the day of the Divine.

The true goal of man's contact with the environment was not to conquer it but to harmonize with it. On the Sabbath the Jewish family lived this harmony and made it a vital experience for each of its members by setting aside the day with special food, ritual, and activities. But during the week both young and old resumed the task of making the environment yield its benefits. Indeed, without such a weekly struggle the family well knew that there would be no true reward on the Sabbath.

The Temporal Focus of the Jewish Family

The temporal focus of the Jewish family was mainly centered on the past and to some extent on the future. Law and tradition constituted the guiding force in the life of the Jew and his family. It was the unique experience of the revelation on Mount Sinai which became the basic frame of reference for the conduct of the individual and of his group. Deuteronomy 4:9 commands the people to tell "thy children and thy children's children: the day that thou stoodest before the Lord thy God in Hoeb." Yet more important than the occurence at Sinai were the testimonies, the statutes, and the ordinances which the Deity commanded the people at that time. These formed the nucleus of the constitution of Jewish life embodied first in the Bible[7] and later continued in the Talmud. However, the supremacy of the authority of the past was unquestioned since the revelation was believed complete and binding for all time[8] in spite of some actual modifications appearing in the Talmud. Not only ancient law but custom as well assumed the authority which tradition conveyed. This orientation inevitably influenced the family and its members since it was the transmitor of the tradition. The Jewish attitude toward the past is best summarized in the Biblical admonition, "Remove not the ancient landmark which the fathers have set."[9]

In the course of daily life as well as on the festivals and special occasions the family constantly revitalized the

past and infused life into the tradition. Beside the past there was also the future, the promise of a life after death, a recompense which was spiritual in nature.[10] And this future was dependent upon one's actions in the present, as the Rabbis had said, "This world is like a vestibule before the world to come: prepare thyself in the vestibule that thou mayest enter into the banqueting hall."[11] Undoubtedly the promise of a future life was comforting to the Jewish family which found itself immersed in a harsh struggle for survival but the importance of the tradition was probably a more universal feature in influencing the family. It was the present which made possible the fulfillment of the tradition and the attainment of the future life.

The Jew's Role in Life

The family in many different ways expressed the distinctiveness of its Jewish character. Dietary regulations, special rituals and most important of all the sense of identification with the Jewish people--these had important effects on the members of the family and especially on the children. It was this distinctiveness which is associated with the Jewish concept of man's role in life. This role had a two-fold aspect.

The first aspect related to the fact that man was made in the image of the Deity. Therefore, he had the potential for close communion with the Divine. He was commanded, "Be ye holy, for I, the Lord your God, am holy" (Leviticus 19:2). His task was to cultivate his spiritual character, to be

as much like God as he could, and since God represents justice and mercy and goodness, these too are the characteristics for which the Jew was to strive. To accomplish this goal the Jew was expected to express his fullest self and to strive for an even higher elevation of that self. The means by which this could be accomplished was through a creative life dedicated to the sanctification of the Deity. "Man's true vocation is to be a creator. He is called upon to complete that which God has initiated."[12]

A second aspect of man's role concerned his identification with his people Israel. His membership in Israel carried with it special obligations. He was first of all expected to live an ethical and holy life and to conduct himself at all times in a manner befitting his station. The basis for this obligation was the admonishment in Exodus 19:6 "Ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." However, in addition to this responsibility there was the concept of communicating the divine word to others by means of the exemplification of upright living. Hence the Jew as an individual and in his family was ever mindful of the mission of Israel.[13]

The Relationship of the Jewish Family to the Jewish People

The Jew's relationship to his immediate family (primary group) was not free of connections with lineal relations (ancestors) nor with collateral relations (present relatives).

The family was the basic unit in Hebrew society and the clan, the tribe and the nation were all considered its extensions. Descent from a common ancestor was the link between the patriarchal family and the Jewish family. This consciousness of ancestral ties is expressed in the frequent references to the patriarchs in the prayerbook. Even in his praise of the Divine the Jew says,

> Blessed art Thou, Lord our God and God of our fathers, God of Abraham, God of Isaac and God of Jacob; great, mighty and revered God, sublime God, who bestowest lovingkindness and art Master of all things; who remememberest the good deeds of our fathers, and who wilt graciously bring a redeemer to their children's children for the sake of Thy name.[14]

Also implied in this passage is the idea that the merit of the fathers is somehow associated with the merit of every Jew since all are part of one family. This idea of imputed righteousness may be derived from the more immediate ancestors and from one's collateral relations.

The Ideals of the Jewish Family

It can be stated that on the basis of this discussion of the five crucial areas in the value orientation of the family, certain ideals reflect most clearly the character of the Jewish family. These ideals are three, the consciousness of individual and collective responsibility, the recognition of scholarship as being the most important work and the attainment of spirituality as the highest goal.

Responsibility was the keynote of the marriage state itself since the establishment of a new family was not completely divorced from allegiance to the family from which one came. According to Jewish law, "If the parents are against their children's marriage to a certain party, the right is with the children provided the marriage is not against religion.[15] However, the parent family could, if it so desired, excommunicate its rebellious offspring who in their eyes had neglected their responsibility. Schauss[16] speaks of this family right in the following description.

> Not all men conformed with the social rules. Occasionally, a defiant young man married beneath his social rank, to the great embarassment of his family. Sometimes the family was shocked into disinheriting the defiant member and severing all connection with him. This act of disinheriting a young man was marked by a ceremony called K'tsotso, which means severing, cutting off.
>
> In the Talmud there is a description of this queer ceremony performed in the following manner:
>
> The members of the family come together, bringing a cask full of fruits. In the presence of the children, the open middle space in the cask was broken and the children picked up the fruit and called out, 'Brethren of the House of Israel, hear! Our brother so-and-so has married a woman who is not worthy of him and we are afraid lest his descendants will be united with our descendants. Come and take a warning for future generations, that his descendants shall not be united with our descendants.' (Ketuboth 28b)

Severance of all relations with the disinherited member was thus publicly proclaimed and impressed upon the memory of both the older and younger generation who participated in the K'tsotso ceremony.

Even in instances where a marriage was endorsed, the parental family continued to have close ties with the married couple. For example it frequently happened that the father-in-law of the groom sustained the couple for a period sufficient enough to give them an opportunity to gain economic independence. This was particularly true in the case of early marriages.

The ideal of responsibility in Jewish marriage and family is best illustrated by Lowenthal's[17] comments about the seventeenth century Glueckel of Hameln.

> Married according to the Jewish custom of her day, at a tender age to a lad of her parent's choice, Glueckel not only found abiding joy in wedlock, but the question of marital unhappiness never arises in all her tattle of herself and her friends. We feel the question does not exist. Few couples, no doubt, lived to call themselves, as Glueckel and Chayim are prepared to do, 'the happiest in all the world,' but love like heaven, earth and the next Sabbath dinner, being duly ordered and set, brought its anticipated rewards. Love was bound to satisfy, so long as men expected from it, not the fulfillment of its own limitless desires but a practical code of social conventions.

Scholarship was the badge of merit and status which the family proudly displayed. Jewish law states that. "He who truly desires to honor his father or mother, should occupy himself with the study of the Torah and with good deeds, for this is a great honor to his parents."[18] A scholar attained the highest possible status in a family. He was treated with the greatest respect for, "The student is the pride of his family, and more. He brings them honor and joy, sheds on them the reflected glory of his yikhus. Every male infant is

potentially a source of honor for his family. Potentially he represents fulfillment of the pattern of the ideal Jew."[19] Such an ideal was a universal feature of the Jewish family. Whether in Eastern Europe or in Germany[20] wisdom and scholarship were elevated even above economic pursuits. But if the family had no scholar of its own it was still enjoined to establish contact with a man of learning. Jewish law states that, "Association with the learned is considered ideal company, hence a man should try to marry the daughter of a scholar, to give his daughter to a scholar and to associate in every way with them."[21] Consequently a marriage match with a learned man or with a family noted for its learning was frequent and highly desirable not only because of the legal encouragement of such action, nor the admiration of scholarship itself, but also because learning was felt to be an insurance of high moral and social standards.[22]

The family's concern with learning was understandable in the light of its identification with tradition. The tradition was contained in the Torah. The term Torah had an all inclusive meaning for the Jew. It was the written law, the oral law, tradition, custom; in a word it was everything implied in Jewish teaching. Torah was the key to life. Without at least minimal knowledge of it the whole pattern of family life would become disrupted and its rationale for existence would be lost. This was true since in contrast to the modern concept of education as the pursuit of knowledge

and the attainment of culture, Jewish scholarship was concerned with learning the rules of conduct.[23] Torah is a "tree of life to those who take hold of it, and happy are those who support it. Its ways are pleasant ways, and all its paths are peace."[24]

The supreme ideal of the family was the attainment of spirituality, the goal for which the study of Torah was initially undertaken. This spirituality is described in Deuteronomy 6:4-9

> Hear O Israel: The Lord Our God, The Lord is One. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day, shall be upon thy heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thy hand, and they shall be for frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the door-posts of thy house, and upon thy gates.

It is clear from the preceding quotation of the "Jewish creed" that love of God as exemplified in the conduct of one's life is the fundamental commandment of the Deity and the highest achievement for the Jew. The responsibility for the infusion of this spiritual consciousness was the most difficult task assigned to the family, but such a challenge was also reflective of the supreme regard in which the family was held. What greater service can an institution perform! What greater honor can an institution attain!

> The Ba'al Habayith appears with the dignity of a father who creates a sanctuary where he, his wife and his children live, devoted to a law which excludes evil and promotes good deeds. The father shuts the door

> of the house, and protects his family, not only from robbers and thieves, but from everything which opposes the sacred law of God.[25]

Summary

In this chapter the values and ideals of the Jewish family have been discussed in order to conceptualize a picture of the character structure of the Jewish family. Consideration has been given to the value orientation of the family which in summation was as follows: Human nature was believed to be innately good but subject to certain passions which though proper must be controlled; man, although forced to struggle with the environment for the necessities of life, yearned to become one with nature and its creator and this harmonization he found in the serenity of the Sabbath; tradition was the constitution by which one lived and therefore the time focus was on the past, the present being the link between the living past and the future promise of a life beyond; since man was made in the Divine image his aim was to become godlike by living an ethical creative life and by his role as a member of a priest people with a mission; the family represented the extension of the original patriarchal family and hence all families were linked by their descent from a common ancestor and all were bound in one continuing chain of life. This value orientation was translated into three basic ideals which the family sought to impart; consciousness of individual and collective responsibility, a recognition of scholarship as the greatest work, and the attainment of spirituality as the supreme goal. Responsibility was

embedded in the very concept of marriage and family. Scholarship was the family's greatest source of honor and respect while the task of inculcating a consciousness of God was its greatest challenge and highest privilege.

CHAPTER IV

JEWISH MASCULINE AND FEMININE ROLES

As noted in an earlier discussion in this study, the definition of role[1] is a pattern of behavior associated with the commonly acknowledged function of a position. This pattern is learned and habituated. It is a major factor in the development of an individual's character since it helps him to define his relationship to the group and contributes to his own sense of identity. Undoubtedly the most basic role in life is that associated with one's sex. Margaret Mead[2] states that,

> We know of no culture that has said, articulately, that there is no difference between men and women except in the way they contribute to the creation of the next generation; that otherwise in all respects they are simply human beings with varying gifts, no one of which can be exclusively assigned to either sex. We find no culture in which it has been thought that all identified traits--stupidity and brilliance, beauty and ugliness, friendliness and hostility, initiative and responsiveness, courage and patience and industry--are merely human traits.

In Jewish culture, as in all other cultures, the starting point of role differentiation was determined by the sex of the individual. In this chapter attention will be focused on the development of the male and female role in the child and then in the adult. This approach may be called the longitudinal view of role--child, adult, spouse in contrast to the cross sectional view of role which concerns the varied roles played by an individual in the course of a day.

The examination of Jewish masculine feminine roles will, it is hoped, demonstrate the strong religious influence in the delineation and definition of roles in the family setting.

The Delineation of Male-Female Roles in Childhood

When the Jewish child born was a male then the rite of circumcision was performed. This rite assumed the character of a definitive and irreversible religious act. The act defined the role of the Jewish male in terms of his destined function as a member of a priestlike people.[3] In the ceremony itself the destiny of the Jewish male was reflected in the response of the witnesses to the circumcision who said, "As he has been entered into the covenant, so may he be introduced to the study of the Law, to the nuptial canopy, and to good deeds."[4] The male received his name on the occasion of his circumcision while the female was given a name soon after birth in the synagogue.[5]

When the child reached school age important distinctions were made regarding the type and amount of education depending on the sex of the child. This distinction as reflected in the life of the Eastern European Jew is described as follows.

> Sometimes the girls study in the same room with the boys, sometimes in a separate room. They may have the same melamed or different one, possibly the wife of the boys' melamed. Their daily sessions are much shorter than the boys' often not more than two hours, for they must run home to help their mothers about the house and to take care of the children. For them study is marginal to their primary activities, while for the boys it is the major occupation and goal.[6]

Masculine privileges accorded early in life to the young Jewish son also entailed corresponding responsibilities. The family well knew that its future hopes rested in the male line that would preserve its name. It was further expected that the son would maintain his parents in their old age and that he would be of service to them. But most important of all the son was charged with the responsibility of continuing the traditionsof the family.[7]

It was the task of the parents to insure the proper loyalty and respect of the young males and females for the adult roles which they would shortly assume. The value orientation in the Jewish family was almost completely focused on the adult, the child being viewed as a miniature man or woman. In this connection Abrahams states that,

> The child life of the middle ages was in many ways a hard one. Discipline was severe and corporal punishment habitual. At the table the utmost self denial was demanded of the child in the presence of guests, and the latter were forbidden, by a really salutary piece of etiquette, to spoil their entertainer's child.[8]

This particular reference to conditions in the middle ages may in its essence reflect the general attitude of Jewish adults toward children as noted above.

The sharp differentiation of what was masculine and what was feminine in the areas of attitude behavior and interests was readily available for the child to observe. The patterns of activity expected of each particular sex could easily be learned by imitating the adult model most

available. Hence the father was viewed as teacher and preservator of those religious values which conveyed blessings.[9] The attitudes emotions and aspirations of Jewish children were formulated into definitive molds by sustained and particularized treatment on the part of each parent. Masculine prowess was not identified with strength or with economic skills but rather with intellectual power, while femininity was symbolic of warmth and affection. This is expressed by one Jewish autobiographer as follows:

> Toward my father my attitude was one of the deepest respect, but in that respect there was not lacking an element of fear ... I would say that my father's influence was to intellectualize me, my mother's to inspire me: From my father streamed a cool, clear light: from my mother warmth and emotion ....[10]

The attitudinal posture of respect for ones elders was a fundamental demand imposed upon the children of a Jewish family. It was a demand which was backed by the authority of Scripture and reaffirmed by the rabbis. The commandment to "honor thy father and thy mother" was broader in import than just insistence on a mere show of respect. One not only revered the elder, one sought to attain the elder status itself. Hence emulation of parents became an internalized goal of the child by virtue of the force of social law and the psychological conditions created by such law. It was this basic factor in Jewish family life that permitted the researcher to suggest the following hypothesis concerning the Eastern European Jewish family: "It appears that children introject parental standards successfully, and much of their

behavior can be understood as modeled after that of the parent of the same sex."[11]

The Adult Male Role

At puberty the child moved into the realm of adulthood. Jewish law was a propelling force in this conversion of status since it commands that sons and daughters are to be married immediately after becoming mature as a precaution against incest.[12] Indeed, marriage not only conveyed adult status,[13] it also naturally imposed duties and obligations associated with the husband and wife roles. It furthermore called for a redefinition of relationships with the parental family. The law states that,

> Either a son or a daughter is equally bound to honor the parents and fearing for them, but a daughter when she is married she is not able to attend the services of her parents because she must attend her family, but if she becomes divorced she must take care of the services of the parents the same as the son.[14]

Although it was considered desirable for a mature male and female to marry, early pressures directed toward this end did not imply rash and hasty choices. The prospective wife was to be personally respectable and the offspring of a reputable family. Modesty, mercifulness and charitableness were the preferred characteristics of the intended spouse.[15]

Following the marriage ceremony it was expected that the groom and bride rejoice for seven days and set aside all work.[16] This honeymoon period was further extended by requiring the husband to be close to his wife for a complete year during

which time he could not leave town and was expected to "rejoice with her" unless his wife decided to relinquish this right.[17]

Though in the main a man had little contact with women and in fact was supposed to avoid them generally,[18] he was required to be concerned with his wife's physical and psychological needs. Indeed compatibility in the marital relationship was an ideal which was transformed into practical rules as for example the regulation that "an ignorant man shall not marry the daughter of a priest, because such an alliance will be unsuccessful."[19] The husband had "to respectably treat his wife for it is only for the wife's sake that a man's house is blessed."[20] It was the duty of the husband, furthermore, to fulfill the sexual needs of his wife. Every husband had the obligation to participate in sexual relations with his mate at certain times in accordance with his station in life. The amount of such contact varied with the type of occupation hw was engaged in.[21] Even when the wife was pregnant or nursing her husband could not deprive herof sexual relations except by her consent.

Beside his obligations to his wife, as husband, the man was generally recognized as the official head of the home. He was the Ba'al Habayith, a position defined by one writer on the Jewish home as "the man who founds a family, supports it and gives it dignity through his achievements and shapes the future of his children."[22] In addition to his role as

ruler of the home, he was also identified as its religious leader. He conducted the prayers at the table in addition to rendering decisions in all domestic religious matters. As study was closely associated with religion and was in fact a religiously prescribed duty it too was one of the expected activities of the Ba'al Habayith. Indeed it was the expectation that study would somehow be possible irrespective of how busy the head of the family might have been. In Glueckel of Humeln's seventeenth century memoirs she writes, "However much my husband toiled, and truly the whole day he ran about upon his business, still he never failed to set aside a fixed time to study his daily portion of the Torah."[23]

The Adult Female Role

The wife was also enjoined by Jewish teaching to conduct herself in a particular manner toward her husband and family. The Talmud suggests that her task was to care for the house, her own attire and to make herself attractive.[24] It was also expected that she be patient, and not given to temper outbursts.[25] In the main she was to follow the lead of her husband. And yet her role and that of her husband's were interdependent in character. Thus, "Even when her husband performs the ceremony, it is her duty to have in readiness the cup of wine, the loaf of bread, the knife, the towel, the incense or whatever is needed."[26] Likewise on any matter involving the problem of law and observance she was expected

to consult with her husband or with some appropriate masculine authority even if she knew the answer, since decisions of this type were exclusively the prerogative of the male.[27]

In addition to the role interdependence of husband and wife defined by Jewish practice there was a concomittant psychological complement. The husband naturally turned to his wife and she to him when advice and help were required on any matter involving just the one or the other of the marital partnership. In this matter of psychological interdependence the legal basis for masculine dominance became subordinate to the human needs of the moment. At such times the wife had full freedom to express her opinions and even to influence decisions. The wife's importance in all significant emotional situations was a vital reason for her influence in the family. It is the fact that she was a woman and hence the personification of emotionality[28] which permitted her to cater to the needs of both her husband and her children. The rabbis had perceived this special function of the woman as suggested by their dictum that "man should be ever mindful of the honor of his wife for she is responsible for all the blessings found in his household" (BM 59a, Ketuboth 62a).

Jewish Parental Roles were Complementary

The interdependence of the male and female parental roles in the Jewish family was a condition built into the structure of the marital union outof which the family emerged.

The full weight of this ideal rests on the Biblical statement, "And the Lord God said: It is not good that the man should be alone: I will make him a helpmeet for him" (Genesis 2:18). Thus man and woman were united in a mating relationship with its obviously unique sexual function for each partner. However, it is significant that the major emphasis of the union was not placed on the sexual procreative aspect but upon its psychological aspect. The authors of the Bible contend that it was not good for a man to be single--he requires emotional satisfactions and the help of another interested human being to share in the life process. Conversely woman needs man for the same reasons. This is the fundamental human bond which constituted the bulwark of Jewish family life. The rabbis operated from this frame of reference when they purposefully interpreted פְּנֵי to mean male and female based on the twenty-seventh verse in Genesis: "And God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them." It is again the same reasoning which is present in the interpretation of the commandment of being fruitful and multiplying (Genesis 1:28) as meaning the bearing of at least one son and one daughter, hence a symbolization of the primary man-woman unit. It was on the basis of this unit that the roles in the traditional family have been formulated, patterning all relationships after the father-mother bond. Thus in the Eastern European Jewish family it has been noted that the father and the

mother "are not spoken of as 'parents' but as tateh-mammah, as if in recognition of the duality that composes the unity."[30] All of the daughters were perceived as potential mothers and all of the sons as potential fathers. This perception required the parents to respect their children regardless of their sex and demanded of the children respect for each other because of their destined graduation into the role of father or mother.

Summary

In this chapter the roles of the male and female have been examined against the fundamental unity of the husband-wife, father-mother bond. Both the differentiation of the roles and the concept of role interdependence of the male and female in the Jewish family have been discussed in terms of the religious prescriptions which have molded these roles and expanded them.

CHAPTER V

SATISFACTION OF INDIVIDUAL NEEDS WITHIN THE JEWISH FAMILY

The ultimate success of group functioning is dependent upon the satisfactions available to the individuals comprising the group. Family compatibility is a term designating social equilibrium. It is achieved through the fulfillment of the individual needs of the group members. The roles of father, mother, and sibling provide only the stage or setting for the attainment of emotional satisfactions. They constitude an arrangement of prescribed attitudes and duties which experience has indicated is an effective means of achieving individual satisfaction and family compatibility. In this chapter attention will be focused on the conditions within the Jewish family which contribute to such satisfaction.

Satisfaction of the Child's Needs

As the child is completely dependent and, therefore, has more needs than any other memberof the family group, it would be well to begin this discussion with a consideration of the emotional satisfactions available to him.

It has been noted that there are no regulations in ancient Jewish legislation governing the rearing of children in terms of their care and treatment.[1] Indeed, the question is first discussed in the Mishnah and there it is generally agreed that children of either sex are entitled to the same right to parental care.

To provide a secure and comforting atmosphere for the infant was the primary concern of the Jewish parent. In Talmudic times those who could not afford a cradle used a kneading trough in its stead, while the wealthier Jews utilized a carriage like contraption with bells on it to keep the baby safe and comfortable.[2] These cradles were used only during the day but at night the mother took the infant to sleep with her.[3] The mother's concern for the child was shared by all the other members of the family who cooed over it, satisfied its demands with love and care and generally surrounded it with warmth and attention especially during the first year.[4] The baby was shielded from stress and was always fed on demand. There was no concern, indeed no concept of spoiling the child. Body processes were considered natural and the child's poor physical control over elimination was acknowledged and treated accordingly even though toilet training came early.[5] Infancy was generally considered a dangerous period of life, since babies were subject to numerous illnesses many of which could be fatal. Therefore weaning, which was thought of as the end of infancy, was an occasion of great joy. This is reflected in the Biblical account of Isaac's birth and subsequent rearing; "And the child grew, and was weaned. And Abraham made a great feast on the day that Isaac was weaned." (Genesis 21:8)

When the infant had graduated into childhood as signified by the cessation of suckling, which occurred any time between eighteen months and three years,[6] there was some

lessening of the freedom accorded during the infancy period. Nonetheless, the greater restrictions on children's activities did not come until the latter period of childhood. Even in the Biblical period children were able to play in the streets and market places with singing and dancing despite the fact that they were charged with responsibilities at an early age.[7]

Play for the child is the language of joy expressed in actions rather than in words. It is frequently the reflection of the world of the child and, therefore, one finds in play evidence of the influence of the general environment on the child. As religion was so much a part of that environment for the Jewish child, it was not unexpected to find play combined with religious rituals. For example, on the eve of Passover boys engaged in numerous pranks at the time the house was being searched for leaven and even the younger children participated in the merriment. They would conceal particles of bread in corners and were vociferously happy when the morsels of bread eluded the vigilance of the searchers.[8]

The physical and emotional security so prominent in the first years of life was not suddenly replaced with responsibilities. The process of training for adult life was initiated with care to avoid the sharp break which might communicate rejection to the child.[9] The mother as the chief symbol of security was always present to cushion against the shock of having to assume more and more independence. Her love and

devotion was a constant source of strength during this adjustment period. The process of growing up was also materially aided by the status and prestige associated with adulthood. Though the Jewish infant's security was, in the main, guaranteed to be the highest measure the family could provide, there were apparently other satisfactions which were of sufficient worth to motivate the child to give up the gratifications of infancy. Evidently the range between infancy and adulthood, though brief by present day standards, was not especially abrupt in the Jewish family because of a successful gradation of values which accorded increasing satisfaction of psychological needs in the direction of adulthood. The choice available to the individual in such a setting was clear. Indulgence was identified with the infant and with infantile behavior, but over against this were all the social rewards associated with maturity.[10] Therefore, by the time one became old enough to recognize himself as a junior, the advantages of seniority were clearly recognized as a goal worth pursuing.[11]

Learning more than any other activity was identified with status. The scholar achieved a degree of status unequaled by any others in the eyes of the Jewish family. Consequently even the beginning of education for the Jewish boy represented the opportunity for gaining an increasing amount of standing within his family. In addition, his progress in learning provided him with a sense of mastery which, apart from its social implication of status, also gave him self

satisfaction simply from the standpoint of being able to execute a task well. Zborowski in his study of East European Jewry states that,

> A boy's position changes, ... when he begins to study, and his prestige increases in proportion to the progress he makes at school. The first real mark of respect he receives is when he passes his primary studies and enters the second stage, When he advances to the study of the Talmud he is considered almost an adult, especially if he shows special aptitude. He may participate in debates of adults, and his opinion carries equal weight. This pattern has existed persistently and goes back to at least the time of Jesus.

Satisfactions Available to the Wife-Mother Figure

Thus the Jewish child's needs for physical security, emotional security, status and mastery[12] were fulfilled by the responsive atmosphere of the home. This responsivity was available because of the high value placed on children. They were the special treasure of their parents and especially the mother. To be able to have children was the raison d'etre for the Jewish woman. The Bible gives more than one instance of women adopting desperate measures to insure the presence of children. Sarah gave her handmaid Hagar to her husband because she herself was barren (Genesis 16:2-4), Lot's daughters committed incestual intercourse with their father in order to have children (Genesis 19:31-36), Rachel cried out to Jacob, "Give me children, or else I die," (Genesis 30:1,3) and she also gave her handmaid to Jacob to insure the presence of children. For the Jewish wife motherhood was the highest status she could achieve. All of her emotional security

and sense of mastery derived from the satisfactions available to her as mother and wife. Her greatest achievements were linked to her children and husband. Everything was measured in termsof what she contributed to them. The Talmud notes, for example, that "if women encourage the children and gladly let the husband study Torah they also have a share in the Torah."[13] It was the Jewish mother's dream to have a son who would one day bear the distinction of being a learned man and to have daughters who would be happily married.

The second aspect of the Jewish woman's role that of being a wife was structured in such a way as to provide opportunities for the satisfaction of her basic physical and psychological needs. This was already a factor in the Bible which set up certain rules for the newly married couple. Deuteronomy 24:5 states that, "When a man taketh a new wife he shall not go out in the host, neither shall he be charged with any business; he shall be free for his house one year, and he shall cheer his wife whom he hath taken." This demonstrable concern for the wife's needs had also been characteristic of the rabbinic regulations regarding the marital relationship. Sex relations was considered a legitimate satisfaction which the husband could not deny to his wife. The wife was even permitted to ask her husband for sexual contact though she could not verbally express her desire.[14] The husband, however, could not make sexual demands upon his wife against her will.[15] This constituted a principal

restriction in the matter of sex contact. But generally speaking sex relations was considered more than an act designed for the procreative purpose, it was also to be enjoyed to the mutual satisfaction of both the husband and the wife.[16] Freedom in sexual relations between husband and wife was therefore encouraged in order to insure the spontaneity requisite for maximum fulfillment. Thus the rabbis state that "a man is free to take any form of pleasure with his wife that he desires."[17]

Satisfactions Available to the Husband-Father Figure

The Jewish husband, in addition to gaining sexual satisfaction from his wife, also looked to her for comfort and companionship to bolster his psychological and spiritual resources. There was genuine meaning for the husband in the recitation from Proverbs 31 customarily read on the Sabbath;

> A woman of valor who can find? For her price is far above rubies. The heart of her husband doth safely trust in her. And he hath no lack of gain. She doeth him good and not evil all the days of her life.

But as the father in the household the Jewish man also derived emotional satisfaction from his children. In this area he could operate with freedom and spontaneity especially with the younger children before they were old enough to be given much responsibility. The Midrash states that a man could make himself look foolish for the amusement of a child.[18] However, as the children grew older, and this was particularly true of the sons in the family, the father assumed the role of teacher and guide.[19] The love of the father for

his son was chiefly satisfied through his successful tutoring of the boy. The father's own status was partially determined by the prominence his son attained as a scholar. However, the Jewish adult male was expected to be scholarly in his own right. Both his need for mastery and status were most easily attained through the discipline of Torah.

Individual Expression in the Jewish Family

Tensions within the family found a ready release through the expression of emotion. Weeping was considered an acceptable means of expressing joy, pain, grief and anger. When children were rebuked by their parents they were prohibited by firm rules against talking back but they could cry and, indeed, were encouraged to cry by knowing parents who recognized that crying served as a good outlet for the expression of sharp anger and acute resentment. The father as well as the mother could weep as a means of expressing emotion though this was restricted to crying during religious rituals and prayers for help.[20] This catharsis of weeping offered the fullest release of emotional tension and was a healthy factor in the life of the family.

> unless the individual interests of all members of a family, whether husband and wife or children, are coordinated the essential requirement of unity is disrupted, not merely dispositions ruffled. Compatibility in Jewish family life is most appropriately designated by the words Shalom Bayith 'The Wholeness (peace) of the household' [21]

This compatibility was a prominent feature of Jewish family life. It was largely due to the fact that "in the Jewish

pattern of values, the life of any individual is measured always in termsof the satisfaction of group needs, never solely in terms of purely personal needs." (See note 21) The individual and his family were considered interdependent not one above the other, not one without the other. Hence although the discussion in this chapter has centered on the individual's satisfactions it should be emphasized that in the family setting there are significant implications for all in the happiness of the person.

CHAPTER VI

INTERACTION IN THE JEWISH FAMILY

In previous chapters the prerequisites for dynamic interaction have been discussed in terms of the character of the Jewish family, the role concepts governing the behavior of its constituents, and the opportunities for individual satisfactions available in the home setting. In the discussion to follow the interactive process itself will be examined with special relevance to the child, since the young are more completely immersed in the process and hence feel its impact more than any other memberof the family. It is the psychological impact of this process on the child which will occupy the focus of attention.

The Child and the Interactive Process

For illustrative purposes it may be helpful to demonstrate an atypical Jewish family experience in which a primarily negative interactive process produced an unhappy embittered Jew. In an anonymous memoir of the seventeenth century[1] a man recalls his childhood with painful emotion. He pictures his father as an individual striving for prominence and power, easily given to temper outbursts and selfish in his outlook. Contrary to Jewish law, the father failed to provide for the proper education of his son but instead chose to save money by hiring inadequate teachers who, with the father's knowledge, virtually starved the boy. Though his father

remarried, matters did not improve for the boy. In fact he was rejected even more completely. He notes that because of his lack of learning, hence his lack of status, he became a "thorn" in his own eyes and in the eyes of his father. Because he lacked a mother he felt himself a "boor brought up in dirt without any cleanliness" and he further states:

> I remember that at the age of eleven I ran around barefooted and without trousers, and no one cared. My father then had many little children, for his wife bore him a son or a daughter almost every year. I am sure that if anybody had announced my death to him at that time, he would have thought this good news; for he considered me ignorant and good for nothing, so that my existence was a burden to him.

Despite constant attempts to acquire an education, the boy failed and in his desperation he sought acceptance from any source. This led him to fall into bad company. In fact his father even endorsed the move with a gesture of contempt. He wistfully comments that he would have been happy if his father had given him a wife at the time. He concludes his memoir with the indication that he is not married and is uncertain of whether he should marry. He hopefully looks for some word from God to guide him.

In the above example the negative family experiences of this man resulted in the greatest possible threat to the Jewish family, namely its potential disruption because of a disinclination to marry and raise a family. In the recollections of this anonymous author there is evidence of failure in every critical aspect of family contact; the failure to

accept responsibility for the child punctuated by rejection of him, his exposure to the severe deprivation of his needs for physical security, emotional security, status and mastery and the absence of a stable home environment. Of particular note isthe evidence in the material of a failure to introject those values which one would expect from one exposed to a healthy Jewish family life, i.e. his association with bad company and his lack of appreciation of the importance of marriage and family.

In the more typical Jewish family the child was valued very highly and was associated in the Jewish mind with religious duty. This is exemplified in the fourteenth century statement of a Jew who addresses God with the following prayer: "He who searcheth hearts knoweth that all my yearning desire for children in this world was solely dictated by my wish to raise up offspring which should fill my father's place in the study of the Law, in good works, and in the service of God."[2]

Other sources of support of the idea that the child had religious significance come from the legends concerning the pre existence of the soul. According to this type of thinking it was believed that the child had previous to birth lived a higher type of life during which he had been conversant with the ministering angels of God. Therefore when a birth occurred it was not considered the beginning of a new life but rather the arrival of an emissary from God. The child,

in this role of emissary, was commissioned to glorify the name of God on earth and, hence, the child rearing attitudes of the parents were more or less dedicated to assisting the child in the fulfillment of its mission.[3]

The training of the child was the responsibility of both the father and mother. The paternal side of this duty is based on the text in Genesis 18:19 in which God says of Abraham, "For I have known him, to the end that he may command his children and his household after him, that they may keep the way of the Lord, to do righteousness and justice." Evidence that mothers were also to share in the educational process, especially during early youth, is derived from the book of Proverbs[4] which clearly describes the training partnership: "Hear my son the instruction of thy father, and forsake not the teaching of thy mother: For they shall be a chaplet of grace unto thy head and chains about thy neck."

The possibility of interaction between parent and child resulting from the educational process was substantially increased because of certain regulations which protected the rights of the child. For example, the Talmud counsels that a promise made to a child should be fulfilled, otherwise it contributes to falsehood.[5] Parents were also warned against favoring one child over another because of Jacob's preference for his son Joseph which led to the enslavement in Egypt.[6] Further consideration of the child was advised with respect to the problem of maturation. In two homilies the developmental

psychology of childhood appears to have been appreciated by Jewish authorities:

> 'And when you have planted all manner of trees for food, then ye shall count the fruit thereof as forbidden; ... referring to the child ... three years shall it be as forbidden unto you for he is unable to walk or talk but in the fourth year it shall be holy unto you for giving praise unto the Lord' ... when his father consecrates him to the Torah: 'And ye shall teach them your children to speak in them' from here they infer that when the child begins to speak his father speaks with him in the holy tongue and teaches him Torah.[7]

The child in accordance with his capacities was subjected from the very dawning of his comprehension to a religious consciousness through ethical and ritual teaching. The importance of ethical conduct was fully appreciated and the problem of its transmission was understood. Rabbinic teaching calls attention to the need of an exemplary figure with whom to identify to insure the transmission of proper behavior. The Schulchan Aruch states that "a father who is desirous of being compassionate with his children should go in a good upright way so that his children may learn from him, and they also are honored through him."[8] Imitation was then reinforced by intensive education undertaken by the father who was obliged to train hisoffspring in the fulfillment of all the commandments both scriptural and rabbinic, with each lesson to be imparted in accordance with the intelligence of the minor male or female.[9] And finally, the learning process aided by imitation and study was reinforced by participation in religious ceremonies increasing in proportion to the child's understanding.[10]

Responsibility toward others was taught early in the child's career through his becoming familiar with the meaning of charity. In Eastern Europe it was customary for a father to let his son give charity to the needy instead of handing it over himself. And very often the child would be put in charge of the weekly dole at home when the "schnorers" made their customary rounds. Thus he learned that constructive giving was a sure way to win approval.[11]

Education was not restricted to certain prescribed areas of investigation but was dictated by the needs of life. Therefore, in addition to training the intellect, there was concern also given to the emotions and to the natural drives within man. "The Jewish boy and girl were brought up from earliest childhood with a clear knowledge of the physical facts of birth and marriage as well as of their spiritual aspects."[12]

Punishment was viewed as a necessary aid to the learning process, but when it was utilized it had to be swift and related to the event.[13] The child never received punishment in such a manner as to threaten his sense of security and acceptance. For punishment did not imply a loss of love either in the mind of the parent or in the mind of the child. Since emotion was freely expressed and rarely inhibited, it was not surprising to the child that punishment could reflect anger, affection or both.[14] He did not find it necessary to attempt to analyze the tone of his parent's voice or the

manner in which the punishment was inflicted, for he had no reason to wonder about hidden meanings. And because of this he, too, could feel free to be angry, even to hate his parent for the punishment he received though he could only express such feelings in a non-verbal manner. The child knew that no matter what he may be subjected to in the way of punishment, it was all dedicated to the intent of making him a real Jew--that is a person conscious of his social ethical responsibility, moderate and restrained in his manner, and eager to utilize his intellect. Whatever the means employed in the service of discipline, care was taken to avoid anything which would interfere with the process of learning for which the punishment was intended. Thus to threaten deprivation of anything as basic as food was taboo; food could be used as a reward but never withheld as a punishment.[15] This whole approach to teaching within the Jewish family is consistent with the insight of modern day psychology. The degree of this consistency is strikingly illustrated by the following excerpt from the writing of a prominent authority on child psychology:

> It takes a young child many years to learn to act in a manner approved by the social group. The whole purpose of discipline is to teach the child what is right and to see to it that he acts as society expects him to act. If discipline has been of the right type and if it has been used consistently instead of in a haphazard manner, ethical conduct sooner or later becomes habitual. When pleasant associations in the form of praise, social approval and reward, are tied up with socially desirable behavior, ethical conduct is learned more quickly than it otherwise would.[16]

It was not exclusively through education and training that the interactive process could operate. It also was produced through the conflicts and the joys of the group. The doors of the household were never used to bar the children from the sights and sounds of quarrels or problems. When anger was present it was not muffled behind closed doors but was given vent to in words or in weeping. Personal quarrels among various members of the family and even between the parents were not concealed or repressed, nor were the family's troubles.[17] In fact, such exposure tended to encourage the formulation of a realistic rather than an idealistic parental image. Children learned early that their parents were human not divine. However, they also were aware that this knowledge could not reduce in any respect the obligation to honor their parents. Jewish law made forgetfulness of this duty well nigh impossible. They were forbidden to stand or sit in the parent's place, to contradict them, or to display anger against them.[18] One was cautioned to be very careful about the honor and fear of his father and mother since scripture compared it to the honor and fear of God.[19]

Special Patterns of Parent Sibling Interaction

The pattern of relationships which linked the children to the parents was regulated by Jewish law. One was forbidden to be alone with a woman whether she was a relative, a Jewess or a non-Jewess excepting that a father could be alone with

his daughter, a mother could be alone with her son, and a husband could be alone with his wife.[20] A father was also permitted to embrace and kiss his daughter while the mother enjoyed the same privilege with respect to her son.[21] These regulations naturally led to the development of significant psychological ties between the parent and the child of the opposite sex, a condition which was somewhat at variance with the formal obligation of the father to his son[22] and that of the mother to her daughter.

The mother's close association with her son was naturally fostered by the fact that she was distinguished from the outset as the primary figure in the home. She was not only the source of food and attention, she was also continually available as the provider of security and knowledge. She would never consider entrusting her child to a nurse[23] nor did she look to others to begin the process of teaching. It was she who began the initiationof the child into religious acts. As soon as a baby began to talk his mother would teach him various religious blessings.[24] Her chief means of relating to her son was to indulge him with food and love. Food for the Jewish mother was a convenient and familiar means of expressing love. Her moods could often be perceived by her family through the kinds of food she would serve and her manner in serving. Yet in the special case of her son her overwhelming attitude was one of adoration which exclusively centered on him. Ruth Landes describes the special attachment as,

> an interacting libidinal universe of two. To no one else will he (the son) ever be so desirable and important, nowhere else will he receive the indulgence shown a helpless child. If the son does not know this the mother and the whole tradition so inform him.[25]

So profound was this interaction of mother and son that it is probable that the Jewish mother more than the father had much to say about the choice of a wife for the son.[26] Indeed even after the son became emancipated from his parents it is probable that his mother continued to wield tremendous influence over him.

Paralleling the mother-son bond was the father-daughter bond. With the exception of an incestuous relationship, the father, as has already been indicated, was free to be quite spontaneous with his daughter. And apparently he had a great need to cultivate this opportunity to develop a friendship with a female other than his wife. It is in the context of this relationship that the father found himself freer of prescribed obligations and dutiesthan was the case with any other role he assumed.

> She (the daughter) is peculiarily his; when she is little, her father calls her his 'queen' and 'princess': At all ages she is the one family member in whose company he can relax; and when she marries, he finds joy in her husband.[27]

In the area of formal obligation the tradition demanded a certain degree of interaction between the mother and daughter and between the father and son. However, these relationships being formal in nature were characterized by respect more

than love. The daughter was required to emulate her mother and to this end she watched her mother carefully and assisted her in caring for the younger children. As the daughter became older, there might arise certain tensions in her relations with her mother. This sometimes occurred because of the mother's unconscious resentment against a daughter whom she now perceived as a threat to her own status. For as the daughter matured she approached the status of herself becoming a mother, and hence this could have the effect of a threatened displacement of the true mother of the household. However, after the marriage of the daughter the threat to the mother's status was removed and it was then that she was freer psychologically to interact with her daughter on an equality basis.[28]

A similar type of rivalry might also arise in the father-son relationship as the son matured. Initially there was little contact while the son was still young. Zborowski notes that,

> for the most part the father participates little in the life and activities of a very small son. If he is a learned man, however, most of his time at home will be spent over his books and while he studies he will take the little boy on his lap. Even before the child is able to talk, he becomes familiar with the 'little black points' the letters on the pages.[29]

Thus the son becomes acclimated to an atmosphere of learning and to the status of the "book" and its interpreter. When the son was precocious and promised to become an even greater scholar than his father, it sometimes happened that this aroused

unconscious resentment within the father because of an implied threat to the father's status.

The Schulchan Aruch has a provision which seeks to prevent some of the tensions which could develop between a father and his son. It expressly forbids the father "to place a heavy yoke upon his children and to be too exacting with them in matters relating to his honor" in order to prevent any deliberacy on his part to make them stumble. "He should rather overlook their shortcomings and forgive them, as a father can allow his son to neglect the acts of honor due to him, and the son may avail himself of this permission."[30]

Interaction Among the Siblings

In the relationships among the siblings tradition and law governed the interaction pattern to the same degree as in the case of the parent-sibling bond. It has already been noted that a male was prohibited from close contact with his sister since the only relationships with females permitted were those with his mother, his wife and his daughter. Thus a brother was obligated to avoid his sister as much as possible. Affection between a brother and sister was not usually expressed by kissing on the lips, instead a brother would salute his sister by a kiss on the hand.[31] With respect to an elder brother, the law considered a man bound to honor his elder brother whether he be from his father's or mother's side.[32] This regulation as it was implemented gave to the

eldest male considerable authority with a progressive decline in authority status for each younger male. In the case of males of the same age their co-equal status precluded any authority of the one over the other. However, if younger brothers were present they were subject to the authority of their older siblings. The pattern was similar for the sisters in the family with the eldest sister sharing the mothering authority at times.[33]

Interaction was greater among the sisters of the family than among the brothers. The brothers tended to remain independent of each other except to interact temporarily in family crises.[34] During times of stress or in unusual circumstances a sibling could develop into a parent substitute. It was only at such times that a sibling would become involved in the private life of a brother or sister.[35]

The regulations governing sibling interaction tended to communicate to each child a thorough understanding of what he could and could not do. Sibling rivalry was kept at a minimum because the authority continuum was graded according to age. Therefore one's status was frozen except when a crisis produced a change in the dynamic organization of the family. In such a case new tensions would arise until the group had had enough time to adjust to the change. Since the Jewish family, by virtue of the interlocking relationships among its various members, was an excellent example of a "dynamic whole," it naturally followed that any action

(change) on the part of one member had an effect on every other individual in the family group. Consequently in any situation in which a sibling became a parent substitute for one reason or another, the accompanying shifts in status among the other siblings had important psycholgical implications. The patterning of sibling relationships as it has been described thus far would normally indicate that the youngest child in the family, because he had the least amount of authority, had a correspondingly low degree of status. This however was not the case because of a built in status distinction accorded the youngest child in the Jewish family. This special distinction was awarded to the young by the parents and was honored by the siblings.[36]

The Significance of Ritual to the Interactive Process

According to the findings of students of the family, ritual is "a social process with definite forms of interaction and a specific cultural content."[37] Since the Jewish family was markedly influenced by religion, ritual was very much a part of the pattern of family life. Therefore an examination of ritual seems warranted as a means of extending the discussion on interaction, which is the subject matter of this chapter, and also as a means of gaining further insight into the psychological impact of religion on the family.

"Just as ritual has been identified as the core of the culture of a people so it seems .... to be the hard core of

family life."[38] This statement and a few other quotations and references to follow are taken from an article by Bossard on ritual in the family (see note 37). They are included as the introduction to an examination of ritual in the Jewish family.

> Ritual has been referred to as the core and essence of culture; we are inclined to think of family rituals as the hard core in a cultural approach to the study of the family. In fact, the longer our studies of the inside of family life have continued, the more we have come to wonder if ritual may not be the best one starting point for the study of family life, just as it has long been recognized as the best one for the study of religion.[39]

> Ritual is a system of procedure, a form or pattern of social interaction, which has three unvarying characteristics. First it is definitely prescribed. This is the way a thing is to be done. Ritual means exactness and precision in procedure. Second, there is the element of rigidity. The longer the prescribed procedure continues, the more binding its precision becomes and finally, there is a sense of rightness which emerges from the past history of the process ie., the oftener the repetition of the prescribed procedure occurs, the more it come to be approved. This distinguishes it from mere habit. To deviate from the procedure is wrong not wholly on utilitarian grounds, but also because it breaks the rythm and the rapport.[40]

Ritual sets in motion an action involving the entire organism. Psychologically a ritual is a vehicle for the intrusion into the self of a gestalt composed of certain sounds, sights, feelings and human relationships which are always identified with the act.[41] Physiologically rituals "carve deep ridged pathways of reaction, and form patterns which are held to effortlessly and without much thought. They become integrated parts of family situation and individual personality because of their continuous directioning."[42]

Although family ritual alone cannot formulate attitudes, values, goals, and ambitions, it nonetheless offers a behavior complex which concretizes aspects of these in a dramatic communication from parent to child.[43] The analysis of ritual "suggests the molding of many personality traits through repeated practice of obligatory actions which, taken in combination, tend to habits of social stability and adaptability."[44] The pedagogic value of ritual as a significant contributor to the socializing process applies particularly to families in which ritual was regular. In this setting "the family was not a group in which a child merely resided, but was a functioning institution which belonged to the group and to each member, and included cooperative responsibility."[45]

From the religious standpoint ritual is an indispensable necessity in the home since ritual in the eyes of the child is religion.[46] Abstract concepts cannot be communicated to a child until a considerable period of development has already taken place. The child even has difficulty grasping a concept as familiar and necessary to the adult world as time; how much the less is he able to comprehend a deity which he cannot see and a religion with formless ideals and values. The only avenues of communication open are those provided by the senses and ritual provides the sights, sounds and feelings which he can understand. Indeed it has been found that "when religious services and rituals are taught to the young child in a reverent manner he gains a feeling of security from them."[47]

To summarize the preceeding discussion it is noted that ritual hasthe following characteristics:

1. It is essentially an interactive mode of behavior and represents the core of family life.
2. It is a pattern with the unvarying characteristics of prescription, rigidity and the communication of a sense of rightness.
3. It is an action which influences the human organism both psychologically and physiologically.
4. It concretizes for the child certain aspects of family attitudes and values and helps to mold personality by its repetitive action.
5. It helps the child to feel more fully identified with his family and to interact with it in a responsible cooperative fashion.
6. It provides the best means of introducing the child to religion because of its non abstract features.
7. It gives the child a sense of security and well being when it is presented in a reverent manner.

Ritual Interaction in the Jewish Family

The Jew is surrounded by ritual, particularly in the environment of his home. From the moment he awakens he is subject to ritual prescriptions. He must wash and purify himself, wear the Tallith Katon and pause to pray with Tephillin before he can begin his day.[48] Thus the Jew's initial ritual activity represents the purification of the self followed by communion with God. These acts are enjoined upon all eligible males of the household but they were of particular significance for the Ba'al Habayith since he represented the Jewish lay priest.[49] Within his domain

> a man, be he banker or tailor, a businessman or intellectual, young or old, rises to fulfill a priestly function in his private home. He is surrounded by his family, who know him as one knows a person with whom one lives and they do not see before them the idealized person, such as might be created by a priestly robe.[50]

Because the stance of the Ba'al Habayith is priestly in nature, the family whose duty it was to follow his leadership sought to abide by the religious and ritual prescriptions encumbent upon them. This was true of the wife, who had to be ever mindful of the ritual laws governing her activities in the kitchen; it was also true of the children as they went about learning their responsibilities in the household.

The whole atmosphere of the home was conditioned by ritual objects and ritual observances. One could not cross the threshold of the home without being cognizant of religious duty.[51] Indeed this atmosphere of the Jewish household already had roots in the Biblical period. It has been pointed out, for example, that "a certain amount of religious ritual was indispensable to every ancient meal and particularly to every ancient meal in Israel. The Jews uttered prayers and 'sanctified' themselves before the meal and when they drank their wine after the meal itself was over."[52]

The study of law was mandatory[53] and this consequently introduced the practice of regular periods of learning in family conclave. Beside a knowledge of the regulations governing a Jew's life, the Bible , the prayerbook, and Jewish moral books were read in the home especially during the Middle Ages.[54]

The religious orientation of the home had particular relevance for the child because in the Jewish family every advance in the child's development was an important event and

was observed as an occasion for joy marked by symbolic rites and religious ceremonies.[55] In the Middle Ages for example,

> the first 'cradling' of a boy after the b'ris was a religious ceremony attended by a ritual quorum of ten men. The little boy was placed in the cradle, dressed in the fine clothes he wore on the day of his circumcision. Then a copy of the Five Books of Moses was placed on him and the people standing about said: 'May this child fulfill what is written in this book!' In addition, the quill of a goose, used as a pen and an ink bottle, were placed in his hand as an omen that when he grew up he should be worthy of being a scribe and writing a scroll of God's Torah with his own hand.[56]

Obviously this kind of ritual could have no meaning for the infant who was the subject of the event, but it nonetheless had potential meaning for his future since the ritual itself mapped the direction that the child's parents were to take in his training. As soon as the child could be taught to recognize the concept "book" he learned to reverence the Hebrew books in his home. He knew that study was something exceedingly important and the books along with other religious materials constantly impressed him with the reality of his being Jewish.

At about three years of age his mother made the ritual Tallith Katon for him and he was taught the appropriate benediction over the fringes.[57] Prayer was as familiar to him as language. To be able to handle such prayers in an appropriate manner provided him with the means to participate in the ritual pageant of his home. His acceptance as an equal in religious matters was demonstrable to him in the Tallith Katon which he wore even as did his father.

The special occasions in the home more than any other factor provided the family and especially the child with the greatest opportunity for interaction through ritual. The most regular and dependable such occasion was the Sabbath.

The Sabbath mood was carefully created by prescriptions calling for the preparation of special foods and personal grooming.[58] The parents were charged with carrying out their complementary roles as the joint chiefs of the household; the mother being concerned with the lighting of the Sabbath candles and the father with the blessings over the meal and the Kiddush.[59] In the Middle Ages the sharing of household duties between the father and mother was frequently motivated by the requirements of the Sabbath. Abrahams notes that the father often bought special articles for the Sabbath meal and that on Friday he would assist his wife by cleaning crockery and saucepans and even help set the table for the receipt of the Sabbath.[60]

The very concept "Sabbath" had the connotation of home associated with it and therefore it exercised a significant force on the Jew. It drew him away from the general environment, from the outside world into the intimacy and warmth of his home. This need to return home is well described in connection with the life of the Eastern European Jew:

> Wherever one is, he will try to reach home in time to greet the Sabbath with his own family. The peddler traveling from village to village, the itinerant tailor, shoemaker, cobbler, the merchant off on a trip, all will plan, push, hurry, trying to reach home before sunset on Friday evening.[61]

Arriving at his home, the father gives his Sabbath greeting to the family. Often after a brief respite he would begin to worship

> slowly pacing the room as he prays, with his head bent slightly and his hands behind his back. Little boys imitate their father's words, his posture, his gait .. .. when the small boy becomes a father and his little sister a housewife, the words of the prayers, the gestures, the intonations will already have become part of them.[62]

The family gathered about the table as the time approached for the Sabbath meal. The Sabbath candles set in holders on the table symbolized the holiness which had been absorbed by the household, a holiness which was drawn in by the mother.[63] The father rose to recite the Kiddush concluded his recitation with a sip of wine and then passed the goblet to the rest of the family. As each member tasted the wine from this single goblet the ritual established for them "the presence of the Queen Sabbath in the family and the participation of all of its members in the Sabbath holiness."[64] At the conclusion of the meal the family remained seated around the table and sang special Sabbath songs. These songs are referred to by Abrahams as "the bridge between the human and the divine, they were at once serious and jocular, they were at once prayers and merry glees."[65] Obviously they made an important contribution to the general atmosphere of relaxation and joyful spontaneity in the family circle. On winter evenings, especially, the family would sing for many hours

after the Friday evening meal and though often the father led most of the singing, sometimes he would join with his wife in inaugurating the Sabbath songs with a duet. (same reference as note 65)

Thus the Sabbath meal itself was a ritual feast encouraging a maximum amount of interplay among the diners. It was in marked contrast to the weekday meals which were often rushed and frequently eaten in solitude, while on the Sabbath everyone sat down at the table together, the men and the boys on one side, the women and the girls on the other.[66]

Feasting was not the only special event associated with the Sabbath. It was also a day in which attention focused on study. In Eastern Europe it was a common custom for the school teacher to come to his young student's home on Saturday afternoon for the purpose of witnessing the father's examination of his son's progress in his lessons. For the boy it was an exciting weekly occasion on which he became, for the moment, the most important person in the household. If he succeeded in passing the test he brought pleasure to his teacher and family and honor to the home. He was also rewarded with fruits or cookies in place of money which was tabooed by the Sabbath laws.[67] Yet even greater than these benefits was the possibility of having attained additional respect in the eyes of his father. Achievement on the Sabbath examination automatically encouraged the young son to feel

freer and more confident in participating in the religious discussions in his home. And with a view toward still greater rewards he looked forward with anticipation to the Sabbaths of the future.

The peace and rest which were ushered in by the ritual of candle lighting in the family circle were likewise ushered out with the lighting of a candle in the presence of the family. They stood in a group, the daughter holding the braided candle of wax, the son reciting the havdolah prayer silently with his father, and the mother absorbed in her own prayer for the protection of the household in the week to come.[68] By this ritual act they acknowledged that the Sabbath holiness had been replaced with the demands and pressures of the work day week. Only after completing the toil of the week ahead would they once again be able to enter the Sabbath world, the chief focus of which was within the four walls of the home.[69]

Sometimes the span of time between one Sabbath and another was intruded by a festival. And like the Sabbath the festival was also a day of feasting and enjoyment. The Ba'al Habayith was duty bound to obey the law which stated,

> It is obligatory upon one to gladden his wife, his children and all who are dependent upon him, in the manner appropriate to each. Thus he should give the little children nuts and confectionary, and gladden the women folk with new apparel and ornaments according to his means and the men with meat and wine.[70]

However, beside the commandment to bring joy and happiness

into the household there was also the eternal demand for holiness as an important aspect of a festival.[71] The degree of festivenessand holiness were proportionate to the nature of each holiday.

By far the most important holiday in the Jewish family was Passover since it more than any other festival transformed the atmosphere of the home. Everything in the home was different; the food, the dishes, even the members of the household wore new clothes during this "festival of freedom," while the house itself received a thorough cleaning prior to the beginning of the holiday. Indeed the many and varied preparations for the festival were in themselves almost ritualistic in character and provided opportunities for interaction especially among the children. For example, the obligation to remove leaven from the confines of the home (Exodus 12:15) required the kind of diligent searching and cleaning which for the children assumed the character of a treasure hunt.[72] But the high point of the festival was the Seder and it was during this ritual and its accompanying feast that the child occupied the center of the stage. Abrahams describes this in detail.

> On the Passover eve the child was the hero of that most ancient of domestic rites extant, a rite in which the departure from Egypt was retold with weeping and with laughter, to the accompaniment of song and good cheer, the bby, like his sire, quaffing the four cups of wine and firing a volley of questions at his elder's head which the elder rejoiced to hear and to answer. The boys were encouraged to do more than ask questions,

> they were persuaded to act. How ancient some of these customs are cannot easily be said. The boy took a matsa or unleavened passover cake, bound it in a cloth, but it on his shoulder and strutted proudly about the room in symbolic allusion to the escape from Pharaonic bondage. Or, midway in the service, the boy would creep outside the door and stumble mirthfully into the room at the identical moment when the service was resumed after supper, probably to typify the entrance of Elijah as the harbinger of the Messiah.[73]

Thus through the experience of sharing, the enactment of drama, and the use of didactic techniques, the Jewish child was given a personal role in celebrating with his family and at the same time was able to absorb from this kind of exposure the meaning of Passover and the feeling of kinship with the people of the Exodus.

These same methods were employed in varying degrees on the other holidays, and though the child was not always the central person in the festival rituals, he nonetheless was always present to perceive and to imbibe the individually satisfying acts and the Jewish meanings associated with them. On Chanukah there was the ceremony of lighting the candles together with stories, feasting, songs, and above all, play, not only for the children but for the entire family.[74] On Purim there were also celebrations with eating, drinking and general merriment.[75] The whole Jewish year was marked by ritual observances in the home and whether these observances were joyous as those described above or whether they were solemn, they nonetheless provided the family with opportunities for participation among its own members and sharing as a whole in the life of the Jewish people.

In fact rites in the Jewish family had such vital meaning that there were also specially created rituals distinctively associated with the particular experiences of a given family. The famous scholar philosopher Maimonides narrates the history of a personal experience which resulted in the establishment of just such a ritual.

> I put to sea on Sunday, the fourth day of the second month, and on the following Sabbath we encountered very rough weather. The storm was so fierce that I vowed to observe annually these two days as strict fast days together with my people and the whole household. I also ordered my children always to observe these fasts in our home, and laid upon them the duty of making charitable donations as liberal as their means permitted.

Maimonides also set aside the day of his safe arrival in Palestine "as an annual family holiday to be celebrated festively with a banquet and the distribution of gifts to the poor."[76]

Not only in the twelfth century were there such family observances, but even as late as the eighteenth century there are records of special family rites. Solomon Maimon in his autobiography wrote:

> For an everlasting memorial of (the) deliverance of my grandfather from death, my father composed in Hebrew a sort of epic, in which the whole event was narrated and the goodnessof God was sung. It was also made a law, that the day of his deliverance should be celebrated in the family every year, when this poem should be recited in the same way as the Book of Esther at the festival of Haman.[77]

In conclusion it is noted that the ritual interaction pattern in the Jewish family enabled its members to partake

as a group in the life of the present and made them mindful of their link with the past. By the same token it provided the family with an excellent vehicle for transmitting to the young a cultural tradition and the requirements of the socalled "Jewish way of life."

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The Observant Jewish Family

The Jewish home was an abode in which the physical and the spiritual life of the Jew joined in harmonious union. In joy and pain, love and conflict, happiness and sadness, the Jew's devotion to his family was steadfast and enduring. He gave nourishment to it even as he derived sustenance and love from it. His home was a sanctuary consecrated to the service of the Deity in the midst of a congregation which was his family. Through an effective alliance of family and religion a powerful structure known as the "Jewish way of life" was created. It represented a successful blending of demand and practice in an interlocking pattern of familial and religious behavior. The over-all effect of this partnership was extraordinary enought to permit, in fact to insure, the continuance of Jewish consciousness and Jewish loyalty in the face of numerous destructive onslaughts originating in the larger environment. Perhaps the basic reason for the success with which the Jew resisted all the hostilities of his ageless enemies was that the bedrock of his existence, his family and home, were invincible. And the source of this invincibility was the fact that within the Jewish home all of the primary human needs--physical, emotional, and spiritual--could be satisfied. As long as this inner environment of

the Jew remained undisturbed all threats to Judaism were largely peripheral not central. Support for this contention comes from the findings of behavioral science which notes that,

> Religion, wisely taught and progressively experienced in the family circle, gives a feeling of security, of being part of something reliable and sure and loving which provides a reinforcement that helps to sustain the personality against the impact of misfortune and self-doubt and at the same time affords identification with the family group as likewise sustained and directed.[1]

Because the Jewish family was solidified by elaborate ritual, rigorous discipline, sentimental interdependence and stimulating cooperative activities and objectives,[2] religion could have an operationally effective influence upon its members. In fact it may be said with some degree of confidence that the Jewish family lived a "religious life" which is explained by one Jewish teacher as follows:

> The religious life claims the whole man. While the formal exercises of religion require set hours, its spirit cannot be limited to them. It grows into reality when it pervades the whole life. Like the moral and cultural so the religious life either controls the whole personality or it is hopelessly inadequate. It must be not a fraction but a mode of life, a way and a quality of living.

That religion did pervade the life of the Jewish family and did control its destiny is borne out by the following evidence derived from the present study:

1. The values of the Jewish family were governed by the supreme objective of inculcating a consciousness of the divine among its members. The values devoted to this purpose were those of religious study, acceptance of social responsibility and attainment of spiritually directed action.

2. All basic relationships within the family and the modes of behavior to be employed in these relationships were determined by religious regulations.

3. The opportunities for individual satisfactions in the family setting were closely associated with religious prescriptions.

4. The great emphasis on ritual in the family made religion an ever present reality.

Therefore, since the family represents the totality of the world for the very young and remains the center of the world for the socialized child, it has a unique though temporary monopoly on the training of an individual. This, despite later competition, affords it an opportunity to implant certain ideas which can never be fully eradicated by future experience. Consequently the Jewish family with its particular orientation constituted the primary institution in Judaism because it was the principal conveyor of the tradition and religion. So pervasive was this tradition and religion in the family that it was psychologically impossible for a person to be reared in such an environment and not be aware of his Jewishness. Thus to the extent that the particular Jewish family was healthy, solidified and religious on the basis of the pattern of the observant family, one would expect the product of such a home to be positively attuned to his Jewishness.

However, these conclusions apply to the Jewish family as it once existed, not as it is today. The family which has been the subject of this study is as much a part of the past as are the rabbinic injunctions by which it lived. The fact that the Jewish family is an historical relic rather than a dynamic reality is not because it is no longer necessary. This is attested to by our present day thinkers one of whom says:

> Both the adult and the youth, as members of a Jewish family, must inevitably acquire not only a satisfying role as persons but also a satisfying role as Jews, else they remain life-long spiritual refugees or fugitives from the fact of their Jewish identity.[3]

The American Jewish Family

In the context of what we call the American Jewish family today the task of achieving a satisfying role as a Jew is a critical problem. One reason for this is the collapse of group values within the family. This is a result of the philosophy of individualism which dominates American society. Respected authority is vastly outweighed by the craving for individual freedom which takes precedence over everything including the family. Hence the American family, whether it be Gentile or Jewish, is more in the nature of a vehicle for the individual than a conveyance in its own right.

This splintering of the group into an association of individuals has taken place gradually. The process began when the family gave up those aspects of its role which

in earlier time had made it a vital functioning dynamism. In the new period labor saving machines, prepared foods and ready made clothes demanded that the family give up its economic function of production. Likewise an elaborate and highly developed universal school program assumed the family's responsibility for the education of the child. These capitulations were an obvious necessity for successful living in the modern era.

The immediate effect of these changes was the increase of leisure, but as it developed this leisure weakened rather than strengthened family life. For when the family's cohesiveness was no longer assured by the pressure of economic, educative, and other responsibilities its members no longer were "group directed" in outlook but rather became "self directed" in outlook. This self directed attitude was aided and abetted by a myriad of institutions in the world away from home. Hence when leisure increased it was not shared with others in the family circle but was spent by the self for the self until today one finds many agencies vying with one another in promising greater and greater satisfaction to the individual. Day and night the home is invaded by tempting offers beckoning each person according to his taste and interest to come forth into the circle of entertainment, fraternal groups, social clubs and other avocational pursuits. And so the Jew like his Christian brother has his newspaper for breakfast, a sandwich for lunch down town, a supper tailored

to suit the needs of the family schedule and an evening with its round of engagements and complications. His home is largely a shelter where he and his family sleep, but primarily it is a base of operations, the place to which one returns for needed supplies of energy and rest. It is not an abode in which parents and children join in leisurely feasting. It is not a sanctuary in which honored ritual conveys Jewish meaning, Jewish identity and individual satisfaction to its members. It is not an atmosphere in which a particular "way of life" yields inevitably to the development of Jewish character. It is a house like every other house in America and its Jewishness or lack of it is not even considered an issue worth noting.

Temple Centered Religion Dominant in Jewish Life

The lack of concern suggested by the foregoing statement may not be wholly true, but it is true enough as demonstrated by the apathy of Jewish religious leaders toward the absence of Jewishness in the family. There is little evidence suggesting that Jewish leadership today is aware that "the disruption of the family pattern inevitably weakens the dynamic structure of religion (and that) whatever affects one is felt by the other also."[4] There are some who do recognize the importance of the connection between family and religion but even they apparently do not appreciate the primacy of the home as the inculcator of religion. They see a dichotomy but feel this is due to a failure to transfer from the religious

institutions to the home rather than the reverse. Lang[5] demonstrates this in the following statement:

> There is, indeed, an increasing number of American Jews upon whom the synagogue, Jewish education and Jewish group life have had a dynamic effect. But frequently they reflect a strange dichotomy. They will think and act Jewishly in the immediate sphere of influence of the institution or association with which they are affiliated, but will fail completely to transfer the implications of such Jewish living to the most intimate relationships of their daily experience, in the life of their family kinship and in the home.

What is described in this statement is the conditional response, a behavioral action confined to a given situation under a given set of circumstances. These Jewish actions by their restrictive jurisdiction are obviously surface features. They are not basic to the character of the people who perform them because the thoughts and actions were not implanted in the personality by the primary institution which molds character and personality, namely the family. The secondary institutions of synagogue and school do not have enough contact with people to build Jewish character in them. Yet the synagogue joins with all the other social agencies in making appeals to individual Jews to come forward and participate in religious programs geared to their respective needs and promising, like all the others in the social arena, individual satisfaction. Religious schools develop new techniques, new textbooks, new dreams of teaching the concept of God, the practice of ethics and the essence of Judaism. Rabbis preach new sermons, marry Judaism to psychology, and expound modern

Jewish values based on these sermons and on this marriage to their temple centered congregants. Yet all of this in the words of Koheleth is the "vanity of vanities," for the experts on the family tell us:

> Religious values are neither developed nor retained apart from group life. They grow best and endure longest when their roots are set deep in the basic realities of the group experience, in the unusual or recurring events in which the family is most aware of itself as a family.[6]

It is the development of a temple centered religion in American Judaism which threatens the whole concept of the "Jewish way of life," a concept created and nourished by the religious family of the past. What can be done to repel this threat cannot be known until an adequate investigation into the religious activities of the Jewish family is made. Indeed, not only is there need for research in the religious area, but also studies should be undertaken to determine just what the American Jewish family is. Until such a time when this basic information becomes available only general suggestions for reversing present trends can be made. The suggestions are as follows:

1. Rabbinical leadership should firmly reassert the ideal of family religious responsibility.

2. Programs associated with all manner of home religious observances should be developed and transmitted in appropriate literature to the family.

3. Workshops for the Sabbath and the holidays should be continued and expanded.

4. Parents should be required to come to Religious School along with their children to study material commensurate with their adult minds yet parallel to what their children are learning.

If Judaism becomes a church centered religion it will lose its fragile contact with the Hebrew heritage. Without a vital family, which is the heart of the Jewish people, this is certain to happen.

Notes to Chapter I

1. Quoted by Stanley Brav, editor, Marriage and the Jewish Tradition, p. viii, from Bessie Bloom Wessel, American Journal of Sociology, p. 442, May 1948.
2. David Mace, Hebrew Marriage, p. 62.
3. Ibid., p. 66.
4. Paul Schrecker, The Family: Conveyor of Tradition. In: Ruth Anshen, The Family: Its Function and Destiny, p. 422.
5. Israel Abrahams, Jewish Life in the Middle Ages, p. 113.
6. Schrecker, op. cit., p. 423.
7. Solomon Ganzfried, Code of Jewish Law. Translated by Hyman Goldin, CXLV:1
8. Abrahams, op. cit., p. 86.
9. Mace, op. cit., pp. 201 ff.
10. Samuel Cohon, Judaism a Way of Life, p. 165.
11. Mace, op. cit., p. 264.
12. Ganzfried, op. cit., CXLV:3
13. Willard Waller, The Family, revision by Reuben Hill, p. 508.
14. Roland Bainton, What Christianity Says About Sex Love and Marriage, p. 43.
15. Mace, op. cit., p. 262.
16. Ibid., p. 264.
17. Bainton, op. cit., p. 44.
18. Abrahams, op. cit., p. 91.

Notes to Chapter II

1. David Krech and Richard Crutchfield, Theory and Problems of Social Psychology, p. 18.

2. Florence Kluckhohn and John Spiegel, Integration and Conflict in Family Behavior, The Committee on the Family of the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, Report No. 27, August, 1954.

3. Waller, op. cit., p. 5.

4. Ibid., p. 26.

5. Ibid., p. 12.

6. Ibid., p. 6.

7. Kluckhohn, op. cit., p. 9.

8. Clyde Kluckhohn, "Valuesand Value Orientations." Quoted by Florence Kluckhohn in Integration and Conflict in Family Behavior.

9. Florence Kluckhohn, op. cit., pp. 9 ff.

10. Kurt Lewin, Resolving Social Conflicts, p. 84.

11. Ibid., p. 86.

12. Henry Murray, Explorations in Personality, p. 74.

13. Waller, op. cit., p. 61.

14. Loc. cit.

15. John Rohrer and Muzafer Sheuf, Social Psychology at the Crossroads, p. 36.

16. Waller, op. cit. p. 86.

17. Florence Kluckhohn, op. cit., p. 6.

18. Waller, op. cit., p. 86

19. Florence Kluckhohn, op. cit., p. 5.

20. Leon Saul, Maternal Love. In: Ashley Montagu, The Meaning of Love, p. 51.

21. Charles Harsh and H. G. Schrickel, Personality, p. 62.

22. Ibid., p. 95.

23. Waller, op. cit., p. 35.

24. Ibid., p. 377.

25. Florence Kluckhohn, op. cit., p. 5.

Notes to Chapter III

1. See p. 15.
2. Solomon Schechter, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, p. 262.
3. Philip Birnbaum, Ha-Siddur Ha-Shalem, p. 16.
4. Schechter, op. cit., p. 242.
5. Ibid., p. 266.
6. Genesis 3:17-19.
7. Deuteronomy 6:20-25.
8. Ibid., 4:2.
9. Proverbs 22:28
10. Morris Joseph, Judaism as Creed and Life. p. 147.
11. Pirke Aboth, 4:16
12. Cohon, op. cit., p. 172.
13. Isaiah 42
14. Birnbaum, op. cit., p. 82.
15. Jewish Code of Jurisprudence, P. 402a.
16. Hayyim Schauss, The Lifetime of a Jew, p. 150.
17. The Memoirs of Glueckel of Hameln. Translated by Marvin Lowenthal, p. XXVIII.
18. Ganzfried, op. cit., CXLIII:21.
19. Mark Zborowski and Elizabeth Herzog. Life is with People, p. 85.
20. Glueckel, op. cit., p. XXV f.
21. Ganzfried, op. cit., XXIX:11.
22. Zborowski, op. cit., p. 82 f.
23. Nathan Drazin, History of Jewish Education, p. 12.

24. Birnbaum, op. cit., p. 374.

25. Ignaz Maybaum, The Jewish Home, p. 27.

Notes to Chapter IV

1. See p. 21.

2. Margaret Mead, Male and Female, p. 8.

3. Maybaum, op. cit., p. 95.

4. Hyman Goldin, Hamadrickh, p. 34.

5. Schauss, op. cit., pp. 43 and 52.

6. Zborowski, op. cit., p. 125.

7. Solomon Schechter, Studies in Judaism (Second Series), p. 98.

8. Abrahams, op. cit., p. 126.

9. Robert Katz, The Role of the Father, p. 4.

10. Quoted in Ruth Landes, Hypotheses Concerning the East European Jewish Family, from Shemariah Levin, Childgood in Exile, p. 6 f.

11. Ibid., p. 451.

12. Ganzfried, op. cit., CXLV:25.

13. Landes, op. cit., p. 464.

14. Kiddushin 30.

15. Ganzfried, CXLV:6.

16. Ibid., CXLIX:12.

17. Ibid., CXLIX:13.

18. Ibid., CLII:8.

19. Ibid., CLV:8.

20. Ibid., CXLV:10.

21. Ibid., CL:7.
22. Maybaum, op. cit., p. 13.
23. Glueckel, op. cit., p. 34.
24. Moed Katan, 9b.
25. Sotah, 3b.
26. Zborowski, op. cit., p. 130.
27. Ibid., p. 130.
28. Landes, op. cit., p. 453.
29. Ganzfried, op. cit., CXLV:2.
30. Zborowski, op. cit., p. 291.

Notes to Chapter V

1. Nahida Remy, The Jewish Woman, p. 43.
2. Schauss, op. cit., p. 21.
3. Jerushalmi Makhoth, ii:4.
4. Solomon Schechter, Studies in Judaism (1896), p. 295.
5. Zborowski, op. cit., p. 328.
6. William Feldman, The Jewish Child, p. 188.
7. Max Radin, The Life of the People in Biblical Times, p. 52.
8. Abrahams, op. cit., p. 128.
9. Zborowski, op. cit., p. 332.
10. Ibid., p. 350.
11. Ibid., p. 84.
12. Need system as taught by Doctor Herbert Carroll, Professor of Psychology, University of New Hampshire.
13. Sotah, 21a.
14. Ganzfried, op. cit., CL:8.

15. Leviticus Rabbah, IX:6; Eruvim 100b.

16. Eugene Mihaly, The Jewish View of Marriage, p. 35.

17. Chayim Bialik and Ravnitski, Sefer Agada, p. 491, no. 165.

18. Genesis Rabbah, 57.

19. Landes, op. cit., p. 454.

20. Zborowski, op. cit., p. 335.

21. Leon Lang, Four Foundation Stones. In: Stanley Brav, Marriage and the Jewish Tradition, p. 22.

Notes to Chapter VI

1. Leo Schwarz, Memoirs of my People, p. 103.

2. Ibid., Judah Asheir, By the Waters of the Tagus, p. 32.

3. Schechter, Judaism Studies 1896, p. 286.

4. Proverbs, 1:8-9.

5. Succah, 46a.

6. Shabbat, 10b.

7. Bialik, op. cit., p. 496, no. 231, 232.

8. Ganzfried, CXLIII:21.

9. Ibid., CLXV:1.

10. Ibid., CLXV:2.

11. Zborowski, op. cit., pp. 193 and 262.

12. Samuel Glasner, A Source for Strengthening Marriage. In: Brav, op. cit., p. 4.

13. Ganzfried, CLXV:7.

14. Zborowski, op. cit., p. 301.

15. Ibid., p. 338.

16. Elizabeth Hurlock, Child Development, p. 436.

17. Zborowski, op. cit., p. 331.
18. Ganzfried, CXLIII:2.
19. Ibid., CXLIII:1.
20. Ibid., CLII:1.
21. Ibid., CLII:10.
22. Kiddushin, 29a.
23. Remy, op. cit., p. 154.
24. Zborowski, op. cit., p. 85.
25. Landes, op. cit., p. 455.
26. Ibid., p. 452.
27. Ibid., p. 455.
28. Ibid., p. 457.
29. Zborowski, op. cit., p. 85.
30. Ganzfried, CXLIII:17.
31. Abrahams, op. cit., p. 124.
32. Ganzfried, CXLIII:20.
33. Landes, op. cit., p. 457.
34. Ibid., p. 452.
35. Ibid., p. 451.
36. Genesis, 37:3; 42:4; 43:33.
37. James Bossard, Ritual in Family Living. p. 17.
38. Ibid., p. 18.
39. Ibid., p. 11.
40. Ibid., p. 16.
41. Ibid., p. 37.
42. Ibid., p. 35.

43. Ibid., p..58.
44. Ibid., p. 81.
45. Ibid., p. 82.
46. Hurlock, op. cit., p. 473.
47. Ibid., p. 479.
48. Ganzfried, op.cit., II:1-2, IX:1, X.
49. Maybaum, op. cit., p. 31.
50. Ibid., p. 36.
51. Ganzfried, op, cit., XI;1.
52. Radin, op. cit., p. 194.
53. Ganzfried, XXVII:2.
54. Abrahams, op. cit., p. 131.
55. Schauss, Lifetime, p. 79.
56. Ibid., p. 79.
57. Ibid., p. 93.
58. Ganzfried, op. cit., LXXII:4, 6, 7, 12, 14, 16.
59. Ibid., LXXV:5 and LXXVII:4, 16.
60. Abrahams, op. cit., p. 83f.
61. Zborowski, op. cit., p. 41.
62. Ibid., p. 45.
63. Ibid., p. 43.
64. Ibid., p. 45.
65. Abrahams, op. cit., p. 133.
66. Zborowski, op. cit., p. 46.
67. Ibid., p. 58.
68. Ibid., p. 58 f.

69. Ibid., p. 61.
70. Ganzfried, op. cit., CIII:5.
71. Ibid., CIII:12.
72. Zborowski, op. cit., p. 384.
73. Abrahams, op. cit., p.127.
74. Hayyim Schauss, The Jewish Festivals, pp. 231 ff.
75. Bangzfried, op. cit., CXLII:5.
76. Schwarz, op. cit., p. 15.
77. Solomon Maimon, The Autobiography ofSolomon Maimon, p. 22.

Notes to Chapter VII

1. Arthus Swift, Religious Values. In: Anshen, op. cit., p. 404.
2. Waller, op. cit., p. 508.
3. Lang, op. cit., p. 11.
4. Swift, op. cit., p. 400.
5. Long, op. cit., p. 8.
6. Swift, op. cit., p. 400.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Israel Abrahams. Jewish Life in the Middle Ages. London, The Macmillan Company, 1917.

Ruth Anshen. The Family: Its Function and Destiny. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1949.

Roland Bainton. What Christianity Says About Sex Love and Marriage. New York, Association Press, 1957.

James Bossard and Eleanor Boll. Ritual in Family Living. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1950.

Stanley Brav. Jewish Family Solidarity. Vicksburg, Nogales Press, 1940.

Stanley Brav, editor. Marriage and The Jewish Tradition. New York, Hallmark-Hubner Press, 1951.

Samuel Cohon. Judaism A Way Of Life. Cincinnati, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1948.

Daily Prayerbook Ha-Siddur Ha-Shalem. Translated by Philip Birnbaum. New York, Hebrew Publishing Company, 1949.

Nathan Drazin. History of Jewish Education from 515 B.C.E. to 220 C.E. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1940.

Jason Edelstein. The Dynamics of a Small Group as Affected By Role Manipulation and Group Discussion. Unpublished thesis for the Master of Arts degree, University of New Hampshire, 1953.

William Feldman. The Jewish Child. London, Bailiere, Tindall and Cox, 1917.

J. C. Fluegel. The Psycho-Analytic Study of the Family. London, The Hogarth Press, 1950.

Solomon Ganzfried. Code of Jewish Law. Translated by Hyman Golding, New York, Hebrew Publishing Company, 1927. 4 Vols.

Glueckel of Hameln. The Memoirs of Glueckel of Hameln. Translated by Marvin Lowenthal. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1932.

Hyman Goldin. Hamadrikh. The Rabbi's Guide. New York. Hebrew Publishing Company, 1939

Sidney Goldstein. The Meaning of Marriage and the Foundations of the Family. New York, Bloch Publishing Company, 1940.

Charles Harsh and H. G. Schrickel. Personality. New York, Ronald Press, 1950.

Hebrew Ethical Wills. Edited by Israel Abrahams. Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1926. 2 Vols.

Elizabeth Hurlock. Child Development. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1950.

Morris Joseph. Judaism as Creed and Life. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1919.

Jacob Kadushin. Jewish Code of Jurisprudence. New York, Van Rees Press, 1917.

Robert Katz. "The Role of the Father" Mental Hygiene, October 1957.

Florence Kluckhohn and John Spiegel. "Integration and Conflict in Family Behavior." (The Committee on the Family of the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry Report No. 27). August, 1954.

David Krech and Richard Crutchfield. Theory and Problems of Social Psychology. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1948.

Ruth Landes and Mark Zborowski. "Hypotheses Concerning the Eastern European Jewish Family." Psychiatry. Vol. 13. 1950.

Kurt Lewin. "The Background of Conflict in Marriage." In: Resolving Social Conflicts. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1948.

David Mace. Hebrew Marriage. New York, The Philosophical Library, 1953.

Solomon Maimon. The Autobiography of Solomon Maimon. Translated by J. Clark Murray. London, Horovitz Publishing Company, 1944.

Ignez Maybaum. The Jewish Home. London, James Clarke and Company, 1946.

Margaret Mead. Male and Female. New York, William Morrow and Company, 1949.

Memoirs of My People. Selected and edited by Leo Schwarz. Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1943.

Eugene Mihaly. "The Jewish View of Marriage." Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal. October, 1950.

Henry Murray. Explorations in Personality. New York, Oxford University Press, 1938.

Max Radin. The Life of the People in Biblical Times. Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1943.

Nahida Remy. The Jewish Woman. New York, Bloch Publishing Company, 1916.

John Rohrer and Muzafer Sherif. Social Psychology at the Crossroads. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Leon Saul. "Maternal Love." In: Ashley Montagu. The Meaning of Love. New York, Julian Press, 1953.

Hayyim Schauss. The Lifetime of a Jew. Cincinnati, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1950.

The Jewish Festivals. Translated by Samuel Jaffe. New York, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1938.

Solomon Schechter. Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1909.

Solomon Schechter. Studies in Judaism. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1896.

Solomon Schechter. Studies in Judaism. Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1908.

Sefer Ha-Agada. Edited by Chaim Bialik and Ravnitski. Tel Aviv. Dvir Company, 1953.

Willard Waller. The Family. Revision by Reuben Hill. New York, The Dryden Press, 1956.

Mark Zborowski and Elizabeth Herzog. Life Is With People. New York, International Universities Press, 1952.

The Holy Bible. Revised version A.D.1881-1885. Cambridge, Oxford University Press, 1898.

The Holy Scriptures. Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1917.