LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
New York School

Report on the Dissertation Submitted by Ralph P. Kingsley
for the Master of Arts in Hebrew Literature Degree and Ordination

The German Translation of the Bible by Martin Buber and Franz Rosenzweig
An Analysis of its Aim, Method, Philology and Literary Style

Ralph Kingsley undertook to analyze the scope and character of the German translation of the Bible by Martin Buber and Franz Rosenzweig. For the purpose of this study, it was felt that approximately the first half of the Book of Genesis (more precisely, Chapters 1-22, ending with G-d's trial of Abraham in the matter of his son, Isaac) provided sufficient material on which to base the analysis.

Before beginning his analysis, Mr. Kingsley read carefully the volume of essays that Martin Buber had written in connection with, and in explanation of, this new German translation. Mr. Kingsley noted what motivated Buber and Rosenzweig to reject all previous German translations of the Bible, and what criteria they were going to employ in their creation of the new translation. He then proceeded to examine specifically and critically how Buber and Rosenzweig carried out in the translation proper the various aspects of their theory of translation.

Mr. Kingsley's analysis and conclusions are interesting and, it would appear, justified. He finds that the translation, in several important categories, does not follow through what the theory had planned. Furthermore, in their attempt to apply their theory consistently, Buber and Rosenzweig frequently have ended up with artificial verbal contrivances that jar the ear and run afoul of what would be regarded as good taste in literary circles. Here and there, on the other hand, some nice points in the Hebrew were brought out in the translation. If any one conclusion were to be drawn from this study, it would be that a scholar and a linguist would scarcely be satisfied with what these two philosophers planned and accomplished in this translation.

I heartily recommend this thesis for acceptance; even more, I have urged Mr. Kingsley to work up the material again, with a view to publishing an article on his findings.

Respectfully submitted,

Harry M. Orlinsky

Dr. Harry M. Orlinsky

April 15, 1960

THE GERMAN TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE BY MARTIN BUBER AND FRANZ ROSENZWEIG: AN ANALYSIS OF ITS AIM, METHOD, PHILOLOGY AND LITERARY STYLE.

Written by: Ralph P. Kingsley

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the Master of Arts in Hebrew Literature Degree and ordination.

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion,
New York, N.Y.

June 1960

Referee: Dr. Harry M. Orlinsky

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My sincere thanks go to two people who were of invaluable help in the preparation of this paper.

First, my thanks go to Dr. Harry M. Orlinsky, who served as its referee. Dr. Orlinsky continuously read this writer's manuscript (despite its often, sloppy handwritten form) as it was in process of being written, and was of great help to the author with his always sound suggestions on both the content and style of this paper. Many times he helped to clarify the writer's thinking and to bring it back to the right path when it had veered away.

Secondly, to my dear wife Brenda, who spent many hours deciphering and typing my not always easy-to-read handwriting, I owe many thanks. The neatly written Hebrew script is hers as well.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

It seems as if almost all articles on"translation" mention, in one context or another, the statement in the prologue to the book of Ecclesiasticus which reads: "For things once expressed in Hebrew do not have the same force when put into another language." So this paper will follow the tradition.

But the tradition of making use of this quote has not developed out of loyalty to the translator of Ben Sirach. Rather, it has developed because that statement speaks great truth, and expresses the most basic dilemma facing not only any translator, but, specifically, the one who wishes to translate from Hebrew into another language. How does one recapture the force, the style, the idiom, the subtleties, of the Hebrew work or expression to be translated, while conveying the essential meaning at the same time? It is that question which must have faced the Septuagint translators, Saint Jerome, Luther, the translators of the King James Bible, the committee which produced the Revised Standard Version, and the new Jewish Publication Society committee. And it is this question which faced Martin Buber and Franz Rosenzweig when they undertook their translation of the Bible from Hebrew into German.

But perhaps this is putting the cart before the horse. More precisely, it is because Buber and Rosenzweig had developed their own conceptions of the nature of language and their own principles of translation, that they felt that other translators had not dealt adequately with these questions.

Moreover, they felt that there was no really suitable German translation available to the German-Jewish community. While they felt the Luther Bible to have many merits, they were convinced that it was not really Jewish in spirit, and that it did not convey the kind of feeling which was so much a part of the original.[1] And so they embarked on their own project - to produce a translation of the Bible into German that was both scholarly and Jewish. They hoped that it would become the Bible of every Jewish home in Germany.

It might be well, at the outset, to discuss some general considerations and problems in the making of Bible translations. Bible translation has undergone considerable change.[2] At one time, it was believed that the translation of the Bible was as much a work of divine inspiration as was the Bible itself. That is to say, it was believed that God himself directed the translator in his work, and revealed to him the proper words with which he was to reproduce the original text. Thus, early translations of the Bible (e.g. the Septuagint) were thought to be as authoritative as the original text, since they too represented the "inspired" word of God. But with the passing of the years, Bible translation came more and more into the province of the philologian, and was less exclusively in the province of the theologian. There came the recognition that the Bible, just as any other book which was to be translated, had to be subjected to all of the rigorous and objective philological

principles known to the translator.

Yet, with all the advances of biblical science, and despite the apparent objectivity with which many scholars approach the biblical text, there still remains a certain aura about the Bible. The fact that even scholars speak of it as"Divine Revelation"[3], puts it in a category all its own. Even t ose who do not veiw the Bible as being "God's word", approach the task of Bible translation with just a bit more reverance than in the case of translation generally. Such feelings create certain difficulties which do not exist in other fields of academic endeavor. While it is stated that there should be no theological intrusions into translation[4], there is no guarantee that there will be none. Indeed, it is hard to see how they can be kept out entirely, especially since so much of the Bible is used in the liturgy of various religions. The very peculiar nature of the Bible- it is, after all, considered a "holy" book- together with the bias of individuals and churches adds some extra problems to tb already difficult job of translation in general.

But such difficulties are of a subtle nature. These are problems which are more obvious and more immediate. For example, should the translator, as William A. Irwin would maintain, merely " tell us as accurately as he can, in his own language, precisely what the original says,"[5] or should not the translator attempt also to take into account the literary value and particular style of the original, giving us " some feeling of the literary quality of the original writer- his language, mood, figures of speech, and structure

of thought."[6] Of course, these two goals are not always compatible. What should the translator do when they clash?

And what of the problems which grow out of the fact that languages differ, sometimes radically, in their of expression- that is, their idiom? R.F. Henderson[7] points to the example of Psalms 26.2,[8] which translated literally is: "Lord, test my kidneys and my heart." The kidneys were regarded by the Hebrews as the seat of emotions, the heart as the seat of the mind. Obviously, a literal translation of this clause would make little sense. Mr. Henderson suggests that Moffatt's translation, "Prove me in heart and mind," is a good solution, and represents the kind of thing which needs to be done with idioms. To use his own words: "The translator's problem is not so much 'How could David the Hebrew have said this in English?' but rather, 'How would David have said this if he had been an Englishman in the same circumstances?'" And yet, what of the translator who, for one reason or another, wishes to remain as true to the original text as possible, desiring to convey, perhaps, that the kidneys were once the center of emotions? Has he no alternative?

Numerous other questions could be raised: How does one find equivalents for individual words when layers of connotation and depths of meaning tend to differ in different languages? Luther himself defied anyone to find a counterpart for the Hebrew רוח.[9] Or, in another vein, does the translator have any responsibility to the emotions of the

reader, who may be used to a particular translation of a passage, and for whom any change would create a severe disturbance? E.g. the proper translation of צלמות in the twenty-third psalm is "gloom","shade", or "deep darkness". But what of the adverse psychological reaction of many, if "the valley of the shadow of death" were replaced by a "valley of shade"?

While the above remarks only skim the surface of some of the bible translator's problems, one can readily understand such a statement as: "Any process of translation is in a sense an effort at the impossible".[10] The Bible translator's task is an almost herculean one, for he must serve so many masters. He must be true to those whose words he translates, and he must also make their words meaningful to the reader of his own day; he must be the servant both of the meaning of individual words and of the ideas developed in groups of words; he needs to be as conversant with the language he is translating, as he is with the language into which he translates; he must be scholar and philologian, but also have a literary flare; he must be scrupulously honest, and yet remain aware of the sensitivities and feelings of his reader.

Yet it is a fact that there is no dearth of persons who desire to make the Bible more intelligible and more meaningful to the contemporary reader, and who regard themselves as adequately equipped for this undertaking, despite the many difficulties involved. Not among the least of these were Martin Buber and Franz Rosenzweig, who in 1925

began their work together, (starting at 1'c/27? and continuing together until death claimed the life of Franz Rosenzweig, in 1929) on the suggestion of Lambert Schneider, a Berlin publisher.[11]

Buber and Rosenzweig were probably not bothered unduly by the problems which concern the average translator. While the critic, in judging the Buber-Rosenzweig translation, must keep the general problems of Bible translation in mind, he must also realize that these two leaders of post World-War I German Jewery had developed their own procedure, which was concerned with somewhat different values and criteria which, in turn, raised other difficulties and problems. Whether their procedure can be defended, and whether the results it produced are valid and in keeping with the general consideration and expectations of scholarship are two questions which the critic must answer.

It will be the purpose of this paper then, first to explicate the Buber-Rosenzweig method. What was their philosophy of translation, their aims and goals? Exactly what were they trying to achieve? Then, one needs to examine their translation proper, and to see their principles in action, so to speak. Our concern here will be, specifically, with Chapters 1-22 in Genesis. Only after that can one evaluate their effort and test their success (1) in terms of what they tried to do, and (2) in terms of what one may expect from a Bible translation- philologically and stylistically.

Fortunately, the student need not approach his task "ex-nihilo". There is available to him a compilation of essays

written by our authors- in which they explain what it is that they attempted in their translation- Die Schrift und Ihre Verdeutschung.[12]

This study will also make use of the German Bible translations of Martin Luther (16th century) and Harry Torczyner (1935), as well as the tentative draft version of the revised translation of Genesis, published by the Jewish Publication Society (1958).

CHAPTER ONE

"The Buber-Rosenzweig Method"

Buber and Rosenzweig had a unique philosophy of language which underlies all that they tried to do. "All language is translation," said Franz Rosenzweig.[13] That is, the hearer is forever translating into his own idiom, that which the speaker is relating. This idea is undoubtedly related to the well known but little understood "I - Thou" relationship, and the entire notion of subjectivity which is a significant part of the writings of these two men. From here, it is but a short step to Rosenzweig's statement: "Es gibt nur eine Sprache."[14] The story of the Tower of Babel notwithstanding, Buber and Rosenzweig believed that there was only one language for mankind. That is, since all language is translation, and since all human beings experience the same emotions and feelings [this is an assumption which I inject, because it seems necessary for the clarity of this presentation], there can be not trait in any language which is not at least latent in all other languages. Each language, therefore, has at least the potentiality of every other, which is what makes translation possible.[15]

This is of course a critical belief both to Buber and Rosenzweig, who built everything upon this foundation, and to the critic, who will quite naturally ask whether one can indeed say the same thing in all languages? To give but one example, is there any word or concept in the English language which can capture all of the connotative nuances of the German word "gemütlich?" Of course, this much can be said. Were it not for some kind of a tacit belief that

a particular word or phrase or idea can be communicated in different languages, there could never have been any translation. In their argument, Buber and Rosenzweig are merely more optimistic than the majority of translators.

This too must be said in defense of Buber and Rosenzweig. They admit that each language has its own uniqueness. But it is that very observation which causes them to assign a most creative role to the translator. The translator must adapt the language of translation, to the original.[16] In so doing, he creates his own language, in a sense. The question which immediately follows is: at what point is the translator being faithful to the text he is reproducing, and when is the translation running away from the translator, and becoming a new creation? This is a question which can be deferred until we have examined the Genesis text proper, as Buber-Rosenzweig reproduced it.

Closely allied to this general notion about translation is the specific notion in reference to the Bible, that "alles in der Schrift ist echte gesprochenheit."[17] The Bible is not to be treated primarily as a written document, but rather, as literally a "recording" of the spoken word. The user of the Bible, then, is to be likened not to a reader, but to a listener, for Buber and Rosenzweig maintain that since the Bible was originally speech, it was meant to be spoken and not read. The very signification of the Bible as קריא is used by these two translators as support for this point of view.[18] The possibility that such an expression

might have developed when the Torah began to be publicly read, is not given consideration.

Here then, we come to the heart of the matter. Since the Bible is a recording of the spoken word, the key to the translation of the Bible is in the rhythm of sentences and in the word formations.[19] Just as Buber and Rosenzweig felt a kind of unity in language in general, so did they feel a definite unity in the language and stylistic form of the Bible. One might draw an analogy between the Bible and the epic poetry of Homer, or any epic poetry for that matter. Epic poetry was meant to be recited, not read. Therefore, the writer used many vocal stylistic devices, not only to help him and future reciters to remember the words, but also to make his poem as vivid and understandable as possible for his listener. Buber and Rosenzweig would maintain, that the same thing holds true for the composer of the Bible. While his purpose in composing the Bible may have been very different from the purpose of a Homer, he too made use of definite stylistic devices to communicate his message. It is an inner rhythm of words and ideas, patterns and phrases which makes biblical style unique and which gives it its unity[20] a unity which the translator must attempt to recapture. The object of biblical translation for Buber and Rosenzweig, then, must be more than to "make intelligible" the text. Or better, it could be said that the biblical text for these men does not become really intelligible until the reader can perceive the "inner unity" of idea and style, the similar strains in concepts, words and laws "as they appear throughout the

Torah, in narrative and legal sections."[21] There is an attempt to capture every nuance of style and meaning, denotative and connotative. The job of translating for Buber and Rosenzweig becomes analagous in a sense, to the task of transmitting the tradition. Buber thinks it impossible to know with certainty the primary meaning of any specific word. It is possible, though, to deduce a meaning, and more important, to presume what the redactor meant, and, of course, what the tradition meant by a certain word; and it is the meaning of a certain word as the redactor understood and transmitted it, and as the reader perceived it, which the translator must recapture and communicate to the reader.[22] While Buber admits the impossibility of the translator's recapturing totally the sense of biblical language, its pulse, movement and music, he does think that one can come close.[23] The German language cannot reproduce the Hebrew idiom, but through analogy, it can "germanize" the Hebrew.[24]

There are then, for Buber and Rosenzweig, three main features of biblical style which have drawn their translation into its proper channels. These are: (1) a conscious use of words to achieve certain effects; (2) the use of certain phrases within a passage to bring out an idea; (3) use of similar phrases in different passages, to remind the reader of certain cross currents and of similar ideas.[25] These three features, which will be illustrated functionally below, can, in turn, be concretely defined by two terms: "Paronomasie" or paronomasia, and "Leitwort" or key -word.

"Paronomasie" is the using of words of similar construction and/or sound, in close proximity to each other, or in separate sections, so that one causes the recall of the other.[26] Thus, there is the use of רב לכם by Korah in Numbers 16.3, as he accuses Moses of taking too much upon himself, and then, the ironic use of that same expression by Moses against Korah in 16.7, as he accuses the sons of Levi of taking too much upon themselves. This, Buber would call a paronomastic relationship. But in a broader sense, Buber and Rosenzweig use "Paronomasie" to designate all manner of word play: the repetition of words similar or slightly changed in form- ויצא יצוא ושוב (Genesis 8.7); alliteration, which enforces a certain meaning- e.g. the double use of the plosive "פ" in פצתה את פיה (Genesis 4.11) supporting vocally the violence of the earth's "opening her mouth" to swallow the blood of Abel; and ordinary alliteration and assonance, which is typical of biblical style-
והקרה המקרה קרבנו ליעוה or ואירא כי עירם אנכי ואחבא

The Leitwort, while being a specific manifestation of the Paronomastic relationship, is a slightly more difficult concept to describe. It is, as Buber explains it, a word or a root which repeats itself within a given text or series of texts, suggesting to the reader an inner connection in idea.[27] Rosenzweig, using another expression, "Stichwort"[28] or catchword, calls it the conscious use of a certain word which serves as a kind of bridge, enabling the reader to make connections between various sections of the Bible. A brief

summation of Buber's chapter "The Use of the Leitwort in Biblical Narrative,"[29] will be most helpful, for an understanding of the Buber-Rosenzweig philosophy of biblical translation.

In using the Tower of Babel episode, Buber shows how key words can give an inner unity to a certain biblical text. He points out thatthe repetition of certain key words such as כל הארץ, שפה, הבן, ומגדל, עיר, נפץ serve to connect and bind together the initial insurrection of the people of Babel, with which the story begins, with the ultimate victory by God, with which the story ends. Buber senses a carefully planned style here. He does not think it accidental that כל הארץ , for example, appears in the very first line: ויהי כל הארץ שפה אחת , and that the same phrase serves to end the episode describing the scattering of the people על פני כל הארץ . Another key word in this brief narrative is נפץ. This word is strategically used, thinks Buber, at the mid-point of the account (11.4) פן נפוץ על פני כל הארץ - where it ominously foreshadows the occurrence in verse 9, of just what the people feared in verse 4-ויפצם יהוה על פני כל הארץ. There are more key words in this particular narrative, but these two will suffice to illustrate what Buber and Rosenzweig would describe as a tightly knit style, and the use of the key word as a unifier.

But the keyword serves other functions too, one of which is to illuminate certain ideas within a specific text.

In the Korah episode, (Numbers 16.1-17.5), the key word is the root קדש "used in two substantives קדש and מקדש, and in one verb(קדש)." It is the interaction between the קדש of Korah and the קדש of Israel(Moses) as they are pitted against one another, and such a phrase as למה אתה וכל עדתך הנועדים עלי (16.11) which establishes a certain literary tension which enhances the meaning of the text. Even if one were to argue that קדש and קדש are two entirely different roots, it still would not affect the paronomastic relationship here- the obvious punning and ironic usage of words- by which the author leads the hearer (or reader) to certain conclusions.

Still a third function of the key word, is that it serves to connect separate portions of the narrative, forming a bridge in the mind of the reader, and enabling him to connect ideas through words and incidents. The thorny problem of who shall be the chosen one of God, and who shall have authority, culminating in the Korah episode, is answered, at least partly by the use of the word בחר in two contexts- Numbers 16.7 and 17.20. In 16.7 the problem is raised as to who shall be holy. Moses arranges a contest involving incense and sacrifice, and says והאיש אשר יבחר יהוה הוא הקדוש Later, in 17.20, when Korah's rebellion had been ended, the Lord issues the authoritative answer to those who would seek to usurp power, as did Korah והאיש אשר אבחר בו מטהו יפרח Again, maintains Buber, the use of the key word בחר adds an authoritative finality to the issue.

In a similar vein, the phrase לֶךְ לְךָ, is used in two connections in the Abraham story- once, when God commands him to leave home, and the second time when God commands him to bind up his son Issac. Both times, observes Buber, Abraham is told to go to an unknown place, and both times, the answer is הִנֵּנִי. The use of this root הלך, then, presumably helps the reader to connect these two separate episodes, and to see Abraham as a man of considerable faith, who trustingly heeds the command of God.

The "Leitwort," then, serves to underline ideas within a given narrative, as well as helping to provide a certain unity- both within a given text, and in a series of texts. Buber does not think it accidental, for example, that both Noah and Abraham are תָּמִים, and that both הִתְהַלֵּךְ with God. Buber calls such words "key words." For Buber, these words connect the story of the pre-Hebrew peoples with the story of the Patriarchs, just as other key words will serve to link the patriarchal story to the story of the People Israel.

Buber goes even further, however. He thinks that through the "Leitwort", the Bible hints at things which it cannot say in so many words, for example, in the story of Hagar. Buber feels that Hagar was wronged by Abraham and Sarah, as do many other contemporary readers of the Bible. But the intriguing thought which Buber offers is that the Bible already expressed such a point of view, namely through the medium of the key word. He notes that Hagar was afflicted,

experienced a revelation, and was given a promise for the future. The People Israel also was afflicted, after which it received both a revelation and a promise for the future. The above might not be significant, except that Buber finds the root שמע to be prominent in both stories, as well as finding other key words and paronomastic relationships, between the Hagar story and the story of the People Israel. Without going into detail, let it merely be said that Buber finds here not only an interrelationship between these two narratives (the maid is, significantly, Egyptian), but also a subtle way for the Bible to say that Hagar is right. "Gott als der 'Erwahler Israel's', gibt Sara recht; aber Gott als der Lebende Michsehende (ראי לחי) nimmt sich Hagar's an." Right or wrong, Buber-Rosenzweig present a distinctive and provocative point of view.

While a great deal more could be said about the idea of "Leitwort" and Paronomasia, it is not our purpose here to enter deeply into the meaning and criticism of these concepts. We have only skimmed the surface in trying to make these terms familiar enough to show how they affect the total methodology of Buber and Rosenzweig. Still, a general understanding of paronomasia and key words is absolutely essential for a full appreciation of the Buber-Rosenzweig method of translating the Bible. It is precisely because they sensed a direct and distinct relationship between style and meaning, that Buber and Rosenzweig thought it so important to come as close to the Hebrew style as possible. If the meaning of a certain passage hinged upon,

or was clarified by, or was enhanced by certain word usages or patterns, than the attempt had to be made to find or to create analogous patterns and usages in German. This meant not only an attempt to recreate assonances, alliterations and word play, but it meant also an attempt at maximum consistency in the translating of a specific word with the same German equivalent throughout, even to the point of attempting to imitate the Hebrew word-construction in German. Obviously, if the root of a certain key word, used in several interrelated contexts, was to "ring a bell" so to speak, in the mind of the reader (in German), it had to appear in a recognizable and knowable form. To revert to the example from the Korah episode, there had to be found a German root to correspond to the Hebrew עדה , out of which several varients could be built, all meaning different things,yet all containing the recognizable root. The German root w hich Buber chose was "gemein." When the text in Numbers speaks of עדת בני ישראל , Buber and Rosenzweig translate "Gemeinschaft". When, on the other hand, עדת קורח is being spoken of, the translation is "Gemeinde." Thus, the common root is still there (gemein), but the difference, and counterpoint is also established. For the word מועד, which Buber translates elsewhere (in the phrase אהל מועד) as "Gegenwart" (das Zelt der Gegenwart), Buber keeps both the sense of "presence" or "nearness" as in "Gegenwart," but adds to it the connotation of assembling or belonging in common, by translating "Gemeinbegegnung". Thus, the root

connection is maintained (גמ' =gemein) in German as in Hebrew. The fourth usage of this root is in the form נִגְמָלִים , and here the translation is the verbal form, "gemeinen", a form which is newly created. "Gemeinen" has, not only the literal meaning of joining together, but also the connotation of the common or profane, which Buber would think a proper appellation for the followers of Korah, to whom the verse refers. Whether the Bible meant it that way or not, and whether Buber is justified in associating אגמון with גמ' , is something which we shall try to answer later. But the intention of Buber and Rosenzweig is clear.

One other stylistic device needs to be discussed in connection with the above, for it grows directly out of the concept of consistency in translation. Where a Hebrew concept is represented by a certain root out of which grows a family of words which transmit different aspects of that concept, every attempt should be made to translate the Hebrew concept consistently by a German root word, and the corresponding family of words derived therefrom. For example, the Hebrew roots חסד and צדק represent different concepts, although they have been similarly translated, in the past, in certain contexts (e.g. both צְדָקָה and חֶסֶד have been translated as Justice). In German, therefore, they should be consistently rendered by two different root words or families of words. Buber selects "Recht" to correspond to חסד , and "Wahr" as coming closest to צדק . It follows then that varients of חסד such as

משפט, משפחה, משפה etc., will be translated by such German varients of "Recht" as "richten," "Gericht," "Gerichtssacher," "Gerichtsverfahren," "Rechtsanspruch," and the like, while "Wahrheit," "Wahrhaftigheit," and "Wahrspruch," can be formed from the אמן family. Specifically, אמונה would be "die Bewahrung," and נאמן would be "der Bewährte."[30] In theory, the more consistently one can reproduce Hebrew roots with a specific family of German words, the closer one will be to the original style, the more accurate will be the translation, and the more direct will be the reader's experiencing of the original biblical text.

The assumption, conceptions and convictions which we have described in this chapter, underlie the Buber-Rosenzweig translation. In brief, they saw the translator's concern as being more than the transmission of the meaning of words in a given context. They felt he needed somehow to capture what centuries of recreating and reweaving had done to the biblical text before it was ever put down in writing, and even what the centuries of tradition had added by way of understanding, since the מקרא became the מדרש. Whether Buber and Rosenzweig are correct, entirely or in part, can best be determined by examining their translation proper.

CHAPTER TWO

"Principles in Action - Genesis, Chapter 1-22."

The task to which we now direct ourselves, is to determine how well, in terms of the first twenty-two chapters of Genesis, the translators applied their theories. It was their intention and desire to go to the limits of the German language without overstepping its bounds.[31] For better or worse, the results are very interesting.

Beginning with the broad category of idiom, one cannot help but notice a certain terseness of style, very reminiscent of the economy of word and phrase in the original Hebrew text, which Buber and Rosenzweig consciously tried to recapture. One need but examine the very first lines in Genesis, to see the point.

> Im Anfang schuf Gott den Himmel und die Erde.
>
> Und die Erde war Wirrnis und Wüste.
> Finsternis allüber Abgrund.
> Braus Gottes brutend allüber den Wassern.
>
> Da sprach Gott: Licht werde! Und Licht ward...
>
> Dem Licht rief Gott: Tag! und der Finsternis
> rief er: Nacht!
> Abend ward und Morgen ward: Ein Tag. (G. 1.1-5)

The style here is both dramatic and vivid, with not a superfluous word being used. The expression "Licht Werde" seems so much more in keeping with the catachlysmic events of creation than the, by comparison, milder form of Luther "Es werde Licht," or the similar "Es werde hell" of Torczyner's.

Similarly, the attempt by Buber-Rosenzweig to reproduce the dative effect of the Hebrew לָאוֹר קָרָא אֱלֹהִים by using the German dative- "Dem Licht rief Gott..." seems, to this writer, to be closer to the original in word and style than Torczyner's "Und Gott nannte die Helle Tag..." or Luther's "Und nannte das Licht Tag..." Buber-Rosenzweig seem consciously to be using an earlier style of German in order to come as close to the stylistic pattern of classical Hebrew as possible. They sense a certain primitive and unsophisticated literary and poetic quality, and try to recreate it with a German that is more characteristic of an earlier period. Such translations as "Sie trankte den Knaben" for וַתַּשְׁקְ אֶת־הַנָּעַר (G. 21.19), or "Er halftete sie mitten durch" for וַיְבַתֵּר אֹתָם בְּתוֹכָם (G. 15.10) are other examples of the attempt to come as close to pristine usage as possible.

Not only in word and phrase but in sentence structure, as well, do Buber and Rosenzweig try to approximate the original Hebrew. While it must be granted that a close approximation of the Hebrew structure does not automatically improve a translation, it needs to be pointed out that this was one of several ways in which the translators attempted to recapture the style of the Hebrew text which, as was pointed out above, they felt was a spoken style. In so doing, they hoped to bring the modern reader, unfamiliar with Hebrew, as close to the original as possible. A good case in point is Genesis 2.5, which we can reproduce here,

followed by the translations of (1) Luther, (2) Buber-Rosenzweig, and (3) Torczyner.

וכל שיח השדה טרם יהיה בארץ
וכל עשב השדה טרם יצמח
כי לא המטיר יהוה אלהים על הארץ
ואדם אין לעבד את האדמה

(1) "Und allerlei Baume auf dem Felde, die zuvor nie gewesen waren auf Erden, und allerlei Kraut auf dem Felde, du zuvor nie gewachsen war. Denn Gott der Herr hatte noch nicht regnen lassen auf Erden, und war kein Mensch, der das Land bauete."

(2) "noch war alles Gesträuch des Feldes nicht auf der Erde,
noch war alles Kraut des Feldes nicht geschossen,
denn nicht hatte regnen lassen ER, Gott, auf die Erde,
und Mensch, Adam, war nicht, den Acker, Adama, zu bauen."

(3) "da war noch alles Gesträuch des Feldes nicht auf der Erde, und sprosste alles Kraut des Feldes noch nicht, denn der Ewige, Gott, hatte nicht regnen lassen auf die Erde, und ein Mensch war nicht da, um den Erdboden zu bebauen."

It would seem to me that Buber-Rosenzweig not only convey the proper meaning- as the other translations do as well- but they capture the distinct rhythm and emphasis of the Hebrew, which Luther misses completely and which Torczyner catches only in spots. The parallel structure of the Hebrew וכל ... טרם יהיה ... וכל ... טרם יצמח is beautifully caught by Buber-Rosenzweig in the idiom "noch war alles...nicht." Their rendering in terms of the rhythm of the original Hebrew, and in terms of the words

which are conjoined and disjoined by the trope notation, is completely accurate here. The spoken, terse, rhythmic poetry is translated into German with no loss of meaning. Luther and Torczyner write in fine, literary prose style, But Buber and Rosenzweig are poets, at least in this section. The very use of "und Mensch, Adam, war nicht," seems to me so simple and direct a statement, and so true in spirit to the Hebrew which tersely says אין אדם . "Ein Mensch" or "kein Mensch" proceed already beyond the force of the Hebrew which starkly says Man- connoting the genre "Man" as well as the particular man who was to be created. Even the very choice of words contributes to the total poetic affect. Buber-Rosenzweig choose "geschossen" to describe the growth of vegetation. While Torczyner's more conservative "sprosste" is quite accurate, it does not have quite the, for lack of a better term, primitive quality of "geschossen." A modern man would speak of vegetation "sprouting," as indeed, the draft version of the new J.P.S. translation of the Book renders נובט. But Buber-Rosenzweig would argue that vegetation "shooting" out of the ground is more in keeping with the way an ancient man might describe growth. But we shall have more occasion later to discuss particular words, their relevance and their irrelevance.

The reader will undoubtedly have noticed the parenthetical inclusion (though without parenthesis) of the transliterated Hebrew next to certain words; so a brief word about this procedure is in order, especically since it

recurs throughout the Buber-Rosenzweig Bible whenever a proper noun is used for the first time. Thus, "Adam" immediately follows "Mensch," "Adama" follows "Acker," "Ischa, Weib, denn von Isch, vom Mann ist die genommen." (G. 2.23). A similar procedure is followed whenever a proper name and its derivation is introduced.

> "Sie ward schwanger, und sie gebar den Kajin.
> Da sprach sie:
> Kaniti-
> Gewonnen habe ich." (G. 4.1)

Two other brief examples will suffice: "Schet, Setzling! denn: gesetzt hat Gott mir einen andern Samen..." (G. 4.25); "wer es irgend erfahrt, jizchak li- lacht uber mich." (G. 21.6).

The J.P.S. draft version gives similar information, but does so in a footnote. Which of the two is the better system is open to debate, but as long as the inclusion of "transliterated Hebraisms" in the text proper does not detract from the narrative, there really is no reason to object. If anything, the reader may gain an insight into the formation of Hebrew names, and their biblical context.

It was in the area of "the Word" that the Buber-Rosenzweig attempt to imitate Hebrew in German becomes most apparent. They try not only to reproduce the word-economy of biblical Hebrew by using the same German root for both the verb and the noun but they try to suggest the word play of puns and alliterations as well.

In the very first chapter of Genesis, they translate the expression אֶרֶץ וְאֶרֶץ אֶרֶץ (1.11) as:

"Spriessen lasse die Erde Gespross." Even though "Gespross" does not appear in the dictionary, they prefer creating a new word which has a root connection, to using Luther's "Kraut" or Torczyner's "junges Grass." While in English it would be most awkward to say: "Let the earth sprout sproutings," the German language lends itself to such manipulation quite readily. Similarly, שֶׁרֶץ הַמַּיִם שֶׁרֶץ נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה (1.20) is rendered "Das Wasser wimmle, ein Wimmeln lebenden Wesens," which Torczyner translates in a similar way (Es wimmle das Wasser von Gewimmel lebender Wesen). Buber and Rosenzweig are especially ingenious in translating the phrase בַּעַל אִשָּׁה (20.3), in the Abimelech episode, as "einem Gemahl ist sie vermahlt," transmitting the proper meaning in a most concise way, while maintaining the root connection. It must be said, however, that they can "be ingenious" only when the German language permits them to be. In another connection they admit that it is often good fortune that the language happens to provide the proper word for them to carry out whatever it is that they are trying to do at the time.

It is, of course, perfectly legitimate to question whether such an "economy of words" is necessary when contemporary language provides so many opportunities for precise translation with its fullness of vocabulary. Might not, for example, the expression אִם אֶמְנֶה עָנָן (9.14) be better translated than the Buber-Rosenzweig rendering "Wenn ich Wolken wölke" (when I cloud clouds)? Not only is the German

somewhat awkward, but the very expression leaves something to be desired. Torczyner's "Wenn ich Gewölke balle" seems to convey the image much more accurately. And in a similar vein, one can criticize the manner of translation when the Hebrew uses, as it frequently does, the infinitive absolute together with the perfect or imperfect form of the verb. Such forms as שׁוֹב אָשׁוּב (18.10), אָכוֹל תֹּאכַל (15.13), שָׁמוֹר תִּשְׁמֹר (2.16), are given as "Kehren, Kehren," "Merken sollst du merken," "magst essen du essen." To be sure, such a translation conveys something of the original usage, and represents a most interesting attempt at duplicating this idiomatic construction in Hebrew. But is it perhaps somewhat meaningless in terms of contemporary German usage? And equally important, does it do justice to the meaning of the original Hebrew? Does "Kehren, Kehren," convey the proper force of שׁוֹב אָשׁוּב, which means, as J.P.S. translates, "I will certainly return?" Poetically, one cannot deny the charm and effectiveness of this root repetition, and the attempt to regain a certain primitive language quality. But in terms of scholarly accuracy, there is perhaps something more to be desired.

Before arriving at conclusion, however, it is necessary to examine some of the other facets of the translation. We have noted above that the Bible is fond of using paronomastic effects- punning, alliteration, and the like. Buber and Rosenzweig seek to produce similar effects in German, and, we may add, with some very interesting results. A part-

icularly good example is the phrase וַיָּרַח יְהוָה אֶת רֵיחַ הַנִּיחֹחַ (G. 8.21) which describes the Lord's reaction to Noah's burnt offerings. Here one is fortunate in being able to make use of Buber's own analyses of this phrase in addition to applying one's own independent objective judgment. Obviously, there is in the Hebrew a distinct euphony involving רֵיחַ, וַיָּרַח, and נִיחֹחַ. Not only is there alliteration, but even a kind of rhyme, as each of these words ends in "ח." Further, there is the suggestion of a root connection between נִיחֹחַ and נוּחַ. As Buber points out, the object of Noah's sacrifice is, in a sense, to pacify God who had just sent flood waters all over the earth, and to put Him at rest. So the word נוּחַ, suggests Buber, contains both the idea of being pleasing as well as the idea of being soothing and restful. All these nuances, needed somehow to be conveyed in the German. Luther's "Und der Herr roch den lieblichen Geruch" was just not sufficient. Torczyner's "Da roch der Ewige den Duft der Befriedigung" comes closer, but is still not as good as Buber-Rosenzweig's "Da roch ER den Ruch der Befriedung." Not only is there the alliteration in "roch" and "Ruch," but the word "Befriedung" is perfectly suited to convey the notion of pacifying God. Further, Buber-Rosenzweig even reproduce the genitive rendering of the Hebrew. After all, רֵיחַ הַנִּיחֹחַ are in a genitive and not in an adjectival relationship. Thus, the J.P.S. "pleasing odor" is also not entirely correct. While one can argue that "Ruch" is an

improper word, not appearing in the dictionary, one must allow the translator a certain freedom to be creative, so long as he does not do absolute violence to the language into which he translates. And further, as Buber himself points out in reply to a critic who picked up that very point, the word is used elsewhere in German literature.[34]

An equally interesting example, along the same lines, though somewhat different, is to be seen in the translation of Genesis 11.3. It will be helpful if we will again contrast the various German translation with the Hebrew.

וַיֹּאמְרוּ אִישׁ אֶל־רֵעֵהוּ הָבָה נִלְבְּנָה לְבֵנִים וְנִשְׂרְפָה לִשְׂרֵפָה וַתְּהִי לָהֶם הַלְּבֵנָה לְאָבֶן וְהַחֵמָר הָיָה לָהֶם לַחֹמֶר׃

Luther: Und sprachen unter einander: Wohlauf, lasst uns Ziegel streichen und brennen. Und nahmen Ziegel zu Stein, und Thon zu Kalk.

Torczyner: Da sprachen sie einer zum andern: "Wohlan, wir wollen Ziegel formen und zu Brandstein brennen!" So diente ihnen der Ziegel als Baustein, und das Erdpech diente ihnen als Mortel.

Buber-Rosenzweig: Sie sprachen einer zum andern:
Auf, backen wir Backsteine und brennen wir sie zu Brande!
So diente ihnen der Backstein zu Baustein und der Asfaltleimen diente ihnen zum Ausfüllehm.

Again, of the three translation, the Buber-Rosenzweig is the most vivid, catching the alliteration which appears within this verse, and very cleverly trying to reproduce the pun involving חֵמָר and חֹמֶר. Buber admits not having succeeded entirely[35] and suggests substituting "Roterdpech" and "Roterdmortel" for "Asfaltleimen" and Ausfüllehm," which

are not entirely accurate renderings. But even where the result is not perfect, the Buber-Rosenzweig approach somehow conveys a greater feeling for the biblical style, and a greater willingness to experiment with the German in order to come closer to the Hebrew. In translating נָד נָד (G. 4.13), for example, they use the German "schwank und schweifend," not only to reproduce the alliterative effect, but also to get at the sense of continual wandering, as well. One can criticize, as does Emanuel Bin Gorion,[36] the use of"schwank" (pliable, unsteady, wavering) in such a way, for it is generally used adjectivally to describe an object, as "a reed shaken by the wind." But this is to miss the overall impact of the image which, in a poetic sense, transcends its literal meaning. For that matter, "schwanken" in a verbal form means to move to and fro and to vacillate. But were Buber and Rosenzweig to use it verbally, they would not have been true to the Hebrew, and neither would they have been able to imitate the curtness of the monosyllabic נָד נָד .

While one could multiply examples of paronomastic imitation with relative ease, two more brief examples will suffice. The first, a translation of מִי יִתֵּן לִי יוֹנָה as "meinem Spross und Schoss" is even rendered appropriately by the J.P.S. translation as "Kith and Kin," in an effort to follow the Hebrew alliteration. The second is an interesting translation of מְצַפְצֵף (7.14) as "Zwitschernde," (warbling one). Not only does that translation communicate the onomatopoeic quality of the Hebrew, but it differentiates the מְצַפְצֵף from the צִפּוֹר, which is mentioned in the same

verse. None of the other translations makes the distinction, in this verse, between the עוף and the צפור. Torczyner renders the former as "Vogelvolk" and the latter as "Vogel," but that distinction is not as sharp as the Buber-Rosenzweig.

We have heretofore mainly described the constant effort by Buber and Rosenzweig to find just the proper, paronomastically suitable word. But their word search proceeded on a philological- conceptual level as well. Not only did a word have to be rhythmically and stylistically suitable, it also had to approximate, to as great a degree as possible, the biblical author's originally intended meaning, in so far as that meaning could be determined. In trying to achieve this worthy goal, the Buber-Rosenzweig translation of certain terms often veers from what had been the generally accepted translation- sometimes for better, sometimes ofr worse. And again, as was said above, no matter what the result, the effort is always interesting and often daring. It will be convenient to divide our discussion here into two sections, the one dealing with some interesting verbal usages, the other, in general, with nouns.

If precision is important for all translators, it was perhaps even more important to Buber and Rosenzweig. They were not satisfied until they found the precise word which would convey a concept or an action to the reader in the way they imagined the author to have intended it, and, equally important, in the way in which they thought the original

hearer or reader to have understood it. (Whether such an objective can be realized or whether such a venture is methodologically permissable, are questions which we shall reserve for later discussion). Thus, Luther's " und da wird man sie zu dienen zwingen" for וַעֲבָדוּם וְעִנּוּ אֹתָם (Gen. 15.13) did not suffice. They preferred to translate "verfronen wird man sie und drücken." The root עבד is rendered in different ways, depending on the context. Genesis 2.5, לַעֲבֹד אֶת הָאֲדָמָה is translated "Der Acker zu bauen." God's service is referred to simply as "Dienst." But service to Pharaoh, in all contexts, is given as "Frondiest," (compulsory service) hence, its verbal form, "verfronen," (which incidentally, is again a Buber-Rosenzweig creation, since the verbal form of "fron" appears in the dictionary only as "frönen"). Undoubtedly, what Buber and Rosenzweig hoped to do here was to convey the idea of forced labor. "Frönen," means to do service as a vassal, as well as to toil and drudge. "Verfronen," therfore, is to place one in a servile position to an overlord, which is exactly what happened to the Jews in Egypt. It is a more exact concept than Luther's "dienen", which means merely "to serve," and which can refer to any kind of service, including serving someone from behind a counter.

Buber, on two occasions[37] enters into a lengthy explanation and defense of his most unusual rendering of the expression in וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֶפֶת עַל פְּנֵי הַמָּיִם (G. 1.2): "Braus Gottes brütend allüber den Wassern." He objects to Luther's "Und der Geist Gottes schwebte auf dem Wasser"

for two reasons. The first, quite simply, is that "Geist", because of its obvious theological connotation is inadequate for רוח. But the second objection, the objection to "schweben" as the proper transcription of מרחפת, is by far more interesting and more subtle, and illustrates Buber-Rosenzweig's meticulous seeking out of the proper word. Only in one other context is רחף found, and that is in Deut. 32.11 (It is found in Jer. 23.9 as well, but in the Kal form as ירחפו). In Deut. 32.11, the context speaks of an eagle, רחף over her young(על גוזליו ירחף). In Genesis, therefore, says Buber, the image is that of God's wind hovering over the waters, in the same way that a bird hovers over the nest of her young. And for that purpose, "brüten", which means to brood over, and to hatch, is more appropriate than "schweben", which means "to soar, to float in air." Buber brings other examples to bear from literature, to strengthen his case. "Braus" (for רוח) which denotes great activity and movement, completes the image for Buber and Rosenzweig. "Wind" is just not as sufficient, a fuller, richer concept being needed, one which suggests an active manifestation of God, as it did to primitive man. Further, while brooding generally connotes stillness, here the brooding goes on over all of the water. "Hier und nur hier ist beides [Bewegung und Stillestehn] in einem; denn der Braus ist allüber (על פני) den Wassern." And so, the image is complete, even to the point of recapturing the alliterative connection between רוח and מרחפת. But fanciful and even powerful though their translation may

be here, it is not accurate. Dr. Harry Orlinsky, in an article entitled "The Plain Meaning of Ruah in Gen. 1.2," [38] points in a footnote to the use of רחף in Ugaritic texts. There, רחף means to move, fly, soar, swoop. From this data, which was unknown to Buber and Rosenzweig, it must be concluded that מרחפת does not mean "brütend" at all, and that the eagle in Deut. 32.11 soared and swooped over the nest of her young rather than having brooded over them. Therefore, Torczyner's "und Gottes "indhauch wehte uber die Wasser" and the new J.P.S. "the wind of God moving over the face of the water," while not being as poetically vivid, are, nonetheless, more exact.

In another attempt to get to what he calls "die Grundbedeutung" (the original meaning), Buber translates אולי אבנה ממנה (G. 16.2) as "vielleicht dass ich aus ihr bekindet werde." This is, of course, in reference to Sarah's hope to gain a son through her maid Hagar's giving birth. The word play in אבנה involves a dual root connection, which the ancient reader of Hebrew would have noticed- a connection with the word בנין (to build up) and with the word בן (son). Literally, Sarah wanted to be "built up" by having a son. The problem is how to bring out this pregnant Hebrew concept in one German word. Luther doesn't transmit the entire force of the Hebrew אבנה, though his translation is literally correct: "ob ich doch vielleicht aus ihr mich bauen möge." Torczyner conveys only the other aspect of אבנה, and does so in a paraphrase, rather than in a single word: "vielleicht werde ich durch sie zu Kindern

kommen." But Buber-Rosenzweig, with their creative facility, form the word which comes as close to the original as possible- "bekinden"- containing both the active notion of יד/ה through the prefix "be" and the connection with יָדַע.

Two more brief examples involving verbs will suffice to round out the picture. Both represent interesting departures from the norm. The root שבת is intriguingly given as "feiern"- und [Gott] feierte am siebenten Tag...; יום השבת is translated "Tag der Feier." By such usage Buber and Rosenzweig accomplish two things: 1) they are able to differentiate between שבת and נוח, the latter being rendered as "ruhen;" and 2) they are able to convey the special quality inherent in the concept of cessation from work in the sabbatical (שבת) sense as opposed to ordinary rest (נוח). The root שבת has distinct connotations which "ruhen" alone does not have. There is the idea of ennobling the day by resting and not working. The English does not have such a word as "feiern" available, although the new J.P.S., not being satisfied with "rested" uses "ceased." There is however, a difficulty inherent in the use of this word too. To the average person who knows German, "feiern" suggests the idea of celebrating, as well as not working, and in many cases, the Hebrew root שבת does not have such connotations. One wonders, then, whether it w ould not be misleading to consistently translate שבת as "feiern" as Buber and Rosenzweig do, even in sections where the context is not one of a religious nature- e.g. Isaiah 14.4, which speaks of the oppressor's ceasing (שבת).

A problem of a not too different nature arises from the translation of לָגוּר, which is given as "zu gasten." While "gasten" properly suggests the transitory and non-permanent position of the גֵּר, one wonders whether that compensates for the fact that "gast" also refers to a person who comes to dinner and leaves again. Isn't גֵּר of a more permanent nature than that? Stylistically, " dort zu gasten" or "dem Land darin du gastest" is so much smoother and more direct than Torczyner's "zu verweilen" or "in dem du als Fremdling geweilt hast," but philologically, it is just not accurate enough.

The same general observations may be made about nouns as were made about verbs: 1) Precision and pristine meaning are the crucial standards; 2) End results are seldom of such a nature as to elicit no reaction from the reader- whether positive or negative. Perhaps the most heralded and most radical translation, with the exception of the rendering of the Tetragrammaton, is the translation assigned to the Hebrew מִזְבֵּחַ - "altar", as it is commonly defined in both English and German. But such a translation, argued Buber and Rosenzweig, contains too many Catholic associat-ions. The translators felt that the average German would associate "Altar" with a church altar- a place before which people kneel and prostrate themselves- and so, they sought a more suitable term, one that would be more in keeping with the primitive quality of that institution. The result was "Schlachtstatt,"- a slaughtering place. There can be little

doubt that when Abraham builds a מזבח, places wood upon it, and then binds Isaac on top of the wood, he is not building an "Altar." He is quite definitely building a "Schlachtstatt." But it is quite another thing to call the cultic מזבח upon which the Aaronites placed offerings to the Lord a "Schlachtstatt." There is no positive evidence to support the contention that animals were actually slaughtered upon the altar. If anything, the evidence points to the fact that animals were killed before they were placed on the altar to be burned. Leviticus 1.5-9 is a good example.

ושחט את בן הבקר לפני יהוה והקריבו בני אהרן הכהנים את
הדם וזרקו את הדם על המזבח סביב אשר פתח אהל
מועד. והפשיט את העלה ונתח אתה לנתחיה ונתנו בני
אהרן הכהן אש על המזבח וערכו עצים על האש. וערכו
בני אהרן הכהנים את הנתחים את הראש ואת הפדר על
העצים אשר על האש אשר על המזבח. והקטיר הכהן את
הכל המזבחה עלה אשה ריח ניחוח ליהוה

Here the animal is first killed, its blood scattered on the מזבח, its body cut into pieces, and only then, after the fire has been made is it placed upon the מזבח. Buber-Rosenzweig translates the first occurrence of מזבח as "Schlachtstatt," and the succeeding occurrences as "Statt." On the meaning of "Statt" we shall comment below. Here, suffice it to say that the מזבח is not used for the slaughter. Further, if one is to believe that animals

were customarily slaughtered upon the מזבח, one has a right to expect to find verses which indicate that such a procedure took place. Yet in Leviticus, where מזבח is used with the greatest frequency, one reads of animals being burned on the מזבח, of blood being sprinkled on the מזבח, and one reads of fires simmering thereon; but one doesn't read of an actual act of slaughtering. The only clear connection between the verbal use of זבח and the מזבח in the Torah is in Exodus 20.24. There we read:

מזבח אדמה תעשה לי וזבחת עליו את עלתיך
ואת שלמיך את צאנך ואת בקרך בכל המקום
אשר אזכיר את שמי אבוא אליך וברכתיך.

But can we infer from this passage that זבח means to slaughter, as Buber and Rosenzweig insist that it does? And even if we were to take such an obviously hyperbolic passage as I Kings 13.2 as literally meaning human sacrifice-

ויקרא על המזבח בדבר יהוה ויאמר מזבח מזבח כה
אמר יהוה הנה בן נולד לבית דוד יאשיהו שמו וזבח
עליך את כהני הבמות המקטרים עליך ועצמות אדם
ישרפו עליך.

it still would be but a single passage standing against the bulk of passages in which the "schlact" does not take place upon the מזבח. For that matter, does זָבַח mean to slaughter or is a זֶבַח a "schlachtung?" Isn't it the root שחט which is generally used in that connection?

It is not our purpose here to analyze the meaning of מזבח or זבח, although it is our strong suspicion that זבח does not mean to slaughter. We wish merely

to point out that even if occasionally an act of slaughter may have taken place on the מזבח proper, "Schlachtstatt" is too narrow a term to be used consistently , and thus gives the reader a false impression of what the מזבח was. Buber and Rosenzweig apparently realize this themselves, as they often use merely the designation "Statt" to represent מזבח . In Isaiah 6.6, when the seraph takes hot coals from the מזבח , Buber-Rosenzweig translate "mit der Greifzange hatte er sie oben von der Statt gegriffen." They frequently use "Statt" in the Torah too. But even to that rather neutral word, there are strong objections. Firstly, the very neutrality of the word (it simply means "place") makes it somewhat meaningless. What does it mean that the Seraph took burning coals from "the Place?" And secondly, the word is used indiscriminately. In the passage from Leviticus (1.5-9) which we quoted above, Buber-Rosenzweig translate the first occurrence of as "Schlachtstatt," (sie sprengen das Blut rings um an die Schlachtstatt), and then, two verses later, in reference to presumably the same מזבח, translates "Statt" ("und Aharons des Priester's Söhne sollen Feuer auf die Statt geben"). One more of many such puzzling passages is Leviticus 8.11. ויז ממנו על המזבח שבע פעמים
וימשח את המזבח ואת כל כליו

Here the translation is: "er spritzte davon auf die Schlachtstatt siebenmal, er salbte die Statt und alle ihre Geräte..." Why the switch from "Schlachtstatt" to "Statt" here? In sum, both "Schlachtstatt" and "Statt" seem

inadequate as representations of עולה. In addition to עולה, they also render עלה and קרבן in their own inimitable way. They try to derive their translation from the intrinsic and basic root meaning of the Hebrew. In the case of עלה, they find the root עלה, to go up. Hence, עלה becomes a "Hochgabe." In the Akeda story, God says to Abraham: והעלהו שם לעלה. The translation: "höhe ihn dort zur Hochgabe." והעל עלות (Gen. 8.20) is given as "er höhte Hochgaben." One is at first impressed with the ingenuity of such a translation, and one asks oneself, "why didn't anyone else ever think of that?" But on second thought, one questions not only the legitimacy of such translation, but one wonders also, whether the non-Hebraist will find any meaning in such an empty phrase as "er höhte Hochgaben." "Höhen" makes sense if you know Hebrew, and if you know, as did the ancients, that "Hochgabe" is specifically a burnt offering. But if you know only German, then the root connection alone will make little sense. To be sure, an עלה is a "Hochgabe;" but so is every offering. Only, this one is of a very special kind. With קרבן, on the other hand, the translators are on safer ground. Since קרבן is itself an offering of a general kind, which needs to be made specific by a modifier, (קרבן מנחה, קרבן נסך): their translation "Nahung" or "Darnahung", while being a bit awkward, is not quite as empty as "Hochgabe." What Buber and Rosenzweig want to do here is to suggest the root connection between קרבן and קרב (to come near or to approach).

the נָבִיא presumably to bring man closer to God, somehow. Such a thought does not lend itself to objective analyses, as did the translation of נבא, but, if nothing else, it is interesting.

Another interesting attempt is made to find a more suitable way of translating נָבִיא than the customary "prophet" because the word today, unlike the original usage, is too easily associated with magic and prediction. And so, Buber and Rosenzweig sought another word- one which would convey the idea of a speaker and forthteller of sorts. But the נָבִיא was a special kind of speaker, they felt- one who was always bound to his particular message, as opposed to one who speaks professionally. Therefore, the word they chose was "Künder," one who "im Gegensatz zum Redner und Sprecher, die beide den Sinn eines Berufs oder Amts annehmen können, immer Künder von etwas, immer gebunden an seine Künde (ist)."[39] The Künder, then, is a proclaimer, but one who is bound to a particular message- he always speaks the word of God. While "Künder" is often used genitively- i.e. "Künder" of something- it can also be used absolutely. In either case, the reader may make, and even should make, the mental addition "of God's word" or its equivalent- i.e. "Künder des Wort Gottes." While such an analyses of the misuse of "prophet," and of its proper meaning, as applied to the so-called literary prophets would be quite accurate, one must nevertheless take issue with the Buber-Rosenzweig persistence in using Künder wherever נָבִיא appears. Specifically, one must object to the

use of Künder in Genesis 20.7, in which Abraham is called a נביא by Abimelech. There, it does not seem proper to speak of a Künder, for quite obviously, something entirely different is meant here. Abimelech does not fear a "proclaimer." He fears the more primitive notion of the נביא, a man who was thought to be possessed of special magical powers. Abraham did no proclaiming. Torczyner's "Begeisteter" comes much closer to the mark. Similarly, can the בני הנביאים - the bands of "prophets" rightly be called proclaimers, or were they not, in reality, little more than wonder workers?

Buber and Rosenzweig stand on safer ground, when they translate מלאך - as in מלאך יהוה or מלאך אלהים - as "Bote" (messenger). If the reader wants to infer that the מלאך is an angel, he may do so, and perhaps מלאך אלהים can be nothing else but an "angel of God." But since there are no angels except "angels of God," (angel of God seems almost redundant) and since מלאך by itself does mean "messenger," it is perfectly legitimate to translate "messenger of God," there being no loss in meaning, while there is gained a more accurate and literal translation. Torczyner, incidentally, also translates "Bote."

There are obviously many times when the limitations of the German language, even when pushed to the extreme, make it impossible for the translators to achieve the desired effects. But fortunately, there are times when the language is on the side of the translators, and when they are able to carry out their creative design- if not entirely,

then at least a good part of the way. Such an instance occurs with the root ילד , specifically in its hiphil form. The verb ויולד, for example, is given as "zeugte"- "da zeugte er einen sohn." This is not unusual, as both Luther and Torczyner use the same verb. But what is different is the Buber-Rosenzweig translation of תולדות, which they render "Zeugungen," keeping the root connection with ילד . Thus, in Genesis 5.1, where the new J.P.S. translation has "This is the record of Adam's lineage" (a fine modern, idiomatic rendering), 1) Luther, 2) Torczyner and 3) Buber-Rosenzweig has as follows:

1) "Dies ist die Schrift von des Menschen Geschlecht"

2) "Dies ist die Schrift von den Nachkommen Adams"

3) "Dies ist die Urkunde der Zeugungen Adams."

A value judgment here must be somewhat subjective, since all three translations are honest and rather straightforward reproductions of the Hebrew זה ספר תולדות אדם .

But there aretwo things which speak well for the Buber-Rosenzweig translation. The one is the more active connotation of "Zeugung" over "Geschlecht," or "Nachkommen," neither of which suggest quite as strongly as "Zeugung" that future generations were "begotten" through Adam's original act of procreation. The second is the root connection with "zeugen," which one either accepts as being desirable, or not. If one may add a further observation, "Urkunde" (deed, document, record) is a vivid and excellent translation of ספר in this context, as the new J.P.S. translators will attest to. The concept "Buch" seems an anachronism in such

an early age, and "Schrift" is not as exact or definitive as "Urkunde." Buber and Rosenzweig use "Zeugungen" for אלה תולדות השמים והארץ as well, where Luther does not translate that phrase, where Torczyner has "Enstehung," and where the new J.P.S. has "This is the story of." Again, perhaps the judgment is subjective, but "Zeugung" seems appropriate even here. In terms of the accounts of the creation story, it is not improper to speak of all things having been generated, in a poetic and perhaps even in a literal sense, by heaven and earth. The new J.P.S. "This is the story of," while again being wonderfully idiomatic, seems so non-committal, if one can use that phrase.

While one could continue cataloging words which the Buber-Rosenzweig Bible translates in an interesting way- שדה is given as "Acker" (Gen. 1.25), פני האדמה variously as "Erdacker" (2.1) or "der Fläche des Bodens" (2.8), כל הארץ as "Das ganze Erdvolk" (11.1), משפחות האדמה as "Sippen des Erdreichs" (12.3), מולדתך as "Geschlecht" (12.1)- we shall point only to two further examples which illustrate Buber and Rosenzweig's technique with words. Often it is just that little extra touch which they apply, which helps to elevate their translation, even when a phrase is, by itself, rather prosaic. ויהי בונה עיר (Gen. 4:17) is given by both Luther and Torczyner as "Und er baute (T. adds da) eine Stadt." Buber-Rosenzweig has "da wurde er Erbauer." Not only is "da wurde er" more true to the

Hebrew, but the word "Erbauer," which has the force of founding as well as building, is just infinitesimally more appropriate. This is such a small point, and yet, it results in a significantly different image. And in a similar vein, perhaps it would have been sufficient to translate "Fenster" (Luther and J.P.S. [windows]), or "Luken"- dormer windows (Torczyner), but Buber-Rosenzweig translates "Schleussen" (sluices) for the ארבות through which pour out the flood waters. "Schleussen" are specifically openings through which water is poured, giving a greater concreteness to the German reproduction of the biblical image. There is justification, too, for such a usage. In Malachi 3.10, where ארבות is used, there is the definite implication that one pours something through them.

Why, then, use window, when sluice is so much more specific and picturesque? אם לא אפתח את ארבות השמים והריקתי לכם ברכה

The most radical departure from established tradition in translation is the unique Buber-Rosenzweig rendition of the Tetragrammaton. Luther had translated יהוה with the German "Herr." Mendelssohn, in the eighteenth century, translated "der Ewige" (the Eternal One), as did Torczyner in the 1930's. Samson Raphael Hirsch, to mention another translator, did not differentiate between אלהים and יהוה, rendering them both as "Gott." But Buber and Rosenzweig were dissatisfied with such renderings. Neither "der Ewige," which was too philosophic, nor "der Herr,"

were adequate. יהוה, writes Buber, is the only word in the Bible for God which is a name throughout, and not a concept.[40] אלהים, שדי, צבאות etc. are all significations of some quality- power, loftiness and the like. But יהוה is pure Being- Being which makes itself known in the burning bush. The very root letters of "The Name" have a connection with the verb which means Being- היה. And in the burning bush, יהוה when asked His name, replies, אהיה אשר אהיה," I am that I am (or, I am Being, as some suggest). So Buber and Rosenzweig conclude that the only appropriate translation for the Tetragrammaton is the personal pronoun- ICH, DU, ER, SEIN, for in the burning bush HE reveals Himself as I.[41] The normal translation for יהוה then, is ER (HE). "ER sprach zu Abram" is given for וַיֹּאמֶר יהוה אֶל אַבְרָם. "ER GOTT" is given for יהוה אלהים. But there are times when "ER" is not appropriate. Such an expression as אֲדֹנָי יהוה, for example, is given as "Mein Herr, DU;" וַיִּבֶן שָׁם מִזְבֵּחַ לַיהוה is rendered, "Da baute er IHM eine Schlachtstatt." בְּשֵׁם יהוה, on the other hand, is simply translated "den NAMEN." The Buber-Rosenzweig motivation is quite obvious. They felt very strongly that the divine should not be not only a philosophical abstract to modern man, but, what is more important, that it was not a philosophical abstract to biblical man. יהוה was and is the ever-present, and how else but with the personal pronoun could one convey such an idea?[42] "Ich und Du"- I and Thou- the Buber trade-

mark in contemporary religious thought- makes its appearance in a most startling and fascinating way. Surely, those who sympathize with Buber's religious outlook must have been highly pleased by this remarkably "creative" translation, and were one to judge this translation from the point of view of some theologians, it might indeed be the subject of much praise. But though one might be inclined to praise such a translation on theological grounds, one must criticize it on scholarly grounds. To be sure, the Tetragrammaton- its pronounciation, and its meaning- has been the subject of much scholarly controversy. Even the phrase אהיה אשר אהיה has never been given a generally accepted translation. But that still does not entitle Buber and Rosenzweig to read into the biblical text, their own theological assumptions. For one thing, the text does not speak of THOU or HE or HIM. It speaks of יהוה. Buber-Rosenzweig do injustice to the text when they translate the first commandment as ICH (אנכי יהוה), bin dein Gott (אלהיך). Further, the very fact that the Divine Name was only pronounced once a year (by the High Priest) and that its pronounciation, except in prayer, was, in later years, encumbered with fears and superstitions would speak against the contention that HE was the "ever present." Finally, it would seem reasonable that somewhere in the tradition of Jewish translation, someone would have made an observation similar to that of Buber and Rosenzweig. Those arguments do not even take into account the internal

criticisms which may be applied. How, for example, is the hearer (assuming that the translation is to be read aloud, just as the original, if Buber and Rosenzweig are correct, was spoken before it was written) to differentiate between ER and Er when the context involves God's speaking? וַיֹּאמֶר and וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה are, after all, translated in the same way: "Er (ER) sprach." Or, why do Buber-Rosenzweig translate "Er war ein gewaltiger Jäger vor dem Herrn" for גִּבֹּר צַיִד לִפְנֵי יְהוָה (Gen. 10.9, referring to Nimrod)? Is there no "dialogue" here? And why, in the aqeda story, are יְהוָה יִרְאֶה and בְּהַר יְהוָה יֵרָאֶה translated "Gott ersieht" and "auf Gottes Berg wirds ersehen," respectively? All things considered, the Buber-Rosenzweig translation of the Tetragrammaton cannot be accepted as sound scholarship, even though its literary and theological effect may be striking.

If the Buber-Rosenzweig handling of the Tetragrammaton can be called a theological intrusion into their translation, then their handling of certain other verses may be called a "midrashic" intrusion. It will be recalled that Buber and Rosenzweig wanted to make theirs a "Jewish" translation of the Bible, in keeping not only with the proper, scholarly standards, but also in keeping with the way in which the post-biblical Jewish tradition had interpreted the Bible. This leads Buber-Rosenzweig to certain renderings which, while they may be in keeping with the interpretations of the biblical commentaries, cannot be supported in any other way. תְּהוֹם (Gen. 1.2ff) may have always been thought of

as whales, but modern scholarship defines them only as sea-monsters. Buber-Rosenzweig's "Wale" is therefore incorrect. Moreover, even though the Midrash says that וְאֵת הַנֶּפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ בְחָרָן (Gen. 12.5) refers to the converts which Abraham and Sarah brought with them, Buber-Rosenzweig are presumptuous to translate "die Seelen die sie gewonnen hatten," especially since there is no concept of "soul" in the Bible. One more example in which Buber-Rosenzweig follow Rashi will suffice. In Genesis 18.21 they go against the trope to translate אֵרְדָה-נָּא וְאֶרְאֶה הַכְּצַעֲקָתָהּ הַבָּאָה אֵלַי עָשׂוּ כָלָה וְאִם-לֹא אֵדָעָה as:

> "Niedersteigen will ich denn und schauen-
> wenn sie nach ihrem Ruf, der zu mir kam, taten:
> -Vernichtung!
> und wenn nicht:
> -ich will es wissen."

Even though other translations are not too clear here either, this is definitely an interpretive translation, and not a literal one.

These, then, have been our observations about the German text of the Buber-Rosenzweig Bible. Even within the limits of twenty-two biblical chapters, one can get a rather clear picture of what the translators have tried to do, and to what degree they have succeeded. We have praised and we have criticized, but above all, we have tried to explain the translation within its own framework, and in terms of the goals which the translator's set up for themselves. It only remains for us now to make some final evaluative remarks.

CHAPTER THREE

"An Evaluation"

Having tried to describe the Buber-Rosenzweig philosophy of translation, and having attempted to describe its application to the text of Genesis 1-22, with critical observations about philology and literary style where they were required, we can now make some general observations by way of evaluating their effort. There are many grounds on which to criticize the Buber-Rosenzweig Bible. We have already indicated some of them in prior pages. But at the same time, there is much that one can admire in this translation as well. Not only does one sense a power and beauty in the more successful sections of the translation, but even where Buber and Rosenzweig failed in carrying out their plan, it was never an ordinary failure. It was a failure which inhered in their very effort itself- the kind of noble failure which the Greek tragic hero was inevitably to meet because of his nature. For, the task to which Buber and Rosenzweig set themselves was an impossible task from the very beginning, as they themselves admitted.[43] Under the best of conditions (admittedly, the German language, because of its flexible nature, was as well suited to what Buber-Rosenzweig wanted to do as could be expected- much more suited than English, for example) there is no language nor translator capable of reproducing another language in its pristine quality.

Moreover, since there must be a certain degree of

subjectivity in this kind of literary criticism, we shall not try to make any final judgments, preferring to leave those to the reader. Rather we shall criticize what strike us as being some of the weaknesses of the Buber-Rosenzweig Method and its application, while pointing also to those aspects of the translation which have special merit.

There is much in the Buber-Rosenzweig understanding of Biblical Hebrew which is open to doubt. Is there really a unity of language throughout the Bible? Or, rather, is there not a difference between the langauge of Isaiah and that of Leviticus, between that of Genesis and that of Samuel? In view of the fact that different sections in the Bible were composed at different times, it would stand to reason that certain words- among them "key-words," perahps- might have changed in meaning and been used in different ways. The fact is that even Buber and Rosenzweig, despite all their talk of the need for consistency in translation, are far from consistent in their word usages- at least in the Torah. For example, while in theory Buber and Rosenzweig would have liked to use the family of words formed from "wahr," for the Hebrew root צדק , in practice, they apparently found it impossible. While it was possible to describe Noah the צדיק as "ein bewährter man" (Gen.6.9), the non-existent בלי־צדיק for whom Abraham pleaded were best described as guiltless ones- "die Schuldlosen." In yet another context, the Lord who is צדיק (Exodus 9.27) is rendered "Der Gerechte." Even where a word in Hebrew

has a specific and unchanging meaning, it is not always possible to be as consistently specific in the language of translation as one might like to be, and when one makes the attempt, the results are often undesirable. Limitations in German make it necessary to translate both עַם and גּוֹי as "Volk." As a rule, Buber-Rosenzweig follows that pattern. But in trying to distinguish between these separate words when they appear in close proximity, they use "Stamme" for גּוֹי. This would be fine except that "Stamme" does not have the same meaning as גּוֹי. While it might have been nice to have separate words for גּוֹי and עַם in German as in Hebrew, Buber-Rosenzweig would have been better advised to translate both words with "Volk," as do Luther and Torczyner. In translating גּוֹי sometimes with "Volk" and sometimes with "Stamme" Buber-Rosenzweig are not only guilty of mis-translation, but they are guilty of the very inconsistency which they had hoped to avoid.

Not only is there a difficulty involved in wanting to translate consistently but, at times, an artificiality as well. Buber-Rosenzweig had arbitrarily decided to translate דִּין with "Recht," "richten," etc. (see above, p. 18). But there had to be found a German word for דָּן, (Gen. 15.14). What word is there in German which is more appropriate than "richten" which Buber-Rosenzweig therefore had to use, even though they had wanted to reserve that family of words for דִּין. Again, contrary to what

Rosenzweig wrote, not all languages are pliable enough to make exact and consistent translation possible.

While the "consistency principle" may be desirable in theory, and while it may be good to use it wherever and whenever possible, the theory cannot be consistently applied to the entire Bible. The fact is that Buber-Rosenzweig found it impossible to adhere to it strictly. Even such terms as חן and חסד which one would hope might be given special attention, are translated in several ways. חן is sometimes rendered "Gunst," sometimes "Gnade," and in one instance (Genesis 6.8) as "Huld." חסד is variously translated as "Güte," and "Huld."

Closely allied to problems involving consistency are questions about the "Leitwort." When is a key word a key word? One cannot help but wonder whether the words which Buber-Rosenzweig single out as being key words, might not simply be commonly used words which appear in many contexts. Did the biblical writer, for example, consciously use ענה (see above) to describe what Sarah did to Hagar, and what Pharoh did to Israel, in order to convey a secret meaning to his reader, or did he merely use that word because it most concisely expressed what he wanted to say? Does the redactor use פקד פקד and פקד because he wants to show Abraham to be a man of faith who trustingly follows the commands of God, or is it simply the best verb to use under the circumstances? This is not to dogmatically deny that the Buber-Rosenzweig key word concept has no validity;

it is only to point to the danger inherent in such a theory, which is that it becomes too easy to read into the text the ideas one might like to see there. Moreover, even if the "Leitwort" theory has validity, Buber-Rosenzweig were not able to effectively carry it through in the German. Inconsistencies of the very kind which Buber-Rosenzweig presumably wanted to avoid found their way into their translation. (1) There are several Hebrew roots which are transmitted by the same or similar German expression: Both צא מן התבה (God to Noah in Gen. 8.16) and לך לך (God to Abraham, Gen. 12.1) are translated "geh aus," with the minor difference in the latter, which is "geh du aus." צא מן התבה (Gen. 7.1) is also translated "geh." How is the reader to know how to infer a connection, and between which words and episodes? (2) The same Hebrew root is translated by different German words: הלך in the form of לך לך is rendered "geh du" (Gen. 21.2), but, וילך (22.3) is given as "er...zog." If לך לך and וילך are key words as Buber contends (see above page 15), then he ought to have translated וילך as "er ging." In that same section, מקום is twice (Gen. 22.3, 22.4) translated "die Stätte" (וילך אל המקום = "er...zog zu der Stätte," וירא את המקום = "da sah er die Statte"), but then, for no apparent reason, translated as "Ort"- וישכם אל המקום (Gen. 22.9). One need not add more examples to make the point that whatever the validity of the "Leitwort" idea in theory,

the German reader of the Buber-Rosenzweig Bible would, more than likely, not have been aware of it because the translators were not sufficiently able to carry the idea through into practice.

Questions similar to those which were applied to the "Leitwort" in particular, can be applied to the area of Paronomasia in general. Even one who is sympathetic to the intentions of Buber-Rosenzweig must have moments when he wonders whether they do not overstate their case. Might not some of the so called conscious punning and root repetition simply be due to the normal style used in biblical days? Biblical Hebrew was, after all, a limited language, in terms of vocabulary and even in terms of the length of the alphabet. There was bound to be a certain repetition of phrases, words and sounds. This is not to deny that biblical style had special and unique characteristics, but merely to warn of the dangers of excess-finding paronomastic effects everywhere. One must seriously doubt, for example, that the ancient reader or hearer of the Bible was aware that אל תפנו אל האלילם (Lev. 19.4) was a conscious effort at a pun, involving אל (no) and אלילם (false god) as Franz Rosenzweig thinks.[44] To translate "Wandet euch ja nicht zu den Gott-nichtzen," (אלילם, the false gods, are here given as the "not-gods," in order for there to be a connection with the Hebrew אל -do not) is very clever, but hardly acceptable. While אל and אלילם have letters in common, by

what right does one make a root connection in German when it does not even exist in Hebrew?

But in a broader sense, questions and criticisms which deal with the Buber-Rosenzweig principles of biblical style and the manner in which they lived up to their principles of translation, become largely academic in the face of still a more central question. Assuming that Buber and Rosenzweig are correct in their analyses of the Bible, and considerably successful in translating with the desired consistency, the question would still remain as to whether the casual reader of the Bible who knows no Hebrew, and who is a product of the style and idiom of the twentieth century, would be sensitive to the kind of effects which Buber and Rosenzweig tried to achieve. Subtle, paronomastic devices may have been familiar to the biblical man, who would have expected them in his literature and who would have looked and listened for them, but they are not common to the western reader of the twentieth century. One suspects that many of the stylistic features which Buber and Rosenzweig describe are lost, even to the reader of the Hebrew text. How much the more so would they be lost to one who reads the Bible only in translation? Max Dienemann,[45] in an article written in 1927, although he praises the Buber-Rosenzweig translation, states the doubt felt by this writer. He wonders whether one can derive the full effect of the translation without a knowledge of Hebrew. We have already alluded to this problem in another context. If this is true, then, would it not have been

more profitable to have aimed for a clear, idiomatic modern translation, without worrying about and struggling with all of the stylistic subtleties, and without risking damage to both the Hebrew and German? Is it necessarily true, as Buber and Rosenzweig seem to assume apriori, that the closer the translation is to the original in style, the better will be the translation?

These methodological criticisms, taken together with the philological criticisms made earlier, point to some severe weaknesses in the Buber-Rosenzweig Bible. Honesty demands that they not be overlooked or discounted in an overall evaluation.

Still, it must also be remembered that Buber-Rosenzweig tried to recreate a work of literature, which cannot be simply praised or condemned in the same manner that on accepts or rejects a scholarly article. Just as it is not fair to judge the entire Bible on the basis of the dry and uninspired verses of Leviticus, so it is not fair to judge the Buber-Rosenzweig Bible only on the basis of its faults. There is such a thing as an overall literary impression which must also be taken into account.

Whether or not Buber and Rosenzweig were misguided in what they tried to do, the fact is that, with all the faults one can find, they did at times come very close to achieving their goal. There are times when their translation comes alive- more so than that of Luther or even Torczyner- and moves one with its literary power and its

loftiness. Buber and Rosenzweig are fine poets. Not only were they masters of German, but they could sense, understand and appreciate the character of biblical Hebrew with its inner rhythms and its unique manner of expression. At times, as we have tried to show, they were able to translate this into German. At such times, the reader is able to experience the dignity and majesty, which is in the very nature of biblical style. The Bible is, after all, a kind of a prose poem. Its verses are rhythmic and its language precise and picturesque. Buber and Rosenzweig, with their feeling for words- both Hebrew and German- and style, were able to create a prose poem in German. Perhaps their German was not of a kind which can be used in present times, or even of a kind which can be understood with ease by the average reader. But was easy intelligibility ever a standard of literary excellence?

In any case, no matter what one's final judgment may be, the Buber-Rosenzweig Bible is to be taken seriously. It represents a unique venture into the area of Bible translation. To be sure, it was not always successful in what it tried to accomplish, nor always acceptable in terms of scholarship. But as literature it is exciting, and as an attempt to recapture Biblical Hebrew, it is daring and imaginative.

FOOTNOTES

1. Buber-Rosenzweig, Die Schrift und Ihre Verdeutschung, pp.88-129.

2. W. Schwarz, Biblical Translation.

3. Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament, p. 61.

4. ibid.

5. Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament, p. 13.

6. ibid.

7. R.F. Henderson, "Problems of Bible Translation" (The Bible Translator VI,3).

8. Mr. Henderson has this referrence as Psalm 5.2 In the Jewish Publication Society translation of 1917, the referrence is in Psalm 26.2.

9. Buber-Rosenzweig, Die Schrift und Ihre Verdeutschung, p. 123.

10. Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament, p.13.

11. Buber-Rosenzweig, Die Schrift und Ihre Verdeutschung, p.318.

12. Buber-Rosenzweig, Die Schrift und Ihre Verdeutschung, Berlin, Im Schochen Verlag, 1936.

13. ibid. p. 88-90.

14. ibid. p. 124.

15. Nahum Glatzer, Franz Rosenzweig, His Life and Thought, p. 254.

16. ibid. p. 253.

17. Buber-Rosenzweig, Die Schrift und Ihre Verdeutschung, p.56.

18. ibid. pp. 140-41.

19. ibid. see also pp. 76-87.

FOOTNOTES

20. ibid. p. 57.

21. ibid. p. 50.

22. ibid. pp. 139-140.

23. ibid. p. 138.

24. ibid. p. 140.

25. ibid. pp. 55-75.

26. ibid. pp. 152-155.

27. ibid. p. 211.

28. ibid. pp. 250-251.

29. ibid. pp. 211-238.

30. ibid. pp. 156-157.

31. ibid. p. 351.

32. ibid. p. 282.

33. ibid. p. 146 and p. 281.

34. ibid. p. 281.

35. ibid. pp. 305-306.

36. Emanuel bin Gorion, "Buber's Bibel" (Das Tage Buch, d.18 Juni 1927) p. 992.

37. Buber-Rosenzweig, Die Schrift und Ihre Verdeutschung, p.33 and pp. 279-282.

38. Harry M. Orlinsky, "The Meaning of RUAH in Genesis 1.2" (Jewish Quarterly Review, Oct. 1957) p. 174.

39. Buber-Rosenzweig, Die Schrift und Ihre Verdeutschung, p. 289.

40. ibid. pp. 163-164.

41. ibid. p. 195.

42. ibid. pp. 332-338.

FOOTNOTES

43. see above, note 23.

44. Buber-Rosenzweig, Die Schrift und Ihre Verdeutschung, p. 50.

45. Max Dienemann, "Die Schrift, Zu Verdeutschen Unternommen" (Morgen, J.3, 1927) pp.344-345.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament, by Members of the Revision Committee, Luther A. Weigle, Chairman. New York, Thomas Nelson & Sons. 1952.

Hilaire Belloc. "On Translation" (The Bible Translator X2). April 1959.

J. Bleichrode. "Die Schrift: Das Buch Namen; Das Buch Er Rief; Das Buch in der Wuster" (Jeschurun, XIV). 1927.

Robert G. Bratcher. "The Art of Translation" (The Bible Translator, IX 2.) April 1958.

Edith Brodsky. "Bible Translation in Progress" (Congress Bi-Weekly) Nov. 30, 1959.

Martin Buber und Franz Rosenzweig. Die Schrift: Das Buch Im Anfang. Berlin, Verlag Lambert Schneider, 1925.

Martin Buber und Franz Rosenzweig. Die Schrift und Ihre Verdeutschung. Berlin, Im Schocken Verlag, 1936.

Max Dienemann. "Die Schrift. Zu verdeutschen unternommen" (Morgen, J.3) 1927.

Ludwig Feuchtwanger. "Ubersetzungs Probleme" (Morgen, J.12) 1936.

Nahum N. Glatzer. Franz Rosenzweig: His Life and Thought. New York, Schoken Books Inc. 1953.

Emanuel bin Gorion. "Buber's Bible" (Das Tage Buch)d. 18 Juni 1927.

R. F. Henderson. "Problems of Bible Translation" (The Bible Translator VI 3) July 1955.

Samson Raphael Hirsch. Der Pentateuch: Erster Theil; Die Genesis. Frankfurt am Main, J. Kauffmann, 1893.

Martin Luther. Die Bibel oder die ganze Heilige Schrift. Leipzig und Dresden, B.G. Teubner, 1868.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Harry M. Orlinsky. "Wanted: A New Bible Translation in English for the Jewish People" (Address at the 65th Annual Meeting of The Jewish Publication Society of America) May 10, 1953.

Victor E. Reichert. "The New Look in Genesis" (C.C.A.R. Journal) January 1959.

W. Schwarz. Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation. Cambridge, At the University Press. 1955.

Joseph Stern. "Die Schrift: Die Bücher Reden, Jehoschiah, Richter, Schmuel, Könige." (Jeschurun XVI) 1929.

The Book of Genesis of the Holy Scriptures: Draft Version of the revised translation. Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1958.

Harry Torczyner. Die Heilige Schrift: Tora/Fünfbuch. Frankfurt am Main, J. Kauffmann Verlag, 1935.

Wohlgemuth. "Die Neue Bibel Übersetzung" (Jeschurun XIII) 1926.

Ernest M. Wolf. "Martin Buber and German Jewry, Prophet and Teacher to a Generation in Catastrophe." (Judaism, v.I no.4) Oct. 1952.