

Judaism in the World of Monotheism :
Collection of Articles Dedicated to Professor Hiroshi Ichikawa,
Etsuko Katsumata, Daisuke Shibata, Masahiro Shida,
and Keisuke Takai eds. (Lithon, 2020)

Akio Tsukimoto

This collection of academic articles is a worthwhile read. Despite having “*Judaism*” in its title, all the 15 articles in fact cover, both temporally and spatially, a wide range of research areas. The collection was organized into four chronological sections and each section contains four articles (except Section 4 with only three articles). All the contributors were students of Professor Hiroshi Ichikawa at the University of Tokyo Graduate School and are active, young (at least from the reviewer’s point of view) researchers in their own areas of specialization. Each of the articles does not necessarily put forward theories but focuses on the elucidation of religious phenomena based on historical sources. The reviewer was able to gain many new insights into facts and events regarding “Jews and Judaism” through the articles and was deeply impressed with some of them. Below is just an introduction to the main points along with a brief review of each article. Although the reviewer might sometimes use critical language, it is hoped that any critical comment is regarded as an expression of encouragement from the reviewer who has been engaged in research in this field a little bit longer than the contributors.

(1)

Section 1, “*The World of Ancient West Asia and the Hebrew Bible*,” includes four articles by Mr. Daisuke Shibata, Ms. Ayako Hosoda, Mr. Keisuke Takai, and Ms. Kumiko Kato, respectively.

D. Shibata’s “*Monotheism in Ancient Mesopotamia*” discusses “monotheistic theology” in ancient Mesopotamia. Although ancient Mesopotamia is generally understood to be a “polytheistic” world, there are a number of cuneiform documents that consider many deities with different characteristics as attributes of a most powerful god, which indicates a

unique propensity for “monotheism.” Shibata collected these documents and examines them carefully with attention to their religious and historical connotations and recognizes in them the “intellectual tradition” of the “scholars,” a tradition to be differentiated from that of Mesopotamian folk religion. Therefore, this article implies as a consequence that the “monotheism” in ancient Mesopotamia was a religious phenomenon different from the “Yahwistic monotheism” which was established in ancient Israel and was passed on to Judaism and to Christianity.

The concept of “*Monotheiotetismus*” (= *Lehre von einer Göttlichkeit*, which should be translated into Japanese as “単一神性論” rather than “一神性教” as translated by Shibata) mentioned on p. 35, was first put forward not by Wolfram von Soden, but by his mentor, Benno Landsberger. The reviewer believes that this concept offers an important perspective for discussing “monotheism and polytheism.” For example, any Shinto shrine in Japan has its own deity or deities, which shows the polytheistic character of Shintoism, where the average Japanese visitor to the shrine does not call on its deity or deities by name but refers instead to any deity simply as “God.” In Buddhist temples, ordinary Japanese people pray to Bodhisattva simply as “Buddha” folding their hands together in worship without differentiating between Buddha and Bodhisattva. The reviewer surmises that this kind of piety could probably be explained by means of the concept of “*Monotheiotetismus*.”

Next, A. Hosoda’s “*The Power of Fire and Water in the Mesopotamian Maqlû Ritual*,” gives detailed descriptions based on recent studies of the incantation ritual called “*maqlû*,” which may not be familiar to those who are not well acquainted with Akkadian religious documents. The ritual aimed at healing illnesses that were considered to have been caused by witchcraft (black magic). The ritual included religious acts such as reciting various incantations (referred to by Hosoda in Japanese as “唱えごと”) and the burning (“*maqlû*” means “burning” in Akkadian) of figurines representing the sorcerer, in order to purify the sick person by removing the disease. The ritual was performed by a priest called “*āšipu*” in Akkadian. Hosoda points out the important function of fire and water in the ritual and concludes that the “*āšipu* who freely manipulated fire and water” is to be regarded as a *shaman*.

The reviewer, however, cannot agree with this conclusion. This is because, as Shibata mentioned on pp. 50-51 of the book, the *āšipus* were “scholars” belonging to the royal palace and state temple. The *āšipūtu* was not a folk religion as the shamanism. The “extraordinary direct experiences” peculiar to *shamans*, such as spirit possession, ecstasy and trance, which are characterized as *shamanistic* by Prof. Kokan Sasaki and others, are not likely to be found among the ritual performances of *āšipu* priests. Shamanistic phenomena in ancient

Mesopotamia can be found rather in activities of the “prophets” called “*maḥḥû / maḥḥûtu*” in Akkadian (“*muhḥû / muhḥûtu*” in Mari, and “*raggimu / ragintu*” in Neo-Assyrian texts).

K. Takai’s “‘*Satrap of Abar-Nahara (Ebir Nari)*’ and the *Al-Yahudu Community*” refers to the 6th-5th century BCE cuneiform documents published in 2014 and discusses the administrative functions of the ‘satrap of Abar-Nahara’ who is mentioned in the Aramaic part of the Hebrew Bible (Ezra 5:3, etc.). Viewed against the political background in the Achaemenid Empire of Persia, Takai explains aspects of the economic activities of the Judahites who remained in Babylonia in the post-exilic period. Under the reign of the Achaemenid Dynasty, some of the Judahites borrowed “leasehold farmland” from the satrap of Ebir Nari (“beyond the river Euphrates,” an Akkadian equivalence to Abar-Nahara in Aramaic) and engaged in the cultivation of fruit trees and cereals. Takai carefully and thoroughly examines these circumstances based on the new documents.

Unfortunately, however, the settled towns of these Judahites in Mesopotamia which are referred to as *Al-Yahudu* (Judah town) etc. in these documents cannot be localized, because these new documents were not artifacts unearthed by legitimate archaeological excavations. They can, however, be dated to the second half of the 6th through the first half of the 5th century BCE and the four generations of a remaining Judahite family are clearly discerned in the texts. Along with the “Murashu tablets” excavated at Nippur at the end of the 19th century and dated to the second half of the 5th century BCE, these new documents bring a wealth of important information about economic activities of the Judahite people who did not return to their homeland but remained in Mesopotamia. Other similar documents are also scheduled for publication. The reviewer hopes that Takai will continue to examine these documents and clarify the social conditions of Judahite life in Babylonia in the post-exilic period. A semantic research on theophoric names of the Judahites there would shed light on aspects of their religious life (Laurie E. Pearce and Cornelia Wunsch, who published the new documents, did not go further beyond a philological analysis of the theophoric names).

The last article in Section 1 is a philological study on “*Structure and Meaning of Proverbs 11:16-22*” by K. Kato. Kato, who has been studying the Book of Proverbs for a couple of decades, makes a thorough linguistic analysis of the vocabulary as well as the literary style of the short paragraph, Prov. 11:16-22. She also investigates the ethical meaning of each maxim in it and insightfully shows that the paragraph that initially appeared to be just an arbitrary collection of maxims is in fact deliberately organized according to a distinct theme and purpose.

This kind of meticulous research should be an orthodox method for studying the

Hebrew Bible. The accumulation of such careful investigations could contribute much to a better understanding of the editing process of the Book of Proverbs and enable the wisdom reflected in the sayings of Proverbs to transcend hundreds of generations and shine its light in the present day. If the reviewer remembers correctly, Kato is currently planning to write a commentary on the Book of Proverbs. The discussions in this article will be included in it.

(2)

Section 2, entitled “*Ancient Mediterranean World and Christianity*,” includes four articles by Ms. Keiko Kobori, Mr. Shizuka Umemura, Ms. Yumi Doi, and Ms. Kyoko Nakanishi, respectively.

K. Kobori’s “*Divination in Ancient Rome*,” as the title suggests, talks about “augury” and “haruspicy” in Ancient Rome. Divination in the Roman state was based on “science,” “technique,” and “knowledge” and carried out by an augur who was appointed as an official priest by involvement from the Roman Senate. Furthermore “the College of Augurs (with 15 members)” was organized to interpret the signs of extraordinary phenomena in nature. “Haruspicy,” divination by means of color and shape of the entrails (mainly the liver) of sacrificial animals, was originally performed by priests from Etruria. From the 3rd century BCE onwards, however, “the Corps of the Haruspices” was composed of 60 priests who were responsible for performing haruspicy for the Roman state.

Due to its emphasis on the official system for performing divination in Ancient Rome, the article does not delve into the aspect of divination as “science,” a systematic method for interpreting a phenomenon observed in nature as a sign of an occurrence to come (the logic of divination). The reviewer is much interested in the comparison of Roman divination with Ancient Mesopotamian divination, the latter having a rich and large volume of so called “omen texts” available. In the reviewer’s book, “*Myths and Rituals of Ancient Mesopotamia*” (Iwanami Shoten, 2010, in Japanese), one chapter is dedicated to the “*Logic of Divination in Ancient Mesopotamia—with a Focus on Augury*” (pp. 182-209).

S. Umemura’s “*Leaders of Galilee in the Second Temple Period—Questions on Being Jewish*,” introduces the figures (“the leaders of Galilee”) who tried to resist the political forces oppressing people in the region called the “Galilee of the Gentiles” (1 Maccabees 5:15 ← Isaiah 8:23) during “Judaization” of the region, namely in the period of the Hasmonean Dynasty and later. Apart from Jesus of Nazareth, movements of “the leaders of Galilee” are only briefly mentioned in the works of Josephus and in Rabbinical literature. Examining these

scarce literary sources, searching their backgrounds, and deciphering their hidden meanings, Uemura delves deeply into the actual circumstances of these resistance movements and the ideologies behind them. According to Umemura, “to be Jewish” must have been the primary motivation for these leaders conducting their resistance movement to protect the livelihood of the Galilean peasants. The article claims that Jesus of Nazareth was the only exception among the “leaders” because he refused “to be Jewish,” which eventually led to the birth of Christianity.

In the chapter on “*Judaization of Galilee*” there is a paragraph on “the archeological materials” in which, with the help of Mordechai Aviam’s research, Uemura confirms the archeological basis for the facts mentioned above. Discoveries from ongoing excavations of Tel Rekhes in Lower Galilee conducted by the Japanese Archaeological Expedition in Israel since 2007 (M. Aviam is also a member of the team and Professor Ichikawa has supported the excavations since 2013) would have served the above-mentioned paragraph more. The findings in Tel Rekhes include a farmhouse, chalk vessels used by devout Jews to avoid religious defilement, and the remains of a synagogue. All of which are dated to the first century CE.

Christianity developed into a major world religion by preaching neighborly love and transcending the formalism and exclusivism of Judaism at that time. It is Professor Ichikawa who raised an objection to this kind of historical interpretation, which is still found in high school World History textbooks. Y. Doi’s “*From Judaism to Christianity—Close to the Pagan Word*” tries to validate Professor Ichikawa’s criticism by interpreting passages from the related literary sources of the Roman period. The first half of the article claims, primarily based on the Books of Gospels, that “the main premise of the execution of Jesus” was not his violation of Jewish law, but his criticism of the Jerusalem temple. Based on the Pauline Epistles as well as archeological records, the second half of the article points out that the process which separated Christianity from Judaism was a diverse and gradual process.

The reviewer fully agrees with Doi’s analysis that Jesus’ criticism of the Jerusalem temple was the primary reason for the Jewish authority accusation against him. The execution of Jesus, however, was not carried out by the Jewish authorities but by the Roman prefect—a fact disregarded in the article despite its announcement of the “premise of the execution of Jesus.” The latter half of the article entitled “*From Judaism to Christianity*” does not clearly explain what caused Christianity to separate from Judaism and set off on its own path. This is probably due to a lack of clear understanding of the most essential element that constituted Judaism as well as Christianity in the late first century. It is also regrettable to find in this

article conspicuous proofreading errors in spelling: (“Chirstiani” for “Christianity,” “20062” for “2006²” on p. 208, “Gen. 2” for “Gen. 22” on p. 210) and improper expressions (“Hebrew” for “Aramaic” on p. 194, “Jerusalem mission” by Paul (?) on p. 205, “Council of Jamnia” (?) on p. 212, etc.).

The last article in Section 2 is K. Nakanishi’s “*Religion of the Earthly City*” in Augustine’s *The City of God*.” It goes without saying that the “Religion of the Earthly City” refers to the Roman religion that Augustine considered to be “wrong.” Augustine refuted the Roman pagan religion by citing the religious theories of Varro and Cicero. Nakanishi discusses Augustine’s refutation from the perspectives of “rituals,” “mythology,” and “philosophy.” According to Augustine, true religion must be the service to God, whereas in Rome the religious rituals were performed for the pursuit of benefits gained in this world. Myths originating from the creative imaginations of writers were used for nature worship accompanied with vulgar rituals. They were devoid of virtue and reason and deviated from morality. Even philosophical faith that believes in “the One”, which is derived from an abstract concept, must incorporate an intermediate existence, i.e., the daemons that in fact embody “the Many.” Such criticism by Augustine of pagan religions, aside from functioning as apologetics for Christianity, points to the necessity of denying the “world of abundant life.” Nakanishi closes the article by saying that the world that Augustine denied, however, was “passed on as a source of allegory” even beyond the Medieval Ages.

Although the article presents the viewpoints of “rituals,” “mythology” and “philosophy” at the beginning, these three perspectives are intertwined in the following discussions, which makes it difficult for the reviewer to grasp the point of the arguments. The concluding statement that the worldview that Augustine had denied was passed on as a “source of allegory” beyond the Medieval Ages would be conceivable to some extent if one thinks of the Renaissance. Otherwise, this statement seems to be somehow a reckless interpretation of history. At least it needs an explanation of how Augustine’s criticism of pagan religions was inherited beyond the Medieval Ages and who denied Augustine’s criticism. Be that as it may, the reviewer would like to imagine that Augustine’s shame and remorse over his own pagan experiences in youth before his conversion might have been reflected in his criticism of pagan religions.

(3)

Section 3, “*Development of Rabbinic Judaism*,” includes four articles contributed by

Mr. Joe Sakurai, Ms. Etsuko Katsumata, Mr. Hideharu Shimada, and Mr. Masahiro Shida, respectively.

J. Sakurai's "*Redefinition of the Origin of Jewish Ethnicity*" deals with discussions in the Babylonian Talmud regarding the treatment of Jewish converts who had pagan relatives. One of the juridical problems concerning converts was whether their first male child born before conversion could keep inheritance rights or not. According to Sakurai's analysis of the Talmudic texts, the earlier view that converts should be regarded as "fatherless" was replaced by the later one that they should be characterized as "newborns." This was because all blood relationships before conversion had to be rejected completely. So, the compilers of the Talmud, called the "*Stams*," tried to demonstrate the "transversion" of the origin of Jewish ethnicity, i.e., the emergence of "the fictive blood ties" resulting from conversion. Sakurai concludes that through "the fictive blood tie" "*the subjective construction of the convert's Jewish ethnic identity became possible*" (p. 269).

It puzzled the reviewer a lot that the article does not mention "circumcision" while discussing the conversion of pagans to Judaism. As is well known, circumcision was commanded by God to the forefather Abraham to be performed on a male newborn on the eighth day after birth. It is also performed on adult male converts as a physical sign. First and foremost, it must be the physical as well as psychological pain of circumcision that brings about the decisive change in ethnical consciousness. Circumcision, therefore, should take precedence over the "fictive blood ties" generated by being treated as "newborns." The reviewer surmises that the religious law treating converts as "newborns" was probably derived from the figurative expression of applying circumcision, which was stipulated to be performed on the eighth day from birth, for adults. In addition, the reviewer also believes that the article should have taken into consideration some possible association of the concept of "newborn" in the Torah law with the "new life" as seen in Christian baptism (John 3:5, Romans 6:4).

E. Katsumata, based on the records in Chapter 41 of "Exodus Rabbah," a Midrash text concerning the "Golden Calf Story" of Exodus 32, discusses the relationship among "people," "freedom," and "idol worship" in Rabbinic Judaism. According to Chapter 41, God had already granted "freedom" to the Israelite people to deliver themselves from the "Angel of Death" through the law (Ten Commandments). However, the people "sat" and corrupted into "idol worship" (the act of "sitting" suggests a voluntary action of the people, p. 294). Therefore, Moses had to intercede with God for the people. Chapter 41 of "Exodus Rabbah," therefore, gives a diametrical description of the "freedom" and the "idol worship" of the "people." Katsumata concludes the article by criticizing Jewish studies in modern Germany that tend to

idealize Rabbinic Judaism as “democratic.”

The article, however, does not provide any referential basis pertaining to Jewish studies in modern Germany that argued for the “democratic characteristics” of Rabbinic Judaism. Without information regarding how and why German scholars idealized Rabbinic Judaism, the readers can hardly agree with the conclusion of this article.

What especially interests the reviewer is the Rabbinic interpretation of the word *ḥārūt* (“engraved”) in Exodus 32:16. Verse 16 says that the Ten Commandments are “engraved” on the (two stone) tablets. The Rabbis interpreted this by saying that the word *ḥēyrūt* (“freedom”) was hidden in *ḥārūt* (“engraved”) and thus the idea of “freedom through the Torah” stemmed from there. The interpretation of this verse that goes back to the time of *Mishnah* (see Ab. 6:2) became common property of Judaism. The reviewer thus finds this a good contrast with the Pauline theology of “freedom from the law,” which, as a result, separated Christianity from Judaism.

H. Shimada’s “*Education and Excommunication Functions in Jewish Society in the Medieval Islamic World*” first summarizes the aspects of children’s education in Rabbinic Judaism as well as the case of the Medieval Jewish community as shown in the Cairo Genizah documents in general. It then discusses the three types of “excommunication” from the Jewish community (one whole day, seven days, and an indefinite period), including a partial transliteration and translation of a letter in Judeo-Arabic from among the Cairo Genizah documents that pertains to “excommunication.”

Almost half article is nothing but a summary using articles from the Jewish Encyclopedias and some studies of other scholars. It discusses “excommunication” in the Genizah but does not clarify how the three types of “excommunication” are related to the “excommunication” observed in the Genizah text. As far as the reviewer has checked, the part that mentions the aspects of “excommunication” in Judaism (pp. 310-312) is just a translation of an article in the Jewish Encyclopedia which one can read online, except for the last three lines. Furthermore, the “excommunication” for “thirty days” in the paragraph on “*niddui*” is wrongly copied as “*for thirty-one days*” on p. 311. Regarding “children’s education,” the author uses expressions such as “*In the following I will show you just a few of the accounts*” (pp. 306 and 307). This style of writing seems to the reviewer, to be impolite to the readers. As for the terminologies used in the article, the expression “*Genizah society*” (p. 302) is incomprehensible, the use of “*illiterate*” (“*mon-mou*” in Japanese, p. 308) is inappropriate, and “*excommunication for one whole day / seven days*” (p. 311) sounds odd in Japanese

because the Japanese word *hamon* the article uses for “*excommunication*” implies “indefinite duration.” *Tsuihou* would be better.

The article does not refer to the “Damascus Document” that was found among the Genizah documents at the end of the 19th century and is now supplemented in the *Halakha* part with the Dead Sea Scrolls. The text includes the Jewish law regarding the period of “banishment / excommunication” based on the weight of sin. It is therefore doubtful, at least in the reviewer’s eyes, whether this article has anything to contribute academically or not.

M. Shida’s “*Hayyim ibn Musa ‘Shield and Sword’—15th Century Religious Controversy and Its Intellectual Background*” is an introduction to “*Shield and Sword*,” the work of Hayyim ibn Musa, a Jewish scholar who refuted Christianity and launched an apologetics for Judaism in the 15th century. The article, however, goes beyond a mere introduction. It begins with an explanation of circumstances surrounding the Jews in 15th century Spain, such as persecution, pressure to convert to Christianity, skepticism and despair in Judaism itself and so on. These matters cast light on ibn Musa’s intention to write “*Shield and Sword*” for Jewish people. The article then gives a detailed discussion of ibn Musa’s “way” of refuting Christianity and defending Judaism.

The writing style that ibn Musa used was a “dialogue” with Nicholas of Lyra, a Franciscan priest who wrote an extensive Biblical commentary from the Christian perspective more than a century earlier. Ibn Musa accepted the method of Biblical exegesis based on the literal interpretation (*peshat*) from Rashi and Rashbam, two great exegetists of the Hebrew Bible in the Medieval Age. In the process of the “dialogue,” ibn Musa attempted to understand the Christian interpretation of the passages of the Hebrew Bible that were considered prophecies for the Virgin Birth of Jesus and the Messiah’s Coming. He then studied words and phrases of the Biblical passages in detail and eventually refuted their Christian interpretation. Shida describes this kind of approach as an “intellectual dialogue” between ibn Musa and Nicholas. Ibn Musa did not side with the Jewish folklore that was meant to ridicule Jesus and Christianity. From here one can see the reason why Shida used the subtitle “*15th Century Religious Controversy and Its Intellectual Background*.”

The article is about one of the most meaningful cases in the history of “religious dialogue.” It reminds the reviewer of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing’s “*Nathan the Wise*.”

(4)

Section 4, which is entitled “*Jews and Judaism in Modern Europe*,” includes three

articles by Ms. Mina Lee, Ms. Ryoka Aoki and Ms. Yukie Tatta, respectively.

In the first article, “*Formation of the Modern Stereotyped Image of the Jews*,” M. Lee clarifies from a social perspective, the history and background of the formation of the Jewish image as being “greedy moneylenders” and having “a lack of loyalty to the nation” in the 17th century Venice. Without going into the historical details discussed by the author, the reviewer first presents the conclusion only of the article. The notion that “Jewish people are greedy moneylenders” arose from a prejudice harbored by Christians to make a distinction between Jewish financial businesses and the “public pawnbrokers” (*Monte di Pietà*) that were run by the Franciscans under the pretext of “charity to the poor,” whereas “disloyalty of the Jews to the nation” could be said to be a discriminatory catch-phrase that was fabricated to distinguish Jewish businessmen from the Venetian merchants, even though the Venetian Republic acknowledged the economic contributions of the Jews.

As such, these stereotyped images of the Jews did not arise from religious discrimination. Rather, these prejudices were born when the influence of religion weakened and religious differences between Christianity and Judaism became irrelevant in the process of building the “concept of citizen” and a “commercialistic nation” (p. 361). This is the main point of the article. At the end of the article, Lee remarks that not a few Rabbis had interactions with Christian clergy, while some Christians were in fact opposed to any prejudice against the Jews. The reviewer hopes that the author will introduce more examples of the interaction between Christians and Jews in 17th Venice to those Japanese who are only acquainted with *Shylock*.

R. Aoki’s “*Study on Volozhin Yeshiva—the Cradle of Misnagdim*” is a study on Chaim of Volozhin, a Lithuanian Rabbi, and the *yeshiva* he founded. The *yeshiva*, which was founded in the rural town of Volozhin, Lithuania in 1802 and started with only ten students, rapidly became well known in Jewish society and gathered students from around the world. By the 1880’s, the *yeshiva* had around 400 students. Even after that, amidst pressure from the Russian government, the *yeshiva* continued to operate until the Holocaust persecution. It served as a model for *yeshivas* in Eastern Europe from the 19th to the 20th century and was known as the “mother of all *yeshivas*.”

As the background behind the establishment of the *yeshiva* by Chaim, the article points out two other Jewish movements, the Enlightenment Movement (*Haskalah*) that looks up to Moses Mendelssohn as their “leader” and Hasidism that was gaining more influence over the Jews in Eastern Europe. After the death of his teacher, Vilna Gaon, Chaim visualized a *yeshiva* that would advocate studies of the Torah and compliance to and practice of the *mitzvah*. He

rejected the adoption of the Jewish Enlightenment Movement as well as immersion into Hasidism. Inheriting from the works of his teacher, he taught the *Halakha* to his students based on the Biblical exegesis that emphasized literal interpretation (*peshat*). His *yeshiva* was run on funds from supporters all over Lithuania and eventually from around the world, which enabled it to support the living expenses of the students and become independent from its local community.

Through this article, the reviewer, who, concerning “Lithuania and Jews,” could only think of the name Chiune Sugihara before, was able to get a glimpse of an unforgettable aspect of Judaism in Lithuania as the root of modern Orthodox Judaism. Aoki concludes the article with a brief history of the *yeshiva* after the death of Chaim.

The final article in this collection is Y. Tatta’s “*Jewish History and Society in Bosnia.*” Sarajevo is stamped indelibly on the mind of those belonging to the reviewer’s generation as a “City of Tragedy” in the wake of the Bosnian War, which took place within less than ten years after the 1984 Winter Olympic Games. The article begins with an interview with the leader of the Jewish community in Bosnia who believed that Sarajevo was the “safest place to live in Europe” and returned thereto after the Bosnian War. It then delves into the reasons for such a conviction.

The article first looks back into the history of the Jews who settled in this region, where the three religions of Islam, Serbian Orthodox, and Roman Catholicism had taken root under the rule of the Ottoman Empire. After that it refers to the Jewish cultural heritage in the city, particularly the Sarajevo Haggadah. Further on, it introduces Jewish humanitarian activities that demonstrated love of one’s neighbor (*La Benevolencija*) during the Fascist Era as well as the Bosnian Civil War and invites the readers to a heart-warming episode of two families, Muslim Hardaga and Jewish Kabiljo, who supported each other during the war.

Most of the records mentioned in the article are not copies of other documents but first-hand information obtained through numerous visits by the author to the area and interviews with the local people. Tatta used a reportage-like style of writing to elicit the readers’ empathy towards the “Jews of Sarajevo.” The article concludes with the author’s view of the reason why the Jews in Sarajevo can still assert that it is the “safest place in Europe”: It is because the city offered and still offers “*assured happiness that can only be gained by persons that stand afar from the majority in society.*”

This collection of articles is dedicated to Professor Hiroshi Ichikawa who was engaged in teaching and researching in the field of Jewish studies at the University of Tokyo for 28

years and retired in April 2019. The reviewer has been friends with Professor Ichikawa for almost half a century and is filled with gratitude for the many favors he has unselfishly shown him, including his cooperation in archaeological excavations in Israel since the 1990's. To close the review, the reviewer as one of his friends would like to extend his heartfelt congratulations to Professor Ichikawa for the publication of such a *Festschrift* as this one by these enthusiastic researchers who have studied under his supervision.