

It is often argued that Judaism maintains a basically indifferent, if not hostile, attitude towards the aesthetic experience. In this essay, Rabbi Shubert Spero re-examines the position of beauty within the Jewish value structure. One of our frequent contributors, his article on "The Rationality of Jewish Ethics" appeared in the Spring 1963 issue of this journal.

TOWARDS A TORAH ESTHETIC

There is a veritable cluster of separate and distinct lines of inquiry which seem to take turns serving as *the* Jewish approach to the fine arts. Firstly, there are books, and they are still being published, which simply enumerate the contribution of Jews to the various branches of the arts. In this approach, the artist's Jewish consciousness or depth of commitment is deemed irrelevant. Here are Jews, at least by birth, who are among the famous or near-famous as painters, sculptors, musicians and dancers. If nothing else, such efforts help to inflate the ethnic pride of many of our people who derive a keen sense of empathetic pleasure from the fame and achievements of their kinsmen.

There is another approach which attempts to isolate the specifically *Jewish qualities* in the artistic work of our more Jewishly oriented artists. This represents the search for a truly *Jewish* art. In the considered opinion of those in the best position to know, however, such a program seems futile. In the area of music, for example, we are told, "There are no specific objective musical qualities which make a piece Jewish or not."¹ Most popular is the functional approach which simply states that "Jewish art is art applied to Judaism."² Art is a universal experience which must meet certain universal criteria. Certainly, the artist's background and the subject matter of the work may reflect Jewish

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

elements. Moreover, we might even be able to agree that by historic circumstances, certain modes or stylistic tendencies have come to be associated with Jews or Jewish life. However, the values that make the object "art" are universal. James Whistler is supposed to have said, "There is no such thing as English art. You might as well talk of English mathematics."

A third approach which has recently come alive as a result of disturbing archeological discoveries is the historic one. By this we mean the attempt to trace the historic effects of the Second Commandment and the traditional negative attitude of Judaism to the representational arts. But here too, the results are either unexciting or inconclusive. On the one hand, there seems to be no doubt that among traditional-minded Jews of every age, "sculpture in relief and in the round of the completely articulated human figure was rejected."³ Yet, as far as other forms of the visual arts were concerned, the recent excavations at Dura Europos and studies of Jewish symbols during the Greco-Roman period would indicate a more extensive indulgence than hitherto believed.⁴ But here too, scholarly opinion concludes, "There was a constant ebb and flow concerning which one can only say that generalization is impossible."⁵

The question to which this paper would like to address itself is one which has received little attention by Jewish thinkers, ancient or modern. Does the biblical-rabbinic world-view contain elements which lend themselves to the development of a Torah esthetic? Or, to put the question differently: Could the metaphysical commitments of Judaism permit it to accept without self-contradiction the existence of a special category of the beautiful?

The point from which such an inquiry must begin must be the recognition that the esthetic experience constitutes another broad area of the peculiar phenomenon called *value*. Whether it be as moral experience or as esthetic experience, man continues to apprehend what appears to be objective and quite distinctive qualities of being which, however, constantly elude rational explanation. There are certain intrinsic ends to which man applies the term "good"; there are certain situations to which he reacts with a sense of obligation, yet philosophical analysis which has run

Towards a Torah Esthetic

the gamut from focusing upon the intention of the agent to the consequences of the deed, from Naturalism to Utilitarianism, from the Categorical Imperative to Emotivism, can only stand mutely by.

There are certain objects which men in all ages have declared to be “beautiful.” From Plato on, thinkers have attempted to stipulate the necessary and sufficient conditions of an object of art with no success. Today we are even being told that such an enterprise is in principle impossible.⁶ What is rather ironic, however, is that the philosophers’ discomfort has not for a moment put a damper upon the activity of the artist, the collecting zeal of the museum curator, or the pleasure of the multitudes who contemplate the artistic creation.

I would venture to say that from the Torah viewpoint, values must be viewed as objective and real qualities of being. They are indeed non-natural by which we mean that neither the “good” as such nor the “beautiful” as such are to be equated with any empirical or physical element in our experience.⁷ They are, however, objective nevertheless because they reflect real qualities with which the Almighty has clothed His creation.⁸

There has been a growing appreciation in theological circles of the biblical doctrine of creation, not merely as cosmological theory, as an explanation of how the world came into being, but primarily as a source of religious truth with great “practical consequences;” as an insightful revelation into the quality of the world we live in today.⁹

Thus, the “Ten Utterances”¹⁰ with which the world was created should be understood not simply as expressions of God’s will, but as the essential principles which themselves became embodied in the universe.¹⁰ From this we learn that the world is essentially intelligible. For the “word” is a rational construct and when that “word” itself becomes the world, it is reasonable to expect that that world will be amenable to rational apprehension. The entire scientific enterprise appears to be based on the premise that nature is akin to the mind and the mind is akin to nature — like knows like. This is what we would expect to find in a world created by the “word of God.” Perhaps in this sense can we interpret the passage wherein God brings to man the other forms of life and

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

man *names* them.¹¹ That is to say, the mind of man is able to grasp the rational essence of the world he inhabits. And so, the doctrine of creation points to intelligibility as one of the qualities which being exhibits to man.

However, the world was not created in response to truth but in response to goodness and to love. Rabbi Moshe Chaim Luzatto tells us that “the purpose of the creation was that the Almighty, out of His goodness, may do good to others.”¹² And so, even in the *manner* in which the world was created, God’s love and kindness is manifest. He creates it in Ten Utterances when He could have created it in one. It is “made known” to man that he was created in the “image of God” which further shows God’s “additional love.”¹³

Because the world was created out of love, being receives in addition to the quality of truth, the quality of value: goodness and beauty. However, in view of the non-natural quality of values, which means that their existence can only be detected by man’s individual perception, the Bible expresses the teaching that the world will exhibit the quality of value with the words, “and the Lord *saw* that it was *good*.” With any other interpretation, this phrase remains unintelligible. Scripture had already reported that the specific creation had appeared as commanded by God. What new information is being offered?

We therefore suggest that with this phrase, the Bible is stating that not only is the world to be intelligible and useful, but that man will experience portions of it under the aspect of *value*, i.e., as good and as beautiful. In the mighty act of creation, Divinity utilized not only power but also beauty. As the Psalmist tells us, “Thou art clothed with splendor and with beauty.”¹⁴ And the Midrash points out: “If a mortal is mighty, he is not beautiful, if beautiful, he is not mighty, but the Almighty possesses both of these qualities.”¹⁵ Thus, to the extent that man is sensitive to beauty in the world, he is detecting the handiwork of Divinity, he is discovering the traces of Divine love. “The voice of God (can be detected) in power; the voice of God is in beauty.”¹⁶

To the qualities of the true, the good and the beautiful, Judaism would add the Holy, which was introduced into the world with the Sabbath. What would appear to support the contention that

Towards a Torah Esthetic

these are indeed objective qualities is the fact that each of them seems to evoke a rather unique feeling — “reason manifested emotionally.” Confronted by a moral situation, the individual experiences a feeling of *obligation*. In the presence of the Holy, we feel *reverence*. Perceiving beauty, one experiences what for lack of a more precise term we will call the esthetic experience, whose exact nature seems to elude the philosophers but which does appear to be something unique, something *sui generis*.

Now, just as Cook Wilson has argued that the very experience of the feeling of reverence presupposes in our consciousness, and possibly even as an objective referent, some Being capable of arousing reverence, so too may it be maintained that the esthetic pleasure with its element of empathy and sense of “mind matching mind” when aroused by natural beauty drives us to the concept of a Divine Artist.¹⁷

That the Almighty is indeed to be conceived as a divine Artist is clearly found in rabbinic thought. On the words, “There is no rock (*Tzur*) like our God,”¹⁸ the Rabbis comment, “There is no sculptor (*Tzayor*) like our God”¹⁹ and proceed to show that in at least eight respects, the Almighty’s forming of the primal man was superior to the work of a human sculptor.²⁰ For, as Rashi comments, while all else were created by the “word,” man was created by the “hands” of God.²¹ Thus, the designation of “sculptor” or “artist” reflects the special attention and love with which God creates man, implying not only functionality and usefulness in the product but beauty as well. As to be expected therefore, the Rabbis do not tire of extolling the beauty of Adam, maintaining that the splendor of his heels was more dazzling than the sun itself.²² In comparing the comeliness of Rav Kahana, the Talmud traces it to Jacob and thence to Adam, and concludes “. . . and the beauty of Adam was of the beauty of the Divine Presence itself.”²³

We should, therefore, consider it significant that in all ages, the human form and the human physiognomy in particular has been a constant subject of artistic representation. Michelangelo is reported to have said that the human figure is the most beautiful thing in the world. As Jews, we should see this as a reflection of the Divine artistry rather than as the cynical consequence

of our collective anthropocentrism. It is striking that the Talmud, enumerating the contribution of the three “partners” to the human being, lists the Almighty’s as being the soul and the “splendor of his face,”²⁴ i.e., the beauty of the human physiognomy.²⁴ And as the Psalmist proclaims of man “with glory and beauty hast Thou crowned him.”²⁵

Plato had already noted the relationship between love and beauty and saw the latter as the presiding genius of procreation. Beauty stimulates our recreation of ourselves in the image of Divinity.²⁶ On the basis of our biblical metaphysics, however, we can best state this relationship in the words of Maritain: “His [God’s] love causes the beauty of what He loves, whereas our love is caused by the beauty of what we love.”²⁷ Since the very existence of beauty in the world is the result of God’s love — it is an undeserved plus — we, in experiencing beauty, respond with a reciprocating love. This can perhaps help to explain in what way the rainbow serves as the “sign of the Covenant” between God and all living things, “no more to destroy all flesh.”²⁸ For, the rainbow is surely no less than an overwhelming manifestation of natural beauty. And a God, who so loves man as to give him a universe filled with such prodigious beauty, would not “destroy all flesh.”

It was given for man, however, not only to preserve and enjoy beauty, but also to create it. Or, perhaps it would be more exact to say that the artist discovers the beauty for us. By eliminating the extraneous and irrelevant elements, he *uncovers* the beauty that was always implicit in the material.

It appears that the Torah implies, like Croce and Schopenhauer in modern times, that the artist in creating art is performing essentially an act of intuitive cognition. For in describing the talented Bezalel who executed the work of the Tabernacle, the Torah states: “And He hath filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom, in understanding and in knowledge and in all manners of workmanship . . . and to contemplate skillful works.”²⁹ On the other hand, the element of emotion is not neglected. For it must surely be agreed with R. G. Collingwood and DeWitt Parker and others, that feeling is central to the esthetic experience. In this manner can we understand the constant use by the

Towards a Torah Esthetic

Torah of the phrase “wisdom of the heart”³⁰ to describe artistic talent of all sorts.³⁰ This “wisdom of the heart” is precisely this unique phenomenon of reason manifested emotionally which is the essence of the artistic process.

The Midrash, however, takes the final step in relating the activity of the human artist to that of the Divine Artist. Noting the “wisdom, understanding and knowledge” with which God endowed Bezalel, the Rabbis comment: “With these three elements were the heavens created, and with these three elements the Holy Temple was made.”³¹ Even as the Almighty in creating the world did not merely fabricate it but by achieving beauty created value, so too does the genuine artist.

Realization that the divine command to build a Tabernacle aimed at the achievement of beauty helps to understand why the Bible here gives not merely verbal instructions but also a visual image. “According to all that I show them after the pattern of the Tabernacle” (Ex. 25:9). “Observe and make them after their pattern which was showed you on the mountain” (Ex. 25:40). Commentators have attempted to explain this by maintaining that Moses encountered some personal difficulty with the *Menorah* which necessitated visual aid. The point is that not only the *Menorah* but the entire Tabernacle and all pertaining to it was “shown.” For when functionality is the aim, then verbal instruction is adequate. Beauty, however, cannot be created by simply following instructions. The artist himself must be inspired with a vision of beauty. Hence the visual emphasis in connection with the Tabernacle.

I believe that the above observations succeeded in validating the claim that Jewish thought contains the necessary ingredients from which a Torah esthetic can be developed. For, it is clear from the references given that the concept of the beautiful does possess the status of a metaphysical category in biblical and rabbinic thought.

What remains to be determined, however, is the precise place this category of the beautiful occupies in the total structure of Jewish theology. Even a cursory perusal of the sources would, I am sure, turn up a deep sense of suspicion of the beautiful. Solomon’s dictum that “beauty is vain” reflects more than shrewd

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

advice to a young man about to select a mate. Judaism is absolutely committed to the unseen reality of the spirit. Beauty, irrespective of what it might imply, is always presented to us in the externality of sensuous form. There is, therefore, the constant danger that the beholder will never get beyond the outer shell.

Samson Raphael Hirsch, one of the few Jewish thinkers to deal with our problem, saw receptivity to beauty as the peculiar cultural contribution of Hellenism. In his philosophy of history, the genius of Japhet represented the middle stage in the spiritual development of mankind. Art, being the point at which mind and sensuality meet, is the means of moving those with the temperament of Ham — unrelieved sensuality — to the conceptual idealism of Shem. Says Hirsch:

Not in vain has God clothed His world in beauty, created the harmony of forms and sounds and given man eyes and ears to understand these harmonies and to enjoy them. Each time man experiences the grandeur of the star-studded firmament and the radiant diadem of the rising or setting sun, each time he enjoys the grace and beauty of a flower, he is elevated above the narrow range of mere materialistic usefulness and a note is struck in his heart which is very close to the even higher feeling for all that is morally beautiful and which carries him an important stage nearer to its understanding.

And the Creator, in His infinite goodness, has endowed the human soul with the sense of beauty which in itself is a first step towards higher perfection, and only in an existence enriched by the sense of beauty can man find happiness and serene enjoyment of his life on earth.³²

So much is certain, that Judaism lost no opportunity to “wed Hellenism to the Hebraic spirit”; to introduce the beauty of Japheth into the tents of Shem; to apply art to Judaism. On the words, “This is my God and I will adorn Him,”³³ there is the well known talmudic comment, “Make beautiful objects in the performance of His commandments, make a beautiful *Succah*, a beautiful *Lulav*, a beautiful *Shofar*.”³⁴ Aside from the ritual fitness of these ceremonial objects, the observant Jew must make further efforts to beautify them. Art applied to Judaism extends over the entire range of the major art forms.

Towards a Torah Esthetic

We have the Song of Moses and Miriam, the music which is used as a stimulus to prophecy, and the vocal and instrumental music of the Temple which has come down to us in the liturgical music of the synagogue.

King David danced before the Ark and devout Jews have ever since fulfilled by dancing the declaration: "All of my bones shall say, Lord who is like unto Thee."³⁵ In addition to Hasidic dancing, the processions in the synagogue, such as the *Hakafot* around the *Bimah*, are stylized movements which participate in the art of the dance.

The many instances in Judaism of liturgical action are aspects of drama; the calling up to the Torah, the Pesach *Seder*, and the *Pidyon Haben*, are all enactments in which the elements of drama convey the teachings of the Torah. Even the Bible itself, while its purpose is primarily education and edification, cannot be fully appreciated unless cognizance is taken of its literary style and value.

And, of course, the Tabernacle and the Temple used the visual arts in fashioning the utensils of the sanctuary and the garments of the Priests which are deliberately designed to be "for glory and for beauty."³⁶

If, however, the "voice of God is in beauty," why should we limit cultivation of the arts to direct application to Judaism? Is there not room for the development of an autonomous art? Should not a religious Jew have a beautiful painting hanging in his living room, even if it is not of the Wailing Wall?

In order to answer this question in as balanced a manner as possible, we must first penetrate more deeply into what we admitted earlier was, if not Judaism's hostility, then certainly Judaism's suspicion of sensuous beauty.

The second commandment prohibits the making of any graven images lest we bow down to them or serve them.³⁷ However, the prohibition reflected more than merely fear of idolatry. In Deuteronomy we are told:

Take you therefore heed unto yourselves; for you saw no manner of likeness on the day that the Lord spoke unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire. Lest you corrupt yourselves and make you a graven

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

image, the likeness of anything that creepeth on the ground, the likeness of any fish that is in the waters beneath the earth.³⁸

This reflects a much broader objection. The Jew's concept of Divinity, its dynamism and sense of becoming is such that no amount or combination of sensuous representation is adequate to express its ideational content. Hence any of the pictorial arts by virtue of their static nature are thus deceptive. As a recent work on the Holy in art has pointed out, "All representation is subjugation, is violation and self-assertion. In pictorial art, motion is fixed, representation is complete and terminal. For this reason the pictorial arts prove to be the most recalcitrant towards the Holy."³⁹

Even more basic is the utter seriousness with which the Jew was taught to face life. Life is short and life is earnest. One may indeed hear the voice of God in the beauty which exists in our world. But like all of Nature, "there is no speech nor words."⁴⁰ The voice of God in nature does not obligate nor does it tell us what to do. "Beloved are Israel for unto them was given the desirable instrument."⁴¹ As recipients of a direct revelation in the form of our Torah, there would appear to be no room in life for anything except the study of the divine truth. Schiller saw art as based upon the impulse to play. Surely Judaism could not encourage adults to spend their time in play! If, therefore, we *are* to find any place for the arts or for the cultivation of the beautiful as such in Judaism, it could never be as a serious contender for a *central* role in the Jew's hierarchy of values. As the Mishnah tells us: "He who is walking by the way, reviewing his learning and *breaks off* his learning to say, how beautiful is that tree . . . him Scripture regards as guilty against himself."⁴² Appreciation of the beautiful cannot replace cultivation of Torah.

But is sensuous beauty as innocent as mere play? Ever since man ate of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, "the imagination of the thoughts of his heart was continually evil."⁴³ The esthetic experience arouses emotion and affords pleasure, both of which are to be distrusted. Pleasure strengthens men's lower impulses and infects them with an abnormal thirst for more. Emotion for emotion's sake creates a turbidity of the soul, withers

Towards a Torah Esthetic

the temperate part of human nature and constantly threatens to plunge the individual into the abyss of voluptuousness and excess. While our society is still attempting to locate the boundary between art and pornography, Judaism maintained⁴⁴ that where the physical passions are involved, a man with his capacity for imagery, (which Buber has defined as “play with possibility, play as self-temptation”⁴⁵) can not have esthetic experiences without crossing the narrow ridge of sinful self-indulgence.

I believe the above represents a fair picture of the extent and complexity of Judaism’s suspicion of sensuous beauty. Nevertheless, I wish to propose that on the basis of the metaphysical status of the category of the beautiful, one can, in all consistency, find a place for art for art’s sake in the life of the observant Jew. In other words, if art is the discovery of the beautiful, and the beautiful reflects the voice of God, then the Jew not only may but should surround himself with art objects and indulge in artistic creativity subject to two limitations: 1) That the activity does not replace the centrality of Torah; 2) That the particular subject matter is not objectionable to the moral sense of Torah.

I would rest my case on two sources. The first is the talmudic teaching which states: “Three, they broaden the mind of a person: a beautiful dwelling, a beautiful wife and beautiful utensils.”⁴⁶ It is most significant that this very statement has been given contrary interpretations. To some it is inconceivable that Judaism should advocate the sheer pleasure of beauty for beauty’s sake and therefore interpret the “broadening of mind” in the sense of the “broad soul” of Balaam,⁴⁷ which is rejected by the Talmud! That is to say, if these three do indeed “broaden the soul”, i.e., induce voluptuousness, then by all means eschew them.

Yet, there are others, Maimonides among them, who interpret this passage in an affirmative manner and say that man “should gaze upon pictures and other beautiful objects.”⁴⁸ While Maimonides advocates this solely for purposes of mental relaxation, I am suggesting that esthetic appreciation involves a positive religious value.

But perhaps this is one of the optional areas in Jewish thought where both approaches are compatible with Torah principle. It appears that even among the Hasidic masters there were some

who upheld the ideal of poverty, while others, notably Rabbi Israel of Ryshin, believed in luxury and beauty as a way of divine service.

Much here depends on the validity of a distinction which some have attempted to draw between the "lower" physical pleasures and the "higher" esthetic pleasures. I believe that Joad echoes the experience of many when he points to four features of esthetic experience which distinguish it from other pleasures.⁴⁹ (1) While generally we experience ourselves as a bundle of fragmented impulses, in the enjoyment of beauty we experience an integration of self. (2) While generally we are in the grip of restless striving and desires, the esthetic experience affords us a sense of release. (3) While satiety in our physical appetites brings about a feeling of disgust and, in terms of pleasure - yields, results in a law of diminishing returns, the esthetic experience possesses an element of continuity in which it grows on the individual, becomes wider, deeper, more satisfying and spreads over a larger area of consciousness. (4) Beauty carries the soul beyond creation and gives us a conviction of coming into contact with the supreme reality.

It is a sense of this difference that seems to motivate the following passage in *Avot* which serves as our second source. "*Beauty, strength, riches, honor . . . are comely to the righteous and comely to the world.*"⁵⁰ While some maintained earlier that the "way of Torah" requires "eating bread with salt and sleeping on the ground,"⁵¹ Rabbi Simeon ben Judah in the name of Rabbi Simeon ben Yochai takes issue with this view and avers that these eight pleasures, among which is the esthetic experience, are *not* to be feared and they need not have baneful effects. Hence, they are as appropriate for the righteous as for the rest of the world.⁵²

Historically the Jew has been prevented from developing the full potentiality of this esthetic experience by almost constant persecution, as a result of which he rarely had his own space long enough to decorate it. For most of his historic existence, the Jew has had to worry about the necessities of life, let alone to cultivate the niceties.

However, whenever blessing comes upon the Jew, he should within the framework of our Torah orientation walk with beauty

Towards a Torah Esthetic

so that he may indeed broaden his personality, and out of a deepened appreciation of beauty, declare with renewed conviction: "Give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good; His loving kindness endureth forever."⁵³

NOTES

1. Weisgall, Hugo D., "Jewish Music in America", *Judaism*, Fall 1954, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 427-437.
2. Kayser, Stephen S., "Defining Jewish Art", *Mordecai M. Kaplan Jubilee Volume*, N. Y. 1953, pp. 457-469, "Visual Arts in American Jewish Life", *Judaism*, Fall 1954, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 437-446. Werner, Alfred, "What is Jewish Art", *Judaism*, Wint. 1962, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 32-44.
3. Cohen, Boaz, "Art in Jewish Law," *Judaism*, Spring 1954, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 155-177.
4. See the entire discussion centering about the thesis of E. R. Goodenough presented in his *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period* (New York, 1953).
5. Roth, Cecil, "The Problem of Jewish Art", *Judaism*, Spring 1957, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 118-126.
6. See Weitz, Morris, "The Role of Theory in Aesthetics" p. 48 in *Philosophy Looks at the Arts*, by Joseph Margolis, N. Y., 1962.
7. To do this is to commit what G. E. Moore calls the "Naturalistic Fallacy". See Chap. VI of his *Principia Ethica*. (Cambridge University Press, 1903).
8. For a recent defense of the objectivity of beauty, see C. E. M. Joad's *Matter, Life and Value*, (London 1929), pp. 266-283.
9. There are important treatments of the creation in *The Faith of Judaism* by I. Epstein (London 1960), *God, Man and History* (New York 1959) by E. Berkovits, and in *Maker of Heaven and Earth* by L. Gilkey.
10. *Avot*, 5:1.
11. *Gen.* 2:19.
12. *Derech Hashem*, Part I, Chap. 2.
13. *Avot*, 3:18.
14. *Psalms* 104:1. See the *Malbim* on *Levit.* 19:15 that *Hadar* refers to external beauty.
15. See the *Yalkut Shimoni* on *Psalms* 104:1.
16. *Psalms* 29:4.
17. See Cook Wilson's important reappraisal of the whole notion of proving God's existence in his *Statement and Inference*, Vol.2, also, *Philosophy of Religion* by D. Trueblood, p. 118.
18. *I Sam.* 2:12.
19. *Berakhot* 10a.
20. *Yalkut Shimoni* on *I Sam.* 2:2.

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

21. Rashi on Gen. 1:27.
22. *Midrash Kohelet* 8:1.
23. *Bava Batra* 58a.
24. *Nidah* 31.
25. Psalms 8:6.
26. *Symposium* 206 D, b.
27. Maritain, Jacques, *Art and Scholasticism*, New York, 1943.
28. Gen. 9:12-15.
29. Ex. 35:30.
30. *Ibid.*, 28:7.
31. *Yalkut Shimoni* on Ex. 35:30.
32. Hirsch, Rabbi S. R., *Hellenism, Judaism and Rome in "Judaism Eternal"*, (London 1959) p. 190. See also his commentary on Gen. 9:27.
33. Ex. 15:2.
34. *Shabbat* 133b.
35. Psalms 35:10.
36. Ex. 28:2.
37. Ex. 20:4,5.
38. Deut. 4:15-18.
39. Van Der Leeuw, G., *Sacred and Profane Beauty: The Holy in Art*, p. 181.
40. Psalms 19:4.
41. *Avot* 3:18.
42. *Ibid.*, 3:9.
43. Gen. 6:5.
44. See "Obscenity as an Esthetic Category", by A. Kaplan in *American Philosophers at Work*, ed., by Sid. Hook and H. M. Kallen, N.Y., 1956, p. 397.
45. *Good and Evil*, Martin Buber, N. Y., 1953, p. 91.
46. *Berakhot* 57.
47. *Avot* 5:22.
48. Commentary on the *Mishnah*, Intro. to *Avot*, Chap. V.
49. C. E. M. Joad, *"God and Evil"*, New York, 1943, p. 274.
50. *Avot* 6:8.
51. *Ibid.*, 6:4.
52. See the commentary of Don Yitzchok Abarbanel on this passage in *Avot*.
53. Psalms 118:1.