

*Jewish Community News* is a monthly newspaper devoted to local Jewish activity and national and international news of Jewish interest.

There is a Conservative synagogue in Montebello, Temple B'nai Emet, and in Pasadena, Congregation B'nai Torah. Pomona has a Reform synagogue, Temple Beth Israel, that houses a pre-school. Ontario features a Conservative synagogue, Temple Shalom. The Chabad of the Inland is located in Rancho Cucamonga. West Covina also has a Conservative congregation, Temple Ami Shalom, and Whittier has a Conservative synagogue, Temple Beth Shalom. The Reconstructionist Havurah in Whittier pioneered the use of Havurot within the congregation long before they became fashionable in other sections of the country, and they have now sustained themselves and continued for a generation. Congregation Shaarei Torah in Arcadia, a Conservative congregation, also houses a Jewish pre-school called B'nai Simcha. There is also a Reform temple, B'nai David, in Temple City. Temple Beth Israel of Highland Park and Eagle Rock is a Conservative congregation. Sinai Temple of Glendale, a Reform congregation, became affiliated with the San Gabriel-Pomona Valleys Federation. Adat Re'im in the Pomona Valley has just been constituted.

There are a string of hospitals along the foothills of the Valley including \*City of Hope, which is now a non-sectarian hospital but well aware of its Jewish roots, and thus the area has attracted Jewish physicians and Jews in allied medical professions. Some parts of the Jewish community are old – at least by California standards – once rooted in the Jewish community of Los Angeles areas such as Monterey Park and Montebello. Others have developed in the post-war migration to California and in the string of Jewish communities throughout Southern California.

Some areas were settled by Jewish chicken farmers; there was an area of egg farming and chicken farming in the valley. Over time the land became more valuable than the farms, and several would-be farmers found themselves prosperous real estate developers.

Because of the vastly increasing cost of housing and the shortage of housing in the Los Angeles area, the Jewish community of Los Angeles is moving westward into the western outreaches of the San Fernando Valley and eastward into the Pomona Valley-San Bernardino area. As young families mature, one suspects that there will be a growing need for Jewish institutions, Jewish education, and synagogues to meet an expanding population.

[Michael Berenbaum (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)]

**SANGUINETTI, AZARIAH ḤAYYIM** (early 19<sup>th</sup> century), Italian preacher. A pupil of \*Ishmael b. Abraham ha-Kohen, rabbi of Modena, Sanguinetti was the author of a book of homilies, *Olah Ḥadashah* (Lehghorn, 1838). The sermons, which make use of talmudic and midrashic sources, rely especially on the Commentaries of Naḥmanides. Influenced by kabbalistic literature, Sanguinetti frequently quoted from the

Zohar and used kabbalistic terms and symbols. Additional material was appended to the work in the supplement, “*Evrei Olah*,” which deals mainly with *halakhah*. The introduction to the book indicates that Sanguinetti succeeded his teacher as rabbi of Modena.

**SANHEDRIN.** Great Sanhedrin usually means the supreme political, religious, and judicial body in Palestine during the Roman period, both before and after the destruction of the Temple, until the abolishment of the patriarchate (c. 425 C.E.). The precise definition of the term Sanhedrin has engaged the attention of historians in the past century, owing to the apparent conflict between the Hellenistic and rabbinic sources as to its nature and functions. While in the Hellenistic sources, in Josephus and the Gospels, it appears as a political and judicial council headed by the ruler, the tannaitic sources depict it chiefly as a legislative body dealing with religious matters, and in rare cases acting as a court – for instance, to try a false prophet or high priest.

The first historical mention of the Sanhedrin is in the statement of Josephus that in 57 B.C.E. \*Gabinius divided the country into five *synedria* (Ant., 14:91) or *synodoi* (Wars, 1:170). Most scholars agree that the reference is to a purely political body, as the Romans did not interfere with the religious life of conquered people. Their objective was, as Schalit points out, the prevention of uprisings. The next report describes \*Hyrcanus, as ethnarch of Judea, presiding over the Sanhedrin trying Herod, the strategus of the Galilee, for political murder (Ant., 14:168–70). Subsequently, when Herod became king, he had the Sanhedrin condemn Hyrcanus for plotting against him (Ant., 15:173), though according to another account, he did so himself without the Sanhedrin (15:176). Josephus' next reference to a Sanhedrin is to one that consisted of Roman high officials, convened at the suggestion of Augustus in Syria, to try the sons of Herod for rebellion against their father (16:356 ff.); according to Josephus (Wars, 1:537), this Sanhedrin consisted of Herod's “own relatives and the provincial governors.” When the Sadducean high priest, Ananus, “convened the judges of the Sanhedrin” (Jos., Ant., 20:200) to condemn James, the brother of Jesus, his opponents, the Pharisees, took great pains to have him removed. Their plea before the Roman governor that Ananus “had no authority to convene the Sanhedrin without his consent” (20:202) was obviously a pretext. Ananus' Sanhedrin was no doubt a Sadducean one, so that in removing Ananus shortly after this, Agrippa II pleased the Pharisees. On the other hand, the Sanhedrin convened by Agrippa II to permit the levitical singers to wear the priestly linen garments – apparently in accord with II Chronicles 5:12 – was a Pharisaic one (Arakh. 11a–b). Josephus' objection to this ruling (Ant., 20:216–18) represents the priestly-Sadducean view. Josephus received his commission as a supreme commander from the Sanhedrin (Life, 62), though he usually refers to it as the *koinon* (*ibid.*, 190, 309) and describes it as the assembly of the leading people of Jerusalem (*ibid.*, 28, see also Wars, 2:562).

The Gospels describe three trials before the Sanhedrin, all of them presided over by the high priest, but apparently in different locations. Jesus was tried on Passover night, or on the preceding night, in the palace of the high priest (Mark 14:53ff.; John 18:13). His disciples, Peter and John Zebedee, were questioned at “eventide,” “in Jerusalem” (Acts, 4:3–6). In the case of Paul, the chief priest “and all their Sanhedrin” were ordered to meet in the chief captain’s quarters (Acts, 22:25–30). The tannaitic sources, however, depict the Great Sanhedrin as an assembly of sages permanently situated in the Chamber of Hewn Stone in the Temple, meeting daily, only during the daytime between the hours of the two daily sacrifices (approximately 7:30 A.M.–3:30 P.M.), and never at night, on the Sabbaths or festivals, or on their eves. It was the place “where the Law went forth to all Israel” (Sanh. 11:2; Tosef., Sanh. 7:1) and was the final authority on *halakhah*; the penalty of contravening its decisions on the part of a scholar – \*zaken mamre – was death (Sanh. *ibid.*). Settling questions of priestly genealogy was also within the province of the Great Sanhedrin (Mid. 5:4; Tosef., Sanh. loc. cit.). Actual cases are recorded of questions being sent to “the sages in the Chamber of Hewn Stone” (Eduy. 7:4) and of Rabban Gamaliel going to the Chamber and receiving a reply to a question which he put (Pe’ah 2:6).

The competence of the Sanhedrin is listed in tannaitic literature. “A tribe, a false prophet, or the high priest may not be tried save by the court of seventy-one; they may not send forth the people to wage a battle of free choice save by the decision of the court of one and seventy; they may not add to the City [of Jerusalem], or the Courts of the Temple save by the decision of the court of seventy-one; they may not set up sanhedrins for the several tribes save by the decision of the court of one and seventy; and they may not proclaim [any city to be] an \*Ir ha-Niddahat [cf. Deut. 13:13–19] save by the decision of one and seventy” (Sanh. 1:5). The Tosefta enumerates still other functions: “They may not burn the red heifer save according to the instructions of the court of 71; they may not declare one a *zaken mamre* save the court of 71; they may not set up a king or a high priest save by the decision of the court of 71” (Tos., Sanh. 3:4). Elsewhere the Mishnah rules that the rites of the water of ordeals (see \*Sotah; Sot. 1:4) and the \*eglah arufah – i.e., the breaking of the heifer’s neck in order to atone for the sin of an anonymous murder (cf. Deut. 21:1–9) – may be performed only under the supervision of the Great *Bet Din* in Jerusalem (Sot. 9:1).

Unlike Buechler (see bibl., pp. 56ff.) and Zeitlin (see bibl., pp. 70–71) who regard the tannaitic list of the functions of the Great *Bet Din* as merely ideal, Tchernowitz (see bibl., 242ff.) insists upon its practical reality. Thus, Simeon the Hasmonean was appointed high priest and “Prince of the people of God” (see \*Asaramel) by the Great Assembly of priests and heads of the nation (1 Macc., 14:27ff.; cf. Tosef., Sanh. 3:4). Again, “Jonathan, after the war with Demetrius, returned and called the elders of the people together; and took counsel with them to raise the height of the walls of Jerusalem, and to raise a great mound between the citadel and the city”

(*ibid.* 12:35–36), things which could only be done, according to the Mishnah, with the consent of the Great Court (Sanh. 1:5; Shevu. 2:2). Yet, in rebuilding the ruins of the city and its walls and carrying on defensive wars, Jonathan did not consult with the Assembly; neither did Simeon take counsel with regard to the fortifying of Judea (1 Macc., 13:33). These things did not require the consent of the Sanhedrin (Tchernowitz, op. cit., 243–7). Furthermore, the reference to “tribes,” as Alon says, is to sections of the country; or else, the term “tribes,” like “false prophet” may put into legal formulation practices current in the biblical period, as Z. Karl suggests.

Another aspect of the conflict between the sources is that, whereas the tannaitic documents represent the Sanhedrin as being composed of Pharisaic scholars, headed by the foremost men of the sect – the *nasi* and *av bet din* – the Hellenistic accounts usually make the high priest, or the king, the president of the body. Thus Samaias and Pollion (that is, probably, Shemaiah and Avtalyon, or Shammai and Hillel) and Simeon b. Gamaliel, who are mentioned in Josephus, and Gamaliel I, who is cited in the Book of Acts, are referred to in these books merely as prominent members of the Sanhedrin, though in the tannaitic documents they are represented as the presidents of that body. In the Book of Acts, moreover, the Sanhedrin is depicted as being “one part Sadducees and the other Pharisees” (Acts, 23:6).

The historians’ answers may be classified into three groups. Some scholars maintain that there was a single Sanhedrin, the supreme political, religious and judicial body, but they differ among themselves as to the other aspects of the reconstruction. Schuerer, who dismisses the rabbinic sources, regards the high priest as the presiding officer. Hoffmann held the highest office to belong to the Pharisaic *nasi*, though the secular rulers often usurped the role. Jelski, following a middle course, divides the functions of the presidency between the high priest, upon whom he bestows the title *nasi*, and the Pharisaic *av bet din*. Similarly, G. Alon believes that the Sanhedrin was composed of Pharisees and Sadducees, each dominating it by turns. Chwolson thinks that the Great Sanhedrin of the rabbinic documents was nothing but a committee on religious law appointed by the Sanhedrin (so, too, Dubnow and Klausner). Common to all these theories is the erroneous assumption that there can be only one Sanhedrin in a city. In reality, a Sanhedrin can be the king’s or ruler’s council, a body of high officials; a congress of allies or confederates, a military war council, etc. (see Liddell-Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, s.v. συνέθριον).

Another group of scholars believes that there were in Jerusalem three small Sanhedrins, each of a different composition and task – priestly, Pharisaic, and aristocratic – each consisting of 23 members. A joint meeting of the three Sanhedrins, headed by a *nasi* and *av bet din*, constituted the Great Sanhedrin of 71 (Geiger, Derenbourg, etc.). This imaginary reconstruction flounders on the Tosefta (Ḥag. 2:9 and Sanh. 7:1) and the Jerusalem Talmud (Sanh. 1:7, 19c), according to which, contrary to the Babylonian Talmud (Sanh. 88b), the

small Sanhedrin consisted only of three. The third group of scholars is agreed that there were two supreme bodies in Jerusalem, a political and a religious, but disagree on almost everything else. Buechler thinks that the religious body was properly called *Bet Din ha-Gadol she-be-Lishkat ha-Gazit* (“Great *Bet Din* in the Chamber of Hewn Stone”), and the application to it of the term Sanhedrin was a misnomer. Zeitlin points out that there is no evidence that the political Sanhedrin was called “Great,” but his view that the division between the political and the religious authorities dates back to Simeon the Hasmonean is questionable. More likely the separation was the result of the fact that the political views of the religious Sanhedrin were not sought by Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, the sons of Salome, nor by Herod, nor by the high priests who were appointed by Romans.

The opponents of the theory of the double Sanhedrin base themselves mainly on three arguments: no proof exists that the *nasi* headed the Sanhedrin in the days of the Temple; the priests’ authority to “declare” the law is scripturally prescribed (Deut. 17:9), so that the high priest must have at least formally headed the religious Sanhedrin, as he did among the Qumran sect; and in Judaism there is no division between the religious and the secular. As against these arguments, it has been pointed out: the law concerning the assignment of one’s property to the *nasi* (Ned. 5:5), which dates from Temple days, assumes that the *nasi* headed the Sanhedrin, just as he did in the post-destruction era; the Pharisaic exegesis dispensed with the need of priests in issuing legal decisions, the Pharisees basing their ruling on the superfluous words “and to judge” (Deut. 17:9; see Sif., Deut. 153); and the Pharisees did not voluntarily relinquish their right to judge on political matters. The political rulers simply did not consult them. After the destruction of the Temple the religious Sanhedrin was reconvened in \*Jabneh, and, under the presidency of the *nasi*, it now became also the supreme political instrument for all the Jews of the Roman Empire. When Judea was destroyed as a result of the failure of Bar Kokhba, the Sanhedrin moved to Galilee. At first it met in Usha, then in nearby Shefaram, subsequently, in Judah ha-Nasi’s time, in Bet She’arim and Sepphoris, and in the end in Tiberias. The Romans apparently withdrew their recognition of the Sanhedrin when they dissolved the patriarchate.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:** Geiger, *Urschrift; Derenbourg, Hist; D. Hoffmann, in: Jahres-Bericht des Rabbiner-Seminars fuer das Orthodoxe Judentum pro 5638 (1878); Schuerer, Gesch, 2 (1907<sup>4</sup>); I. Jelski, Die innere Einrichtung des grossen Synedrions zu Jerusalem (1894); A. Buechler, *Das Synedriion in Jerusalem* (1902); A. Schalit, *Ha-Mishtar ha-Roma’i be-Erez Yisrael* (1937); S. Zeitlin, *Who Crucified Jesus?* (1942); Ch. Tchernowitz, *Toledot ha-Halakhah* (1935–50), especially 4 (1950), 215–61; Alon, *Toledot*, 2 (1961<sup>2</sup>), 38f. and passim; S. Hoenig, *The Great Sanhedrin* (1953); H. Mantel, *Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin* (1961).*

[Hugo Mantel]

**SANHEDRIN** (Heb. סַנְהֶדְרִין), fourth tractate in the Mishnah order of *Nezikin*. The sequence of the tractates within an or-

der being as a rule determined by the size of the tractates, it should be remembered that the three *Bavot* originally constituted one large tractate of 30 chapters, to which *Sanhedrin*, together with \*Makkot which was originally united with it, is second in size. \*Sanhedrin, in the context of this tractate, means “court of justice,” referring to the great *bet din*, which comprised 71 ordained scholars, and the subordinate courts, composed of 23 judges, functioning in various towns. The general term *bet din* usually referred to minor courts of three members. In general, the tractate deals with the composition and power of the courts of different kinds and degrees, with legal procedure and criminal law.

Chapter 1 defines the various courts and their competence: i.e., the “courts of three” with monetary matters; that of 23 with criminal cases which may involve the death penalty; and that of 71 with exceptional cases, like trying a high priest or a whole city accused of idolatry. Chapter 2 deals with the privileges of the high priest and the king in general. Chapter 3 describes the setting up of ad hoc “courts of three,” rules concerning the qualification of judges and witnesses, and questions of judicial procedure. Chapter 4 discusses the differences between criminal and civil procedure, and Chapter 5 gives details on the way witnesses were examined. Chapter 6 gives information as to how the death penalty by stoning was carried out, and Chapter 7 enumerates the four modes of execution: stoning, burning, decapitation, and strangulation, but stoning having been discussed in the previous chapter, it proceeds with the details of the three other modes of execution. The subject of stoning is then taken up again, giving the crimes to which this mode of execution applies. Chapter 8 deals with the “stubborn and rebellious son” (Deut. 21:18–21). Chapter 9 discusses the crimes to which the penalties of burning and decapitation are applicable, and goes in detail into the various aspects of the crime of murder, especially the question of intent (premeditation). Some extraordinary modes of punishment are also discussed here. Chapter 10 opens with the well-known statement that “all Israel have a portion in the world to come,” implying that even criminals put to death by order of the court will be resurrected at the end of days, but then it goes on to list certain categories of sinners (specific kinds of heretics and idolaters) to whom the comfort of resurrection is denied. Chapter 11 deals with the crimes to which the penalty of strangulation applies, discussing the case of the \**zaken mamre* (“rebellious teacher”) and the false prophet, in particular. In the Babylonian Talmud this last chapter is placed tenth, while the mishnaic tenth becomes the concluding chapter. The rabbis go to great lengths (90b–92a) to prove that the belief in the resurrection of the dead was rooted in the Torah. There is *Gemara* to both Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds. In the *Tosefta*, this tractate is divided into 14 chapters.

Incorporated in the Mishnah *Sanhedrin* are ancient *halakhot* and even *mishnayot* from the time of the Second Temple. “The king can neither judge nor be judged” (2:4) is an early enactment dating from the time of Alexander \*Yannai, and earlier still is the statement, “when [the king] sits in judg-

ment [the Torah scroll] shall be with him" (*ibid*). Mishnah 4:2, which deals with those who married into the priesthood, also belongs to the time when Jerusalem was at the height of its glory, and the whole order of the four capital cases certainly – by its very nature – dates from Temple times. Chapter 9:6 is connected apparently with the \*Hasmonean era, and this is most certainly the case with regard to the Mishnah "Kanna'im [zealots] fall upon one who has intercourse with an Aramean woman" (9:6). The well-known Mishnah at the beginning of chapter 10 is anti-Sadducean, and this testifies to its early origin. Naturally the views of *tanna'im* of a very much later period were incorporated in the final arrangement of the Mishnah. Recognizable and particularly conspicuous in *Sanhedrin* are additions from the halakhic Midrashim, most of which are from the school of Akiva. Some of them belong to the school of R. Ishmael and were apparently added by R. Simeon b. Yoḥai, since many anonymous *mishnayot* are in accordance with their view. The English translation of the tractate in the Soncino Talmud (1935) is by J. Shachter and H. Freedman.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:** Epstein, *Tanna'im*, 417–21; H. Albeck, *Shi-shah Sidrei Mishnah*, 4 (1959), 163–8.

[Arnost Zvi Ehrman]

**SANHEDRIN, FRENCH**, Jewish assembly of 71 members convened in Paris during February–March 1807, at the request of Napoleon \*Bonaparte. The object of this assembly was to convert the "secular" answers given by the Assembly of Jewish \*Notables to the questions put to them by the government into doctrinal decisions, which would be binding on the Jews religiously, by drafting them as precepts based on the Bible and *halakhah*. Previously, on Oct. 6, 1806, the Assembly of Jewish Notables sent a manifesto to the Jewish communities in Europe, inviting them – in vague terms – to participate in the activities for "revival" and "freedom" which Napoleon was preparing through the Sanhedrin for the benefit of the Jewish people. The response of European Jewry to this manifesto was exceedingly poor. The Sanhedrin was constituted of two-thirds rabbis and one-third laymen (some of the rabbis and all the laymen had been members of the Assembly of Jewish Notables), all from the French Empire and the "Kingdom of Italy." David \*Sinzheim of Strasbourg, one of the eminent halakhic authorities of the day, was appointed president. The nine regulations issued by the Sanhedrin were confirmed in eight solemn and magnificent sessions. The doctrinal preamble to the regulations states that the Jewish religion comprises both religious precepts which are eternal, and political precepts which had no further validity from the time Jewry ceased to be a nation.

The regulations stated that:

(1) polygamy is prohibited among Jews; (2–3) the Jewish bill of divorce or religious marriage has no validity unless it has been preceded by a civil act, and mixed marriages are binding upon Jews civilly (but not religiously); (4–5–6) the Jews of every country must treat its citizens as their own brothers according to the universalist rules of moral conduct, and Jews who have become citizens of a state must regard

that country as their fatherland; (7–8–9) Jews must engage in useful professions, and the taking of interest from both Jews and gentiles shall be subject to the laws of the country. At first sight, it would appear that the drafters of the regulations subordinated Jewish law to that of the state, but in reality they did not undermine halakhic principles. It was only in subsequent generations that the declaration of the "separation of the political from the religious in Judaism" became a matter of principle among certain Jewish circles who became assimilated in the modern state.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:** D. Tama, *Collection des procès-verbaux et décisions du Grand-Sanhédrin* (Paris, 1807); idem, *Transactions of the Parisian Sanhédrim* (London, 1807); A.-E. Halphen (ed.), *Recueil des lois, décrets et ordonnances concernant les Israélites* (1851), 20–34; R. Anchel, *Napoléon et les Juifs* (1928); F. Pietri, *Napoléon et les Israélites* (1965), 84–115; B. Mevorah (ed.), *Napoleon u-Tekufato* (1968), 77–132.

[Baruch Mevorah]

**SANIELEVICI, HENRIC** (1875–1951), Romanian literary critic and biologist. Born in Botoșani, Moldavia, Sanielevici pursued two entirely separate careers, one scientific and the other literary. His polemical gifts revealed themselves in the articles which he contributed – some under the pseudonym Hassan – to leading Romanian periodicals and newspapers. He held that literary works contained two types of phenomena: the sociological and the psychological. The former was to be clarified and coordinated on the basis of materialistic principles of history, the latter on what Sanielevici himself termed "differential psychology" and "the psycho-physiology of race." Sanielevici particularly opposed ultra-nationalistic tendencies in Romanian literary circles and from 1903 published critical essays and studies written in a vigorous and uncompromising spirit. The most important were collected in *Incercări critice* (1903), *Cercetări critice și filosofice* (1916), *Studii critice* (1920), and *Alte cercetări critice și filosofice* (1925).

Sanielevici's work as a biologist eventually led him to the issue of race. In *La vie des mammifères et des hommes fossiles déchiffrée à l'aide de l'anatomie* (1926), he examined and compared the organs of mastication and digestion in man and other mammals in order to explain the development of man and the ethnic diversity of mankind. Within a decade he had entered the fight against Nazi racial theories with his two-volume work *In slujba Satanei* ("In the Service of the Devil", 1930–35). Here he rejected the usual criteria of language and nation, and determined race solely according to anthropological type. He also endeavored to establish psychological constants that would explain national characteristics, thus setting forth a new theory of race and racial psychology. Though originally an advocate of Jewish assimilation, Sanielevici greatly modified his views after World War I.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:** P.P. Negulescu, in: *Analele Academiei Române*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ser., 38 (1915–16); E. Lovinescu, *Critice*, 8 (1923), 117; G. Călinescu, *Istoria literaturii Române...* (c. 1941), 569–70; idem, *Ulysse* (1967), 261–5.

[Dora Litani-Littman]