

APPENDIX A

Who is a Jew?

When a Jewish couple has children, the children are clearly Jewish. However, when an intermarried couple has children, the identity of the children is less clear. Are they Jews? Half-Jews? Is Jewish identity passed through the mother or father? Intermarriage begs the question: Who is a Jew?

The Messianic Consensus

While there is no center of *halakhic* (legal) authority in the Messianic Jewish movement to rule on the issue of “who is a Jew,”¹ the movement as a whole is generally supportive of *both* the patrilineal and matrilineal definitions of Jewish identity.

Messianic Judaism has concurred on this issue with the Reform movement, and considers the children of intermarriage Jewish regardless of whether their Jewish status is through the father or mother.”²

This is the official position of the International Messianic Jewish Alliance (IMJA)³ and the International Alliance of Messianic Congregations and Synagogues (IAMCS), and is affirmed by the majority of leaders within the Union of Messianic Jewish Congregations (UMJC).⁴ In addition, there is the recognition of converted Jews, i.e. Jews by choice, who have gone through a formal conversion ceremony under a recognized authority.⁵

Patrilineal Definition

Messianic rabbis generally uphold the patrilineal definition of Jewish identity because it is the standard established by God in the Torah. Ancient Israel was a patriarchal society and family genealogies were reckoned according to the father’s identity (Gen. 5:1; 10:1; 11:1; 1 Chron. 23:6).⁶ The male head of household spoke on behalf of the

entire family unit and the wife would follow in the way of her husband. Shaye Cohen explains this ancient Near Eastern social dynamic:

If a gentile man married a Jewish woman, in all likelihood he would not thereby enter the Jewish community, since a wife would normally join her husband's house and family. In contrast, if a gentile woman was married to a Jewish man, she too was supposed to join her husband's house and family, thereby becoming part of the community to which her husband belonged. There was no ritual of conversion; the act of marriage to a Jewish husband was de facto an act of conversion—that is, an act of integration into the Jewish community.⁷

On a spiritual level, Jewish identity is a matter of covenant. According to the Torah, a Jew is an individual who abides in the Abrahamic covenant of circumcision. It is the object of this covenant to walk before God and be blameless (Gen. 17:1). While females do not bear the sign of the covenant, they appropriate it through either their father or husband.

The patrilineal definition of Jewish identity is implied in virtually every case of intermarriage in the Scriptures.⁸ For example, Moses and Zipporah's children were Jews because Moses was a Jew. Boaz and Ruth's children were Jews because Boaz was a Jew. 1 Kings emphasizes the fact that King Rehoboam's parents had intermarried. His mother was an Ammonite (1 Kings 14:21, 31) and his father, Solomon, was a Jew. Rehoboam was, consequently, a Jew. King Ahaz married Jezebel, a Sidonian. The royal children of this intermarriage were Jews because King Ahaz was a Jew. Jezebel was certainly not a convert to Judaism (1 Kings 16:31–33; 18:4).

In the Scriptures, the only seeming exception to patrilinealism is the intermarriage between an Egyptian slave named Jarha and his Israelite owner's daughter (1 Chron. 2:34–35). According to Professor Cohen, the biblical passage suggests “the offspring of Israelite women and foreign men were judged matrilineally only if the marriage was matrilineal—that is, only if the foreign husband joined the wife's domicile or clan. . . . The marriage was probably a form of adoption.”⁹ It is significant that this passage occurs in the middle of a genealogy. The verses before 2:34 read, “The son of . . . the son of . . . the son of . . .” The verses following 2:34 read, “The father of . . . the father of . . . the father of . . .” There is clearly no break in emphasis on patrilinealism. One might conclude from this context that an adoption, or even a recognized

conversion, took place whereby the children of Jarha would be reckoned as continuing the genealogy of his father-in-law, thus upholding the patrilineal principle.

The patrilineal principle continues to be upheld today according to traditional *halakhah* (the application of Jewish law). For example, a person is reckoned a *cohen* (a descendant of a priestly family) according to the identity of his father, not his mother.¹⁰ The Talmud states, “The family of the father is considered family, the family of the mother is not considered family.”¹¹ This is derived from a Torah passage that identifies families with fathers (Num. 1:2).¹² Many synagogue traditions are, despite assertions to the contrary, based on patrilinealism:

The same holds true for naming children with the formula *son or daughter of the name of the father*. The mother's name is not included. And if the father is a *kohen* or a *Levi* or the mother is the daughter of a *kohen* or a *Levi*, no *pidyon haben* [redemption of the firstborn son ceremony] takes place, a further nod to patrilineal descent. Patrilineality is also reaffirmed when a man is called to the Torah for an *aliyah* by his name and his father's name. The traditional marriage contract, the *ketubah*, records the names of the groom and the bride and their father's names respectively. The witnesses to the *ketubah* sign their own names along with the names of their fathers. At no time is the mother's name mentioned in any of the examples cited above.¹³

In Jewish history, Karaite Jews (who recognized the authority of the Hebrew Bible but not the Oral Torah) upheld the patrilineal standard of Jewish identity.¹⁴

The worldwide Jewish community recognizes that six million Jews were killed in the Holocaust. Many of these martyrs, however, were Jews according to the patrilineal definition of Jewish identity, including the daughter of Theodore Herzl, the founder of modern Zionism. She died at Theresienstadt concentration camp because she was a Jew, even though her mother was a Gentile.¹⁵

In 1968, Reconstructionist Judaism accepted the patrilineal principle as a standard of Jewish identity:

In the first centuries of our era—*only* eighteen or nineteen centuries ago—the Tannaitic rabbis decided that Jewish identity would be transmitted only through the mother

(matrilineal descent). Current research indicates that before that time, identity had been transmitted through the father. When the rabbis made that reversal, they lived in a Roman empire in which the matrilineal principle was the norm for all matters of personal status. . . . The Reconstructionist movement, since 1968, has recognized the Jewishness of the child of a Jewish father and a non-Jewish mother when that child is raised and educated as a Jew (patrilineal descent).¹⁶

At the 1983 Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR), Reform Judaism included patrilinealism as a standard for Jewish identity under certain conditions:

The conference voted to override the *halachah*, which recognizes matrilineal descent; that is, the child is automatically Jewish if born to a Jewish mother. Instead, the CCAR declared that in an intermarriage where either the father or the mother is Jewish, the child is “under presumption of Jewish descent.” In other words, descent alone is not sufficient. Such a child will be considered Jewish only after identifying with the Jewish community by fulfilling the *mitzvot* and participating in Jewish life. Indeed, the CCAR’s position is even more stringent than that of the *halachah*, which confers automatic Jewishness if the mother is Jewish, regardless of how the child is reared.¹⁷

Patrilinealism is a view widely held by lay members of the modern Jewish community. As many as “70 percent of Conservative Jews say they would consider their grandchildren Jewish even if their mother was not.”¹⁸ Approximately ten percent of Orthodox Jews are also accepting of patrilinealism.¹⁹ In a 1990 survey of B’nai Brith women, eighty percent said they would regard their grandchildren as Jews even if the mother was not Jewish.²⁰ A similar study found that seven percent of Orthodox rabbis and forty-one percent of Conservative rabbis would consider their grandchildren Jewish by patrilineal definition. Similarly, among board members of local Jewish community organizations, seventeen percent of those Orthodox and seventy-nine percent of those Conservative would embrace patrilinealism.²¹ According to Egon Mayer, such surveys reveal that patrilinealism is receiving a “growing acceptance” in the Conservative and Orthodox Jewish world.²²

Matrilineal Definition

Given the ancient roots of patrilinealism, how does one explain the origin of the matrilineal definition of Jewish identity? It is often claimed by traditional Jews that the matrilineal definition is rooted in the return of the Babylonian exiles to Jerusalem, among whom were Jews who had married foreign women and who had children by these unions. The Scriptures relate that Ezra sent away the children of intermarriage from the camp of Israel (Ezra 10), along with their Gentile mothers, an act taken by traditional Jews to mean that the children were not accepted as Jews. It is suggested by some that the paternity of these children was in question, compelling Ezra to switch the basis of Jewish identity from patrilineal to matrilineal since the mother’s identity is almost always known.²³

There are a number of issues related to these assumptions. First, the text does not explicitly state a change in the definition of who is a Jew. Second, Ezra is described as a devout observer of the Torah (Ezra 7:6, 10), a legal tradition that upholds patrilinealism. Third, of the 31,089 men who returned from exile, 111 had married non-convert wives and only some of these wives were mothers (Ezra 2:64–65; 10:18–44). Assuming that 80 percent of the returning men were married (a conservative estimate), the non-conversionary intermarriage rate would be 0.4 percent. It is a stretch to believe that Ezra, the Torah-faithful scribe, would have changed the basis of Jewish identity for all future generations, affecting millions of Jews, in order to deal with 111 couples and their children. Finally, in Israel’s history, there were numerous times when Jewish men married foreign women. However, the inability to establish paternity never undermined the patrilineal standard of Jewish identity.

In my view, there is a better explanation for why Ezra sent away the children—their Gentile mothers had clung to their foreign gods.²⁴ They were not righteous converts like Ruth but idolaters like Solomon’s foreign wives (Neh. 13:26). Support for this view is found in the fact that Ezra emphasized their detestable practices (Ezra 9:1, 14). Ezra knew that keeping these women in the camp of Israel would have introduced a corrupting element into the community.²⁵ Since Ezra was intent on rededicating the community to the service of God, the women were a clear impediment; even some of the priests of Israel had intermarried with them (Ezra 9:1–2), compromising the integrity of the priesthood. The pagan wives, therefore, had to be sent away.

This interpretation is confirmed by Ezra’s and Nehemiah’s reiteration of the commandment that prohibited Jews from marrying peoples

(male or female) of the land (Ezra 9:10–14; 10:2; Neh. 10:30; 13:1–3, 23–27; see also Deut. 7:1–4; Exod. 34:16; Josh. 23:12; 1 Kings 11:1). The basis for this law was that such marriages would introduce idolatrous practices into Israel. If the foreign women had been righteous converts like Ruth (who abandoned the Moabite religion and clung to the God of Israel), Ezra would not have had a problem with the intermarriages. Ezra's concern was rather with the Torah commandment, which, in principle, prohibited marriages with Canaanite-like women.²⁶ This was the post-exilic situation. If Jewish women had returned from captivity with pagan husbands, he would have sent the pagan husbands away as well, for they would have also tainted the camp!

Sending the children of intermarriage away did not imply that they were non-Jews or that their identity was suspect. On the basis of Torah, the fathers were Jews and so the children were Jews. The issue was more likely a matter of custody. Ezra's decision was consistent with Near Eastern divorce laws that gave custody of the children to the mother. Such was the Babylonian tradition, even as it is the American tradition today. Moreover, Ezra would have been lacking in compassion had he kept these Jewish children from their non-Jewish mothers, especially the babies.

Where, then, did the matrilineal principle come from? In addition to the traditional explanation, Professor Cohen presents six other possible explanations for the origin of matrilinealism. The two most compelling theories, he states, are that it derived from Roman law or from the rabbinic view of forbidden mixtures.²⁷ Whichever is the case, it is likely that the matrilineal principle did not exist before 70 C.E.

I conclude that the matrilineal principle was not yet known in second-temple times. This conclusion is supported by an argument from silence and an argument from positive testimony. The argument from silence is that none of the works of "the Apocrypha," "the Pseudepigrapha," or the Qumran scrolls knows, assumes, mentions, or applies the rabbinic matrilineal principle. The argument from positive testimony is that in various scattered passages Philo, Paul, Josephus, and Acts make statements or assumptions that cannot be squared with the rabbinic matrilineal principle. . . . The matrilineal principle is first attested in the Mishnah.²⁸

At some point after the Second Temple period, we may assume that nascent Rabbinic Judaism switched the standard of Jewish identity

from patrilineal to matrilineal. This means that matrilinealism has no basis in the Hebrew Bible or New Testament.

Messianic Judaism seeks to honor the tradition of the fathers, but it seeks to honor God and his Word above all. In this regard, most Messianic Jews cannot support the rabbinic view that it was permissible to deviate from the Torah's standard of Jewish identity. From the Messianic perspective, then, the switch from patrilinealism to matrilinealism was unauthorized. How can modern Jews continue to call themselves Jews if their identity is based on an errant definition of Jewishness? In my opinion, there is only one answer—matrilineal Jews are Jews on the basis of covenantal declaration and not ancestry alone. Behind the Messianic Jewish recognition of matrilineal Jews as Jews, therefore, is the implicit recognition that a person can become a Jew, even without undergoing a formal conversion ceremony.²⁹ It is enough that a person is raised as a Jew (and is circumcised if a male), thinks he is a Jew, declares he is a Jew, and is received by the community as a Jew.³⁰ One might call such a person a "common law Jew."³¹

Conversion

All the evidence suggests that, in ancient Israel, Ruth-like converts did not undergo a formal conversion ceremony to become Jews. Professor Cohen explains: "The woman was joined to the house of Israel by being joined to her Israelite husband; the act of marriage was functionally equivalent to the later idea of 'conversion.'"³² The Torah's silence on the issue of formal conversion implies that the need for it did not exist in ancient times. Instead, the Torah emphasizes the importance of a wife submitting to her husband. In this context, a Gentile woman married to an Israelite man was called to embrace the God of Israel and the people of Israel as her own. In the rare instance of a Gentile man marrying an Israelite woman, it is possible that a form of adoption took place whereby he would enter the wife's family and carry on the name of her family (e.g. 1 Chron. 2:34–35). In such a case, he would also be expected to embrace the God of Israel and the people of Israel as his own. Why didn't the Jewish woman take on her Gentile husband's religious identity? It is because Israel is a nation in covenant with God. Jews are obligated to circumcise their sons and pass on Jewish heritage to the next generation (Gen. 17). If a Jewish woman marries a Gentile man and she converts to her husband's religion, she cannot fulfill her covenantal obligations pertaining to Jewish continuity. The covenant with God is violated. However, if the Gentile husband converts to Judaism, from the biblical perspective, no cov-

enant violation occurs. Such is the biblical rationale for conversion from Gentile to Jew and not the other way around.³³

The world has changed much since ancient times, especially in regard to gender roles. In the United States, in particular, women do not automatically follow their husband's religion. The idea of a husband marrying into his wife's family is an alien concept. Conversion is no longer assumed or normative in cases of intermarriage. Consequently, it is expedient for the Gentile spouse to formally convert to Judaism, if only so that the children can have a clear and unambiguous identity.³⁴

The debate over "who is a Jew" is still in session in the Messianic Jewish community. While a consensus exists in some areas, in others (such as standards for formal conversion) there is much diversity of opinion. What else would you expect from a truly Jewish movement? In seeking to be Scripture-based and tradition-honoring, Messianic Judaism must question the traditional boundaries that have been passed down from ancient times. The result is a fresh look at this millennia-old issue.

APPENDIX B

Why Messianic Jews Believe Yeshua is the Messiah

Many intermarried Jews wonder why Messianic Jews believe Yeshua is the Messiah since he died two thousand years ago. Isn't the Messiah supposed to bring peace to the world? The key biblical text that Messianic Jews point to in support of their belief is Isaiah 53, which speaks of a suffering servant, sent by God to lay down his life as a ransom for sin. The writers of the New Testament, all Jews,¹ believed that Yeshua was this suffering servant that Isaiah foretold (Matt. 8:17; 27:27–66; Acts 8:32–33; 1 Pet. 2:22–25). Significantly, many Chabad *Hasidim* (members of the largest sect of ultra-Orthodox Jews) concur with Messianic Jews that a suffering Messiah is depicted in Isaiah 53 (they point to the Talmud [*b. Sanh.* 98b]); but instead of believing that Yeshua is the suffering servant, they believe that Menachem Schneerson, the Lubavitcher *rebbe*, fulfilled this prophecy when he died in 1994 (see Appendix D).² What does the prophecy actually say? Read it and judge for yourself. Does any Jewish person in history fit this portrait?

In fact, it was our diseases he bore,
our pains from which he suffered;
yet we regarded him as punished,
stricken and afflicted by God.
But he was wounded because of our crimes,
crushed because of our sins;
the disciplining that makes us whole fell on him,
and by his bruises we are healed.

We all, like sheep, went astray;
we turned, each one, to his own way;
yet *ADONAI* laid on him
the guilt of all of us.

Though mistreated, he was submissive—
he did not open his mouth.

- our Jewish tradition. The tradition, however, is to be tested by the Bible . . . that which is consistent with the Scriptures can be accepted; that which is inconsistent must be rejected. The Bible is the final rule of faith and practice." (Juster 158, 163).
15. Harris-Shapiro 42.
 16. Cohn-Sherbok 211.
 17. Feher 78.
 18. Harris-Shapiro 108–109.
 19. Feher 139.
 20. Feher 103; Harris-Shapiro 142–143.
 21. Harris-Shapiro 146.
 22. Harris-Shapiro 96.
 23. DellaPergola, "New Data on Demography and Identification Among Jews in the U.S.," 75.
 24. For an example of Messianic Jewish *Rosh HaShanah* liturgy, see Cohn-Sherbok 113–117.
 25. Cohn-Sherbok 118.
 26. Feher 106.
 27. For an example of Messianic Jewish *Sukkot* liturgy, see Cohn-Sherbok 110–111.
 28. Cohn-Sherbok 110.
 29. For an example of Messianic Jewish *Simchat Torah* liturgy, see Cohn-Sherbok 125–127.
 30. Cohn-Sherbok 111.
 31. For an example of Messianic Jewish Hanukkah liturgy, see Cohn-Sherbok 129.
 32. Feher 107.
 33. Harris-Shapiro 147. Messianic Jews recall the Messiah's birth in ways other than Christmas. Some recall it monthly on the *Rosh Chodesh* (New Moon) based on Col. 2:16–17. See Rudolph, *The Voice of the Lord: Messianic Jewish Daily Devotional*, Appendix A, iii. Others recall Yeshua's birth during the festival of *Sukkot*, a more likely time for the shepherds to be in the Bethlehem fields (Luke 2:8). It should not be forgotten that the celebration of Christmas was unknown to the Apostles; its origins can be traced to the time of Constantine in the fourth century and has little to do with the actual date of Yeshua's birth (Miles 20–23).
 34. There are no statistics available as to what percentage of Messianic Jewish intermarried families have Christmas trees. However, the numbers are probably less than the mainstream Jewish community where 10–18 percent of Jewish-Jewish couples and 62–80 percent of Jewish-Gentile couples have Christmas trees. See McClain 140; Cohen, "Rais-

- ing Children in an Interfaith Family: Mixed Marrieds Speak," 104–105, 35. Feher 109.
36. Cohn-Sherbok 130.
 37. Easter is historically and theologically rooted in the celebration of Passover. It was originally observed on the same day as Passover and called *pascha* by the early Church Fathers. See Bradshaw and Hoffman, Bacchiocchi, Broadhurst, Saldarini (1984), Stallings, and Cantalamessa.
 38. For an example of Messianic Jewish *Shavu'ot* liturgy, see Cohn-Sherbok 107–108.
 39. Cohn-Sherbok 144.
 40. For an example of Messianic Jewish *B'rit Milah* liturgy, see Cohn-Sherbok 144–145.
 41. Harris-Shapiro 153–154. My father, Michael Rudolph, was the first Messianic Jewish *mohel* certified by the Union of Messianic Jewish Congregations.
 42. For an example of Messianic Jewish *Bar/Bat Mitzvah* liturgy, see Cohn-Sherbok 149–150.
 43. For an example of Messianic Jewish Wedding liturgy, see Cohn-Sherbok 151–153.
 44. ". . . (as long as the cemetery is privately or corporately owned, rather than owned by a synagogue) cemetery officials generally won't inquire into the status of the dead person unless someone raises the issue" (Petsonk and Remsen 322).
 45. Cohn-Sherbok 155.

Appendix A

1. Some synagogues in the movement are under the authority of regional, national or international Messianic *beit dins* (courts of law). This may be the direction of the Messianic movement as standards of rabbinical ordination are increasingly defined by umbrella organizations like the Union of Messianic Jewish Congregations (UMJC) and the Messianic Jewish Alliance of America (MJAA).
2. Schiffman, "Intermarriage Can Have an Adverse Effect on Messianic Judaism," 113.
3. Riggans, "Messianic Jews and the Definition of Jewishness," 240, n. 6.
4. "Messianic Judaism has functionally decided to agree with the Reform Jewish ruling that descent from either parent who is Jewish makes one Jewish, if one maintains some connection with Jewish community and practice. This usage, although not officially sanctioned, seems to be almost universal among us . . ." Russ Resnik,

- "Commentary on Defining Messianic Judaism: Addendum 1. What do we mean by 'Jewish'?"
5. Russ Resnik, "Commentary on Defining Messianic Judaism: Addendum 1. What do we mean by 'Jewish'?"
 6. Hiat and Zlotowitz 43–48; Zlotowitz 129–135.
 7. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 156.
 8. Hiat and Zlotowitz 43–48. For a critical response to the patrilineal argument and its implications, see Gordis; Bayme, "Patrilineal Descent Revisited," 137–145.
 9. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 266.
 10. Qiddushin 3:12.
 11. Bava Batra 109b. See Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 264.
 12. Hyman 224.
 13. Hirt-Manheimer 264.
 14. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 283.
 15. McClain 197.
 16. Alpert and Staub 57–58.
 17. Hirt-Manheimer 264–265.
 18. McClain 280.
 19. Mayer, "American-Jewish Outreach in the 1990s and Beyond," 53.
 20. Hawxhurst 150–151.
 21. Mayer, "American-Jewish Outreach in the 1990s and Beyond," 53.
 22. Hirt-Manheimer 266.
 23. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 267.
 24. See Hayes, 27–34, for a discussion of views by Epstein, Milgrom, Klawans, Fishbane, and Olyan. I am not convinced by Hayes' argument that Ezra and Nehemiah instituted a "prohibition of intermarriage with all Gentiles" to preserve "genealogical purity." Even Hayes, 33, admits that "many postexilic biblical sources advance the integrationist approach characteristic of the First Temple period."
 25. Klayman, "Who is a Jew? The Concept of Kin," 9–11.
 26. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 244.
 27. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 285–307.
 28. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 273. See Klayman, "The Offspring of Intermarriage: The Matrilineal Principle," 15–18.
 29. Rudolph, "Intermarriage, Proselytes & The Next Generation." It is important to remember that formal conversion ceremonies did not exist until the Second Temple period (Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 109–110).
 30. A precedent for covenant declaration is found in the complete edition of the *Shulchan Aruch* (Code of Jewish Law). See Yoreh Deah 268; trans. Eichhorn 108. According to the 1990 National Jewish

- Population Study, in the mainstream Jewish community there are approximately 65,000 people who "identify themselves as Jewish even though they were not born Jewish and did not undergo formal conversion. These people are Jewish by self-definition" (Hirt-Manheimer 253).
31. McClain, 215, notes that some rabbis today use the term "common law Jew."
 32. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 265.
 33. I am grateful to Carl Kinbar for pointing this out to me.
 34. Stern, *Messianic Jewish Manifesto*, 175–180; Juster 192, 235; Rudolph, "Proselytes to Israel in a Messianic Jewish Congregation"; Fischer, "Messianic Jewish Conversion: Is it Viable?," 30–49; Fischer, "The Legitimacy of Conversion," 141–149; Schiffman, "Conversion of Gentiles Within Messianic Judaism."

Appendix B

1. Luke may be the one exception (Col. 4:10–14). Some have suggested that he was a Gentile God-fearer who worshiped in the synagogue. Others question whether the Luke of Colossians 4 is the same person who wrote Luke-Acts.
2. Berger, *The Rebbe, the Messiah and the Scandal of Orthodox Indifference*, 53; Brown, *Answering Jewish Objections to Jesus: Theological Objections*, 228.
3. Reventlow 24; Kac, *The Messianic Hope*, 75.
4. Fishbane, "Midrashic Theologies of Messianic Suffering," 73–85; Patai, *The Messiah Texts*, 104–121, 165–170; Dubov 63–64;
5. Driver and Neubauer 258.
6. Driver and Neubauer 319–322,
7. Driver and Neubauer 153.
8. Driver and Neubauer 7.
9. Driver and Neubauer 9.
10. Driver and Neubauer 14–15.
11. Driver and Neubauer 399.
12. Driver and Neubauer 5.
13. Driver and Neubauer 11.
14. Driver and Neubauer 10–11.
15. Driver and Neubauer 374.
16. Driver and Neubauer 32.
17. Driver and Neubauer 386.
18. Driver and Neubauer 23–24.
19. Driver and Neubauer 99–100.