HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
New York School

INSTRUCTIONS TO LIBRARY

Statement by Referee

The Senior Thesis of David Ellenson

Entitled: Ezriel Hildesheimer's Concept of Neo-Orthodoxy

1) May (with revisions) be considered for publication ( ) (✓)
yes no

2) May be circulated ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
to faculty to students to alumni no restriction

3) May be consulted in Library only ( ) ( )
by faculty by students

( ) ( )
by alumni no restriction

May 2, 1977 (date)

(signature of referee)

Statement by Author

I hereby give permission to the Library to circulate my thesis
( ) (✓)
yes no

The Library may sell positive microfilm copies of my thesis
( ) (✓)
yes no

4/4/77 (date)

David Ellenson (signature of author)

Library Record

The above-named thesis was microfilmed on _____ (date)

For the Library _____ (signature of staff member)

ESRIEL HILDESHEIMER'S CONCEPT OF NEO-ORTHODOXY

DAVID ELLENSON

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
Requirements for Ordination

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

April 1, 1977

Referee: Professor Fritz Bamberger

While it may be possible for scholarship to be objective, the values which lead persons to pursue a particular topic surely are not. My own interest in Esriel Hildesheimer is proof of this, for much of my own life has been spent in an effort to find a solution to the same problem which confronted him: i.e., how to live in two cultural worlds? Of course, this problem is not unique either to me or to him. It has confronted Jews ever since their emergence from the ghetto in Western Europe approximately two centuries ago. Nevertheless, by tracing one particular response to this dilemma, I have attempted to gain a deeper insight into my own being and the challenges which confront me. Obviously, my own answer to this problem is different from Esriel Hildesheimer's. Yet, through this study, I have come to see much of his problem as my own and to admire his efforts to resolve it.

To two teachers, Eugene Borowitz and Martin Cohen, I wish to express a word of thanks, for both have aided me in understanding the place of the Jew in the modern world, and in so doing have helped me to come to know myself. To Fritz Bamberger, my advisor, I must acknowledge a special debt of gratitude. Not only has he given me unsparingly of his time and insights into the condition of the modern Jew, but he has provided me with an example of human sensitivity, warmth, and concern. I value him not only as a teacher, but as a human being, and hope that many of his qualities will be reflected in me as I engage in the rabbinate in the years ahead.

To my father, who died just two months ago, and to my mother, I am unable fully to express my thanks. Their love sustained me throughout my early life and it continues to live for me today. They planted within me a love for Judaism and the Jewish people, and I only regret that my father did not live to participate in the simcha of my ordination.

Finally, it is to Lynn and our daughter Ruth that this study is dedicated. Of Lynn it truly can be said, "Many daughters have done valiantly, but you exceed them all," and Ruth has enriched my life beyond my fondest hopes.

Jacob Katz, in his masterful work, Out of the Ghetto, has noted that the Jewish community of Western Europe experienced profound social changes and cultural transformations between the years 1770-1870. He observes:

> During the century under question, Jewish communities underwent a transformation that changed their legal status, their occupational distribution, their cultural habits, as well as their religious outlook and behavior. [1]

Prior to that era, Western European Jews lived in semi-autonomous communities within the larger societies of which they were a part. Cultural values and norms were established in accord with rabbinic teachings. So long as the Jewish people of Western Europe lived in an unfragmented community marked by a belief in the divine sanction of rabbinic interpretation of the tradition, the individual Jew was "provided...with both the legitimation and plausibility structure necessary to sustain a traditional, closed society." [2] By the end of the 18th century, however, the Jew was segregated no longer. Scholars such as Katz, Blau, [3] Baron, [4] and Landes [5] have noted that the teachings of the Enlightenment combined with socio-economic and political changes to erode the traditional nature of medieval Jewish society. In addition, both Katz and Scholem have pointed to developments within the Jewish community which also contributed to this dissolution of the traditional world of medieval Jewry. [6] In short, both the traditional legitimation and plausibility structure of medieval Western European Judaism began to collapse in the late 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries.

In unprecedented numbers, Jews began to participate in the life of the larger society of which they became a part and began both to incorporate Western values into their own

thought systems and to perceive their tradition in light of Western values. Laurence Silberstein describes this process in the following terms:

> Jewry was transformed from a segregated ethnic-religious community united by a common ethos, world view, and social structure into a fragmented "religious" community, stripped of distinguishing ethnic traits and socio-cultural autonomy, and eagerly seeking its place "in the sun" within European culture and society. [7]

With this exodus from the ghetto, with enfranchisement, and with the creation of a "semi-neutral" [8] society in which the Jew was permitted to participate, the semi-autonomous nature of medieval Jewish life was weakened, if not destroyed. The Jewish group no longer provided the single societal center around which the lives of individual Jews revolved. As Blau notes, emancipation "...destroyed almost completely the viability of the Jewish community." [9] and with the destruction of such community it became almost impossible to sustain the plausibility structure necessary for the survival of an unmodified medieval rabbinic orthodoxy. Judaism, which was "not subject to radical and extreme stresses" [10] during the Middle Ages, suddenly confronted a situation that demanded religious modification and/or innovation. Had Judaism not responded to these alterations in the environment, it would have run the risk of obsolescence.

Yet, Judaism did possess enough resilience to respond to these new conditions. While Jewish existence was transformed by Jewish entry into 19th century Western European cultural and political life, this did not mark the termination of Judaism. Jewish values did not simply atrophy and die.

Rather, they responded both to the demise of the medieval world and to the challenge of the modern one. The response, however, was not univocal. Instead, there were variegated Jewish reactions to the challenge of modernity. Reform, Neo-Orthodox, Conservative, and Zionist movements emerged during the 19th century, responding to the changed social, political, and cultural character of the modern world while attempting to maintain a sense of continuity with the past. Moreover, within each movement there existed a great deal of contrariety, and it is, consequently, impossible to characterize any one of them in unilinear terms.

The movement labelled Neo-Orthodox, the denomination of modern Judaism to which this study is devoted, attests to the accuracy of this last observation. Generally associated with the person and writings of Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch (1808-1888) of Frankfurt, Neo-Orthodoxy had other leading exponents whose visions of modern Orthodoxy were distinct from that of Hirsch. This study will examine one of these competing visions by analyzing the life and writings of Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer (1820-1899) of Berlin, a major spokesman for German Neo-Orthodoxy throughout the 19th century and the founder, in 1873, of the Berlin Rabbinical Seminary. It will provide a necessary corrective and supplement to those descriptions of Neo-Orthodoxy which focus exclusively upon Hirsch. Also, since Hildesheimer has been almost totally neglected by writers on modern Jewish history and religion,[11] this study will fill an important lacuna in the study of modern Judaism.

I

Esriel Hildesheimer was born in Halberstadt, Germany. in 1820. His father was a famous rabbinical scholar, but, unlike many other Orthodox Jews of his day. was not opposed to secular studies. He sent Esriel to Hasharat Tsvi in Halberstadt, the first Orthodox Jewish school in Germany to include a program of secular studies in its curriculum--a sign that Esriel's father was not a rigid traditionalist. As is apparent from his later career, Esriel imbibed his father's flexible attitude toward the importance of secular studies; his attendance at this novel elementary school reinforced his positive attitude toward secular learning. [12] His father died when he was twelve. but his brother Abraham. twenty-five years his senior. confirmed this appraoch to secular learning by having Esriel. then seventeen, enroll in the yeshiva of Jacob Ettlinger (1798-1871) of Altona.

While Ettlinger's yeshiva provided instruction only in the traditional religious subjects. Ettlinger himself. in many ways, was a product of the changing times. He had attended a German university and. unlike many of his rabbinic peers, preached in German. not Yiddish. [13] Hildesheimer's respect for Ettlinger was unbounded. and he always referred to Ettlinger as his "outstanding teacher." [14] Mordecai Eliav reports that letters in the Tel Aviv Hildesheimer Archives indicate Hildesheimer consulted with his teacher both on private matters and on

public issues throughout his life.[15] Hildesheimer's deep respect and high esteem for Ettlinger obviously was reciprocated. Ettlinger more than once described Hildesheimer as his "outstanding student", and he even referred to him as "my son" in a legal responsum he issued.[16] Most important, Ettlinger granted Hildesheimer permission, while he was yet a student, to attend the philosophical lectures Isaac Bernays (1792-1849), Rabbi of Hamburg, delivered on Saturday afternoons.[17] Few students received such permission, for Ettlinger felt that unless a student's faith was well anchored and absolutely secure, the study of philosophy would lead to heresy. The fact, then, that he permitted Hildesheimer to attend Bernays' lectures (given in German) is a special mark of Ettlinger's esteem for Hildesheimer.

During these years of his apprenticeship Hildesheimer secured a reputation as an outstanding Talmudist. His peers said of him that even if there were twenty-five hours in a day, Hildesheimer would find still another one for study.[18] Indeed, Hildesheimer himself reported that he did not return home to visit his mother during the entire four-and-a-half years he was a student in Altona. Moreover, according to Hildesheimer, his mother was so pleased with his devotion to Torah that she did not even request he return home to Halberstadt during that time.[19] Even if these reports of Hildesheimer's fervor for his studies are somewhat exaggerated, they indicate that he was a devoted student and that the Hildesheimer household placed

the highest priority upon rabbinic studies. It should be mentioned that Hildesheimer, unlike many other Orthodox rabbis of his generation, perfected his knowledge of Jewish civil law during these years in Altona, for the Jewish court of Altona still retained the right of jurisdiction in civil cases during the 1840's.[20]

Hildesheimer not only gained an unusual mastery of rabbinic materials during his years in Altona, but he was also exposed to and made conscious of the dangers of Reform during his days there. Ettlinger and Bernays both fought actively against the advances of Reform, and Meir Hildesheimer, Esriel's great-grandson, writes:

> Rabbi Ettlinger did not enclose himself within the four ells of halacha, but waged a stormy war against the Reform Movement, and for this purpose founded the weekly journal, "The Faithful Guardian of Zion." The Chacham Bernays also fought aggressively against the Reformers. The example of these two...men taught him (Esriel Hildesheimer) that a rabbi in Israel is obligated to take an active part in improving the religious situation (of Jewry).[21]

Hildesheimer himself spoke of the growing dominance of Reform during those years and of the sorrow and consternation this caused him. He said:

> The lawless who denied the Torah were dominant everywhere, ...and those who feared God cowered before these enemies and despisers of religion. ...Such a time of distress had never been visited upon Israel previously.[22]

These years of spiritual development were crucial for Hildesheimer: following his own inclinations and observations on the the state of Judaism in Germany during the 1830's and 1840's and the examples set by his teachers Ettlinger and Bernays, he felt compelled to take up the cudgels against

Reform and wage an active fight against it. In deciding on the means to reach this goal, Hildesheimer again followed the examples of his rabbinical masters, and at their urging turned to secular studies. Sensitive to the events and developments of their day, these men felt they could combat Reform only by employing the same weapons Reform utilized in its attacks upon traditional Judaism. The Reformers, quite wisely Hildesheimer felt, had acquired status and prestige in the eyes of both Jew and gentile by their engagement in Wissenschaft. Consequently, Orthodoxy could survive only if its adherents were similarly trained in and devoted to scientific pursuits. [23]

In 1843, then, Hildesheimer went to Berlin where at the University he majored in the study of Semitic languages for two years. In addition, he studied philosophy, history (with Ranke), physics, and analytic geometry. [24] He continued with his rabbinic studies at the yeshiva of Michael Landsburg while attending the university, and both in the yeshiva and at the university he gained a reputation for exceeding piety. Derisively, the students in the university labelled him a "walking Shulchan Aruch", and they mocked his custom of retiring into one of the university classrooms in order to pray the afternoon prayers. Rabbi Elhanan Rothenstein, judge of the Jewish court in Berlin, praised his devotion, however, and wrote an enthusiastic recommendation for him, extolling both his piety and his learning. [25]

Hildesheimer reveals his own feelings about this juncture of his life, as well as basic insights into his character,

in letters to his fiancee, Henriette Hirsch, sister of the wealthy metal firm owner, Joseph Hirsch, who financed Hildesheimer's advanced education and was to be one of Hildesheimer's closest confidants throughout his life. Writing to Henriette, Hildesheimer confided that nine-tenths of the Jewish students he encountered at the university were either heretics or indifferent to Judaism. Yet, he expressed his own views on religion and the importance of his studies this way:

> Religion demands from its adherents a solid character, ...and gives one the strength to withstand any tempest. ...Only that which is connected with religion, more or less, receives my full stamp of approval. This explains my constant, unremitting engagement in academics, because for me it stands in the service of religion... [26]

His commitment to Judaism permitted him to overcome any doubts about his faith created by university study: his commitment to secular learning was obviously utilitarian. In a very real sense this youthful outlook foreshadows the mature Hildesheimer's thoughts on secular studies, for while he was an erstwhile defender of the absolute necessity for secular learning and accomplishment, Hildesheimer did not, like Samson Raphael Hirsch, believe in the amalgamation of secular and religious studies. Rather, he saw secular studies as handmaiden to religious ones. [27]

One other aspect of Hildesheimer's character revealed in his letters to Henriette is his devotion to the notion of the "community of Israel." His activities on behalf of the Land of Israel, the Falashas, Russian Jewish refugees, and other general charitable activities involving the entire,

and not just the Orthodox, Jewish community, arose from a deep feeling of commitment to the people Israel. He wrote:

> The life of a religious Jew is never an autonomous one. (Judaism) is not a personal matter, closed or individual. In his thoughts, and also in his feelings of joy as well as pain, the Jew finds himself connected with the rest of his people. [28]

Hildesheimer left Berlin in 1846 and enrolled at the University of Halle, where he continued his studies and, in that same year, received the Ph.D. degree. His dissertation was entitled, "The Correct Way to Interpret Scripture," and while the manuscript of the dissertation has been lost, an article, "Material For An Investigation of the Septuagint," which appeared in the Literatur Blatt des Orient in 1848, appears to be a section of it. By earning the Ph.D., Hildesheimer became one of the few, perhaps the only, Orthodox rabbi in Germany up to that time to receive a secular doctorate. In any event, by earning the degree Hildesheimer felt that he had acheived the status and legitimacy necessary to combat the Reformers. In addition, he proposed a translation of the Torah into German both to "elevate the estimation of our party in the opinion of science" and to earn public esteem and confidence. [29] Hildesheimer, just like the Reformers, saw Wissenschaft as a weapon to be employed in the struggle over the religious character of German Jewry. While Hildesheimer never completed his translation (due to the translation of Samson Raphael Hirsch), his proposal of the project as well as

the support and approval granted it by Ettlinger and Seligman Baer Bamberger (1807-1878), Rabbi of Wuerzburg. indicates that the Orthodox party in Germany was becoming increasingly sensitive to the demands of the new age.

Upon completing his education, Hildesheimer returned to Halberstadt, where he became secretary of the community, a post which his brother Abraham had filled until his death in 1844. Reform came to Halberstadt in 1847, and Ludwig Philippson (1811-1889), the editor of the Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums, began to campaign on its behalf in the pages of his journal. Moreover, Philippson convened a meeting of all the Jewish communities in Saxony on October 22, 1847, in the town of Magdeburg. The purpose of the meeting was to urge the adoption of a reformed prayerbook as well as to give impetus to the Reform Movement in Saxony. Hildesheimer and his brother-in-law Joseph Hirsch, the delegates from Halberstadt, walked out of the assembly when they discovered its true intent and sent out a circular, "The Necessity of Protest Against the Actions of the Reformers," to all the delegates who had gathered in Magdeburg. [30]

As a result of this controversy, the struggle between the two sides intensified, with Philippson arguing on behalf of Reform in the pages of the Allgemeine and Hildesheimer arguing on behalf of Orthodoxy in the Leipzig periodical, Der Orient. [31] Writing on November 20, 1847, Hildesheimer described the feelings motivating his involvement in this dispute. He wrote:

> When I began to fight with Philippson and his lawless peers, ...I was very bitter that no one else seemed to be upset over the situation, that no great man stood up in order to overturn these licentious persons who disrupted the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts. ...Finally, when I saw that no one acted, I felt that this was no time to refrain from expressing my thoughts on account of embarrassment or humility... [32]

As a result Hildesheimer not only attacked Philippson and Reform in journal articles, but, in 1848, when eight members of the community wished to secede from the general community on the grounds of religious conscience, Hildesheimer also, in conjunction with the rabbi of the community, issued a legal responsum forbidding these Reformers to withdraw and threatening them with loss of all communal rights if they did so. [33] As a result, secession was prevented and the unity of the community maintained.

In addition, Hildesheimer's fame as a champion of Orthodoxy spread. Well-versed in rabbinics, armed with a secular doctorate, and a fighter against Reform, Hildesheimer was now esteemed by many throughout the Orthodox world as a person capable of meeting the challenges of a changing age.

At this crucial juncture in his life the heads of the Jewish community in Eisenstadt, Hungary, decided to invite Hildesheimer to become their rabbi. This post had been vacant for eleven years, when, in 1851, Hildesheimer decided to accept the invitation tendered him. The community of Eisenstadt, according to a letter Hildesheimer received, was "one of the most important in Hungary" and consisted of approximately "160 families." [34] Moreover,

because of its proximity to Vienna, it had been exposed to external cultural influences, though it "remained in the Orthodox camp." [35] This last fact explains why the leaders of the community decided to invite Hildesheimer to occupy the long-vacant post, for in spite of opposition to his election by conservative elements in the community who feared the coming of a rabbi with a secular education, the majority of the leaders decided that an Orthodox rabbi of Hildesheimer's type was essential if the community was to survive the onslaught of Reform. [36] Hildesheimer was instructed to devote his major efforts to the field of education, "an area currently neglected." [37] Anxious both to combat the possible spread of Reform and to meet the demands of the time, Hildesheimer left Halberstadt and his years of educational apprenticeship behind.

II

Hildesheimer firmly believed that the continued existence of Orthodox Judaism in Hungary, as in Germany, depended on a basic reform in the educational curriculum of the yeshiva. That is, Hildesheimer felt it essential that students be not only steeped in traditional rabbinic texts, but also capable of transmitting the relevance of these texts to the general Jewish populace. In order to accomplish this goal, Hildesheimer thought including secular subjects into the yeshiva curriculum was an absolute necessity: knowledge of the vernacular was a priority. [38] Consequently, immediately upon his arrival at Eisenstadt in 1851, he founded the first yeshiva in the Western world to include both secular and

religious subjects in its curriculum. In addition, all courses were taught in German, not Yiddish.[39] These were major innovations, and Hildesheimer's yeshiva grew and prospered throughout the 1850's and 1860's.[40]

Pleased with his success and confident of his accomplishments, he stated, "Schools alone will assure the future."[41] It appeared to him that his policy of combining secular learning with religious instruction was working, and in 1860 he wrote to Wolf Feilchenfeld (1827-1913), a German rabbi and close friend from his student days in Berlin, this description of his life in Hungary:

> Here there is still Torah and the honor of Torah. Here there is still an authentic Jewish life, and many communities properly honor and respect their rabbis, something one cannot find in Germany except Frankfurt. ...Here life is really a pleasure.[42]

His success during this period is evidenced by the decisions of Rabbis Judah Assad (1794-1866) and Maharam Schick (1807-1879), two of the greatest Orthodox rabbis in Hungary during this era, to send their sons to Hildesheimer's yeshiva, and by the invitation of Abraham Schreiber, the Ktav Sofer (1815-1871), leader of Orthodoxy in Hungary and son of Rabbi Moses Sofer, to serve as his assistant in Pressburg.[43]

The yeshiva itself, however, remained his principal arena. Declining Schreiber's invitation, Hildesheimer nurtured his yeshiva and watched it expand to an enrollment of over 110 students, the second largest yeshiva in Hungary.[44]

The curriculum of the yeshiva reflects Hildesheimer's understanding of the notion, "Torah im Derekh Eretz." Thirty-five to thirty-six hours a week were devoted to the study of traditional rabbinic subjects, while sixteen to seventeen hours were spent on secular ones.[45] The secular subjects consisted of physics, mathematics, Latin (Cicero), and Greek (Virgil and Homer). He also encouraged the use of Hebrew by the students of the yeshiva, and taught a course in Hebrew grammar, a subject generally omitted from a yeshiva curriculum. This attention to Hebrew as a language demanding systematic study reflects, once again, his sensitivity to modernity. His major innovation in the curriculum was requiring Hungarian as a subject of study.[46] He felt that knowledge of Hungarian was becoming "more essential daily," and his insistence upon student mastery of the vernacular, as well as his choice of German as the language of instruction in the yeshiva, reflects both his commitment to spreading Orthodoxy among enlightened segments of the Jewish community and his sensitivity to the dominant social trends of his day. This combination of religious and secular subjects enabled his students "to fight the war on behalf of Torah and her commandments."[47] and gained them the respect of both "their congregants and their opponents."[48] Nonetheless, it is interesting to note that secular studies clearly were subordinated to religious ones, and were viewed primarily as a stratagem necessary to adapt Orthodoxy to the needs of a changing social and intellectual situation. Just

as he had viewed academic studies during his Berlin school days as being in the service of religion, so now Hildesheimer viewed the study of Torah as the principal object of his yeshiva. Secular studies were, of course, essential in Hildesheimer's scheme, but only because they met "the academic demands of the day." [49] Indeed, all secular study was legitimated only insofar as it aimed to serve "the sake of heaven." [50] Consequently, Hildesheimer omitted philosophy and metaphysics from the curriculum of his Eisenstadt yeshiva because he felt it likely to lead to heresy for the untutored. Instead, as pointed out above, the substance of "Derekh Eretz," secular studies, for Hildesheimer was science and languages. Moreover, the justification for this was not that secular studies should be engaged in for their own sake. Rather, it was because they could supply Hildesheimer and his students with the weapons necessary to preserve Orthodoxy. As Hildesheimer observed:

> It is my great hope that (my students) will grow and become men who stand in the breach, who emerge as pioneers with all the necessary stratagems for war which are needed at the present time. [51]

Hildesheimer was engaged in a war. Fighting for the survival of Orthodoxy in an era that witnessed the destruction of Jewish communal autonomy and rabbinic hegemony, he was perceptive enough to realize that Orthodoxy's only chance for continued existence depended upon adaption to the new age.

Others, however, did not agree. Reform elements in Hungary believed that Orthodox Judaism was destined to die,

and they felt Hildesheimer's educational attainments and theories only obscured his religious rigidity. His attempt to combine general enlightenment with a traditional way of life only aroused their ire. Thus, Leopold Low, the leading Reform rabbi in Hungary and editor of the Reform journal, Ben Chanajah, began bitterly to attack Hildesheimer in the pages of his journal. Low claimed that Hildesheimer's seminary did not match the standards of the Breslau seminary directed by Zacharias Frankel (1801-1875). In addition, Low charged that Frankel was far superior to Hildesheimer in scholarship and contended that Hildesheimer's knowledge of Hebrew was inadequate. Finally, Low stated that the general standards of the Hildesheimer yeshiva were low and the students' secular educational backgrounds poor. [52]

Hildesheimer replied by defending himself against the charges that his scholarship was inadequate and that his learning was inferior to Frankel's. As for the claim that he possessed a poor knowledge of Hebrew, he did not feel this particular item in Low's bill of particulars against him even merited a reply. However, Hildesheimer did concede that the level of secular studies in his yeshiva was not on a par with the Breslau seminary, and he acknowledged the correctness of Low's critique of the poor educational background of his students. Hildesheimer felt, though, that a major purpose of his yeshiva was to have his students remedy their deficiencies in secular studies, and thus he did not discriminate against those students who came to him with insufficient secular educations. Indeed, these

were among the students he cherished most, for they provided him with material he could mold to meet the challenges posed for Orthodoxy during his day. Finally, while Hildesheimer did acknowledge that the level of secular instruction in his yeshiva was not totally satisfactory, he argued that the level of rabbinic instruction was at least equal to, and probably far better than, the level of instruction in rabbinics in the Breslau seminary. [53]

Reform attacks against Hildesheimer were mild, however, when compared with the savage criticisms hurled against him by his fellow Orthodox rabbis. While Hildesheimer did maintain cordial relations with several Orthodox luminaries such as the Ktav Sofer, Judah Assad, and Maharam Schick, the overwhelming majority of Orthodox rabbis in Hungary distrusted this German Ph.D. who introduced secular subjects into the yeshiva curriculum. Hildesheimer's daughter, Esther Calvary, reports that Hildesheimer wore modern garb and corresponded occasionally in German, thus setting himself apart from other Hungarian Orthodox rabbis. [54] Jacob Katz has pointed out that the method devised originally by the Hatam Sofer, and later continued by other Orthodox rabbis in Hungary, to defend the Tradition was to condemn even the slightest innovation as a major deviation. [55] Thus, Hildesheimer's decision to dress according to contemporary standards of fashion, as well as his use of German, were not minor matters in the eyes of many Hungarian Orthodox rabbis. Rabbi Neta Wolf of Pressburg reflected this view when he stated that anyone who spoke or learned German would become a gentile. [56]

Hildesheimer's most serious deviation in their view, though, was his decision to include secular studies within the curriculum of his yeshiva. According to Mordecai Eliav:

> Orthodox Jewry in Hungary regarded the establishment of the seminary as a dangerous deed, for the innovations were introduced by a religious rabbi, a German Ph.D., and an outstanding Maskil. ...These innovations, in their view, could only damage the traditional way of education and tear a dangerous hole in their wall of opposition to Haskalah. [57]

Fearful lest the slightest chink in their wall of opposition to the changing currents of the time be revealed, Orthodox rabbis in Hungary savagely attacked Hildesheimer and his yeshiva. Akiva Joseph Schlesinger (1837-1922), opposed to any form of religious innovation, pronounced a ban of excommunication upon Hildesheimer because of his yeshiva, and charged that only sinners who caused others to sin emerged from the Eisenstadt yeshiva. [58] Hillel Lichtenstein (1815-1891), Schlesinger's father-in-law and one of Moses Sofer's outstanding pupils, called Hildesheimer "the befouler of Israel" and added that "his every tendency uproots Torah and fear of God and plants in their stead apostasy and heresy in Israel." [59] These men feared that Hildesheimer was creating a philosophy in which Torah would become simply the handmaiden of secular pursuits and, consequently, opposed it as heresy. As Schlesinger wrote in his Kol Naky Mitsiyon:

> As it is written in Mishna Sanhedrin, Israel knows that one who reads external books receives no place in the world to come. [60]

Hildesheimer, of course, regarded these men as hopelessly myopic, and felt their ostrichlike approach to the conditions of the day would only result in the destruction of Orthodoxy. This is revealed fully in Hildesheimer's response to an assembly of extreme Hungarian Orthodox rabbis convened in Mihalowitz in 1866. The assembly was led by Lichtenstein and Rabbi Chaim Sofer of Budapest. The assembly issued a ban against preaching in a non-Jewish language and decreed that it was forbidden to enter a synagogue where the prayer platform was not in the middle. In addition, the assembly forbade a Jew from entering a synagogue where there was a choir or where the officiant leading services wore a robe. Finally, they stated that a wedding could take place only outdoors and ruled that a tower could not be erected on a synagogue lest one mistake it for a church. [61]

Hildesheimer responded by stating that a prohibition against delivering a sermon in a non-Jewish language was absurd and had no foundation in Jewish law. His own teachers, Ettlinger and Bernays, had preached in German and Hildesheimer wrote that to follow a custom against preaching in the vernacular when there was no authority for it in the Talmud and the early rabbinical authorities would be akin to idolatry. [62] Indeed, given the fact that no such prohibition against preaching in a non-Jewish language existed in Jewish sources, Hildesheimer felt that Orthodox rabbis had an obligation to preach in either German or Hungarian, for only then could they speak to the public against "the temptation of the destructive party, i.e., the Reformers." [63]

As for the ban against entering a synagogue where the prayer platform was not in the middle, Hildesheimer again stated that there was no source for this in Jewish law.[64] While he agreed that officiants should not wear robes and acknowledged that Rabbi Moses Isserles (1530-1572), the great legal authority of European Jewry, was opposed to marriages being performed inside a synagogue, Hildesheimer felt these issues were open enough to allow for honest differences of opinion between observant Jews. Most importantly, he felt it was ridiculous to split the community over them by taking a stringent stand in regard to either one.[65]

Hildesheimer regarded the ban against choirs as being halachically unfounded,[66] and, according to oral reports, he permitted an unmixed male choir in his own synagogue in Berlin.[67] He agreed that a tower could not be erected on a synagogue for fear that it might appear as a church but stated:

> Architecture does not make the synagogue what it is, but the genuine Jewish spirit which resides in those who attend it.[68]

Finally, in a letter which he wrote to the Ktav Sofer, Hildesheimer openly expressed his fear that these obdurate men were destroying the possibilities for the continued existence of Orthodoxy in Hungary. Hildesheimer stated:

> It seems to me that there is a great danger in always shouting, "No! No!"[69]

Hildesheimer decried the negative attitudes toward change and modification exhibited by his Orthodox colleagues

in Hungary and was certain that they were not attuned to the pulse of the times. In 1860, for example, when a group of Orthodox rabbis praised a zealous youth who had stoned and almost killed a liberal rabbi in Amsterdam, Hildesheimer condemned the actions of the youth in the strongest possible language and noted that such acts could only harm the cause of Orthodoxy.[70] Similarly, when another Orthodox rabbi in Hungary issued a ban of excommunication against the famed historian Heinrich Graetz, Hildesheimer condemned the stupidity of the ban and noted that such weapons could no longer be used to promote the cause of traditional Judaism.[71] These statements on Hildesheimer's part reveal his sensitivity to the changed social climate of 19th century Western Europe and illustrate his realization that the old weapons of invective and excommunication, which worked so effectively to stifle dissent and deviance from rabbinic norms in the ghetto, were no longer functional in the world of the 19th century.

Instead, Hildesheimer repeated his endless claim, "...Our only hope lies in the creation of a seminary."[72] While Hildesheimer's yeshiva combined Torah with Derekh Eretz, it did not merit the title seminary. Secular studies were a vital part of the curriculum, but Wissenschaft was not practiced within its walls and, as we saw above, the secular educational backgrounds of the students did not permit advanced secular or academic study. More than ever Hildesheimer felt that Orthodox Judaism in Hungary would survive only if a modern rabbinical seminary were established.[73]

Yet, the time was not propitious for Hildesheimer to realize his ambition. Forces in the Reform community had been petitioning the government for the right to establish such a seminary under Reform auspices. Consequently, whatever support there might have been in the Orthodox camp for the establishment of a modern seminary totally dissolved, and Hildesheimer became the only Orthodox rabbi in Hungary to support the creation of a modern rabbinical school. His increasing isolation from the rest of the Orthodox community on account of this issue is indicated by his exclusion from a delegation of seven rabbis who met with the Emperor on April 11, 1864, to protest the establishment of a seminary under Reform auspices. This exclusion by his Orthodox colleagues embarrassed and embittered Hildesheimer, and when asked to comment on the meeting, he wrote:

> What was discussed and agreed upon privately was totally unknown to me, as I did not take part in the discussion. [74]

In 1865, however, Hildesheimer's break with the other Orthodox rabbis became absolute. Fearing that the government would not heed their earlier protest against the establishment of a modern seminary, Judah Assad and other Orthodox rabbinical leaders in Hungary circulated a petition among the Orthodox rabbis of Hungary protesting the establishment of a modern rabbinical school. The petition stated that "a seminary...in the end will create a neology which will result in leading the Jews of Hungary completely into the paths of Reform." [75] The petition was sent to the

Emperor and was published by Leopold Low in the Reform newspaper, Neuzeit. Hildesheimer had not seen the petition, but when it was published by Low, he learned that his name had been among the 121 attached to it. Hildesheimer was certain that Low had signed his name to the petition in order to embarrass him, and in a letter to Judah Assad, wrote:

> Last week I heard that Ben Chananjah published a petition of the Orthodox rabbis of Hungary in the paper Neuzeit, ...and that my name was included among the signatories. Yet, I am not opposed to the establishment of a seminary if it is in the hands of pious men. 76

Hildesheimer reiterated his previous position regarding the establishment of a seminary and reaffirmed his support for the establishment of a modern Orthodox rabbinical school. Indeed, as Hildesheimer wrote to Rabbi Pinchas Stein:

> (So far) we have only seen the fruit of a seminary which has sinners at its head. However, if a seminary will be established which has God fearers as its leaders, there will be a sanctification of God's name. 77

Assad replied to Hildesheimer's position by stating that the petition had been signed only by the seven men who had comprised the delegation which went to see the Emperor in 1864. The other 114 names had been added, Assad wrote, in order to make the strength of the Orthodox party felt in government circles. He wrote that he, not Low, was responsible for attaching Hildesheimer's name to the petition, and he apologized to Hildesheimer for doing this, but honestly felt Hildesheimer supported their cause. Nevertheless, Assad urged Hildesheimer not to withdraw his name publicly from the

list as it would only embarrass the Orthodox before the Emperor and delight the heretical Reformers. Assad closed by stating that Hildesheimer, now that the deed was done, should accept the judgment of the other rabbis and cited the verse from Proverbs, "Do not rely upon your understanding," to indicate that Hildesheimer should not take any public action against the petition. [78]

Hildesheimer replied to Assad immediately. He wrote:

> The truth is that it is no small matter to me that my name was signed to a petition which contains the opposite of what I had said, and not only privately, but publicly. [79]

Hildesheimer felt an obligation to express himself publicly once again in support of a seminary, for, he told Assad, he owed it to his own supporters not to confuse them. He realized that this set him apart from the other Orthodox rabbis in Hungary, but he felt strongly on this issue. Hildesheimer informed Assad that he intended to write letters to both the Israelit and Jeschurun disassociating himself from the petition and reaffirming his earlier publicly expressed support for the establishment of a seminary. He hoped that the other rabbis would not take offense at this action, but felt he had no other choice. [80] As Hildesheimer wrote elsewhere to the Ktav Sofer, "I know that my ways are not theirs, though our intentions are the same." [81]

Others did not agree with Hildesheimer's assessment, however. Besides Assad, Hildesheimer's old friend Maharan Schick warned him not to write any more in support of a

seminary and told him that he was now obligated to accept the decision of the majority of the rabbis in Hungary on this matter. Indeed, if he continued to aid those who wanted to establish a seminary, Schick claimed that Hildesheimer "would, in the future, have to give a strict accounting," [82] presumably before God. Moreover, as extremist attacks mounted against Hildesheimer during the 1860's, not one Orthodox rabbi in Hungary publicly defended him. [83] Finally, at the Hungarian Jewish Congress of 1868, at which Hildesheimer attempted to offer a moderate position between the Reform on one side and the extreme Orthodox on the other, the attack against him reached a climax. All positions he represented and every proposal which he offered were roundly rejected and the extremists of both factions dominated. While Hildesheimer felt that his modern Orthodox stance offered the only alternative to "absolute destruction and deadening paralysis" [84] for Hungarian Jewry, others disagreed with him, and he realized that there was no possibility for effectuating his policy of "Torah im Derekh Eretz" in Hungary. [85] Consequently, Hildesheimer decided to accept the invitation extended him by Congregation Adass Yisroel in Berlin to become its spiritual leader. Hildesheimer had recognized that emancipation had altered fundamentally the status of the Jews and that return to the ghetto was impossible. Hildesheimer was determined to construct an Orthodox seminary in keeping with the demands of the age, and Berlin was now to become the major arena of his life's work, the place where his ideas acheived their full maturation and realization.

III

The Hildesheimer Rabbinical Seminary opened in Berlin in October, 1873. Hildesheimer saw it as the crowning moment of his life, his opportunity to "combat the destructive ambitions of the Reformers and to answer the demands of the time." [86] The Reformers had established a modern rabbinical school under the leadership of Abraham Geiger just the year before, and Hildesheimer saw his rabbinical school as a weapon to be used in the furtherance of Orthodoxy and the diminution of both Reform and "academic heretics." [87] Hildesheimer, unlike Hirsch, was not opposed to Wissenschaft. Instead, he believed it could and must be harnessed in the service of traditional Judaism. As Hildesheimer said in the ceremonies which marked the inauguration of the Seminary:

> It is impossible that the quest for knowledge in one area of learning will not build a bridge to other areas of knowledge. Jewish learning is "our length and the length of our days," as we pray every day in the evening prayer. And it is inconceivable that this ideal will not sink anchor in other waters of the spiritual world. We are proud, very proud, about this sanctification of God's Name. ...Our time here will be devoted to Talmud and Poskim as much as possible. Yet, our other studies will not be neglected and we will engage in these different areas with the same love, as all our study will be for the sake of heaven.
>
> The second half of this century has brought several changes: the new Science of Judaism has paved the road for these changes, and areas that have been known for a long time, i.e., Bible commentary, demand investigation from a new point of view and require the usage of valuable linguistic materials... In our desire to engage in these areas as our own, we will attempt to work in them with absolute academic seriousness and for the sake of, and only the sake of, the truth. [88]

Furthermore, Hildesheimer continued, the raising of funds for the establishment of the Seminary ...

> in less than a year-and-a-half testifies like a hundred witnesses to the pressing need for an institution founded on the basis of Orthodox Judaism whose goal will be to qualify its graduates as rabbis, based upon a fundamental and all-embracing knowledge of the Bible, the Talmud, and all the halachic works succored by them. Secondarily, (our goal) is to present them with knowledge in all branches of Wissenschaft des Judentums, inasmuch as such knowledge is a demand of our times, and to educate them so that they can undertake independent scientific studies. [89]

Elsewhere, Hildesheimer wrote:

> May it be God's will that this institution, founded for the sake of our holy religion and the scientific study of our religion, grow and flourish for the glory of God and the good of Judaism. [90]

All these statements reveal both Hildesheimer's basic belief that Hirsch's notion of "Torah im Derekh Eretz" could be broadened to include Wissenschaft and his conviction that Wissenschaft was of utilitarian importance. That is, social conditions in the 19th century demanded that Orthodox Judaism, if it were to survive, include Wissenschaft among its arsenal of weapons. His seminary was vital to the future of traditional Judaism, Hildesheimer felt, because it would produce "rabbis imbued with Torah and fear of God," who would yet be "armed with science." [91] In short, these writings reflect Hildesheimer's view that "Torah im Derekh Eretz" had to include Wissenschaft. They also reflect his opinion that secular study was vital only because it was necessary both to permit traditional Judaism to meet the demands of the age and to serve as a supplement to Torah. In no way, though, can Hildesheimer's view of "Torah im

Derekh Eretz" be interpreted as elevating Derekh Eretz to the status of Torah. The fact that Hildesheimer did not believe in the unqualified coequality of Derekh Eretz with Torah implies that Hildesheimer, at least philosophically, was attached to secular studies as a result of the times.

This approach to secular studies is underscored by Hildesheimer's statement on the importance of securing a properly qualified faculty for the Seminary. Hildesheimer stated:

> There is an absolute necessity that our institution be able to meet the competition. Consequently, it is necessary that our faculty be able to answer the demands of the time, i.e., that they be fit to give academic lectures...92

While Hildesheimer selected men for the faculty whose secular academic credentials were impeccable, he did this because the demands "of the time" dictated it. Only men like David Hoffman, Jacob Barth, and Abraham Berliner, who possessed both academic credentials and outstanding piety, were selected for faculty posts by Hildesheimer. Only men like these, Hildesheimer felt, could make the Seminary a force of "infinite importance" in German Jewish life, and strengthen "Orthodox Judaism internally and raise its esteem externally." 93

Hildesheimer revealed his belief that Wissenschaft constituted an integral part of his Torah im Derekh Eretz philosophy by explicitly approving his son Hirsch's response to criticisms issued against the philosophy by Samson Raphael Hirsch's son, Isaac.[94] Writing in the Judische Presse, Isaac Hirsch, commenting upon the Hildesheimer Rabbinical Seminary, asked that "an announcement be made setting forth its aims

and objects and explaining clearly wherein it differed from the Breslau Seminary." [95] Hildesheimer made note of this statement, and when he wrote to Emanuel Schwarzschild, a Frankfurt banker and supporter of Samson Raphael Hirsch, in 1885, he stated, "I know our 'Orthodoxy' does not meet the standards established by Samson Raphael Hirsch's son, Isaac Hirsch." Furthermore, Hildesheimer noted that Hirsch opposed the Hildesheimer Seminary from its inception and acknowledged that "the question arises as to whether Rabbi Hirsch sees our institution as an Orthodox one." [96]

Yet, Hirsch Hildesheimer claimed, "The future of Orthodox Judaism in Germany depends upon it (the Hildesheimer Seminary)." [97] Hildesheimer continued by observing that Isaac Hirsch had attacked David Hoffman and Jacob Barth, both faculty members at the Hildesheimer Seminary, for academic works which they had published. Both, in Hirsch's opinion, were examples of heresy and indicated the danger posed by Wissenschaft. "It is apparent," Hildesheimer observed, "that Rabbi Hirsch has a different approach to general culture than does my father." [98] He continued:

> Rabbi Hirsch desires and is able to label a book as loyal to Orthodoxy only when he deems it worthy of that appellation. [99]

Hildesheimer argued, however, that there could be an honest difference of opinion between observant Jews and he, unlike Hirsch, "would never attempt to force others to accept his opinions." [100] While he respected Rabbi Hirsch, Hildesheimer certainly did not intend his professors to be

subject to Hirsch's censorship. In addition, Hildesheimer refused to wait for Hirsch's "stamp of approval" on books written by his faculty members before allowing their publication. [101] Hildesheimer acknowledged that he was wounded deeply by Hirsch's failure to approve his seminary, but he would not yield to Hirsch on the issue of Wissenschaft.

On the other hand, Hildesheimer's critiques of the Breslau Seminary indicate that he was not above attacking those persons who used Wissenschaft, in his opinion, perversely. Indeed, one of the major reasons Hildesheimer felt the need to establish a rabbinical school was that "the Children of Israel in Germany will no longer need to request rabbis from the Seminary in Breslau." [102] His opposition to the Breslau Seminary was intractable. When the community of Trier asked him whether it would be permissible to select a Breslau graduate as rabbi of the community, Hildesheimer replied negatively and stated that if a Breslau graduate were selected, then observant Jews should secede from the community. [103] Moreover, Hildesheimer held that religious unity between traditional graduates of the Breslau Seminary and graduates of his own school was impossible because the Breslau Seminary and its faculty were not totally committed "to the words of the Sages and their customs." [104] Breslau graduates did not forbid the buying of gentile wine, nor did they prohibit the purchase of milk which was produced under gentile supervision. They allowed women to appear in public without a head covering. [105]

Breslau graduates were also known to serve Reform congregations and would often compromise, Hildesheimer felt unwisely, on religious principles "for the sake of peace." [106] However, the major reason for Hildesheimer's hatred of the Breslau Seminary was his belief that the fundamental assumption of Judaism was "the Oral Law was given us from the mouth of the Almighty without any intermediary." [107] Consequently, any investigation regarding the historical development of the Oral Law was, in Hildesheimer's view, heretical and scientifically incorrect. [108] While Wissenschaft could and must be employed to investigate the Jewish past, it could not be used to question certain fundamentals of Jewish faith. This position might appear to be self-contradictory, but Hildesheimer obviously did not think it was. He criticized those who misused Wissenschaft, coterminously demanding that Wissenschaft be employed on behalf of Orthodox Judaism.

As a result, Hildesheimer could both defend his own faculty from the attacks of Hirsch and condemn Frankel for his work on the development of the Oral Law. While Hildesheimer respected Frankel's learning, [109] Frankel's Darke Hamishnah, which cast doubt on the notion that all the Oral Law emerged with Moses from Mount Sinai, branded him a heretic and made his seminary an unfit place to train for the rabbinate. Moreover, Hildesheimer's hatred for the religious views of Heinrich Graetz, the famed 19th century Jewish historian and faculty member at the Breslau Seminary, meant that Hildesheimer could "never give his approval"

to the Breslau Seminary.[110] Hildesheimer, while still in Hungary, had severely criticized Graetz for an article he had published in 1864. In it Graetz claimed Isaiah 52 was written by a second Isaiah who lived during the time of Ezra. Moreover, Graetz claimed the "servant of the Lord" passages there referred not to a personal messiah who would arise from the House of David, but to the people Israel. In response to this study, Hildesheimer wrote an article arguing that a basic article of Jewish faith was the belief in the coming of a personal messiah as referred to in the Isaiah passage. To deny this, Hildesheimer stated, was akin to denying God's revelation at Sinai.[111]

Hildesheimer commented on the propriety of Graetz's teaching in a rabbinical seminary:

> Graetz teaches one class there (the Breslau Seminary) in Talmud. What a mockery under the guise of being Judaism. It is an unprecedented disgrace. Anyone who witnesses this needs to overcome a feeling of genuine grief. One sees innocent children being led there to the slaughter, one after another, and they are reduced to a lower level than that of common sinners in Israel. They are made into hypocrites, Jesuits, and heretics just like Graetz, who, as I know from a reliable source, waves the lulav in his hands on Succot as if he were a Hasidic rebbe....[112]

No wonder Hildesheimer boasted:

> For a long time I have had the merit of dissuading youth from going to Breslau to study, for they can only be transformed there into hypocrites and worse.[113]

Finally, to that other institution of Wissenschaft in Germany, the Hochschule fuer die Wissenschaft des Judentums, the Reform rabbinical seminary established by Abraham Geiger in 1872, Hildesheimer applied the words of Psalm 137:7, "Raze

it, raze it to its very foundations." [114] Hildesheimer, then, while advocating the inclusion of Wissenschaft into the notion of Torah im Derekh Eretz, legitimated it only if it served the interests of "authentic," i.e., Orthodox, Judaism. Otherwise he felt its use was perverted and fought its proponents with all the means at his disposal. Indeed, he condemned its practitioners at both the Hochschule and the Breslau Seminary as being cut from the same cloth.

> How little is the real difference between these reformers (the Breslau people) who do their work with silk gloves on their hands and the Reformer Geiger who strikes with a sledgehammer. [115]

The establishment of the Hildesheimer Seminary in 1873 may have legitimated the practice of Wissenschaft among Orthodox Jews. Standards in the Hildesheimer Seminary were clearly high. Its students had to be qualified for entrance into the upper levels of the Gymnasium: competence in rabbinic studies was not enough to qualify a student for admission. [116] Its teachers were first-rate academics who compared favorably with the faculties of the other modern rabbinical seminaries serving German Jewry at that time. Finally, its course of studies was comparable to the course of studies required at the other seminaries. In short, the Hildesheimer Seminary was a rabbinical school of the first rank, equipped to produce modern Orthodox rabbis who could serve German Jewry with distinction. Nevertheless, Wissenschaft clearly did not enjoy the status of Torah. While Hildesheimer viewed Wissenschaft as a necessary stratagem in light of the demands of the day, it was ancillary to Torah.

Hildesheimer's commitment to religious Orthodoxy was absolute, and his view of Torah im Derekh Eretz, as we have seen, confirms this absolute commitment.

IV

Hildesheimer, according to Isaac Unna, believed "that Jews of various nations were organs of the body of one nation." [117] Yet, as a staunch defender of religious Orthodoxy, Hildesheimer was a bitter critic of religious reform and waged an unremitting war against both Reform and the Breslau Seminary. His whole theory of education and his establishment of the Hildesheimer Rabbinical Seminary were dedicated, as we have seen, to the cause of Orthodoxy and its struggle against Reform. This struggle centered around a disagreement as to the very nature of Judaism itself. Indeed, the battle between Reform and Orthodox in the area of education can be seen as symptomatic of this far more basic issue. As the struggle between Reform and Orthodox continued throughout 19th century Germany, the discord between them escalated. Many Orthodox, soon outnumbered in most large communities by adherents of either Geiger or Frankel, felt that their communal needs could not be achieved so long as they remained a minority in general Jewish communities. However, religious voluntarism was not sanctioned in Germany, and all Jews were required by law to pay a tax to the Jewish community. Indeed, the Prussian Jew Law of 1847 raised each Jewish community to the "status of a public body" and required each Jew "to become a member of the community of his place of domicile." [118] The only way to escape this obligation was to convert to Christianity, an

alternative unpalatable to most Jews. [119]

In 1873, however, the Prussian Parliament promulgated a bill, "Concerning Secession From the State Church," which granted to every Christian the right to secede from the State Church without thereby severing connection with Christianity. [120] The passage of this law granted an excellent opportunity for modification of the Prussian Jew Law of 1847. As Salo Baron notes:

> Eduard Lasker, the Jewish leader of the then powerful National Liberal Party, suggested on March 19, 1873, that, in accordance with the general principle of equality of all citizens, the government also be asked to submit a bill on the right of secession from the Jewish community. When a conservative deputy ...objected that the Jewish community would thereby lose a precious privilege safeguarding its unity, Lasker argued that this prerogative, based upon the denial of the liberty of conscience, was a privilegium odiosum and that the Jewish community itself should concur in its removal. The government promised to prepare a bill in due course. [120a.]

Lasker's proposal provoked great controversy within the Jewish community itself. Non-Orthodox Jews and representatives of both the Hochschule and the Breslau Seminary opposed it, claiming it would lead to the destruction of the Jewish community. [121] On the other hand, political liberals and certain Orthodox Jews, notably Samson Raphael Hirsch, labored long and hard on its behalf. Indeed, Hirsch appears to have been the major catalyst behind Lasker's proposal. Taking advantage of the Christian kulturkampf and the dominant general trend that favored religious freedom, Hirsch wrote a pamphlet, "The Principle of Freedom of Conscience...," arguing that

compulsion could not bring a religious community into existence. Hirsch said all Jewish communities had originally been autonomous bodies and only a sense of shared religious duty could bring a community into existence. He concluded:

> The divergence between the religious beliefs of Reform and Orthodoxy is so profound that when an individual publicly secedes he is only giving formal expression to convictions which had long since matured and become perfectly clear to himself. All the institutions and establishments in the care of a community are religious in nature, and they are so intimately bound up with the religious Law that when a man secedes out of religious conviction, no sort of contributions can any longer be required of him. 122

It is not surprising that Hirsch would characterize Judaism in such exclusively religious language. On July 28, 1876, Lasker's bill was passed; the lion's share of the credit for its success must be attributed to Hirsch. The bill stated:

> Every Jew is entitled without severing his religious affiliation, to secede, on account of religious scruples, from the particular community to which he belongs by virtue of a law, custom, or administrative regulation. 123

Though Hildesheimer had denied the right of secession to Reform Jews who wished to secede from the general Jewish community in Halberstadt in 1847, throughout this struggle he both supported Hirsch and urged passage of this law. To the Prussian Chamber of Deputies in 1875 he wrote:

> The gulf between the adherents of traditional Judaism and its religious opponents is at least as deep and wide as in any other religious faith; in fact, it is larger than in most and much bigger than what is permitted by law. 124

Hildesheimer, like Hirsch, believed that compromise involving issues of religious principle was impossible. In light of his previous stances on issues regarding the non-Orthodox world, this is hardly a wonder. After all, he had attacked both the Hochschule and the Breslau Seminary as places of heresy. He attempted to dissuade students from attending the Breslau Seminary even while he lived in Hungary and refused to recognize its graduates as rabbis, urging secession from the general Jewish community if one of its graduates were picked. In addition, Hildesheimer refused to acknowledge the right of Reform Jews to speak on behalf of Judaism. When, in 1883, a group of liberal rabbis issued a circular to counteract the charge that Judaism promulgated an internal and external morality, Hildesheimer explained why Orthodox rabbis could not sign it, offering another memorandum in its stead. [125] Finally, in 1897, the Orthodox rabbis in Germany, under Hildesheimer's direction, seceded from the "general Union of Rabbis in Germany" to form the "Union of Torah-Faithful Rabbis." [126] In short, Hildesheimer refused to cooperate with the liberal rabbis on matters of strictly religious concern.

However, this does not mean that Hildesheimer viewed Judaism solely in religious terms. Indeed, the opposite is true. Alone among 19th century German rabbis, Hildesheimer, in 1886, argued for the reinstitution of Jewish courts and on behalf of the superiority of Jewish civil law, [127] indicating that he was anxious to salvage as much of Jewish communal autonomy as was possible under contemporary conditions.

Moreover, even though he did advocate secession from the general Jewish community on matters of religious dispute, Hildesheimer "never considered secession the ideal; on the contrary, as far as possible, he maintained unity for the idea of 'Klal,' the feeling of solidarity with all Israel." [128] This is borne out by the correspondence between Hirsch and Hildesheimer on the issue of secession.

Hirsch, in a letter to Hildesheimer dated July 6, 1876, assured him that Orthodox Jews would not exploit the secession law. Secession, Hirsch stated, would take place only in rare communities and would occur only on account of substantive religious issues. [129] This letter indicates that Hildesheimer only reluctantly accepted the notion of secession, and Hirsch's obvious attempt to alleviate Hildesheimer's anxieties shows that Hirsch was much more enthusiastic than Hildesheimer over the new law. In addition, Hildesheimer was very disturbed over the opposition to the law expressed by Seligman Baer Bamberger, the "Wuerzburger Rav." Bamberger felt secession from the general Jewish community by Orthodox Jews was legitimated only in the most extreme instances, and he and Hirsch disputed publicly over the issue in an exchange of open letters. [130] While Hildesheimer agreed with Hirsch, he nevertheless wrote:

> This sad matter has distracted me from my work many hours, and it has caused me many sleepless nights in which I have shed many tears. [131]

Hildesheimer refused to comment publicly on the dispute between Bamberger and Hirsch for fear that no beneficial

result could be derived from public comment. [132] Moreover, while he acknowledged that Hirsch had "restored the traditional Judaism of our day to its place of prestige," [133] in a letter to Hirsch he said:

> I do dissent from several passages (in your open letter) directed against Bamberger, which appear to me to be too strong. They make it even less likely for a bridge to be built from your congregation to those who are "secessionists". [134]

Hildesheimer's obvious ambivalence toward secession and its attendant division of the Jewish community as well as his advocacy of the reestablishment of the Jewish court in 1886 indicates that he was not the sectarian that Hirsch was. His greater sense of Klal Yisroel, Jewish solidarity, is reflected in several other actions he took. While Hirsch wrote, "An Orthodox Jew must not consider joining a B'nai B'rith group, for it threatens traditional Judaism," [135] Hildesheimer became an active participant in the Berlin lodge. [136] Moreover, Hirsch noted that Hildesheimer delivered an address at a meeting of the Berlin chapter of the Alliance Israélite Universelle, a Paris-based Jewish educational and charitable organization. Non-Orthodox Jews, including graduates of the Breslau Seminary, were members of the group, and its Paris head, Isaac Crémieux, was not only non-Orthodox, but permitted his wife to have their children baptized. [137] As a result, Hirsch wrote:

> I have absolutely no connection with the Alliance. ...I fail to see how a man imbued with proper Jewish thought can attach himself to a group founded for the sake of a Jewish task, when its founder and administration are completely removed from genuine religious Judaism. ...Indeed, it is

> very painful to me to see an honored name like Dr. Hildesheimer united with the Alliance and the men of the Breslau Seminary.... [138]

Hirsch concluded by stating that this was not the way of the pious men of old who dwelt in Jerusalem and separated themselves absolutely from the rest of the community for the sake of preserving Judaism. A sectarian, Hirsch contended that the Jews in 19th century Germany needed to follow their example.

Hildesheimer disagreed. Replying to Hirsch, Hildesheimer stated that an article published by the famed Eastern European Orthodox rabbi and proto-Zionist Zvi Hirsch Kalischer (1795-1874) on behalf of the Alliance and its charitable activities persuaded him to join. Citing the charitable activities of the Alliance, Hildesheimer wrote, "I feel myself obligated to promote the unity of various Jewish communities." [139] Hildesheimer informed Hirsch that their common opponents delighted in Orthodox isolation, for when groups boycotted by the Orthodox performed positive functions, these opponents were able to claim that the Orthodox were negative and isolationist. This only added to their strength and esteem in the eyes of others. Crémieux was not, in Hildesheimer's view, a fit representative of Judaism, but Hildesheimer closed by stating that Jews were still obligated to join the Alliance because of the positive functions it performed. [140] Not only is Hildesheimer's stronger sense of solidarity with the Jewish people revealed here, but, once more, it is obvious that he and Hirsch disagreed as to the best tactics to serve Orthodoxy's cause in the modern world.

Hildesheimer reveals his moderate approach to the problem of Orthodox cooperation with the non-Orthodox Jewish world in another episode resulting in correspondence between Hildesheimer and Hirsch. Hirsch charged that Hildesheimer, by receiving in his home a Rabbi Ungerleider who had come to discuss plans for a rabbinical union between Orthodox and non-Orthodox rabbis in Germany, had committed "an offense against the holiness and truth of our cause." [141] Hildesheimer simply dismissed Hirsch's complaint, and while he had no intention of sanctioning such a union, he thought that to deny seeing Ungerleider would have demonstrated a real lack of common decency (derekh eretz). [142] Indeed, Hildesheimer had friendships with several non-observant Jews, and his correspondence demonstrates that even when he was vitriolic in his denunciation of his opponents' religious views, he was careful to distinguish between the person and the person's views. [143]

Hildesheimer's openness to dealing with non-observant Jews on matters of common communal concern is demonstrated most clearly by an incident involving Heinrich Graetz and the establishement of an orphanage in Jerusalem. In 1872, Graetz and two companions, one of whom, Gottschalk Lewy, was a friend of Hildesheimer's, went to Israel and toured the entire land. Upon their return, the three men issued a report describing the depressed economic and social condition of the Jewish settlement. [144] Particularly disturbing to Hildesheimer was their report concerning the number of

orphans who were entirely neglected, both spiritually and physically, by the existing Jewish communities in Israel. Hildesheimer had long toiled on behalf of the Jewish settlement in Israel and had raised significant funds to support it throughout his career.[145] As early as 1858 he and his brother-in-law, Joseph Hirsch, had established the "Society for the Support of Eretz Yisroel," which aided the inhabitants of the Land of Israel both spiritually and physically. Their major activity was to supply housing for Jews living in the Old City of Jerusalem so that they would not have to be dependent on help from Christian missionaries.

Hildesheimer's strong attachment to the "Land of his Fathers" was reflected even more visibly in 1882. At a Berlin meeting of Jewish representatives gathered from all over the world to deal with the problem of Russian Jewish refugees fleeing from the 1881 pogroms, Hildesheimer was the only delegate to recommend that the stream of refugees be directed toward Israel, not America. He wrote in 1885, "America or Palestine -- on religious grounds I plead for Palestine."[146] Hildesheimer's relationship with Palestine is reflected even more clearly in a letter he wrote in 1894:

> Israel is our homeland and--especially during a time of antisemitism--our only hope.[147]

Hildesheimer's strong feelings for Israel caused him to be disturbed deeply by Graetz's report, and he wholeheartedly supported Graetz's suggestion that an orphanage be established to ensure proper care for these youngsters. In a memorandum circulated in December, 1872, Hildesheimer called for the immediate establishment of these orphanages in Israel.

Because he distrusted the means of distribution used by the rabbis in Israel, Hildesheimer advocated placing the administration of the orphanages in the hands of a committee located in Europe, which, in turn, would appoint a local committee in Israel to administer the orphanage. Finally, in accordance with Graetz's suggestion, Hildesheimer stated that while the education of these youths would be based upon "the Holy Torah," secular subjects would be added to the curriculum to ensure that these youngsters would be able to lead an independent life. [148] As Hildesheimer stated:

> A radiant picture of Jerusalem stands as an ideal before my eyes, ...an upright loyal generation of which one may justly be proud, imbued with deep and real religious feeling, and equipped with indispensable secular knowledge. By their peace-loving and blameless conduct they are to uphold the honor of Jerusalem. The average individual shall have a sound knowledge of Bible and Talmud. ...They should earn their living by their own toil, by craftmanship or trade which is properly learnt and honestly exercised. Such a generation is the high ideal towards which all friends of Zion and Jerusalem should strive with all the fibers of their being. [149]

Hildesheimer's vision had its opponents, however. Indeed, the rabbis in Israel were adamant in their critique of Hildesheimer's proposed orphanage and his educational theory of Torah im Derekh Eretz. Just as the extremists in Hungary had opposed this policy a few years earlier, so now Hildesheimer's critics foresaw his proposed course of studies for the orphanage desecrating the sanctity of the Holy Land. Hildesheimer replied that the world was changing, and "the need for this knowledge grows every day." [150] The

only remedy for the situation, in Hildesheimer's opinion, was to "educate the children according to Torah im Derekh Eretz." [151] Once more, the salvific power which Hildesheimer ascribed to Torah im Derekh Eretz is evident.

Hildesheimer's proposal was opposed not only by pre-modern rabbis living in Israel, but also by every other Orthodox rabbi in Europe.[152] The reason for this opposition was not based upon the merit of Hildesheimer's plan, but upon the fact that the "heretic Heinrich Graetz" had first proposed it. [153] As Hirsch wrote to Hildesheimer:

> I feel myself obligated to inform you... that the idea to establish an orphanage in Israel both to rescue the orphans from the hands of the missionaries and to raise the level of culture is the idea of Graetz. Already this proposal has resulted in an exchange of letters between the committee in Amsterdam (which administered European funds collected on behalf of the Jewish settlement in Palestine) and men of reputation in Jerusalem. I feel I am not violating a trust by sending you copies of these letters in order for you to look at them, only please return them to me. As you can see from looking at them, Graetz's total assessment is fundamentally a lie. [154]

Moreover, Hirsch claimed that he was personally unfamiliar with the situation in Israel and would side with the rabbis resident in Israel (as opposed to Graetz) about the true situation there. "A man like this (Graetz)," Hirsch concluded, "is not fit to be trusted by us, especially when his words are opposed by the clear declarations of sages." [155]

Hildesheimer refused to accept Hirsch's reasons for not aiding him in his program for Israel. As for the excuse of ignorance Hirsch had offered, Hildesheimer said that employing such an excuse to avoid sending aid to Israel was

tantamount "to throwing out the baby with the bathwater." [156] In letters to rabbinical authorities throughout Europe, Hildesheimer reconfirmed his opinion that Graetz was a heretic. No one, he stated, had fought Graetz and his heresy as adamantly as he. [157] Yet, Hildesheimer wrote:

> A grave situation has arisen in opposition to my program among circles who do not wish to distinguish between the heresies of Graetz and his reports regarding established facts in our times; and there are great dangers bound up with this approach. [158]

Hildesheimer felt it essential to distinguish between a man's religious views and other aspects of his being. Though a man such as Graetz might hold, in Hildesheimer's opinion, despicable religious beliefs injurious to the continuity of Judaism, Hildesheimer did not believe that one should therefore totally isolate oneself from such a person. Here the contrast between Hirsch and Hildesheimer and their respective brands of modern Orthodoxy is fully manifest. Hildesheimer thought Graetz correct and, as he put it, "The truth is the truth, even if it be on the side of our opponents." [159] Hildesheimer's proposed orphanage never achieved fruition, and ultimately he abandoned his efforts on its behalf. Nevertheless, this episode, as well as his activity on behalf of the Land of Israel and his participation in the Alliance, indicates that his brand of Judaism was significantly different from Hirsch's, and that he had a very real and strong sense of both the Jewish people and their religion.

V

This brief study has demonstrated that Esriel Hildesheimer enunciated a distinct vision of Jewish Neo-Orthodoxy, one which accommodated modernity. A perceptive man, Hildesheimer realized that Wissenschaft and secular learning were items Orthodoxy had to embody if traditional Judaism was to survive in the modern world. The modern world could not be turned back, and Judaism had to accommodate itself to the modern spirit. Weapons such as excommunication and vitriolic public attacks against heretics, which had been so effective in the ghetto, were no longer viable if Judaism was to continue in the modern world. Consequently, Hildesheimer discarded them.

Yet, Hildesheimer was a traditionalist who was unyielding on issues he felt might compromise his religious beliefs. This religious traditionalism informed his stance on secession and, in addition, caused Hildesheimer to participate in both secular and charitable activities with his fellow Jews, even when they were non-Orthodox. Moreover, this love for both the Land and people of Israel, as well as his call for reinstitution of the Jewish court, indicate that Hildesheimer advanced a type of Neo-Orthodoxy which attempted to retain as much of the old communal-national tone of medieval Judaism as was possible in a radically changed social era.

In short, Hildesheimer seems to have been both genuinely conscious of and informed by the values of pre-modern Judaism. In addition, he was sensitive to the demands of modernity. Hildesheimer was aware that the struggle of Judaism to retain its integrity in the changed social and political milieu of

the 19th century was an intense and difficult one. Yet, by refusing to adopt a sectarian stance, Hildesheimer carved out a vision which permitted modern Orthodoxy to meet the challenge of modernity.

FOOTNOTES

1. Jacob Katz, Out of the Ghetto (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), p. 1.

2. Laurence J. Silberstein, "Historical Sociology and Jewish Historiography," Journal of the American Academy of Religion, XIII (December, 1974), p.692.

3. Joseph L. Blau, Modern Varieties of Judaism (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966).

4. Salo W. Baron, "Ghetto and Emancipation," Menorah Journal, XIV (1928), pp. 515-26.

5. David Landes, The Unbound Prometheus (London: Cambridge University Press, 1969).

6. Katz, Tradition and Crisis (New York: Schocken, 1971); and Gershom Scholem, The Messianic Idea In Judaism (New York: Schocken, 1971). Especially consult his essays, "The Crisis of Tradition in Jewish Messianism," and "Redemption Through Sin," which are contained in that volume. Scholem writes, "The Sabbatian 'believers' ...represent the extreme consequence to which a Messianic crisis of tradition, erupting in the very heart of Judaism, could lead. The old mystical Kabbalistic symbols in which the crisis was formulated disappeared. What remained was a wild revolt against the old traditions...", p. 77.

7. Silberstein, "Historical Sociology and Jewish Historiography," p. 693.

8. The term, "semi-neutral," which is used to describe the nature of 19th century Western European society is taken from Katz, Out of the Ghetto, pp. 42-50.

9. Blau, Modern Varieties of Judaism, p.26.

10. Ibid., p. 13.

11. Only two academic articles, both by Eliav and both in Hebrew, have appeared on Hildesheimer. In addition, only one English article, hagiographic in tone, has been written on him. For a selected list of other secondary articles, primarily hagiographic, on Hildesheimer, see bibliography at the end of this paper, as well as Mordechai Eliav, ed., Rabbiner Esriel Hildesheimer Briefe (Jerusalem, 1965), pp. 284-5. Hereafter referred to as Hildesheimer Briefe.

12. Mordechai Eliav, Jewish Education In Germany During The Era Of Haskalah and Emancipation (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Sivan Press, 1960), p. 159 and pp. 227-239.

13. Meir Hildesheimer, ed., "The Rabbi and His Student," (Hebrew) HaMaayan (1972), p. 41.

14. Ibid.

15. Mordechai Eliav, "Torah im Derekh Eretz in Hungary," (Hebrew) Sinai (1962), p. 128.

16. M. Hildesheimer, ed., "The Rabbi and His Student," p. 41.

17. Ibid., p. 40.

18. Ibid.

19. Ibid.

20. Isaac Unna, "Ezriel (sic) Hildesheimer," in Leo Jung, ed., Jewish Leaders (New York: 1953), p. 218.

21. Meir Hildesheimer, "Contributions Towards A Portrait of Esriel Hildesheimer," (Hebrew) Sinai (1964), p. 69. Hereafter referred to as "Contributions Towards A Portrait."

22. Cited by Zvi Benjamin Urbach, "A Biography of Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer in His Hometown of Halberstadt," Festschrift For Yehiel Jacob Weinberg (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: 1969), p. 232. Hereafter referred to as "Hildesheimer In Halberstadt."

23. Ibid., p. 231.

24. M. Hildesheimer, "Contributions Towards a Portrait," p. 70.

25. Ibid., p. 71.

26. Cited in Ibid., p. 72.

27. For this distinction between the views of Hildesheimer and Hirsch, see Mordechai Eliav, "Rabbi Hildesheimer and His Influence on Hungarian Jewry," (Hebrew) Zion (1962), pp. 84-86. For a fuller exposition of Hirsch's views on Torah im Derekh Eretz, see Noah Rosenbloom, Tradition In An Age of Reform (Philadelphia: 1976), pp. 351-353.

28. Cited in M. Hildesheimer, "Contributions Towards A Portrait," p. 72.

29. Azriel Hildesheimer, ed., "Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer On Zacherias Frankel and the Jewish Theological Seminary in Breslau." (Hebrew), HaMaayan (1953), p. 65. Hereafter referred to as "Hildesheimer On Frankel."

30. Urbach, "Hildesheimer In Halberstadt," pp. 234-5.

31. Herman Schwab, The History Of Orthodox Jewry In Germany, translated by Irene R. Birnbaum (London: 1950), p. 50.

32. Eliav, ed., Hildesheimer Briefe, p. 17 (Hebrew Section). Also cited in M. Hildesheimer, "Contributions Towards A Portrait," p. 73.

33. Esriel Hildesheimer, Responsa, Vol. I (Tel-Aviv: 1969), pp. 11-14.

34. Eliav, "Rabbi Hildesheimer and His Influence on Hungarian Jewry," p. 61.

35. Ibid.

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid.

38. Eliav, "Torah im Derekh Eretz In Hungary," p. 139.

39. Ibid., p. 129.

40. Ibid.

41. Cited in, Ibid., p. 133.

42. Cited in, Ibid., p. 129.

43. Ibid., p. 140.

44. Ibid., pp. 136-39.

45. Ibid., p. 135.

46. Ibid., p. 139.

47. Cited in, Ibid., p. 138

48. Cited in Isaiah Wolfsberg, "Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer and Rabbi David Hoffman," (Hebrew) Sinai (1944), p. 70.

49. Cited in Eliav, "Torah im Derekh Eretz In Hungary," p. 133.

50. Cited in, Ibid.

51. Cited in M. Hildesheimer, "Contributions Towards A Portrait," p. 76.

52. Eliav, "Torah im Derekh Eretz In Hungary," p. 132.

53. Ibid.

54. Cited in, Ibid., p.130. Calvary also reports in her "Kindheitserinnerungen," Bulletin des Leo Baeck Instituts (1959), p. 187, that Hildesheimer enjoyed singing German operas with his children on Saturday afternoons after the Sabbath meal and before students would come to visit.

55. Jacob Katz, "Contributions Towards A Biography of the Hatam Sofer," (Hebrew) In Studies In Honor of Gershom Scholem (Jerusalem: 1967).

56. M. Hildesheimer, "Contributions Towards A Portrait," p. 76.

57. Eliav, "Torah im Derekh Eretz In Hungary," p. 130.

58. Cited in Eliav, "Rabbi Hildesheimer and His Influence On Hungarian Jewry," p. 72.

59. Cited in, Ibid., p. 73.

60. Azriel Hildesheimer, ed., "An Exchange of Letters Between Esriel Hildesheimer and Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch On Matters Relating to the Land of Israel," (Hebrew) HaMaayan (1954), p. 42. Hereafter cited as "Hildesheimer and Hirsch On Israel."

61. Esriel Hildesheimer, Rabbiner Dr. I. Hildesheimer: Gesammelte Aufsätze, Meir Hildesheimer, ed. (Frankfurt, 1923), p. 26. Hereafter cited as Gesammelte Aufsätze.

62. Ibid., p. 13.

63. Cited in Eliav, "Rabbi Hildesheimer and His Influence On Hungarian Jewry," p. 76.

64. Gesammelte Aufsätze, p. 27.

65. Ibid.

66. Ibid.

67. In a conversation I had with Mrs. Martin Lederman, a native of Frankfurt who was raised in the Separatist Orthodox community there, she told me of the Hildesheimer synagogue in Berlin.

68. Gesammelte Aufsätze, p. 19.

69. Eliav, "Rabbi Hildesheimer and His Influence On Hungarian Jewry," p. 77.

70. Eliav, ed., Hildesheimer Briefe, p. 28 and 88 (Hebrew Section).

71. Ibid., p. 47 and pp. 96-97 (Hebrew Section). Also see Hildesheimer's letter to Hirsch Plato, pp. 230-31, in the German Section, where he similarly attacks Orthodox extremists who employ the weapon of excommunication in the 19th century.

72. Cited in Eliav, "Rabbi Hildesheimer and His Influence On Hungarian Jewry," p. 72.

73. Ibid.

74. Israelit (1864), p. 358.

75. Meir Hildesheimer ed., "Rabbi Judah Assad and Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer," (Hebrew) Festschrift for Yehiel Jacob Weinberg, p. 293.

76. Eliav, ed., Hildesheimer Briefe, p. 36 (Hebrew Section).

77. Ibid., p. 34.

78. M. Hildesheimer, ed., "Assad and Hildesheimer," p. 295.

79. Ibid., p. 296.

80. Ibid., pp. 296-97.

81. Ibid., p. 301.

82. Cited in Eliav, "Rabbi Hildesheimer and His Influence On Hungarian Jewry," p. 74.

83. Ibid., pp. 74ff.

84. Eliav, "Torah im Derekh Eretz In Hungary," p.140.

85. Ibid., p. 141.

86. Meir Hildesheimer, ed., "Writings Regarding the Founding of the Berlin Rabbinical Seminary," (Hebrew) HaMaayan (1974), p. 14.

87. Cited in M. Hildesheimer, "Contributions Towards A Portrait," p. 81.

88. Cited in, Ibid., pp. 80-1.

89. M. Hildesheimer, ed., "Writings Regarding the Founding of the Berlin Rabbinical Seminary," p. 22.

90. Ibid., p. 24.

91. Ibid., pp. 29-30.

92. Ibid., p. 16.

93. Ibid., p. 17.

94. Azriel Hildesheimer, ed., "A Selection of Letters Between Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer and Samson Raphael Hirsch and His Supporters," (Hebrew) Yad Shaul (Tel-Aviv: 1953), p. 241. Hirsch Hildesheimer, writing to Emmanuel Schwarzschild, a Frankfurt banker and supporter of Samson Raphael Hirsch, stated, "Everything I have written is only the opinion of my father who transmitted it to me exactly." Hereafter cited as "Letters Between Hildesheimer and Hirsch."

95. Cited in Schwab, The History of Orthodox Jewry in Germany, p. 54.

96. A. Hildesheimer, ed., "Letters Between Hildesheimer and Hirsch," p. 242.

97. Ibid.

98. Ibid.

99. Ibid.

100. Ibid., p. 244.

101. Ibid., p. 245.

102. M. Hildesheimer, ed., "Writings Regarding the Founding of the Berlin Rabbinical Seminary," p. 29.

103. A. Hildesheimer, ed., "Hildesheimer on Frankel," p. 69.

104. Ibid.

105. Ibid., p. 71.

106. Ibid., p. 72.

107. Ibid., p. 71.

108. Ibid., p. 79.

109. Ibid., p. 72.

110. Ibid. Hildesheimer wrote, "So long as Graetz remains in the institution, we will never give our approval to the students educated there."

111. M. Hildesheimer, "Contributions Towards A Portrait," p. 78.

112. A. Hildesheimer, ed., "Hildesheimer on Frankel," pp. 68-69.

113. Ibid.

114. M. Hildesheimer, ed., "Writings Regarding the Founding of the Berlin Rabbinical Seminary," p. 13.

115. A. Hildesheimer, ed., "Hildesheimer on Frankel," p. 66.

116. M. Hildesheimer, ed., "Writings Regarding the Founding of the Berlin Rabbinical Seminary," pp. 20, 25, 26, 32, 33.

117. Isaac Unna, "Ezriel (sic) Hildesheimer," p. 227.

118. Schwab, History of Orthodox Jewry in Germany, p. 60.

119. Salo Baron, "Freedom and Constraint in the Jewish Community," in Essays and Studies in Memory of Linda R. Miller, ed. by Israel Davidson (New York: 1938)p. 12.

120. Schwab, History of Orthodox Jewry in Germany, p. 66.

120a. Baron, "Freedom and Constraint in the Jewish Community," pp. 12-13.

121. Ibid., p. 14. For a fuller discussion of this whole matter against the background of the times, see Uriel Tal, Christians and Jews In Germany: Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich, 1870-1914, translated by Noah Jacobs (Ithaca: Cornell Press, 1975), Chapter 2.

122. Schwab, History of Orthodox Jewry in Germany, pp. 68-9.

123. Quoted in Baron, "Freedom and Constraint in the Jewish Community," p. 15.

124. Eliav, ed., Hildesheimer Briefe, p. 109 (German Section).

125. Ibid., pp. 195-97. Also see Ismar Schorsch, Jewish Reaction to German Anti-Semitism, 1870-1914 (New York: 1972), p. 73.

126. Schwab, The History of Orthodox Jewry in Germany, pp. 95-6.

127. Gesammelte Aufsätze, "Das biblisch-talmudische Recht."

128. Isaac Unna, "Ezriel (sic) Hildesheimer," p. 226.

129. A. Hildesheimer, ed., "Letters Between Hildesheimer and Hirsch," p. 236.

130. Ibid., pp. 236-238. Also see Schwab, The History of Orthodox Jewry in Germany, Chapter 9.

131. Ibid., p. 238.

132. Ibid.

133. Ibid., p. 233.

134. Ibid., p. 240.

135. Quoted by Isaac Heineman, "Rabbi Marcus Horovitz," in Jewish Leaders, Leo Jung, ed., p. 263.

136. Ibid.

137. A. Hildesheimer, ed., "Hildesheimer and Hirsch on Israel," p. 50.

138. Ibid., pp. 48-9.

139. Ibid., p. 49.

140. Ibid., p. 50.

141. Eliav, ed., Hildesheimer Briefe, p. 199 (German Section).

142. Ibid.

143. See Schorsch, Jewish Reactions to German Anti-Semitism, 1870-1914, p. 35, where he describes Hildesheimer's friendship with Samuel Kristeller, a non-observant Jew. Also note his attitude toward Graetz as described below, pp. 41-5.

144. This report is found in J. Meisl, Heinrich Graetz (Berlin: 1917), pp. 101-105, and 142-151. A Hebrew translation is found in Shmuel Ettinger, ed., Heinrich Graetz (Jerusalem: 1969), pp. 277-285.

145. M. Hildesheimer, "Contributions Towards a Portrait," p. 84.

146. Eliav, ed., Hildesheimer Briefe, p. 205.

147. Ibid., p. 244.

148. A. Hildesheimer, ed., "Hildesheimer and Hirsch on Israel," p. 41.

149. Quoted by Isaac Unna, "Ezriel (sic) Hildesheimer," pp. 228-29.

150. Eliav, ed., Hildesheimer Briefe, p. 54 (Hebrew Section).

151. Ibid., p. 52.

152. A. Hildesheimer, ed., "Hildesheimer and Hirsch on Israel," p. 42.

153. Ibid., p. 44.

154. Ibid., p. 45.

155. Ibid.

156. Ibid., p. 51.

157. Eliav, ed., Hildesheimer Briefe, pp. 90-1 (German Section).

158. A. Hildesheimer, ed., "Hildesheimer and Hirsch on Israel," p. 44.

159. Eliav, ed., "Hildesheimer Briefe, p. 48 (Hebrew Section).

PRIMARY SOURCES

Calvary, E. "Kindheitserinnerungen." Bulletin des Leo Baeck Instituts, 1959, pp. 187-192.

Eliav, Mordechai, ed. Rabbiner Esriel Hildesheimer Briefe. (Hebrew and German). Jerusalem, 1965.

Ettinger, Shmuel, ed. Heinrich Graetz. Jerusalem, 1969.

Hildesheimer, Azriel, ed. "An Exchange of Letters Between Esriel Hildesheimer and Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch on Matters Relating to the Land of Israel," (Hebrew). HaMaayan, 1954, pp. 41-52.

_____. "Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer on Zacherias Frankel and the Jewish Theological Seminary in Breslau," (Hebrew). HaMaayan, 1953, pp. 65-73.

_____. "A Selection of Letters Between Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer and Samson Raphael Hirsch and His Supporters," (Hebrew). Yad Shaul. Tel-Aviv, 1953, pp. 233-251.

Hildesheimer, Esriel. Responsa. Tel-Aviv, 1969.

Hildesheimer, Meir, ed. "Rabbi Judah Assad and Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer," (Hebrew). Festschrift for Yehiel Jacob Weinberg. Jerusalem, 1969, pp 285-302.

_____. "The Rabbi and His Student: Rabbi Jacob Ettlinger and Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer," (Hebrew). HaMaayan, 1972, pp. 40-48.

_____. "Writings Regarding the Founding of the Berlin Rabbinical Seminary," (Hebrew). HaMaayan, 1974, pp. 12-37.

_____. Rabbiner Dr. I. Hildesheimer: Gesammelte Aufsätze. Frankfurt/M, 1923.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Baron, Salo W. "Freedom and Constraint in the Jewish Community." In Essays and Studies in Memory of Linda R. Miller. Edited by Israel Davidson. New York, 1938.

_____. "Ghetto and Emancipation." Menorah Journal, XIV (1928), pp. 515-526.

Blau, Joseph L. Modern Varieties of Judaism. New York, 1966.

Eliav, Mordechai. Jewish Education in Germany During the Era of Haskalah and Emancipation (Hebrew). Jerusalem, 1960.

_____. "Rabbi Hildesheimer and His Influence on Hungarian Jewry," (Hebrew). Zion (1962), pp. 59-86.

_____. "Torah im Derekh Eretz in Hungary," (Hebrew). Sinai (1962), pp. 127-142.

Heineman, Isaac. "Rabbi Marcus Horovitz." In Jewish Leaders. Edited by Leo Jung, New York, 1953.

Hildesheimer, Meir. "Contributions Towards a Portrait of Esriel Hildesheimer," (Hebrew). Sinai (1964), pp. 67-94.

Katz, Jacob. Out of the Ghetto. Cambridge, 1965.

_____. Tradition and Crisis. New York, 1971.

_____. "Contributions Towards a Biography of the Hatam Sofer," (Hebrew). In Studies In Honor of Gershom Scholem. Jerusalem, 1967.

Landes, David. The Unbound Prometheus. London, 1969.

Rosenbloom, Noah. Tradition In An Age of Reform. Philadelphia, 1976.

Scholem, Gershom. The Messianic Idea in Judaism. New York, 1971.

Schorsch, Ismar. Jewish Reactions to German Anti-Semitism, 1870-1914. New York, 1972.

Schwab, Herman. The History of Orthodox Jewry in Germany. Translated by Irene Birnbaum. London, 1950.

Silberstein, Laurence J. "Historical Sociology and Jewish Historiography." Journal of the American Academy of Religion, XIII (December, 1974), pp. 692-699.

Tal, Uriel. Christians and Jews in Germany: Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich. Ithica, 1975.

Unna, Isaac. "Esriel Hildesheimer." In Jewish Leaders. Edited by Leo Jung. New York, 1953.

Urbach, Zvi Benjamin. "A Biography of Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer in His Hometown of Halberstadt," (Hebrew). Festschrift for Yehiel Jacob Weinberg. Jerusalem, 1969.

Wolfsberg, Isaiah. "Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer and Rabbi David Hoffman," (Hebrew). Sinai (1944), pp. 65-74.