

Statement by Referee of Master's Thesis

The M.H.L. dissertation entitled:

"Abraham Geiger as Reformer and Theologian, First Phase,  
as Presented in Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift fuer  
Juedische Theologie"

written by Wolfgang Hamburger

(name of student)

1) may (with revisions) be considered for  
publication ( X )

cannot be considered for publication ( )

2) may, on request, be loaned by the Library ( X )

may not be loaned by the Library ( )

Samuel S. Cohon  
(signature of referee)

Samuel S. Cohon

(referee)

February 17 '52  
(date)

Mic. 9/78

## Digest.

This thesis is based on the six volumes of the Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift fuer juedische Theologie. Geiger's contributions to this periodical have been utilized to show his work as a reformer and theologian. After the introduction describing events and personalities of the time between Mendelssohn and Geiger, a biographical sketch of Geiger leads up to the two most important factors which determined Geiger's whole work: the scientific approach to history and the awakening of patriotism among the Jews of Germany.

As every reform begins with a criticism, it is necessary to discuss Geiger's criticism of the various trends and personalities in contemporary Judaism. This criticism was directed against both sides, against the right wing radicals whom he called idolaters of forms, and against the left wing radicals who, in their indifference toward Judaism, hampered the development, as Geiger wanted it, not less than rigid and thoughtless Orthodoxy. Geiger advocated a constant development in line with the historical growth of Judaism.

Geiger's theological concepts were shaped by one basic idea, namely that Judaism is becoming a denomination as are Protestantism and Catholicism. Judaism a denomination was the result of the political changes Europe had undergone as well as the consequence of a new thinking. Necessarily the

universalistic aspects of Judaism were stressed while the particularistic elements were eliminated. The nature of the Jewish denomination in Geiger's concept was a universalistic-rationalistic-ethical one.

Geiger's theological concepts were rather radical. How far did he go in his practical applications? Here the difference has been pointed out which exists between theological ideas and practical reforms. As a reformer Geiger was no radical. He was a defender of unity within the congregations. This desire for unity compelled him to be cautious in his reforms. Consequently, he spoke always of a long development, of the unfinished.

In the last chapter his views on the dietary laws and his prayer book have been discussed to illustrate the range of his reforms.

Abraham Geiger as Reformer and Theologian,  
First Phase, as Presented in  
Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift fuer Juedische Theologie  
by  
Wolfgang Hamburger

Submitted in partial fulfill-  
ment of the requirements for  
the Master of Hebrew Letters  
Degree and Ordination.

Hebrew Union College-  
Jewish Institute of Religion  
Cincinnati, Ohio  
January, 1952

Referee:  
Professor Samuel S. Cohon

## Contents.

Introduction. From Mendelssohn to Geiger	1
I. Abraham Geiger, his life and his intellectual environment	13
II. Criticism	25
III. Theological concepts	43
IV. Reforms	63
V. Dietary laws and prayer book	84
Notes	92
Bibliography	101

## Introduction

### From Mendelssohn to Geiger

Goethe said in his "Faust": "Was du ererbt von deinen Vaetern hast, erwirb es, um es zu besitzen." This sage utterance reveals the secret of the manifold movements in mankind's history and the source of human progress and advancement. Man's constant striving for making the values of the past his own possession and for blending them with the achievements of his own time prevent him from becoming a radical in either sense. He will not attempt to adhere to the results of yesterday's thinking slavishly and to keep them like items of a museum, which do not exert any influence upon his life, nor will he discard the work of former generations completely and follow the way of his own imagination. He who accepts Goethe's advice as the maxim of his labors represents the ideal personality with an understanding for the heritage which has been handed down to him and with a clear vision for the opportunities and necessities as how to utilize it for his own endeavors.

Abraham Geiger was such an ideal personality. As a theologian he labored for the possession ~~of the possession~~ of the Jewish heritage, and as a reformer he sought the way that would lead from a Jewish past into a Jewish future. He has been acclaimed the father of the Reform movement in Judaism. It was he who headed a generation of reformers by which the true significance of the Reform movement was set forth and established on the basis of historical research and logical development.<sup>1</sup> Though other sporadic attempts preceded Geiger's, he was the

first to be successful, yet not without fighting and suffering for his cause. And, above all, he was the first to enter the arena of public life and leave it with unchanged general attitudes, principles, and aims. With the high ideals of a reformer he came to his first congregation; forty-two years later, after a hard day of scientific work and preparation for the opening fall semester at the liberal Lehranstalt fuer die Wissenschaft des Judentums, at which he taught, he died while in his sleep.<sup>2</sup> As reform Jews we are greatly indebted to this "Pioneer and Leader of the Reform Movement in Judaism." It is the purpose of this study to observe the young Geiger in unfolding his theories and giving them concrete expression in practical life. As the result of our research we may not only hope for an understanding of our indebtedness but also expect a hint for the direction in which we have to proceed.

Geiger had his forerunners who prepared the ground on which he could build. Though Reform in Judaism is not an absolutely new phenomenon,<sup>3</sup> the beginnings of modern Reform can be traced to Moses Mendelssohn's time. From Mendelssohn to Geiger, a number of attempts were made to solve the great problem of the new time. We can see distinctly how each generation approached the task in its own way, influenced and guided by the fast changing spirit of the time. These attempts were made mainly on three levels: in the field of learning, of historical and scientific research, and the religious service. The fact that Geiger succeeded in welding them into a harmonious, inseparable unity gave his work a value which never has lost the directness of its influence.

The problem with which the Jews have ever been confronted since the days of Mendelssohn was not recognized by all of them immediately. But the understanding of it spread more and more among them as the new situation took on ever sharper and more distinct contours. Reform and Orthodox Jews began to share this understanding; the liberal Abraham Geiger found in the orthodox Samson Raphael Hirsch his counterpart to the extent that they both undertook it to solve the problem, each one on the ground of his own philosophy and theology.

The problem was: how can the Jew live in his German environment, as a part of this environment, and yet remain a faithful Jew? Never before had this question presented itself to the Jews in Germany. They were not a part of their environment, but lived a life completely of their own. Every form of individual and communal life was Jewish, based on the tradition or derived from it. Whatever influences penetrated the ghetto, Jewish thought and emotion were strong enough to absorb them. The Jewish as well as the Christian world were Einheitskulturen.<sup>4</sup> Their nature was a religious one, bearing the imprint of Judaism and Christianity. As in the one realm neither a thought could be expressed nor an action be performed without being in harmony with the principles of Judaism, even so the other realm was Christian in the totality of human existence.

But the eighteenth century witnessed a drastic change; the Einheitskulturen broke down. The natural sciences and philosophy were emancipated from the tutelage of the Church. Man began to think, search, and explore without heeding the Church's



dogmatic system. Reason, which had been oppressed and distorted, became the foundation of a new outlook. The period of Enlightenment began. The ideals of reason, tolerance, and humanity were proclaimed. One was convinced that by reason every difficulty could be solved, every misunderstanding removed, and every barrier broken down. The ill will toward the stranger turned slowly into an interest in him. A century later, there developed out of this interest the comparative studies in the various fields of national civilizations. The eighteenth century is inscribed in the annals of Western European history as a time of optimism, happiness, and cosmopolitan atmosphere.

Moses Mendelssohn was a child of this time, the most powerful spokesman of the Enlightenment at the time of its decline. He was the first Jew in Berlin to gain fame and respect even in non-Jewish circles all over Western Europe. As a philosopher he was important to his contemporaries; as the one who discovered and paved the way to European culture for his Jewish coreligionists, he erected for himself a lasting memorial among the Jewish people. Mendelssohn was a reformer in so far as his Jewish work was concerned. His was a reform of education. He himself had experienced the transition from the mediæval system of Jewish education in the cheder to the broader fields of general learning after his arrival in Berlin. That every Jew shared the knowledge of Europe, was his aim. Mendelssohn realized that only by speaking the language of the country would the Jews come into a closer contact with their environment. His translation of the Pentateuch and the Psalms into German

enabled the Jews in Germany to learn the German language. Though the orthodox group denounced this work, it served many as the stepping stone to more adventures in science and philosophy. From the Jewish traditional point of view Mendelssohn was a revolutionary, but, taking the trend of his time into consideration, we must admit that the sage of Berlin did no more than utilize for his own people the high ideals which were generally accepted. In one of the most important writings of this period, in Lessing's "Die Erziehung des Menschengeschlechtes", we find the key to Mendelssohn's interest in learning and education. There we read: "What education does for the individual, revelation does for all of mankind. Education is revelation which <sup>has been</sup> ~~is~~ given and is being given to humanity."<sup>5</sup> It was only natural that a desire for more knowledge went hand in hand with the admiration for reason and understanding. Without the former the latter could not exist. This period had its Locke, Hume, and Voltaire, but also its Rousseau and Pestalozzi.

By accepting the challenge of a new type of education for himself and his coreligionists, Mendelssohn took advantage of a great opportunity. And yet, this move created the problem of harmonizing the Jewish tradition with modern Europe. Though we spoke of Mendelssohn's German translation of the Pentateuch and the Psalms, one must not forget that every thought was European in scope. Nationalism was yet unknown, Fichte still to come. German ideals were European ideals and vice versa. One could speak of the international of the educated classes as a fact. Voltaire was at home in Paris as well as Potsdam.

He and Rousseau spent some years in London. Frederick the Second of Prussia spoke French even when he was not engaged in state affairs. The American Revolution fructified the soil on which the French Revolution ripened. Though less than a generation later a reaction destroyed the practical achievements of 1789 and the following years, the ideals could not be quenched. They were strong enough to prevail upon the authorities to be gradually accepted by them in the course of the nineteenth century.

Mendelssohn entered the arena of European culture, but he did not solve the problem. He did not even recognize it. To characterize him, one may well use a quotation by Goethe. "Two souls, alas!, dwell in my breast." Remaining a Stockjude, that is to say a Jew who lives most faithfully the traditional way of Jewish life, he became a European in so far as education was concerned. Peacefully did the two souls live in his breast. One was not emphasized at the expense of the other. In the generation after him many men and women could not understand this type of harmony which was sustained by a sharp division. Not a few solved the problem in their way by taking to baptism. This, however, was not a desirable solution for those whose loyalty to Judaism made them reject such one-sidedness.

In a brief survey we shall see how during the following decades the search for a synthesis proceeded. Then shall we understand Geiger's position within this general outline and recognize the new factors which shaped his attitude; and the details of his work will fully justify the acclaim he has ever

received from reform Jews.

During the time after Mendelssohn three trends marked the development which finally led to Geiger: the interest in education resulting in the foundation of a number of modern Jewish schools; the desire to reform the service at the synagogue from an aesthetic point of view; and the awakening of historical consciousness leading to the scientific research into the Jewish past. All of these three tendencies, apparent among the Jews of Germany at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries were nourished and directed by influences from the outside. In them we have the practical application of concepts that filled, so to speak, the air.

The role of education within the framework of the Enlightenment was already discussed. Mendelssohn's friends and followers devoted their efforts to the practical task of spreading European culture among the Jews. These efforts found their expression in two institutions: the publication of the Hebrew periodical Hameasef and in the foundation of modern Jewish schools. Mendelssohn had created a new Hebrew style in his commentary Biur. A number of his disciples endeavored to give the renaissance of Hebrew a broader foundation. Meir Israel Bresselau and Isaac Abraham Euchel made a proclamation in Koenigsberg in 1783 in which they asked for the foundation of a society for the advancement of the Hebrew language and of a Hebrew periodical. The Hameasef, though the older and the younger generation contributed to it, ceased to be published in 1811, after its publication had been interrupted for several times.<sup>7</sup> The knowledge

of Hebrew was limited to too small a number of people in order to make it the instrument of a general education.

The modern Jewish schools, which were founded before and after the turn of the century, yielded more success. Not only the joy of learning and educating made the existence of these schools possible but also the awareness that a reform can only succeed if due attention is paid to the forms and contents of the child's instructions. In a child's soul the seed is sown which may bear its fruit during the time of manhood. The cheder was not adequate to prepare children for a Jewish life outside the ghetto walls. It seems that even alert pupils realized that their teachers represented a world which had become old-fashioned. Solomon Schechter tells us that Leopold Zunz used his mastery of the Hebrew language to direct his sarcastic wit against the narrow-mindedness of his teachers at the Samson school at Wolfenbuettel.<sup>8</sup> The new Jewish schools, which opened their doors in various German cities, offered secular subjects as well as Jewish courses. Leading in this segment of reform endeavors were men like David Friedlaender and Isaac Daniel Itzig, who founded the Jewish Free School of Berlin in 1878; Israel Jacobson, founder of the school at Seesen, and Naphtali Herz Wessely who, in his letter "Divre shalom veemes", hailed the reforms of Joseph II of Austria and proposed a curriculum for modern Jewish schools.<sup>9</sup>

The second trend of this time devoted its attention and energy to the aesthetic improvement of the religious service. Neither in form nor in contents did the traditional service

appeal to the worshippers. The situation called for a quick and satisfactory remedy, since the Jewishly less responsible of the dissatisfied were driven to indifference or, if they were in need of any other value, to baptism; for there was no help to be expected from the orthodox group. Those among the dissatisfied who had a sense of responsibility great enough to look for a remedy, found it in a reform of the service. By shortening its length, by introducing sermons and prayers in the vernacular, and by using organ and choir they dealt with the problem at their hands. Here again we have a tendency that was not particularly Jewish. The Jews, in their thinking and evaluating, adopted thought and evaluation as they were apparent in the spirit of the time. Aesthetics had gained some importance. Alexander Baumgarten had wished to have a science of the perfection of sensation as the branch corresponding to the science of perfect use of the intellect. The science of the beautiful came into being. Kant, having adopted the term "aesthetics" at a later time, understood by it the philosophical doctrine of the beautiful and of art. Schiller took it over from Kant and brought it into general use by his writings.<sup>10</sup>

The Jews, too, learned to look at things from the angle of the beautiful and to use it as a standard of evaluation. In various places, the reformers tried to implement the standards of the new time. On July 17, 1810 Jacobson dedicated the temple at Seesen which he had built at his own expense. The modern services in Berlin could not be held for a longtime; the reactionary Frederick William III of Prussia put an end to them,

seeing in everything progressive a threat to his concept of state and society. A new attempt was made in Hamburg. It was successful insofar as the assaults of the orthodox could be averted and the existence of the temple be secured. The fairs in Leipzig offered the opportunity to make the Jewish visitors, who came from all parts of Europe, familiar with the modern service. However, there was another place where the progressive service could be introduced. This place was in the new schools. Here, in semi-public so to speak, changes of the liturgy could be made without arousing the loud protest of the orthodox. These services, which served as a part of the children's education, were attended even by adults who would not have liked to support, by their attendance, such innovations in the congregational house of worship.<sup>11</sup> The foremost leader of this group was Israel Jacobson. He and those who worked along the same lines attempted to approach the reform from the outside by some changes here and some there and by imitating the Protestant service. But, in the long run, this did not suffice. The task was to unearth the powers of development which are innate in Judaism and to employ them logically and harmoniously in conformity with the principles of Judaism according to the needs of the time. These early reformers knew little of the principles of Judaism and were only concerned with the needs of the time.

A further step toward that goal was made by "The Society for Culture and Science of Judaism", which was founded by a group of young men in Berlin in 1819. It was the conviction of this group, to which Leopold Zunz, Heinrich Heine, Eduard

Gans, Moses Moser, David Friedlaender, and more than forty others belonged, that Reform must be based on science. By the term "science", they understood a critical approach to the history and literature of Judaism. The term "Science of Judaism" was used for the first time by Leopold Zunz in 1823, when he had to submit to the censor a title for the periodical to be published by the above mentioned society.<sup>12</sup> Zunz, the most important man of this group judged from a Jewish point of view, had pursued his studies at the University of Berlin, where he was influenced by the two professors of antiquity, August Boeckh and Friedrich August Wolf. To both he owed his mastery of philological methodology.<sup>13</sup> He employed it for the benefit of the Jews who had to struggle against the reaction in Prussia's capital. The essay "About the names of Spanish localities occurring in the Hebrew Jewish writings", published in the Periodical for the Science of Judaism, he proved that Jews used secular names. And in his masterpiece, The history and development of Jewish homiletics, he showed that discourses in the vernacular were not unknown in the synagogue. In this sense, the Science of Judaism was employed, namely to help the non-Jewish world to understand Judaism and, by achieving such an understanding, to improve the conditions of the Jews in the various spheres of life. Here we have undoubtedly the last influence of the Enlightenment upon Jewish thinking. However, practical results were wanting. Consequently, the members of the society lost their interest, and the society failed. The disappointment must have been great, for some of the members turned to Christianity. Zunz carried on his work firmly though alone. He never was in



close contact with life again after the failure of the society and his own twofold failure in the capacity of a preacher.<sup>14</sup> Though his motto was, "True science is bringing forth deeds", we must say that his research-work, as great as it was, followed rather the line of scientific interests than the necessity of practical results. To this testifies his statement quoted by Solomon Schechter: "I confess that next to the resignation to the will of God, it is the science of Judaism in which I find my only comfort and stay."<sup>15</sup>

We have arrived at the time of Abraham Geiger. When he began the work of his life, Reform and Science of Judaism had lost their vitality and their immediate importance for the life of the Jew. It seemed that the growth of indifference could not be checked. Geiger filled both, Reform and Science of Judaism, with new life by discovering the inner connection between them and by showing how one needed the other for the sake of Judaism's future. This he did not only show by his research-work, but he also proved it by his practical applications.

## Chapter I

Abraham Geiger, his life and his intellectual environment.

Abraham Geiger's life, measured with today's tenaciousness of life, did not last very long. He was born on Frankfort on Main on the 24th of May, 1810 and died in Berlin on the 23rd of 1874.<sup>16</sup> At an early age he gained for himself a sound judgment. Taking some kind of development in every man for granted, we may well generalize in his case and say that, having once arrived at his philosophy of life and understanding of Judaism, he did not change his major principles.

The parents were orthodox. Abraham was their sixth~~th~~ child; his oldest brother Salomon became his counselor and teacher after the father's untimely passing. Salomon Geiger, eighteen years Abraham's senior, was a merchant. This pious man, steeped in Jewish learning, was the ideal type of a Jew. Abraham owed much to him and showed him his gratitude at every occasion. The family's orthodox background was the decisive factor in Abraham's early education. Though the Philanthropin had been founded in 1804, he did not receive his instructions there. A modern education at an institute, where services were held on Sunday - but later transferred to Saturday - and sermons preached in German, did not agree with the principles of the family. Tenach, Mishna, and Talmud were his first subjects. It was in secrecy that he read with a friend works on mathematics and algebra.

However, the boy's sharp mind convinced the family that a more modern education might be advisable. They were all the more willing to agree to it as Rothschild granted the gifted

pupil a fellowship. As the Philanthropin did not satisfy the demands of the Geigers, private teachers were hired for Abraham. They taught him Latin, Greek, and German style. Though these instructions did not take place regularly, they provided him with the foundation, on which he could build his critical attitude, and led to the shattering of those ideals and ideas which his family cherished. By reading a history of the world, he was enabled to compare Greece, Rome, and Judaism with one another. He did not doubt the validity of Judaism, but that of the Talmud; never did he change his mind on this point.

Provided with the testimonies of his teachers, Abraham left for the University of Heidelberg in 1829. Not satisfied with the courses in Semitic languages, he went to Bonn, where he studied, apart from Arabic, Greek and Roman philology, history, philosophy, and even some disciplines of natural science. The purpose of the studies was the preparation for the rabinate. The family, led by Salomon, would have liked to see Abraham attend rather a yeshiva than a university which they considered a secular and Christian institution. But Abraham had <sup>his</sup> ~~his~~ way. It seems that generous people had made funds available to him. It was in Bonn that he met and befriended Samson Raphael Hirsch and Joseph Dernburg. During this time, he published his first essays on Jewish questions and took part in a prize essay contest on the subject: "What did Mohammed accept from Judaism?" In June of 1832 Geiger left the university.

After he had preached a sermon in the chapel in Frankfort, he received an invitation to deliver a trial sermon in Wiesbaden,

whereupon he was elected rabbi, preacher, and teacher of the congregation in that town. Two years later, in 1834, the University of Marburg conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The prize essay, he had written in Bonn, was accepted by the faculty as the thesis. It may have been at this time that Rabbi Gosen in Marburg gave him the rabbinical ordination. During the six years he served the congregation in Wiesbaden, two events took place which deserve a mentioning in this short biographical sketch. In Wiesbaden, Geiger began to publish the first of his two periodicals, the Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift fuer juedische Theologie.

The first volume of this periodical appeared in 1835, yet the plan originated at the time when he was a student in Bonn. In 1831, he wrote about it in a letter to Zunz. During the few months he spent in Frankfort upon the conclusion of his studies, he took it up again in a letter to S. Frensdorff, who had been one of his colleagues in Bonn. Discussing the status of the contemporary periodicals, he put forth his own ideas about the kind of a publication that was needed. It was necessary, he stated, to stop talking only in apologetical terms and pointing constantly at one's own improvement; to him, this was a weak enlightened argument. A scientific procedure was now required and a publication which employed it. Without any tendency as purpose and any fear of what results the research may produce, the periodical should follow a scientific line. Geiger was convinced that only this unpremeditated, strictly scientific approach must lead to a tendency. To have such a periodical

of his own, was necessitated not only by the fact that non-Jewish publications would not very willingly accept his contributions, but also by the desire to provide himself with a platform of his own where he could express himself freely according to his convictions. The first part of the sixth volume was published in 1847. It marked the end of Geiger's first activity as an editor. He contributed more than anybody else to the Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift. His were the burdens. The lack of coworkers and the demands of the rabbinical duties in Breslau upon his time account for the two interruptions of the publication after 1839 and 1844.<sup>18</sup>

The second important event during his stay in Wiesbaden was the meeting of fourteen rabbis, who had come to Wiesbaden, upon Geiger's invitation, during the summer of 1837. Geiger had realized that a group of friends in thought and action alone could do the work which he envisaged. As this meeting had no official character, the participants decided that the problems at hand should be presented one by one in Geiger's periodical. The first essay was devoted to a discussion on Jewish mourning customs; it appeared in the fourth volume. Though the convention was of a private nature, the general public took an interest in it, and distorted reports were circulated. Geiger, from whom the initiative had come, was compelled to clarify the situation. The purpose of the convention was to have a friendly discussion among colleagues and to reach an agreement with regard to rab<sup>b</sup>inical administration.<sup>19</sup> This informal meeting was the forerunner of the rabbinical assemblies

at which Geiger was destined to play an important role.

Geiger left Wiesbaden during the summer of 1838. It had been his ambition to become the official rabbi (Landesrabbiner) of the Duchy of Nassau, the Jewish population of which numbered 6,200 souls at the end of 1838.<sup>20</sup> Though some members of the government were sympathetic to his request, he never obtained that status. On the part of the Duchy, the inconvenience of having to change the status of the Jewish congregations within the whole structure of the state was the cause ~~of~~ the failure. But on the Jewish part, too, voices were heard against this plan. Especially in the villages the Jews had remained traditional and disliked Geiger's progressive ideas. Whether the objection raised against him by the orthodox<sup>21</sup> ~~of~~ his failure to achieve an official status caused him to resign, is an unsolved question. But we do know that such a position was created in 1842 and Geiger invited to return in 1843; he did not accept.

A few days after he left Wiesbaden, he received an invitation to visit Breslau, where already at that time more than 5,400 Jews lived. Upon a discourse, delivered in the synagogue, Geiger was elected second rabbi of the congregation. The position of the first rabbi was held by Salomon A. Tiktin, an ardent fighter for the strictest orthodox observation. A long and merciless struggle was the consequence of the election. This fight with its slanders, denunciations, and viciousness ended only when Tiktin died, though he had been suspended from his rabbinical office by the board eight months earlier.

The more important events during Geiger's stay in Breslau were the three rabbinical assemblies in Brunswick (1844), Frankfurt (1845), and Breslau (1846). He was recognized by his colleagues as the champion of critical research and progressive attitude within the fold of rabbinism. The third assembly, over which he presided, was different from the two preceding ones by virtue of the unity in attitude of the participants. Though Geiger, as the host, had invited a number of men of more conservative trends, they did not come. Thus, delicate problems could be discussed. An agreement was reached with regard to the observance of the Sabbath; more leniency was advocated. The fulfillment of the state laws even on the Sabbath was considered advisable. Here we have a practical point in which the desire of the Jews to make themselves available as full citizens, without restrictions on their part, is reflected. Another meeting was scheduled to take place in Mannheim in 1847, but the political atmosphere stifled religious interests for some time.

Extremely fruitful was Geiger's literary work during his years in Breslau. In 1845, he published the Lehr-und Lesebuch zur Sprache der Mischna. Already as a student in Heidelberg he had begun to develop an interest in this field. His philological studies had prepared him for this kind of work. The most important of his contributions is Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der inneren Entwicklung des Judentums. The book was received with great enthusiasm. Three years earlier, in 1854, the first edition of his Israelitisches Gebetbuch appeared. As it reflects the

practical aspect of Geiger's work in the Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift, it will be discussed in a special chapter.

Before he left Breslau in 1863, he <sup>began</sup>~~began~~ the publication of his second periodical Juedische Zeitschrift fuer Wissenschaft und Leben. A number of events took place which may have removed all pleasures of living in that town. When Jones<sup>a</sup> Fraen~~K~~-enckel, a respected merchant in Breslau, had died in 1846, a certain amount of his estate was allotted to the foundation of a Jewish seminary for the training of rabbis and teachers. Geiger was very happy about this generosity and warm interest in the improvement of the inner conditions of the congregations. He saw his dream realized, for which he had written and<sup>22</sup> talked. But he was greatly disappointed when Zacharias Frankel was elected rector of the institution in 1853. Having had Fraenckel among his followers in Breslau, he had good reason to consider himself the candidate for this position. Other reasons may have been Gedalja Tiktin's appointment as district rabbi (Landrabbiner), whereby his former opponent's son became his superior; his wife's death in 1860 after a married life of twenty years; and a growth of indifference toward the ideals for which Geiger stood. Thus he accepted, after some hesitation, in 1863 the call to Frankfort, where he hoped to find a broader field for his Jewish and scientific work, and where the companionship of the family and the friends would give him comfort.

Geiger served the congregation in his home town from 1863 to the end of 1869. Hirsch, too, had found his way to Frankfort. But the friendship between them had ended a long time



ago. They were rabbis of two different congregations. It was in Frankfort that Geiger delivered popular lectures on Jewish history which he continued in Berlin. In accordance with his historical concept, he worked out in these lectures the spiritual movements within Judaism. The growth and development of ideas fascinated him in all his studies. In the meantime, he continued the publication of the Juedische Zeitschrift and took part in the revived rabbinical conferences in Kassel (1868), Leipzig (1869), and Augsburg (1871). In Leipzig and Augsburg he was elected vice-president. However, the dream of his life was not fulfilled in Frankfort, either. And yet, the plan of establishing a Jewish theological faculty had been discussed at the conference in Leipzig and recommended. A committee was set up of which Professor Moritz Lazarus of Berlin was the chairman. Therefore he accepted happily the invitation of the board of directors of the congregation in Berlin to become a rabbi in Prussia's capital. The promise that he would be made a teacher at the *Lehranstalt fuer die Wissenschaft des Judentums* could not be given. The preparation for its foundation was interrupted by the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-1871. But when all plans had been realized and when the doors of the first seminary for liberal rabbis were opened, Geiger was a member of the faculty. During the dedication ceremony he gave a lecture on the subject "Ueber die Bedeutung der Wissenschaft des Judentums und die Berechtigung der dieser gewidmeten Lehranstalt." He taught for five semesters; he conducted classes on general introduction to the Science of Judaism; general and special introduction to the books of the Bible; interpretation of Genesis

and Joshua; interpretation of Pirke Avot. Among his disciples were Emil G. Hirsch, Felix Adler, and Immanuel Loew. Thus he became one of the few who <sup>are</sup> <sub>A</sub>graced to see the fulfilment of their dreams.

We discussed the trends of thinking and the ways of reforming during the period from Mendelssohn to Geiger. A short biography made us familiar with the <sup>a</sup>men whose theology and reforms, as they are presented in his first periodical, we shall analyze. However, our preparation is not yet complete. Before we are able to understand and appreciate Geiger's approach to the problem of a synthesis of Judaism and the German environment, and the way in which he sought a solution, we must consider two factors which determined and directed his thinking to a very great extent. These two factors were the rise of a love for Germany among the Jews <sup>23</sup> and the beginning of critical research in history.

Prussia granted the Jews civil rights in 1812. The royal order, announcing the new political status of the Jews, closed the circle. The cultural and intellectual adjustment, as we have seen, had begun already during the last decades of the eighteenth century. Undoubtedly, the Jews of Prussia owed their advancement to the new ideas which went forth from France. In those German states, which came under direct French influence, the Jews received the same rights from Napoleon as were enjoyed by the French Jews. Jacobson's activities in the Kingdom of Westfalia were made possible by the enlightened reign of Jerome. Wherever Jews enjoyed civil rights, they were indebted to Napoleon.

Yet, when the wars of liberation against Napoleon I broke out, Prussian Jews offered their services to the Army of Frederick William III. One may take this action as ingratitude. However we have here the first case in which Jewish aspects had to yield to German aspects.<sup>24</sup> It is of importance to note that the Jews wanted to become Germans and prove their allegiance. They motivated this desire by quoting Jeremiah 29:7,<sup>25</sup> and it remained the basis of their philosophy for more than 125 years. This new attitude toward the state penetrated into all Jewish circles. Orthodox authorities like Rabbis Karfunkel of Breslau and Ezechiel Landau of Prague were reported to have issued decisions according to which Jewish warriors were released from the observation of the Sabbath laws if the military service conflicted with the religious law.<sup>26</sup> In order to be emancipated, the Jews had to become fully qualified citizens. And since the emancipation was a problem of national assimilation of the Jews to Germany, it had to be followed necessarily by the denationalization of Judaism. Judaism had to become a denomination (Konfession) as are Protestantism and Catholicism.

In the meantime, since Mendelssohn, a great change in the approach to history had taken place. Mendelssohn had not been aware of a historical process; history was a discipline yet unknown to the men who represented the Enlightenment. They did not think in terms of development and the individual. Mendelssohn noticed only human types, not growing, changing, and struggling individuals. No period appeared as an improvement upon the preceding one. The first evaluation of the past became

apparent in the treatment of Greek-Roman antiquity, whose champion was Joachim Winckelmann. This movement is called Classicism. It lifted antiquity - by which term always Greek and Roman civilization is understood - above the historical conditions and set it up as an example and symbol of humanity.<sup>27</sup> The emphasis on the essence and character of Greece and Rome led to a reaction, the German Romanticism. Not in the past of strange peoples alone did one search for greatness and examples; did not ~~en~~ <sup>the</sup> past of one's own people contain enough greatness of which one could be proud? The German Middle Ages began to hold the interest of poets, writers, and intellectuals. More or less they were dreamers, dreaming of a revival of their past. History became, in their hands, a tool of glorification. Another reaction commenced and put an end to this one-sidedness. Not historical glorification but a critical approach to history was now considered the only way to an understanding of the past. Ernst Troeltsch, discussing the German historical school, says: "These interests and ideas (i. e. the search for the substance of the totality of German culture (Deutschtum) and a humanistic education of the bourgeoisie) brought in close contact historians and legal experts, philologists and theologians, theorists of education, teachers of German and Germanic philology, and classicists. They all have one common ground: the exact critical research-work in details and the idea of totality and organism; both are closely connected by these scholars and thinkers... It is the concept of life instead of the Hegelian idea..."<sup>28</sup>

Here we have the link with Geiger. Time and again did he

stress the concept of life. His whole work can only be understood from this angle. His research helped him to shape the ideas and forms of life; his critical approach enabled him to unearth hidden treasures and to make them work toward his goal: a modern Jewish life, rich in content and meaningful in its application. The relationship of science and life is the same as that of the river and the Ocean. As the river empties into the ocean even so "science must empty into life."<sup>29</sup>

## Chapter II

### Criticism

Every revision, change or reform begins with a criticism. Criticism arises when man becomes aware of a discrepancy. A discrepancy is the result of stagnation on the one hand and development on the other, or of growing demands on the one side and a disintegrating ability to cope with them on the other. Criticism attempts to describe a discrepancy, to explain its causes, and to find a way in which a solution can be achieved. This is the essence of every constructive criticism.

Abraham Geiger was a constructive critic. He noticed the faults in contemporary Judaism and fought to eliminate them. He saw the discrepancy which modern life had brought about. To be sure, this discrepancy was a twofold one: it was characterized by stagnation on the one side and revolution on the other. Geiger spoke against stagnation and against revolution; he wrote and spoke and acted for evolution.

The effect of the political, social, and intellectual emancipation created two extreme parties among the Jews: the right wing radicals and the left wing radicals. The former wanted to preserve the totality of traditional Judaism. To them, every detail of tradition was sacrosanct. They would not accept the idea that one must evaluate the various components and creations of tradition in order to preserve religion as a powerful factor in life. They did not realize, or did not want to recognize, that every period has its own needs, and that every generation

must find its own way to God. Such a radical attitude, such a complete negation of life's demands could be disregarded were its consequences not extremely grave. Geiger recognized them with deep insight and a fine understanding of human nature. He called these radicals idolaters of forms (Formgläubige) and their attitude formal rigidity (Formstarrheit).

Every form is useful and helpful as long as it has meaning. A form which lacks content is a liability to religious life; it is not observed because of its value for piety and religiosity but because of its mere existence. Either thoughtless routine or fear enforces the observation of such a form. Is there a greater enemy to religious life than thoughtless routine? Geiger had the proof. He knew that these idolaters of forms performed what they thought was expected of them, but indifferent mockery was inherent in the fulfilment of their religious duties.<sup>30</sup> There was no life, there was no conviction, there was even indifference to the future of Judaism, a dull resignation to ~~formal~~<sup>or</sup> rigidity and the egocentric motto: "God will do what is good, ... if there is only peace in my days."<sup>31</sup>

The tragedy of mistakes is that they always initiate other mistakes. It was the tragedy of the indifference inherent in the petrified concept of Judaism that another indifference was created by it. The indifference of the parents toward life evoked the indifference of the children toward the parental religion. The right wing radicals found their counterpart in the left wing radicals. This was the other grave consequence of misunderstanding and misjudging the value of forms and making

them the whole content of religious life.

Geiger saw this, too, and he fought against the men who advocated complete dissolution and disintegration as he fought the idolaters of form. His criticism was directed against both sides. The left wing radicals did not take any constructive interest in Judaism, because they had only known the fetters of the ritual and, by them, had been hampered in their attempt to assimilate their lives to the environment. They did not desire any institutions which might have satisfied the religious needs; they did not demand a purification of the whole system of the Jewish religion; their aim was only to do away with everything that could disturb or encroach upon their convenience. With regret Geiger had to state that "the weapons, which are now in use, are wit and mockery; but they are poisonous arrows which eliminate the healthy power with the wound."<sup>32</sup> How could Judaism ever regain its old strength, if superstition was treated with indifference? This indifference of the left wing radicals destroyed the appeal which true belief might have for modern man.

Whether Geiger looked to the left or to the right, he beheld a void. Where patience and sympathetic attitude should have been employed, only willful destruction for the sake of greatest convenience was to be noticed. Where understanding and good will should have been displayed, only narrow-mindedness and dullness could be observed. In neither case was life paid its due.

The synagogue is the place where the intensity or the



superficiality of Jewish life comes into the open. It was here that Geiger became fully aware of the desperate situation of Judaism. The traditional service was repulsive to a great number of Jews. The disorder, its unaesthetic form, its tiring length, the lack of inspirational elements, the difficulty to understand the meaning of the prayers, and the implausible content of the whole service repelled many people. Those who did come, whether regularly or not, did not pay any attention and busied themselves with other things. One could not speak of any influence the service exerted upon the worshippers. People either stayed away or took the attitude of merely fulfilling a duty which had been imposed upon them.<sup>33</sup> The synagogue, where Jewish life finds its concrete expression and where it is provided with new strength, had become a relic, a house without a purpose. It seemed to be doomed by the indifference of one group and the superstition of the other.

It was, however, not sufficient to recognize and describe the decline of Jewish life as it became obvious in the eyes of the keen and interested observer. To find a ~~resolution~~, Geiger had to analyze the reasons leading to this decline, for his own sake and for the sake of those who were willing to listen to him. Geiger, the man whose thoughts and actions were devoted to life, saw the source of all the difficulties. "Not in the subordinate discrepancies of life, but in the important discrepancy between life and teaching, which still exists in its full sharpness, do we find the sore spot ~~of spot~~ of Judaism."<sup>34</sup> This discrepancy is the old problem of harmonizing Judaism with its

environment. It is the same problem with which the generation after Mendelssohn was confronted, the men who propagated modern education and the first reformers. It is obvious that all previous attempts to establish a symbiosis had not achieved a satisfactory result, if they had not completely failed. We may even assume that the difficulty had grown as the years passed. The educational program had provided children and adults with a greater familiarity with the general knowledge of their time. Jews were permitted to study at universities. More and more had they taken roots in the soil of European culture. But nothing of a permanent value had been done for making Judaism an equal partner of the environmental culture. There was no symbiosis, as we just learned. And it was even worse than this; the interest in the Jewish group declined to such an extent between 1815 and 1830 that one individual did not care for the sufferings of the other as long as he was spared such a fate.<sup>35</sup> The reforms were sporadic and lacked the platform which is needed to make a new attempt possible and acceptable to the masses of the group. Thus, instead of a synthesis two different worlds had come into being. On the one hand, the Jew gained new convictions at school, at the university or by living an open-minded life in his environment. On the other hand, Jewish thoughts were not developed to match the general convictions. Progress here and stagnation there had to produce a delicate lack of balance; the convictions contradicted often the concepts of Jewish tradition.<sup>36</sup> Geiger recognized this contradiction as the root of Judaism's unhealthy position. His whole work was devoted to solving this problem. Using the terms of Geiger one would

say, the contradiction could only be solved by settling the battle between the past and the present.<sup>37</sup> This term "battle between past and present" contains Geiger's philosophy..

The remedy was found. Had anything been done in the sense of equalizing the ideas and ambitions of the present with the beliefs and teachings of the past? Geiger did not find anything worth-while praising. The task was almost insurmountable: the groups, the traditionalists and the progressives, were sharply separated from each other. The one demanded carefulness. "Beware not to move away from tradition a single step." The other proclaimed<sup>d</sup>: "Onward with large steps, otherwise you are a jesuit, a hypocrit, an obscurant, an orthodox..."<sup>38</sup> Geiger stood between the two parties. That he aimed his criticism at those rabbis whose motto was retrogression and thoughtless preservation, needs no further elaboration. But the progressives, too, had to stand on trial before his criticism. Here he blamed obviously the laymen who lacked decent knowledge of their religion and employed the shallow talk of enlightening tendencies. In their superficiality and insecurity, they preferred rather to destroy the tower on which they stood than to run the risk of falling off their high position.<sup>39</sup> Geiger's language in this passage is not very clear. But it seems that he referred to the reforms of such men as Friedlaender and Jacobson. Nowhere in the periodical do we find Geiger making mention of them or their work. However, one may expect him to have done so. During the early time of his work for the Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift, not too many years had elapsed since

those two men had engaged themselves in reforming the service. It is not unlikely that Geiger did not pay any attention to their attempts. He did not expect much of the laity. Whatever they did was in no way related to the historical growth of Judaism; the reforms of the laymen sprang forth from the needs of the day. Geiger could not stress the necessity of a historical consciousness often enough. To disregard the historical foundation of Judaism and the continuity of its historical growth was as dangerous and unrealistic in his eyes as to neglect the demands of the present. It was in line with this thought that Geiger set his hope upon the work of the theologians.

Demanding the leadership of the theologians, Geiger met the opposition of Sigismund Stern. Stern, an educator by profession and in his later years director of the Philanthropin in Frankfurt, was one of the founders of the Juedische Reform-genossenschaft in Berlin. This congregation was organized after the board of the main congregation had not heeded an application of a number of members to secure a rabbi of modern training and liberal outlook. Michael Sachs, of Prague, elected in 1844, proved himself a strongly conservative man. Upon this disappointment, the liberal laymen of Berlin, who had already founded a cultural society in 1841, set up a congregation of their own.<sup>40</sup> They did this without the assistance of a rabbi. Thus we can understand the pride which Stern took in the achievement of the Berlin laymen and of himself. That he did not like rabbinical aspirations for authority is also possible. But that he blamed Geiger for having advocated a theologico-

rabbinical authority as one of the two pillars on which the intellectual frame of Judaism should be erected, was, at least, a misunderstanding. Stern even stated that, by construing a contrast between laymen and theologians or rabbis, Geiger initiated a development which had to lead to an un-Jewish priest-<sup>41</sup>ly hierarchy.

The disproof of the validity of Stern's statement seems to be important, because his judgment could cause us to arrive at a wrong conclusion with regard to Geiger's idea of the rabbinical office. In the passage, just quoted, Stern spoke of an "un-Jewish priestly hierarchy" as if it had come into being by the time he published his lectures (1857). That this was not the case is very obvious. To the student of the Reform movement it is obvious that at the rabbinical assemblies of the forties a hierarchic spirit was not displayed. The attending rabbis did not make binding decisions nor had they the power to enforce them in their congregations. They could not even give a unanimous answer to all the questions which they had brought along. During the second assembly, the role of Hebrew was discussed. Geiger voted against the objective necessity to preserve Hebrew in the prayer book.<sup>42</sup> When Geiger published his Israelitisches Gebetbuch in 1854, he could not eliminate Hebrew from it according to his principles of 1845, but he had to respect the sentiments of his congregants.

The historical facts speak clearly against Stern's statement; and the Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift provides us with the evidence that Geiger had not even the<sup>e</sup> ambition to establish

the hierarchy which, in Stern's judgment, had become a fact. In the second of his four articles on "Der Kampf christlicher Theologen gegen die bürgerliche Gleichstellung der Juden, namentlich mit Bezug auf Anton Theodor Hartmann", Geiger discussed the Sanhedrin which Napoleon I convoked to Paris in 1807. This was, in Geiger's opinion, an institution "to which we do not at all ascribe the power of a synod; such a power is completely unknown to Judaism."<sup>43</sup> In his first article on Hirsch's Neunzehn Briefe ueber Judentum, von Ben Usiel, this point of view found an even clearer expression, since it served as the basic principle of the writer's approach to the concept of authority in Judaism. The spirit "is the authority which will rule all, in spite of the resistance of others, in spite of the often fortunate lack of synods and administrative authorities; apart from it, there is no need for any documentation and plenitude of power."<sup>44</sup> These two quotations suffice to prove that Geiger had not even the ambition to establish a priestly hierarchy invested with a theologico-rabbinical authority.

Though he was opposed to rabbinical authority, Geiger expected help from the theologians. "...That they alone are in a position to promote the good of Israel by intellectual as well as practical activity, we boldly dare to state."<sup>45</sup> However, this expectation was conditioned; the theologian as such did not offer any guarantee. Too many of them had not promoted the good of Israel as Geiger saw it. The condition, upon which Geiger based his expectation, is, therefore, the most important part of his statement, because it modifies the type of theologian

which promised hope for an understanding of the situation. The condition was: "... If they are deeply steeped in the whole historical structure of our religion and, at the same time, rooted in the Zeitgeist."<sup>46</sup> This was the condition for any progress, the source from which alone the Jewish religion could take the claim to life. This condition was Geiger's formula of the synthesis that had to be achieved. It provided him with the means of criticism and the ways of development. From this point he could proceed: the synthesis could be turned into the symbiosis, the idea could become manifest in life. Life without an idea and an idea without life seemed to be a bloodless organism. Life had to verify the idea, and the idea had to give meaning to life. This interrelationship was a complicated one. To bring it about and make it work, Geiger looked not only for the help of the theologians, who fulfilled the requirements set up by him, but also for the support of the intelligentsia.<sup>47</sup> Whether we have here a remnant of the ideal of the Enlightenment, which concerned itself with the international of the educated class or not, can hardly be proved. That Geiger was interested in this group of people is only natural, since a movement which cannot be sustained but by insight, must rely upon those who are capable of developing it.

This criticism of general conditions was supplemented by a criticism of individuals. The clearer man's position becomes, the stronger man's convictions grow, the better he can appreciate and judge the position and convictions of others. When we speak of Abraham Geiger, we are immediately reminded

of Samson Raphael Hirsch, the founder of neo-Orthodoxy in Western Europe. Geiger and Hirsch are usually described as antipodes, "as representing the two opposing streams of thought."<sup>48</sup> It must be stated, however, that to a certain extent their principles were identical. Many of Geiger's ideals were shared by Hirsch. When Hirsch decided to become a rabbi, he thought of his function "in the modern sense of the term;" he wanted to officiate as "the religious leader of a community."<sup>49</sup> The observance of good manner in accordance with the standards of the educated European classes was important in his judgment.<sup>50</sup> In this sense, he also spoke of progress, demanding "the support of all that is 'sound' and ... the removal of all that is decayed in 'Torah, Avodah, Gemiluth Hasadim.'"<sup>51</sup> Even the traditional relationship between Bible and Talmud was completely changed by Hirsch. When he was rabbi in Nikolsburg, the talmudists of that town complained about his innovation of saying Gemara and learning Psalms instead of learning Gemara and saying Psalms.<sup>52</sup> Hirsch was so modern in his outlook and demands that one could be misled to ascribe the statements above to Geiger. And even Geiger recognized that Hirsch cherished the same ideals as he did, though they differed from one another in practical applications.<sup>53</sup> Many people agree in theory, but only the <sup>actice</sup>praxis shows whether the agreement is a sound one or not. The <sup>a</sup>same term, employed by two persons, has in most cases a different meaning and finds a different application. It was in this sense, that Geiger and Hirsch disagreed completely. And it was here, that Geiger criticized Hirsch.



Caesar Seligmann classifies Geiger as a universalist who represented the principle of individuality and allowed the present to claim its rights; and Hirsch as a particularist who bowed before the principle of authority and recognized the claims of the past.<sup>54</sup> The implication was that Geiger looked at Jewish tradition as something that had been in the state of growth and development. This understanding gave him the right to evaluate and differentiate between eternal and temporary values of whatever tradition brought forth. Hirsch did not accept such an evaluation. "Every distinction between eternal and temporary, absolute and relative in religious affairs, is both false and conducive to falsehood."<sup>55</sup> It is obvious that we find the roots of Hirsch's and Geiger's disagreement in their way of evaluating the past. Here we touch upon one of the most crucial and complicated points of historical understanding. Nicolai Hartmann discusses the problem of evaluation (Wertproblem) in historical research and points out that, even in evaluating men such as Alexander, Caesar, and Napoleon, we are dependent<sup>t</sup> upon our personality, upon our preference, taste, and appreciation of human greatness. These factors decide whether we consider those men, heroes or adventurers.<sup>56</sup> How much more must the personality of the observer be taken into consideration when we have the evaluation of ideas and convictions under discussion. Background and education are the sources from which man derives his personality. But they are not the only sources. Family traditions, personal experiences, disappointments as well as successes, influences, encouragements, and failures, all these factors have a part in shaping the hu-

man personality. We are here not interested in tracing the trends of Hirsch's and Geiger's personalities. It suffices to state wherein they differed from one another. Though Se~~X~~ligmann and Philipson describe the difference very distinctly, it seems that we are able to locate the kernel of the disagreement on a deeper level. Hirsch's theology was built upon the concept of the chosen people, the consequences of which force upon the Jew a certain isolation. The essence of Geiger's theology is found in Isaiah's vision of God's house as the house of prayer for all people.<sup>57</sup> Geiger never spoke of an isolation; on the contrary, he was convinced that the time had **arrived** which demanded the destruction of all barriers.<sup>58</sup> Hirsch spoke constantly of the "Tauroh", Geiger stressed the prophetic element.<sup>59</sup>

The diversity of basic concepts necessitated a sharp criticism. In his review of Hirsch's Neunzehn Briefe ueber Judentum, Geiger was very friendly toward the author. He called Hirsch a "highly respected, dear friend", who had won his whole admiration and friendship during the time they first met. Here however, Geiger wrote, not the recognition of the person is under discussion but the welfare of Judaism.<sup>60</sup> Yet, Geiger did not remain impersonal. Only three years later, when reviewing the Horeb and Erste Mittheilungen aus Naphthali's Briefwechsel, Geiger argued ad hominem.<sup>61</sup> The whole review of the Mittheilungen consisted of two sentences which broke their friendship. One may be surprised about the sharp language employed by Geiger against a friend; and one is reminded

of the terms which Luther used in order to state his opinions. We should not be hasty in our judgment and ascribe this harshness of expression to the personality. Whenever a man wants to impress others with his convictions and convince them of the correctness of his point of view, he is attempted to use drastic terms. A retiring presentation does not serve his purpose. Thus we have to explain Geiger's language which he also used against Anton Theodor Hartmann.

Geiger's criticism was necessitated by their difference of historical concept, by the divergent historical role which they ascribed to Judaism. Judaism, as Hirsch understood it, was based upon the divinity and unity of the written and oral law. This hypothesis could not be supported by a historical-critical examination. Its strength lay in the realm of willful obedience to the law.<sup>62</sup> For Hirsch, the Bible was a "factum", and he could not admit a historical consideration of it. With regret did Geiger take cognizance of this attitude which forced the student of the Bible "to spit indeed into the face of history without being permitted to find in it (the Bible) a becoming, beginning, and decaying... If the author would only fully comprehend the meaning of the factum, not only discern in it that which exists but also that which has become."<sup>63</sup> Hirsch had to save as much of the biblical points of view and of the traditional interpretations as possible. The type of interpretation, employed by Agada and Midrash, was taken over by him. Whereas the men of the Agada and Midrash had been partially aware of their arbitrariness, Hirsch was not.<sup>64</sup> His

work was the preservation of almost every detail of tradition; Geiger evaluated the ideas and ceremonies of Judaism, and then accepted some and rejected others. It was Hirsch's symbolic interpretation that Geiger criticized most vigorously. The Sukka and Lulav, for instance, serve in Hirsch's conception, the purpose to warn us not to delfy nor to despise possessions but to use them wisely. Geiger called this procedure an abstract sublimation, want of appreciation of natural causes of ceremonies, and phantastic imagination.<sup>65</sup> Not less vehemently did he reject Hirsch's idea that the other peoples were only warning examples for the generations to come to teach them that solely human greatness was vanity. In accordance with his universalistic outlook, Geiger believed that these peoples are not symbols of warning but contributors to human development. One could not think in other terms, unless one would ascribe to God a clumsy management of mankind.<sup>66</sup>

Geiger, having been interested in theory for the sake of ~~praxis~~<sup>ctise</sup>, in learning for the purpose of life, ~~and~~<sup>had</sup> to criticize two groups among those who attempted to accomplish the reform of Judaism. In his eyes, both became guilty of one-sidedness. The theorists among the reformers were too radical in their demands by paying no attention to the conditions and influences which determine the degree of adjustment to, and orientation after, the newly established principles on the part of the congregants. This procedure does not show the expected results, because the far-reaching demands are never fully realized, and they even arouse scruples; concessions, which otherwise may

have been made, are not granted. The second group of reformers recognized this difficulty. But instead of having admitted the divergence of theory and <sup>ctice</sup>praxis, they attempted to alter the theory for the sake of the <sup>ctice</sup>praxis. They wanted to fix the limits of reform in accordance with the momentary feasibility. In other words, the degree to which reforms could be practically accomplished without arousing the protest of the majority of the congregants should determine the breadth and depth of the theory.<sup>67</sup>

The first group was criticized by Geiger for having neglected the practical aspects of reform, i. e. the mentality, habits, and slow process of reorientation of the Jewish population. Hard work and patience were required of the theologians in making the results of their intellectual work understandable and acceptable to the laymen.<sup>68</sup> A very happy blending of theoretical research and practical wisdom was Geiger's strength. Any attitude that disturbed this blending was criticized by him. In no case did Geiger accept the idea that the flexibility, which is inherent in progress and development, should be given up for the sake of fixed principles and rules.<sup>69</sup> This was exactly what the second group tried to do.

Two concrete examples of Geiger's criticism may illustrate the point. The Hamburg Temple deserved an unfavorable judgment. Twenty-one years after its foundation, the attempts at compromise and the hesitation to be consistent in reforming the service had resulted in such an unhappy state of affairs, that a critic had to describe the situation as follows: "Is the rabbi

consistent who germanizes and deorientalizes his sermons and his theological disquisitions so far as language, form, and style are concerned, and at the time worships with covered head and has his children do likewise? is he consistent if he recites the prayer hanoten t'shua composed for some Asiatic despot or Italian condottiere, and immediately thereafter speaks of civic conditions in the light and spirit of our century? is he consistent when he strains every nerve to have order and decorum in the synagogue of the ninth of Ab and then permits torn clothes and unshaven faces on occasions of private mourning? is he consistent when he preaches conciliation and tolerance toward all and then does not dare abolish the prayer welamalshinim?"<sup>70</sup> The same criticism was made by Geiger when the Hamburg Temple's thirtieth anniversary drew near. Certainly, one must not expect, he wrote, that any historical phenomenon appears on the scene in a complete and final form. But he could not remain faithful to his principles and, at the same time, speak of a lively intellectual search within the Temple congregation. In the beginning, one could look with hope to the Temple. Now, however, one must admit that it has surrendered to stagnation for the last twenty-five years as others did for centuries.<sup>71</sup>

The other criticism was directed against Samuel Holdheim. Geiger wrote it in February, of the year 1847,<sup>72</sup> a few months before Holdheim delivered his inaugural sermon in the synagogue of the Juedische Reform<sup>9</sup>genossenschaft in Berlin. The kernel of Geiger's and Holdheim's disagreement must be sought in

their background. Holdheim was an excellent talmudist, skilled in the art of pilpul; Geiger was a linguist, well versed in the technic of philology. The former was ambitious to derive the justification for, and the direction of, Reform from the "word and letter" of the Bible and Talmud. The same means which were used in the yeshiva to preserve tradition, served Holdheim in his work for Reform. The philologist Geiger could not sanction the pilpulistic treatment of words and letters. He rather employed "the creating spirit which operates in the secret workshop."<sup>73</sup> That Holdheim did not make use of it, was regretted by Geiger.

In this chapter, we touched, necessarily, upon some of Geiger's theological concepts; they will be presented in the next chapter.

### Chapter III

#### Theological Concepts

"Abraham Geiger, the eminent Jewish historian whose divinatory genius showed Judaism to have been a continuous process of growth and transformation according to time and environment, started the (Reform) movement."<sup>74</sup> In this statement of Kaufmann Kohler we have the best definition of Geiger's role in modern Judaism. Geiger was a historian, and with his understanding of Jewish history he developed his theological concepts. Samuel Hirsch and Hermann Cohn~~e~~<sup>e</sup> became theologians as philosophers, Geiger became a theologian as a historian. Not for the sake of history, but because of history did he arrive at his theological concepts. History and theology were but a part of the fields in which he was interested. One can see very distinctly how the various fields of research were interrelated. The starting point was philology. From this angle the Bible was approached. The result made Jewish history appear in a new light. The concept of development in Jewish history led necessarily to the principle of evaluation and a new theological standpoint. The theory alone did not suffice; practical life had to provide the testing grounds: Reform was the logical consequence. Geiger's activities verify Philipson's remark that the true Reform movement is based on the investigations of scholars.<sup>75</sup> Geiger was aware of this fact; he spoke of "Veredlung durch die Wissenschaft,"<sup>76</sup> "Altar der Wissenschaft," and "Wissenschaft fuers Leben."<sup>77</sup>



In this chapter, we are concerned with the concepts which Geiger presented in his Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift. He did not order them systematically. He never wrote a systematic theology; this was left to Kaufmann Kohler. We shall attempt to arrange the remarks, scattered over almost six volumes, in that order in which one resulted from the other. It cannot be our aim to be complete in our presentation; the material is too extensive. The writer hopes that his selection serves the purpose to understand and appreciate this aspect of Geiger's work.

The essence of everything Geiger wrote in the Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift can be traced back to the following statement in which we can recognize the standard of his thinking: "Children of this time we want to be, we have to be, as children of this time we strive for penetrating the idea of Judaism; this idea was never satisfied with a faith that is independent of life, nor with a deed which is not directed by convictions."<sup>78</sup> By what general tendencies a child of this time was influenced, was discussed previously. The German Jew was on his way to complete emancipation. Even princes and kings had to realize that the doctrine of the natural rights of man, promulgated by the Enlightenment, would remain a myth unless it was applied to the Jews too. Therefore the Jews prepared themselves to be ready for the status of citizens enjoying all rights and fulfilling all duties. Geiger's theological concepts were in line with this preparation. Through them, he wanted to make the Jews Germans of the Jewish faith.

Traditional Judaism contains elements of universalism as

well as of particularism. To be a child of the time, i.e. to become a good German citizen and to remain a faithful Jew, the former elements had to be stressed and the latter ones to be eliminated. Universalism was, in Geiger's opinion, a part of the Jewish spirit. The basic idea of Judaism comprises the belief in God's unity and holiness, the conviction that man is created in God's image, man's duty to sanctify himself and to love human beings without distinction, the hope for a constant development of mankind and for the coming of the kingdom of truth and knowledge, justice and love. It is this idea alone which constitutes the difference between Judaism and the other religions. No idea can be presented in an abstract way alone; it needs the concrete form as a means of expression. That the form was paid an extreme attention ~~at~~ the expense of the idea, was the consequence of unfavorable conditions. But the historical trend within Reform Judaism recognized the validity of this idea and freed the idea from the superfluous and crushing crust of forms and ceremonies. In this spirit of Judaism did Geiger find the legitimate power to form the present and shape the future. Pointing to the prophets, who had declared the form the less important element but the conviction the bearer of morality and religiosity, Geiger could denounce the whole mediaeval system of self-imposed restrictions and limitations.<sup>79</sup> The way leading to the denationalization of Judaism was prepared.

The grasping of the pure idea of Judaism is identical with the elimination of the consequences of the national character as well as the external service.<sup>80</sup> The prophetic ideals cannot

harmonize with the exclusiveness which Jewish life needed as a protection and moral support in times of uncertainty. In Geiger's time, the moral support of past centuries had become an obstacle to the new life. This element of Judaism had become not only meaningless but also dangerous. The new life, the aim of which was "to be harmoniously a member of the human organism", demanded of the Jewish group to give up its narrowmindedness without losing its characteristics.<sup>81</sup> The characteristics of the Jews are found in the pure idea of their religion. Thus, the historian Geiger recognized the change that had taken place, and the theologian Geiger could, a few years later, observe: "More and more people understood that Judaism is based not on Israel's national characteristics but on the pure belief in God, on the conviction of man's divine likeness, and the moral truths generally accepted by man."<sup>82</sup>

It was the rediscovery of the prophetic element in Judaism that saved the Jew from an embarrassing position and the most difficult decision between the German environment and the Jewish religion. And it was in this respect that Geiger's work affected the life of his contemporaries and of the following generations most directly. Honestly and convincingly Geiger could proclaim that he did not invent a new type of Judaism, but that he stood on grounds consecrated by the prophets.

On these grounds he erected his theological structure the nature of which was distinctly denominational. The term 'denomination' (Konfession, Bekenntnis) was frequently used by

him. Judaism as a denomination can make use only of a specific type of elements which has been developed in the course of the history of Jewish thought. We refer to the universal elements. Universal elements are always appreciative of, and tolerant toward, the aspirations of other groups; they are liberal in nature. Though the term 'liberal' was first employed by politicians to designate a progressive attitude, it came to play an important role also in the sphere of religion. Not every reform must be liberal. What Luther did was not done in the spirit of liberalism. But Geiger's reform was based on a liberal theology. He was a child of his time, and still today we cherish the heritage of that time.

On this basis, the sublime aspects of Judaism were unearthed by Geiger, following others and with others, but with the greatest authority, from the heap of particularistic and superstitious elements with which talmudic and rabbinic Judaism had covered them. What Geiger understood by the pure idea of Judaism was already discussed. The true essence of religion he found in man's inner life (innerstes Gemuetsleben). "The inaccessibly high which rules over us, and the awareness of our insignificance and pettiness; the beauty and loving guidance which we encounter everywhere, and the longing of our heart for them; the admiration and love of which the calm, meditating soul is sensible toward the Inscrutable, who reveals Himself in our own heart as the Great and Loving one - these are the elements, which in their kind way, cause the religious impulse of the heart."<sup>83</sup>

Geiger did not introduce anything new with this definition of religion. His merit was that he gave a definition. A definition is a revaluation of one's concepts and position, and it saves terms from becoming words without a clearly understood meaning. By defining the term 'religion', Geiger was of service to the radicals on both sides. The right wing radicals learned that there is more to Judaism than the mere observance of its ceremonial part and the pilpulistic application of its legal aspects. Those on the extreme left heard that Judaism, as appearing throughout its history and its development, does not lack concern for man's inner life nor values of inspiration and elevation. With the help of his theology, Geiger could stretch out his hands to the idolaters of forms as well as the indifferent to teach both of them that a synthesis was needed and that only by a symbiosis the Jew could remain faithful and become a useful citizen of the country. Theology and life needed one another, and Geiger was the sage intermediary.

In this light, a number of concepts required a reinterpretation. What Geiger made of the commonly known and accepted concepts was no creation of his own. His vast knowledge of Jewish tradition enabled him to discover and prove that he was not the first to ask for development and to demand a more liberal consideration of Israel's relationship to the other nations than was hitherto admitted.<sup>84</sup> "The saying of our teachers of old: 'The pious ones of all faiths have a portion in life eternal', elevated me very much; in this statement I found the recognition that man's merit lies in his efficacy

according to the received, constantly sought, and gained perception as well as the employed strong will; this statement was all the more elevating as I had no preconceived reason to find a weak, leveling indulgence with those men who considered, with the greatest strictness, their understanding the only correct one and their deeds the only good ones."<sup>85</sup> From here Geiger could well proceed and formulate his theology which was in harmony with the Zeitgeist.

One of the most important doctrines is that of Israel's being a chosen people. Samson Raphael Hirsch had upheld the traditional point of view, already given by Mendelssohn, in his Neunzehn Briefe ueber Judentum and declared that Israel is obliged to fulfil duties which he called "Eidauss." They were binding only for Jews but not for non-Jews. Geiger rejected the existence of such duties. Israel is a group, he pointed out, which is not treated by the Creator with distinction by showing any special physical or intellectual qualities. Israel, too, has weak and intellectually inferior people. Should God have laid them under the obligation of extraordinary duties only because they belong to Israel's family? Geiger discarded the notion of the chosen people. The unfortunate idea that races and castes have different purposes and qualities making for their differentiated values has no place in the system of modern Judaism. All peoples will strive for the same goal of life after they have come closer and closer to one another and found each other in a brotherly union and in complete equality. This unity of search will be achieved by Jews and

non Jews alike. Judaism's role is a very simple one: to prepare the Jews for mankind's union. "I am convinced that Judaism has the only destiny to make the Israelites, in accordance with their historical course of instruction, truly human beings and worshippers of God."<sup>86</sup> The non-Jews will be truly human beings and worshippers of God, too. We have here, perhaps, the last glow of the ideals of the Enlightenment, before a few decades later, nationalism rumbled for the first time and broke the heart of Geiger's friend Berthold Auerbach.

Bruno Bauer, a radical critic of theology, had made the statement that the Jews did not take part in solving the problems of the time and that they had no influence upon the new rise which the generation was enjoying. Geiger came to the defense of the Jews and Judaism. Though he considered his work for the Reform most important, he made himself occasionally a fearless apologist.<sup>87</sup> He asserted that the Jews were cooperating, not as individuals but as a group, because Judaism was taking an interest in all new formations. These new products of civilization, Geiger stressed, were not unilaterally created by Judaism or Christianity, but they were brought forth by the constantly growing spirit of humanity. Judaism dedicates itself joyfully and willingly to be an able supporter of mankind's spirit and makes itself more and more qualified for this task."<sup>88</sup> The importance of this statement cannot be overestimated. By giving education, civilization, and any other field of human endeavor a Christian imprint, Christians liked to relegate Judaism and its adherents to an inferior position

within the human family. Not many contributions could be expected of the Jew, many a Gentile thought. Especially in his essays on "Der Kampf christlicher Theologen gegen die bürgerliche Gleichstellung der Juden", did Geiger attack the Christian usage to judge the whole of Christianity according to the last stage it had reached in its development while singling out primitive elements of Judaism as standards of its evaluation. If Judaism has to have its part in the concerted efforts of mankind, it had to be recognized as an equal partner. For this purpose, Geiger was an unequivocal and courageous apologist; he became a daring attacker for the sake of Judaism's vindication.<sup>89</sup>

Many quotations can be added to show that Geiger wanted his theology to be effective in two directions: outside and inside the Jewish congregations. Recognition outside the Jewish group would foster self-respect at home, and an enlightened understanding of Judaism<sup>is</sup> among the Jews themselves would raise the respect for Judaism among the non-Jews. Connected with this aim was Geiger's wish to establish a Jewish-theological faculty in connection with a university. Such a department of a university would teach the Jews respect for their past and appreciation of their present.<sup>90</sup>

Geiger was an apologist only occasionally. His theology was foremost a theology of reform. He was mostly concerned with the inner structure of Judaism, with its theories and practices. That they could stand the trials of modern times was the purpose of his labors. Maimonides and Mendelssohn were the



prototypes he set up for himself. Though they may have erred, their principles were correct. Geiger referred to the rationalistic element. "In their strivings we shall always recognize the spirit of Judaism which does not find the testimony of belief in supernatural phenomena, but which discovers the belief in truth only in reasonableness."<sup>91</sup> Not the letter but the spirit should lead us in our search, the spirit of the rationalistic time. Any other type of spirit was denounced by him as "Darschanimggeist."<sup>92</sup>

The belief in a personal Messiah, this most important and sustaining article of faith during the Middle Ages, was transplanted to another level of religious life. An intellectual concept of the Messiah replaced the old belief. Geiger connected this with the new consciousness of the individual who no longer considered himself completely independent, but realized that he was a part of all of mankind. His highest aspirations were not of a personal but of a community nature; his hopes were set in mankind's progress. Herein could the modern Jew find the new content of the old belief, and in serving mankind he could fulfil the high expectations of his religion. Even the most rationalistic Jew could not deny that this concept had a strong appeal and could serve as a part of the Zeitgeist. The old-fashioned Jew must have seen in this change of meaning a distortion of an important principle of Judaism. But Geiger did not encounter any difficulty in proving the legitimacy of his procedure. He showed how the relationship of the individual to the Jewish people changed at the time of the destruction of the Jewish Commonwealth and again in modern times.

First, the Israelite was no more than a part of his people. The people, not the individual, would enjoy a glorious future under the leadership of the Messiah, the Davidic king, was the general belief. The prophets spoke of life in this world and its sanctification, and the single person did not cherish much hope for the time after death. But the disappointments after the fall of the Temple brought about the belief in resurrection and united it finally with the messianic belief. The Messiah would come, and the individual, who had to suffer so much during his life, would return to life in order to be rehabilitated. It was during the long exile that the Jews thought more in terms of the individual than of the whole group. But now, Geiger continued, the individual considers himself not only a part of his people but even of mankind. Thus, Geiger could point out that the modern Jew was in accord with the prophets when he thought in terms of humanity's salvation through progress instead of his own by supernatural means.<sup>93</sup> Furthermore, the belief in a personal Messiah, because of its nationalistic connotations, imperiled the new development of a symbiosis.

The belief in a physical resurrection had become untenable in the light of man's insight in nature. Being consistent, Geiger did not tolerate even the discussion of it in books which were used in the religious school. That science and religion should not exclude one another, that they should not be combined by chance, but that they acted and reacted on one another necessarily, was the task of the leaders of the people and of

the scholars.<sup>94</sup> Geiger showed how this interrelationship could work. Those who clung to tradition were certainly horrified, but Geiger was convinced that he had eliminated nothing essential. On the contrary, his scientific research had taught him to see things as they had been and to give them back their original meaning.

Mendelssohn had spoken of two different sources of revelation. The first, of a general character, was allotted to all men. It was the revelation through reason and understanding, so to speak a natural revelation. No one was excluded from it. The Jews, however, possessed an additional source of revelation: the revealed law. God gave it on Mount Sinai, and it will be valid and binding, until God revokes it. The rationalist Geiger recognized only the former type of revelation. Divine revelation becomes always apparent in history and development, he declared.<sup>95</sup> Here we can clearly observe the process which put modern Judaism on a rationalistic basis. What Mendelssohn, who was a rationalist himself, had preserved for the sake of Jewish group identity by introducing an unsatisfactory dualism, was discarded by Geiger with consistency. It was Mendelssohn's personality that permitted him to establish a happy blending of universalism and group identity on a rationalistic basis for himself. Already his children could not understand their father's full philosophy. They chose Christianity which, at that time, was often identified with natural religion. Geiger, being aware of this difficulty, wanted to offer a homogeneous system.

Universalism and rationalism were but two sides of Geiger's theology. Combined with the principle of ethics, they made for the foundation of the whole structure. Geiger's theology is best described as a universalistic-rationalistic-ethical one.

We begin our discussion of Geiger's concept of ethics with the most important question any religion has to answer a question that was already discussed in tannaitic times and was answered in both ways: the obedience to God. The orthodox, whether Jew or non-Jew, has here no problem. God commands something, and he has to do it. He does not try to find out whether the commandment contains truth or not. Rather his conscientiousness than his intellect reacts to the divine law. But the enlightened Jew has learned to ask for truth and reasonableness; he wants to know reason and purpose of the commandment. His heart is not moved without his mind's participation; as Geiger put it: "The whole heart and the whole mind in harmony."<sup>96</sup> Geiger did not accept the rule of blind obedience to the law. His argument was as follows: according to our nature, we are destined to develop and strengthen our ethical consciousness. But how could God on the one side demand ethical consciousness and on the other expect it to be silent? Geiger differentiated between obedience and absolute obedience. It is obedience when we examine God's teachings carefully and rise to the truths contained in them so that we may act with a firm conviction. If it is impossible to perceive the truths of God's teachings, because they are beyond our capacity, obedience is only a case of prudence. This Geiger called absolute

obedience to which man may subject himself in the belief that God knows better to care for him than he does. The contradiction between ethical consciousness and absolute obedience is obvious, and Geiger was convinced that such a contradiction is unworthy of God.<sup>97</sup>

This was not merely an academic discussion. Geiger, the functioning rabbi, did not know such discussions. Everything ~~Everything~~ was related to life, nothing merely scientific. Ethical consciousness was the new incentive ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> piety, to a religious life. Geiger once remarked that his time was a time of struggles and doubts. He who never struggles does not advance, ~~and he who never struggles does not advance~~, and he who never doubts does not gain clarity and insight. The powerful demands of the new time had broken the old bond of believing piety; the sincere search of devoted men replaced it with an ethical-religious spirit which seeks first to comprehend and then to penetrate life.

Ethical consciousness became the means by which the Jewish religion was transplanted to a level where it could encounter modern ideas on equal terms. It was rationalistic in nature and universalistic in purpose. It was made the standard by which actions should be evaluated.

Ceremonies are of great importance in traditional Judaism. Daily life is accompanied by them. That they should not be made a mechanical, thoughtless performance was already advised by the teachers of old. They demanded of man "to direct his heart

toward Heaven" when he observes the manifold ceremonial laws. Directing the heart toward Heaven was a principle of too abstract a nature to satisfy the religious impulses of modern man. He required a concept that was more closely connected with his intellectual understanding. As he wanted to comprehend God's commandments in order to obey Him consciously, even so he desired to know why he should observe the ceremonial part of Judaism. And this was an all the more burning issue since the non-Jewish society began to accept it. In this new situation, ceremonies did not beautify Jewish life any more but hampered the freedom for which so many Jews longed. Consequently, a great number of them turned indifferent and cast the ceremonies off. Geiger criticized these people severely, because he was convinced that their indifference was responsible for the little support modern Judaism received and for the lack of constructive criticism.

Yet, it was clear to Geiger that not all ceremonies could be saved. Those which contradicted prophetic universalism and contemporary rationalism had to be discontinued; here he spoke against the idolaters of form. But those which strengthened man's ethical consciousness and led him to acting ethically, had to be observed; and here he turned against the indifferent Jews. The formula which Geiger presented was this: the purpose of ceremonies lies in their being an educational means by which humility toward God is implanted within us; by which we are reminded of God's providence, strengthened in our good will, and spiritually purified. But if the ceremonies do not have

this power and become an end in themselves, they lose their value and become forms without content, superstitious practices.<sup>98</sup> We may well say that Geiger succeeded in making the old concept of sanctifying life on earth an important element of Reform Judaism. This is what Geiger called "religiosity full of life" (lebensvolle Religiositaet).<sup>99</sup> As rabbi, historian, theologian, and reformer he devoted himself to interpreting this religiosity and establishing it as an integral part of the modern Jew.

It seemed ~~that~~ <sup>to</sup> Geiger that ethical consciousness cannot be acquired by everybody. Men have varying abilities; some rise to higher levels of intellectual life while others have to be satisfied with a more modest position. But in either case, man's actions are worthwhile only when they express an ethical impetus. This impetus is developed by consciousness in the case of the educated person and by ethical sentiments in the case of the non-intellectual person. The direction, in which the ethical impetus works, is one of a general nature: toward self-refinement, that is to say, elevation of the spirit and invigoration of the will with the purpose to defeat sensuality; toward a sense of justice and benevolence toward the fellow-man, and reverence and love of God. It is not necessary that every deed must be preceded by an intellectual act of grasping its desirability and value. They are so obvious in many cases that every man with a common sense recognizes his duty without any difficulty.<sup>100</sup> Here was a road open to all strata of the Jewish community; Geiger's con-

tact with the Jews of the small Duchy of Nassau made him aware of the diversity of intellectual standing among the Jews.

Now that the national elements of Judaism were cast off, that Judaism was on its way to being reformed and to taking on the features of a denomination, we must ask: what remains as Judaism's purpose? Though the remembrance of historical events plays an important role in our liturgy and our whole thinking, the trend of Judaism directs us to the future. The hope for a return to the Holy Land, for the reconstruction of the Temple and the reintroduction of the sacrifices, and for the coming of the Messiah and the beginning of a glorious time in the history of the Jewish people had always been an elementary factor of Jewish piety. Heroic suffering for God's law and patient trust in God's fulfilling His promises were expressions of Jewish piety in themselves. This was the essence of Judaism until "the time of struggles and doubts" began. These hopes had no validity any more; they contradicted the new aspirations of the Jew. Wherein could one find the essence of Judaism now?

Reading Geiger's essays in the Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift ~~rift~~ one discovers an obvious shift of emphasis. That the hopes, hitherto concerned with the Jewish people, began to embrace all of mankind, was already stated. But it seems that, what was formerly expected in the future, whether near or distant had been left to God's judgment, became now, to an increasing extent, a part of the present. Though Geiger spoke of God's providence and guidance, he considered man as capable of doing very much himself for the ideal time and for ideal mankind.



Certainly, the factor of man's active participation in shaping a good world was never absent from Jewish thinking. But it was now that it became the dominant element of Jewish piety. The shift to a very personal level of religious aspirations was connected with the denationalization of Judaism. Thus, Geiger could explain the essence of Judaism: it lies in the free unfolding of ethical strength and in the recognition of man's dignity. But man's dignity stands only as long as he, while being conscious of his limitations as an imperfect creature, has the power to cultivate the good inclination which raises him above covetous beings; the victory of his good inclination as well as the humble acknowledgment of his imperfection mark human dignity.<sup>101</sup> Therefore man's life is a constant battle, and religion does not serve the purpose to provide man with contentment. "Religion," Geiger wrote, "is the penetration and sanctification of life by sublime concepts and sublime endeavors."<sup>102</sup>

In another passage Geiger enumerated the basic principles of Judaism. "Truth and understanding (Erkenntnis), not unfounded belief, justice and charitableness, not weak love, firm trust in the Guide and Father, not hope derived from feeble longing, these are the pillars on which Judaism rests, and which sustain the timely shaping and the detailed work."<sup>103</sup>

We see that the essence of Judaism lies for Geiger in religious ethics.

Geiger developed a program for Judaism, since everything done for the present should be a stepping stone for the future,

not an achievement with its end in itself. Here his concept was perhaps most Jewish, because he was concerned with the whole Jewish group, not with individual Jews or mankind in general. Judaism created Christianity, Islam, and modern philosophy, the latter through Spinoza's criticism. But all creations became independent of Judaism. Now, however, Judaism must prove its generative power by creating something in fulfilling spiritually its basic idea which then, as its own, will be a part of the grand spiritual process through which mankind has to go. Taking this into consideration, one must strive for spreading useful knowledge among the Jews. The efforts to obtain civil rights and equality must be rooted in the desire to take part in mankind's development.<sup>104</sup> "The spiritual fulfillment of Judaism's basic idea" must be the realization of the prophetic principles of ethics. Though Geiger did not say that explicitly, it must have been the kernel of his program in accordance with his understanding of the true values of Judaism. The program was universalistic in its final effect, but particularistic in its origin and early development.

Geiger was not particularly interested in politics; yet, the emancipation of the Jews was an issue that forced him to express himself. Already in the first volume of the Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift he had to take his stand against a certain tendency that arose among the Jews in connection with the struggle for emancipation. Some Jews longed so fervently for equal rights that they were willing to give up every custom which might have endangered the attainment of their goal.

As Geiger put it: "One would drop everything for the sake of one advantage." To be accepted by their environment as enlightened people, Jews began to copy the Christians in a superficial manner (christeln).<sup>105</sup> Geiger, who himself turned against many traditional customs, criticized sharply this attitude. Not the elimination or preservation of customs was debated but the motivation behind it. Geiger's reform, based on scientific research, was directed toward a renaissance of Judaism and a strengthening of its influence upon the life of the individual Jew. But in the blind removal of elements for political purposes he saw a threat to Judaism. On the contrary, the Jews' attainment of their political goals should be of service to their religious life.<sup>106</sup>

Geiger was not indifferent toward the emancipation. He desired it as much as any other Jew. The fact of being emancipated was important to him; but the new perspective, which the emancipation would offer, was even more important. The emancipation, he said, should not be an end in itself, but should serve as another way to enable the qualities of the Jew.<sup>107</sup> This was a highly spiritual vision in the midst of egotistic ambitions to secure one's convenience.

The historian and theologian Geiger was a rabbi who worked with his congregants and for them, and who understood them. It is, therefore, necessary that we turn to the practical aspects on which he elaborated in the periodical.

## Chapter IV

## Reforms

Abraham Geiger was a rabbi, yet he had to fight to be recognized as such. The attacks upon his claim of being a rabbi came from the orthodox circles. It is interesting to see in what ways Orthodoxy attempted to prevent the new movement from taking roots and gaining the status of equality.

The first attack was launched in 1838 by the representatives of thirteen rural congregations in the Duchy of Nassau. These rural congregations, which, in that part of Germany, remained strongholds of strictest traditionalism to the very end of German Jewry, fought the effort to promote Geiger to be the official rabbi of the Duchy. One of the reasons, enumerated in their petition, was that Geiger, instead of having taken an examination with the rabbi of his home town, provided himself with a document (hatarath horaa) in Marburg "in a not very praiseworthy manner." The petitioners claimed that Geiger had never been examined as a theologian and rabbi in a proper and formal way. It seems that Geiger did not answer this statement; he left Wiesbaden a few weeks later.

The reason for Geiger's going to Rabbi Gosen in Marburg can be appreciated very easily. Rabbi in Frankfurt was Salomon Trier who belonged to the group of the strict orthodox (Altfromme). When Leopold Stein was elected rabbi in Frankfurt in 1844, Trier resigned from his office.<sup>108</sup> How could Geiger expect Trier to give him, whose liberal attitude was

very well known, the rabbinical diploma? The hatarath horaa was not only a document testifying to the learning of its possessor but was also concerned with his personality, with "preaching what is moral and practising the morals he preaches."<sup>109</sup> In a matter, which combines the objective judgment with the subject<sup>ive</sup> evaluation of convictions, it is only self-understood that an applicant should approach a man of whom he is certain that this person is well-disposed toward him. Geiger's step was not an extraordinary one, since in those days seminaries and committees on examinations did not yet exist and ordination through an individual was customary.<sup>110</sup>

The second attack came less than eight weeks later. On the 25th of July, 1838, Geiger was elected associate rabbi (Rabbinatsassessor) in Breslau. Two days later, Salomon A. Tiktin, the senior rabbi of the congregation, declared in a meeting of the board, "that he could not approve of the election of Dr. Geiger, because he attacked religion in his periodical; and in general, he who studied at a university must not take the position of a rabbi."<sup>111</sup> Tiktin knew, indeed, how to discredit the liberal tendency among the Jews. By denying a man with a modern education to function as a rabbi, he doubtlessly hoped to make a progressing intellectual foundation of Reform Judaism impossible, to prevent the new movement from gaining recognition, and to keep it on a level inferior to that of the established and, by the government recognized, form of Judaism. Geiger saw the danger and, courageous as he was, entered the arena.

This was the situation: as long as the Jewish communities formed a unity regulated by Jewish law, the rabbi held the key position. His were the decisions according to the law, and by his work the members of his congregation would abide. When the observance of the Shulchan aruch fell victim to the modern concept of religion, the old-fashioned rabbis guarded jealously their institution and tried to keep modernists away from it. They wanted to be known as the only legitimate guardians of Judaism. On the other hand, most of the modern rabbis did not like to have people associate them with the old type of rabbinate. Thus, men like Zunz, Salomon, Kley, and Mannheimer called themselves preachers.<sup>112</sup> From their point of view, the title indicated a new tendency, a new concept of an old institution, the new position the modern rabbi occupied in his congregation. From the angle of the orthodox rabbis the title gave proof of a position completely different from theirs and of less authority to speak on vital Jewish matters.

Geiger was the first who claimed to be recognized as a rabbi; Holdheim, when he came, a few years later, to Berlin as the rabbi of the Reform congregation, called himself rabbi and preacher.<sup>113</sup> Geiger always signed his letters to the various ministries in Berlin: "Dr. Abraham Geiger, Rabbi."<sup>114</sup> This was only a tactical procedure in dealing with the government which could not deprive him of his title.

The next volume of the Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift - volume five - did not appear until 1844. The first essay of this volume on, "Die Aufgabe der Gegenwart" contains a

description of the sentiments which entered into the considerations when a rabbi was to be elected. The question whether a rabbi should be trained in the traditional way alone, or whether he should combine with it knowledge in the fields of philosophy<sup>h</sup>, philology, history was not of an academic nature. Whenever a congregation was going to elect a rabbi, the board had *to* choose between these two categories, before personalities could be taken into consideration. Every time the question became a burning issue. Geiger rejected the attitude as it was revealed by both sides.

He certainly could not agree with those who held that the Talmud is like an ocean containing all wisdom. The study of it, the orthodox argued, requires so much time and devotion that no true talmudist can find the leisure to engage himself in other disciplines. The more knowledge one acquires outside the realm of the Talmud, the less piety one has.<sup>115</sup> What we said before about Geiger's training, his literary work, and concept of Judaism makes a further discussion on this point of view unnecessary.

The enlightened members of the congregations took a stand which was not less objectionable to Geiger. To them, a rabbi, whether of the traditional or modern type, was identical with a fanatic. These people were only interested in eliminating the rabbi's influence to the greatest possible extent. The moral power of the rabbinical office was to be undermined. Whenever the position of a rabbi was vacant, a rather unimportant person, not a man of reputation, was called. He had to

function as associate or assistant or substitute. Whatever congregational matters required his attention, could be taken care of by him. But beyond this activity he should possess no influence. And time would work toward making him dispensable, the enlightened congregants hoped.<sup>116</sup>

How closely Geiger's theological concepts and his reforms, i. e. his practical work, were connected, can be seen from his objections to the two standpoints. An important step was made by the Breslau congregation in the direction of solving the question quite to Geiger's satisfaction. It was his own election as "second rabbi who should not function as a subordinate but as an associate."<sup>117</sup> He was to be the mouth-piece for, and the representative of, the principle which began to penetrate the newly awakened life in the congregation. It was self-understood that Geiger would not give up the right to be called a rabbi. In Breslau he had found the place where he could go to work and utilize the results of his studies in practical life. Already in 1835, he had written in the essay with which he introduced his periodical, that the theologians must master the history of the development of our religion as well as be well versed in those fields of learning which make for a good general education.<sup>118</sup> Only such men can fulfil their rabbinical duties with success, only they can keep Judaism alive, and they alone are in a position to instil the indifferent with new zeal and to disperse doubts and lack of clarity. Had Geiger yielded to the claim of the orthodox, he would have had to repudiate his years in Heidelberg and Bonn and give up his



whole theology. It was Geiger's merit that the title "rabbi" was saved for the Reform theologians.

In a letter to the ministry in Berlin of the 12th of November, 1838, Geiger made a declaration of his intentions in order to do his best for obtaining Prussian citizenship and to support a petition of the Breslau congregation referring to this. The most important phrase of this letter, for our discussion on Geiger's reforms, is "that finally the statement (of his orthodox opponents in Breslau), that my opinions will create Jewish sects, will probably be turned into the hope that, through a sincere, lively religious sentiment, the indifferent will be caused to return to the positive religion."<sup>119</sup> Geiger did not want to create Jewish sects. We are in all probability not wrong when we assume, that Tiktin and his friends knew very well this attitude of Geiger. But the use of the word "sect" could have had a twofold effect. First of all, Tiktin could have been sure that the Prussian government would not have tolerated any Jewish sects. He could have trusted in Frederick William's III repeating the royal order of 1823 by which only the service in its traditional form, without any changes or innovations, was permitted. On the other hand, Orthodox Judaism always employed the term "sect" to designate a new movement rising against it. The word cast an ill reputation upon those who made themselves a part of the new movement; it was a euphemism for illegal existence.

Geiger's letter to the ministry was convincing. For he himself was convinced that he was not the spokesman of a sect,

of a group of innovators and revolutionaries, but that he spoke as the advocate of those who had come to understand the true, historic essence of Judaism. Though the Jewish community was divided in his time into two major camps, and though he was strongly opposed to a superficial appeasement and agreement between them,<sup>120</sup> he did not give up the hope for an understanding between Orthodoxy and Reform. The achievement of true reconciliation was not the task of the elected officials of the congregation or individual congregants, but a matter of science, of the progressing ethical religious education as well as of a deeper general understanding of the essence and form of Judaism.<sup>121</sup> In one passage, Geiger even went so far as to say that Orthodoxy must follow Reform, though it may cause pains and require sacrifices.<sup>122</sup> Though Geiger was an ardent partisan, the foremost leader of the new movement, his thinking was not bound to the liberal segment of the Jewish group; as a liberal he wanted to be a part of the Jewish community. This firm stand on unity, we should perhaps say organizational unity, was reflected in his attitude towards the extreme reformers. After Geiger had declined<sup>d</sup> the invitation of the Berlin Reform congregation to preach the sermon on the first day of Passover, two representatives of that congregation came to Breslau on the 17th and 18th of March, 1846 to offer him personally the rabbinate of the newly established Reformgenossenschaft. But Geiger did not accept the offer.<sup>123</sup> According to Seligmann, this offer was repeated, but Geiger declined it every time, "because he did not want to be the rabbi of a private congregation separated

from the whole..."<sup>124</sup> He acted similarly in the case of the Breslau Friends of Reform, who had published a declaration, consisting of five points, in a Breslau newspaper in April, 1845. The last point stated that these reformers did not intend to establish a congregation of their own. This pleased Geiger most, and in a letter to the board of his congregation he pointed out, that as a rabbi he would not join any party because of his conviction that the rabbi must stand above the parties, though he might be more favorably inclined toward one than toward the other.<sup>125</sup> The major difference between Geiger and the radical reformers of his time was that Geiger wanted to avoid even the semblance of a split within the congregation.<sup>126</sup>

It was Geiger's merit that the unity of the Jewish congregations was preserved. In this respect he differed greatly from Holdheim who, by accepting the rabbinate of the Reform congregation in Berlin, came to advocate rather individual trends than unity. One may compare the two German rabbis to David Einhorn and Isaac M. Wise in this country. "Wise was motivated by "Union" in all areas of Jewish life, by the development of a religious philosophy of life for the intellectuals, for the enlightened, the elite among the Jews. Wise veered away from sectarianism, while Einhorn said openly that he was uninterested in the effect his reforms might have on the main body of Israel."<sup>127</sup> With regard to the point under discussion, Geiger was succeeded by Wise and Holdheim by Einhorn. The Berlin Reform congregation remained the only one

of its kind in Germany, and at no time did it exert any influence upon German Jewry in general. This accounts for the fact that there was no conflict among German Jews similar to that between Einhorn and Wise. Geiger's practical theology left its imprint on German Jewry which, in spite of all differences of opinions and practices, created the united congregations (Einheitsgemeinden).

By describing Geiger's claim for the title "rabbi" and his firm stand on unity within the congregation, we have touched upon two of the most important points which characterized his reforms. What he set forth in theory through his studies, became an integral part of his practical work: to continue the development of Judaism along the lines of its historical growth. This gave him the right to claim the traditional title and obliged him to be a defender of unity.

A short time before Geiger left Wiesbaden, he wrote the most revealing and finest essay for our study. It is entitled: "Die zwei verschiedenen Betrachtungsweisen. Der Schriftsteller und der Rabbiner."<sup>128</sup> This essay is a revelation insofar as Geiger showed us the inner conflicts with which a rabbi was confronted who pursued his studies as a scholar and historian. The conflicts may even be ours; therefore the value of Geiger's observations is not only a literary one.

The major conflict arises from the fact that the author and the rabbi, i. e. the theorist and the practitioner, face two different worlds and are led by two different points of

view. The former is independent in his work, he may present the results of his studies without fear of, and consideration for, anybody. The latter is bound to his congregation, he must not forget that his work is done for the benefit of others. The scholar can demand, the rabbi may only propose. The scholar thinks in terms of all of Jewry and "demands the sovereign authority of the pure Jewish ideas in their harmony with science; he demands their complete authority over life with all its expressions and formations."<sup>129</sup> The rabbi, however, must make certain facts and factors the basis of his work. His is a small domain, and he has to recognize that there are different stages of culture within the congregation and varying social relations.<sup>130</sup> The scholar and the rabbi have the same goal, but their starting point is not the same. The scholar fights that which exists, and the rabbi uses it to establish the authority of the religious idea.

Geiger confessed in this essay that the task of the theologian and that of the reformer were not identical, could not be identical. Had Geiger considered them identical, had he, as a reformer, disregarded the sphere of congregational life as he had to disregard it as a theologian, he would have failed in his rabbinical career.

The following quotation reveals the circumstances under which Geiger labored as a reformer: "It is, comparatively spoken, an easy matter to separate oneself from usual conditions for the sake of one's conviction and finally to sacrifice one's temporal welfare, one's life; it is a more difficult

matter to hold back one's conviction, without denying it, because of kind feelings and the desire to be a benefactor unto one's brethren by progressing slowly and cautiously; it is a more difficult matter to endanger ~~the~~ own peace of mind in order to secure the progress of the fellowmen all the more, to permit smilingly that one's deepest sentiments and endeavors are hurt with points of needles. How much do I respect this ideal with its happy, glorified sorrow!"<sup>131</sup> As long as he sent out invitations to his colleagues to attend the meeting of progressive rabbis in Wiesbaden, he could speak of the medusan head of idolatry of forms and demand its destruction under all circumstances.<sup>132</sup> Here he could speak as a theorist. But the rabbi of a congregation, a man of practical life, had to go another way, "the way of mediation to correct and soothe with prudence.. Who could demand of him what to do and how to act at a time of confused conditions and of frustrated claims made by the situation and by men? He should be happy if he does not lose sight of his position; he should be happy if he does not deceive himself in any way; he should be happy if he does not become completely dishonest, if he does not completely misjudge the fruitfulness which is contained even in the given circumstances; if he does not forget the goal and build his foundation on quick sand."<sup>133</sup> He assured his reader that he recognized the diversity of the theological and rabbinical position, though he did not believe in their strict separation. Without blending them, he hoped for a mutual influence of the two spheres in which he lived and labored.<sup>134</sup> Geiger understood very well that tasks of a different nature

required a different approach. He was a fighter when theoretical clarity and such fundamental questions as the title "rabbi" and unity were involved. Practical problems, however, which were related to the life of the congregants, called for tact, understanding, and caution. "Practical problems...cannot be solved at once, but their solution must gradually be prepared."<sup>135</sup>

What kind of reforms did Geiger advocate in the Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift? How far did he go, and what were his motivations? It must be repeated that not every remark about reforms can be mentioned. The most interesting and important examples will be treated.

One of the most delicate parts of Halacha is that which deals with the status of the woman. The difficulty which arose was caused by a diversity of civilization: East and West had met. The generally accepted status of the woman there could not be maintained here. As long as the Jewish community formed a distinct and unique entity, the remnants of the oriental concept, as they had become an integral part of Halacha, could continue to regulate life. With an ever increasing adjustment of the Jews to the occidental habits, sentiments, and thoughts more and more people disregarded the legalism of their religion. The end of the juridical authority of the rabbis supported this development. There was no need for the modern Jew to abide by the paragraphs of the Shulchan aruch and to seek the decision of a rabbi; the state had taken over legal competency in all respects. The state law superseded the findings derived

from Halacha.

This was the fact as it presented itself to any keen observer. The orthodox rabbi deplored it and tried to hold his ground and defend the legal aspects of Judaism. The progressive rabbi recognized the change as a necessity. What should he do? Should he treat it with silence and let the natural development take its course? Or should he justify the new attitude and prove that it did not mark a break with the spirit of Judaism?

Geiger chose the latter way. First of all, he could point to Rabbenu Gershom who had adjusted the old point of view to the European environment.<sup>136</sup> It was through Gershom's takana that polygamy became, even theoretically, prohibited in the countries of Europe, and that a divorce could only take place with the consent of the wife. Thus, Geiger could justify his attempt to interpret and defend the new development. Apart from this historical consideration, Geiger had reality as his support: Jewish law was not valid any more before the state.<sup>137</sup>

What was needed in Geiger's opinion was a "meeting of intelligent rabbis who appreciate the spirit of our time as well as of our faith." He expected this assembly to take actions, since silent disregard would not have served the needs of Judaism in transition.<sup>138</sup> The right of this assembly to set up principles was based by him upon a talmudic statement that he who marries does it in accordance with the statement of the scholars. "The same importance", he continued, "would be accorded



to a decree which is now to be promulgated."<sup>139</sup> For centuries the rabbis had not dared to take a step of their own; their decisions were based on, or derived from, tradition. Geiger claimed for himself and his colleagues the right which the talmudic scholars of old had enjoyed. Their decisions had been bound to the conditions of the time; a new time was now requiring new decisions. Why should he have hesitated to take that step? This is what he proposed: "That no marriage be considered valid when the civil court (the state) declares the husband dead or missing; when the civil court pronounces a divorce to be valid; when the brother-in-law, who has to perform the chalitza, cannot be located, or when he tries to harm the wife of the late brother..."<sup>140</sup> The wedding should be performed by a ceremony which was in keeping with the time and with the honor of the bride, and which should replace the offensive act of a fictitious acquisition.

Geiger's proposal was made in anticipation of a development which came to its end under Bismarck, who, during the raging Kulturkampf, introduced the civil marriage as a preliminary condition of the religious ceremony. The chalitza was less and less frequently performed even among orthodox Jews, while the problem of the aguna never ceased to engage orthodox authorities and to call for a revision.

Geiger went even a step further. He demanded equal rights for the women and their full participation in religious life. During the morning service, a blessing is recited in which the man thanks God that he is not made a woman. Though the women

have a blessing of their own, Geiger did not like the prayer. The common explanation of the blessing is, that the women are not held in low esteem, as it may appear from the phrasing, but that the men have the opportunity to fulfil more religious obligations than the women. For that they express their gratitude to God. Geiger was opposed to counting religious acts by numbers; rather their contents should be decisive, he stated. But not only from this point of view did he advocate the elimination of the blessing. Since it gave rise to misunderstanding, namely that the women rank lower in Judaism than the men, and contained an offending element, its abrogation was all the more desirable in his judgment.<sup>141</sup>

Most of Geiger's reforms were devoted to the synagogue. Form of service, language, and prayers were discussed or touched upon. The most interesting subject, however, was the problem of the Sunday service. When the service was reformed, most attention was paid to the Saturday morning service. Yet, only a small part of the membership had the leisure to attend it. Business life claimed many a congregant's time.<sup>142</sup> Therefore, the Berlin Reform congregation introduced already in the first year of its existence, in 1846, an additional service on Sunday morning. When the attendance on Saturday became negligible, the Sabbath service was dropped.<sup>143</sup> During the third rabbinical conference, which took place in Breslau a few months later, the Sabbath service was discussed, and Holdheim was the only one who argued for the Reformgenossenschaft and also for the Sunday service.<sup>144</sup> More than a year later, Geiger presented

the problem in the Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift, discussed it from various angles, and offered his own solution.

The conference had postponed the discussion on holding services on Sunday morning. Geiger had been in favor of this decision, because he was convinced that the time for such an institution had not yet come. Even when he wrote his article on "Die religioesen Taten der Gegenwart", he did not change his opinion.<sup>145</sup> Looking at the issue from one angle, one could defend it, considering it from another point of view, however, one had to reject it. The institution of the enlarged morning service on Monday and Thursday gave the historical justification for introducing a special service on Sunday. As an economic reason, the villagers coming to town on the marketday, had been a proper cause for having scriptural reading and special fasts on Monday and Thursday, and even the reading of the scroll of Esther on the Monday or Thursday preceding Purim, even so the economic structure, of which the Jews had become a part in Geiger's time, could justify a service on Sunday morning. However, two objections were raised. The first was that a Jewish Sunday service with the emphasis of a Sabbath service, for want of attendance on Saturday, would have appeared as if Judaism began to yield to the religion recognized by the state, i. e. Christianity. It would have been a "dangerous concession." The second reason for objecting was the apparent degradation of the Sabbath. Observing the Sabbath on Sunday seemed to indicate "a self-sacrifice and a surrender to Christianity."<sup>146</sup> That Geiger agreed with the op-

ponents of the Reformgenossenschaft's innovation is of no little interest. More revealing even is his preferring emotional considerations to a historical example in this case. As a reformer Geiger was careful, respecting sentiments and thinking of feasibility, for he knew "that a hallowed institution is more easily destroyed than established."<sup>147</sup>

Nevertheless, the situation called for new experiments. The congregations in Koenigsberg and Offenbach followed the Berlin Reform congregation and held Sunday services. In Worms the attempt was made to solve the difficulty by holding a special service on Saturday afternoon in the hope that more people had the opportunity to attend. Geiger doubted the success of the latter remedy. He made his own proposal. Not regularly but occasionally, perhaps once a month, a service should be held on Sunday morning. Such a monthly service would not deprive the Saturday of its liturgical emphasis; the Jews would not give the impression as if they sanctified the Sunday; and the temporal nature of the institution, called for by the needs of the time, would be established beyond doubt.<sup>148</sup> In his practical reforms Geiger was moderate. As one who wanted to preserve the unity of the Jewish community he had to be. This was painful, and Geiger gave expression to it, as we quoted him above. In Breslau he was criticized by the orthodox who called him a renegade in spite of his moderate position; and the radical reformers considered his utterances and reforms a denunciation of his former principles because of his moderate position.<sup>149</sup>

A similar caution can be observed in his dealing with the question, which language should dominate the service. Hebrew was no more understood by every worshipper. It was only natural that German should be introduced in the synagogue. Friedlaender and Jacobson had done it more than thirty years earlier, and the Berlin Reform congregation conducted an almost completely German service. Most congregations, however, did not seek a radical solution, but made a compromise. German was used but Hebrew reserved for the prayers "of a more hallowed nature." To Geiger, this was a solution for the time being.<sup>150</sup> Though the transition from Hebrew to German could not take place at once, the complete Germanization of the service should have been the ultimate goal in the future. Prayers in a public service, Geiger said, mark the immediate expression of denominational life.<sup>151</sup> Keeping in mind the position to which he assigned the Jewish religion, namely to be a denomination with Protestantism and Catholicism, we understand the radical change he proposed for the future. Yet, one should not take his proposal as a consequence of attacks from the outside upon Judaism as a national structure and upon the Hebrew language as the most eloquent witness to the Jewish nationality. He defended Hebrew in the synagogue by pointing to the Latin mass of the Catholic Church and the French service of the French Reformed Church in Germany.<sup>152</sup> Geiger's practical proposal for harmonizing the Hebrew and German elements, for reconciling the habits of the past with the demands of the present was this: both languages should remain separated; the German element should provide the frame for the

scriptural reading and the sermon. From this central position it could, at a later time, easily progress to a dominating position within the whole service.<sup>153</sup>

The public service as the expression of denominational life and the most important act of the religious congregation required a change of forms and prayers. As we said in the introduction, Friedlaender and Jacobson had realized this necessity more than three decades earlier. Geiger did not make a new motion, when he called for external dignity of the service, for a shortening of the service the length of which had become annoying, and for the elimination of those elements which had become unfit in the light of the new development.<sup>154</sup> New, however, was the element of legitimacy, the proof that the spirit of Judaism was not abandoned by the changes. Friedlaender and Jacobson had justified their reforms only by proclaiming the *Zeitgeist* the new standard of evaluation. Geiger, with his profound knowledge of Judaism, its history and development, supported by the work of such historians as Zunz and Jost and his liberal colleagues in the rabbinate, could strengthen Friedlaender's and Jacobson's justification by showing the link to the past.

"But we may set up Maimonides' carefulness as our example... and learn from him how such duties (to look after the dignity of the service) are more obliging than the fulfilment of the talmudic letter."<sup>155</sup> Geiger referred to a reform which Maimonides urged the community in Mizra to introduce. The *t'filla* was recited twice, first silently, and then it was repeated

by the cantor. The silent recitation was intended for those who could not say it. While the cantor repeated it, those who had said the prayer silently engaged themselves in conversations, because they felt that they had fulfilled their duty. The others, for whose benefit the cantor recited it, took part in the talking. To eliminate this improper conduct and to restore the dignity of the service, Maimonides proposed to begin immediately with the loud recitation of the t'filla.<sup>156</sup> By quoting this advice, Geiger could say that he followed in the footsteps of an outstanding personality when he demanded reforms for the sake of dignity, order, and beauty.

Not only the form of the service but also the contents of the prayers called for a revision. Prayers express man's hopes and aspirations. Many of the traditional prayers give testimony to the national character of Judaism and to the Jews' longing for the reinstitution of the sacrificial cult in Jerusalem. The new spirit did not permit to utter words and to express thoughts which had become obsolete. The conviction that the Jews did not form the chosen people but that they were charged with the mission to represent the belief in God's unity demanded a universalistic leitmotif in the prayer book.<sup>157</sup> Geiger turned against those prayers which spoke of the return to Palestine and the rebuilding of a Jewish state as well as the Temple.<sup>158</sup> If the Jew is convinced, Geiger held, that the sacrifice was merely a forerunner of the prayer and that the latter marks a higher level of worship, then

he cannot continue to recite the prayers for the former's re-institution.<sup>159</sup>

Geiger took cognizance of the different tasks he faced as a theologian and as a reformer. A short analysis of his position towards the dietary laws and a brief discussion on his prayer book will conclude this study.



## Chapter V

### Dietary Laws and Prayer Book

In the preceding chapter we spoke of the different tasks with which scientific research and practical life confront the theologian and reformer. That reforms cannot be carried through solely on the basis of intellectual arguments and proofs, has been stated. Reforms are implemented; they are to become a part of the life of the group. Therefore, the theoretical conclusions alone are not sufficiently <sup>strong</sup> ~~stern~~ to guide the practical work. Only when they are blended with a profound sense of feasibility, can they serve man as an instrument of renaissance. The conclusions of the theologian tell us how far we must go; the reformer's sense of feasibility tells us how far we can go at the moment. This is the reason why Geiger always spoke in terms of the unfinished, why he rejected the attempts to work toward completion immediately. He spoke in terms of the future when he was concerned with what should be done, and in terms of the present when he discussed what could be done. His remarks on the language of the service and the Sunday morning service were examples of this attitude. In the following we shall further illustrate this point.

The third rabbinical conference set up a committee which had to prepare a report on the revision of the dietary laws. The report, to be presented at the fourth conference, concluded with the proposal "to abrogate the binding force of the dietary laws." Einhorn<sup>160</sup> and Holdheim<sup>161</sup> argued that the dietary laws had lost their validity. Though they arrived

at the same conclusion, they did not agree in their reasoning. Their difference of opinion was a matter of approach. Einhorn identified the dietary laws with <sup>ritual</sup> cleanliness. Since cleanliness ceased to be an important element of the Jewish religion with the destruction of <sup>t</sup>the Temple, the dietary laws also lost their place in the life of the Jews at that time.<sup>162</sup> Holdheim, however, showed that the dietary laws formed a <sup>e</sup>category of their own within the whole complex of the ceremonial law.<sup>163</sup> Not only one or another segment of the ceremonial law has been abrogated by the course of history, Holdheim pointed out, but the ceremonial law in its entirety. It was a part of biblical theocracy. As the modern Jew does not intend to reinstitute this phenomenon of biblical times, even so can he not think in terms of its legalism; "We do not believe in its binding force."<sup>164</sup> Furthermore, the biblical association of symbolic cleanliness and holiness with ethical cleanliness and holiness has lost its meaning in modern times. "We know of no other holiness but the ethical and have no concept of the unclean as having an ethical implication."<sup>164</sup>

Geiger objected to this "far-reaching statement."<sup>165</sup> Though the presented arguments be valid and acceptable, he held, the rabbinical conference could not promulgate resolutions the practical implications of which reached beyond the limits within which the individual rabbi could work successfully. "The assembly must ask itself two questions when making a pronouncement: is this necessary for the purification of religious sentiment and life? And: can this be implemented without

endangering the transitory Jewish concept of the present?" If the latter question could not be answered in the affirmative, then the practical pronouncement regarding a reform had to be postponed until literary stimulation has prepared the congregants for such a reform. One could hardly think of another situation in which the trends within Reform Judaism come to the fore so clearly. As these remarks mark one of Geiger's last contributions to the Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift, one is attempted to belief that the practical considerations, which engaged him constantly in his congregational work, superseded the freedom of thought he enjoyed in his studies and determined the nature and range of his contribution to Reform Judaism.

Geiger was not a defender of the dietary laws as such. He regretted that "the stomach was made the essence of religious ~~ous~~ life", and belonged to those who realized "that religion had to be emancipated from the kitchen." In addition to this sentiment, another aspect was involved which might have called for an open abrogation: the dietary laws made for separating the Jews from their environment. These laws were an obstacle on the way to building the brotherhood of mankind. Yet, there were other factors which demanded caution and prudence. Only a small segment of the Jewish population looked at the dietary laws as a ~~minor~~ <sup>i</sup> minor element of Jewish religious life. The dietary rules had taken deep roots in the religious consciousness of the people. On the other hand, most of those who paid little or no attention to them, justified themselves not by

creating a new concept of Judaism but by claiming individual liberty to ignore these regulations of Judaism. Geiger conceded that the popular opinion about the dietary laws, belonging to the unchangeable essence of Judaism, was erroneous; he agreed with Einhorn and Holdheim in theory. But he doubted that the rabbinical conference could perform a quick correction of the people's wrong attitude.

Geiger chose a unique way of treating the dietary laws both from a modern point of view and from the angle of prudence. He divided them into two parts: those which are left to the care of the individual and those the observance of which is a part of congregational institutions. The rules concerning basar b'chalav, taarovot, and kelim he counted as parts of the first group. The second group consisted of sh'chita and t'refot. The former required the attention of the women to such an extent that her busy activity with these matters led to a religious superficiality and dullness. The discussion, Geiger proposed, should be limited to these very regulations aiming at their abolition. The second group, however, did not concern the individual and his sense of piety; it was put under the supervision of the congregation. The individual's conscience and opinion alone were not important, "but the various convictions had to be taken into consideration." As long as these matters attracted the interest of the whole group, and as long as the congregations did not give up their competency and charge the individual members with taking over the responsibility, Geiger considered it delicate to touch upon sh'chita

and t'refot. The man of practical life foresaw "controversies of the most obstinate nature." He concluded by assuring his reader that he understood the judgment passed by theory; that the dietary laws were obstacles to the fulfilment of the task set by modern Judaism; and that these laws had become dead wood in the light of the new religious concepts. But, and this is important, theory remains mere theory if its contents are not made absolutely clear. Only then could it be transformed into practice and would be accepted by the people.

Though Geiger does not say it explicitly, it is implied in his conclusion: at whatever theological concepts the theorist arrives, the reformer can only implement them after a process of instruction and education helped the congregants to understand and accept the fruits of intellectual labor. It was in this sense that Geiger spoke of the function of the sermon: "The sermon must make the people comprehend what science has already fully accepted."<sup>166</sup> The reformer is simultaneously an educator. Because he was a theologian and a reformer, Geiger called constantly for an academic institution which would contribute to the understanding of the theories and prepare their practical applications.

A few remarks may be made on Geiger's prayer book, which was published in 1854. It was neither the first prayer book, of the Reform Movement<sup>167</sup> nor the first with a German translation.<sup>168</sup> We detect in this prayer book his consideration for the congregation. As we saw, Geiger favored, in theory, the Germanization of the service.<sup>169</sup> But the time for that had not

yet come; the complete service was conducted in Hebrew. Only a few German prayers were provided for silent meditation.<sup>170</sup>

The only occasion the rabbi had to recite German prayers was after the scriptural reading. We see that Geiger implemented the modest recommendations which he had made about seven years earlier in his periodical.<sup>171</sup>

As the title page of the prayer book indicates, the German text is not a translation; it was rather intended to be a free arrangement. Geiger did not translate the words but reproduced the thoughts of the prayers in a poetic style. Thus, his German rendition of the Hebrew text is very short. The German section of the first b'racha of the t'fila reads like this: "Praised be Thou, O Lord, God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Almighty and Holy. Thou reignest in mercy, Thou rememberest the faithfulness of the fathers and bringest redemption to their descendants." It is no exaggeration when we say that the German part of the prayer book constitutes a prayer book ~~constitutes a prayer book~~ in itself. The pleonasm, which characterizes the style of many Hebrew prayers, has been eliminated from the German rendition. New thoughts were connected with the essential ideas of the traditional prayers. Thus we read in the second blessing of the evening service on Friday night: "With deep gratitude we think of the completed day and of the merciful support which Thou hast rendered unto us in its course." The Hebrew text simply says: "With eternal love dost Thou love Thy people Israel."

This leads us to those elements which Geiger even eliminated

from the Hebrew text in accordance with his theories and the demands of the new time. The passages concerning sacrifices, the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and the return of the Jews from the four corners of the world to Palestine were no more a part of the liturgy. Another change may be mentioned: the traditional text of the twelfth blessing of the t'fila reads: "And for slanderers let there be no hope." Geiger replaced "slanderers" with "slander", "not because he was afraid of the opponents of the emancipation, but because the old version is unworthy of a prayer."<sup>172</sup> In the Kiddush and in the blessing over the Tora the words "from among all peoples" were eliminated. A later compromise kept Geiger's version of the Kiddush but reintroduced the original Tora blessing. The mediaeval poems did not find a place in Geiger's prayer book. This was one way to shorten the lengthy traditional service. Another one was used by Geiger who had the cantor recite the t'fila immediately without the preceding silent prayer of the congregation.

Geiger's prayer book reflects his practical reform, though he kept many passages which we find no more in our Union Prayer Book. Time, patience, and understanding made flourish the seed which Geiger planted.

## Epilogue

In concluding our study on the young Geiger, we must say that we have found him a fascinating personality. He was a Reform theologian, yet time and circumstances did not permit him to let his reforms follow closely his theological concepts. He could be consistent in his theology, could agree with Holdheim and Einhorn and demand as much as we have come to accept today. His reforms, however, were dictated more by potentiality and necessity. *It was this inner conflict between potentiality and necessity,* we dare say, which made him fascinating. And in this inner conflict the majority of the German Reform rabbinate remained to the very end. But it must be added, that with Geiger the conflict was a necessity, with most of his successors it was an escape from the task which Geiger ascribed to the future. This future remained always future in Germany.

Geiger's legacy to us is his call for the harmony of the whole heart and the whole mind. When this is achieved, there will be no thought which is not reflected in a deed, and no deed will be done without a thought behind it.



## Footnotes.

When no title is given, reference is made to the Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift fuer juedische Theologie.

1. D. Philipson, "Abraham Geiger as Reformer," in Year Book of C.C.A.R., v. XX, p. 249.
2. L. Geiger in Abraham Geiger, Leben und Lebenswerk, p. 231.
3. See Jacob S. Raisin, "Reform Judaism prior to Abraham Geiger, or the conflict between rationalism and traditionalism in ancient Judaism," Year Book of C.C.A.R., v. XX, p. 197-245.
4. Max Wiener, Juedische Religion im Zeitalter der Emanzipation, p. 6.
5. Gotthold E. Lessing, "Die Erziehung des Menschengeschlechtes," paragr. 1 and 2. Translation by the writer.
6. L. Baeck, Wege im Judentum, p. 338.
7. Rosa Dukas in Juedisches Lexikon, v. IV, col. 1.
8. Solomon Schechter, Studies in Judaism, Third Series, p. 85.
9. J. Meisl in Juedisches Lexikon, v. V, col. 1415-1416.
10. W. Windelband, A History of Philosophy, p. 484.
11. D. Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism, p. 13.
12. I. Elbogen in Juedisches Lexikon, v. V, col. 1461.
13. L. Wallach in Zeitschrift fuer die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland, v. V, p. 250.
14. S. Schechter, ibid., p. 113.
15. ibid., p. 117.
16. This biographical sketch follows Ludwig Geiger's biography of his father in Abraham Geiger, Leben und Lebenswerk, p. 5-231.
17. Abraham Geiger's Nachgelassene Schriften, v. V, p. 60-61.

18. v. IV, p. 472; v. V, p. 373.
19. Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums, v. I, p. 189.
20. ibid., v. IV, p. 495.
21. ibid., v. II, p. 399.
22. See the essay "Die Gruendung einer juedisch-theologischen Fakultae, ein dringendes Beduerfnis unserer Zeit" in W.Z.J.T., v. II, and Ludwig Geiger's description of the procedures of the second rabbinical conference, Abraham Geiger, Leben und Lebenswerk, p. 116.
23. Though a unified Germany did not come into existence until 1871, we speak, nevertheless, of Germany, since the unification achieved after the Franco-Prussian war marked merely the end of a movement which had gone on for some time. However, we shall confine our discussion to the Jews in Prussia, since they represented numerically the strongest group in Germany, and since from here a strong influence was exerted upon the Jews in the other German states.
24. B. Offenburg, Das Erwachen des deutschen Nationalbewusstseins in der preussischen Judenheit, p. 53.
25. Sulamith, v. I,2, p. 366f.
26. ibid., v. IV,1, p. 399f.; v. VII,2, p. 409f.
27. H. Mahlberg, Literarisches Woerterbuch, p. 97.
28. E. Troeltsch, Der Historismus und seine Probleme, Erstes Buch, p. 282.
29. v. V, p. 28.
30. v. I, p. 146.
31. v. I, p. 147.
32. v. I, p. 149.
33. v. VI, p. 8.
34. v. V, p. 151.
35. v. V, p. 148-149.
36. v. I, p. 288.
37. v. I, p. 10.
38. loc. cit.

39. v. I, p. 11.
40. D. Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism, p. 226, and C. Seligmann, Geschichte der juedischen Reformbewegung, p. 119-120.
41. S. Stern, Geschichte des Judentums, p. 235.
42. C. Seligmann, ibid., p. 123-124.
43. v. I, p. 355.
44. v. II, p. 358; Geiger rejected the striving for authority on the part of the individual rabbi, since it would have hampered the successful activities for the benefit of Judaism. v. III, p. 325.
45. v. I, p. 10.
46. loc. cit.
47. v. II, p. 91-92. Geiger defended the Jewish position towards apostates, which had been attacked by Anton T. Hartmann, and wrote: "Schon dass ihre (der Juden) Reihen gelichtet werden, darf eine Glaubensgemeinde betruenen, die wohl weiss, wie nur durch eine etwas bedeutende Stellung ihre Sicherheit verbuergt ist; noch mehr aber klagt die jetzige Zeit allerdings immer darueber, wenn einer aus der Klasse der Intelligenten abtruennig wird, weil diese allein unser Heil sind, weil bei dem gewaltigen Ringen nach Anerkennung und innerer Reinigung, nach buergerlicher und geistiger Befreiung, ein jeder Talentvolle uns ein hohes Gut ist, dessen Verlust uns eine Wunde schlaegt."
48. D. Philipson, ibid., p. 48.
49. Heinemann, Historia Judaica, v. XIII, pt. I, p. 30.
50. Heinemann, ibid., p. 32.
51. Heinemann, ibid., p. 36-37.
52. Heinemann, ibid., p. 31.
53. v. II, p. 210: "Ein gleiches Gebiet ist den Kaempfern eroeffnet, sie stehn auf gleichem Boden; eine gleich hohe Idee erfuehlt sie, in deren zweckmaessigster Durchfuehrung und Darstellung sie verschieden sind. Dieser Anzeichen moegen wir uns freuen; es war nicht immer so, und um so mehr freuen wir uns."

54. C. Seligmann, ibid., p. 97.
55. Qoted by Philipson, ibid., p. 48.
56. N. Hartmann, Das Problem des geistigen Seins, p. 24-25.
57. I am indebted to Dr. L. Baeck for having clarified this point.
58. v. V, p. 359-360: "Auch das Judentum ist in seine dritte Entwicklungsphase eingetreten, es hat noch zu kaempfen und zu ringen, um sich in ihr zurechtzufinden, um sich zu der Hoehe emporzuschwingen, die es in ihr einzunehmen hat, aber es arbeitet auch ehrlich, und wir erblicken es in der immerwaehrenden Bemuehung, sich zu idealisieren, sich nun erst recht in die Idee einzuleben, aus der es urspruenglich hervorgegangen und alle Einseitigkeiten, alle Verhaertungen der Ausschiesslichkeit, alle schroffen Konsequenzen der Volkstuemlichkeit und des aeussern Dienstes abzuwerfen."
59. v. V, p. 337-338: "Es ist ein Produkt der rabbinisch-talmudischen Dogmatik, die wir bald naeher kennen lernen, den Pentateuch herauszuheben aus der ganzen Bibel, ihm fast die ausschliessliche Verehrung zu weihen, waehrend er doch das Judentum jener Zeit mehr aeusserlich nach den damaligen Umstaenden, nach seiner Ausarbeitung im damaligen Leben, nach seiner Beschraenkung durch Volks- und Zeitverhaeltnisse darzustellen bestimmt ist, aber die echte Geistigkeit, die lebendige Idee des Judentums, die allein es damals getragen und ewig traegt und in der Entwicklung der Zeitlaeufer frisch erhaelt, also das prophetische Element, in ihm zwar nicht fehlt, vielmehr ueberall durchscheint und die Zeremonien mit seinem Strahle verklaert, aber doch nicht so allgewaltig hervortritt wie in den eigentlich sogenannten prophetischen Schriften, die von gleicher, ja in gewissem Sinne noch von hoeherer Bedeutung sind."
60. v. II, p. 352.
61. v. IV, p. 381.
62. M. Wiener, ibid., p. 81.
63. v. III, p. 77.
64. v. III, p. 81-82.
65. v. III, p. 85.
66. v. II, p. 540-541.
67. v. VI, p. 82.

68. v. VI, p. 66: "Praktische Fragen von solchem Umfange werden nicht mit einem Male geloest, aber ihre Loesung muss allmaehlich angebahnt werden."
69. v. V, p. 375. Speaking about his periodical, Geiger discussed the editorial principles which he had set up as his guides: "Einer solchen Tendenz mussten viele an sich wertvolle Beitraege weichen, ihr koennen sich weder die Maenner anschliessen, welche ein Fertiges, Festbegrenztes wuenschen und aufstellen wollen, noch die grosse Anzahl derer, die, in das praktische Leben aufgehend, auch ihre Forschungen dessen unmittelbarem Heile widmen."
70. Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums, v. II, p. 210, quoted by Philipson, ibid., p. 34.
71. v. VI, p. 16.
72. v. VI, p. 11-16.
73. v. VI, p. 15.
74. K. Kohler, A Living Faith, p. 301.
75. Philipson, ibid., p. 11.
76. v. I, p. 58.
77. v. II, p. 220.
78. loc. cit.
79. v. VI, p. 11-13.
80. v. V, p. 359-360.
81. v. IV, p. 324.
82. v. VI, p. 4.
83. v. I, p. 142.
84. See especially Geiger's denunciation of Hirsch's intolerance, v. IV, p. 357-360. In as much as Geiger could excuse and even appreciate intolerance under political, economic, and other types of pressure from the outside, he could not accept the same principle, finally codified in the Shulchan aruch, for himself as a child of his time.
85. v. II, p. 547.

86. v. II, p. 545-546.
87. v. II, p. 446-447.
88. v. V, p. 367-368.
89. This may be illustrated by a few sentences directed against Anton Theodor Hartmann: "Und Sie schaemen sich nicht, verehrter Mann, solcher Kniffe? - Nicht? Nun, so freuen Sie sich ferner solcher Siege, hochherziger Held, wie Sie jetzt einen davon zu tragen glauben, bleiben Sie hartnaeckig, sehen Sie ferner ueberall sich, wo andere die Sache im Auge haben, ruehmen Sie sich noch weiter und handlangern Sie tuechtig zu! Die Angegriffenen werden wohl, notgedrungen, weil man Sie noch nicht ueberall kennt, weil Sie Christ und Professor u. s. w. sind, Ihnen einmal hie und da, des allgemeinen Besten wegen, entgegen muessen, zu ihrem innigsten Bedauern; aber um der Wissenschaft willen ziemte es sich wahrlich auch nicht von ferne, Sie zu beruehren." v. III, p. 246.
90. M. Wiener, ibid., p. 177-178; v. II, p. 16, 18.
91. v. III, p. 90-91.
92. v. III, p. 83.
93. v. IV, p. 249-251 (footnote).
94. v. V, p. 29.
95. v. I, p. 325.
96. v. V, p. 26.
97. v. IV, p. 7.
98. v. IV, p. 10.
99. v. V, p. 2.
100. v. IV, p. 1.
101. v. III, p. 314.
102. v. II, p. 356.
103. v. III, p. 91.
104. v. V, p. 28.
105. v. I, p. 9.

106. v. V, p. 224.
107. v. II, p. 542.
108. Raphael Straus in Juedisches Lexikon, v. II, col. 747.
109. This passage is taken from the diploma which Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Spector of Kovno used to give, quoted by J. D. Eisenstein in Jewish Encyclopedia, v. VI, p. 264.
110. L. Geiger, ibid., p. 34-35.
111. L. Geiger, ibid., p. 56.
112. K. Kohler, ibid., p. 140.
113. The title pages of his collections of sermons show this phrasing: "Predigten ueber die juedische Religion. Gehalten im Gotteshause der juedischen Reform-Gemeinde zu Berlin von Dr. Samuel Holdheim, Rabbiner und Prediger bei derselben."
114. L. Geiger, ibid., p. 63, 82, 85.
115. v. V, p. 16.
116. loc. cit.
117. v. V, p. 18.
118. v. I, p. 10.
119. L. Geiger, ibid., p. 61-62.
120. v. VI, p. 7.
121. v. V, p. 19.
122. v. V, p. 27: "Wir haben lange genug eingesessen, wir muessen gehen, rasch gehen, weit gehen, so wir wieder Waerme und Kraft gewinnen wollen, lasst uns nur vorangehen, ihr (the orthodox faction of the communities) werdet uns schon nachkommen, ihr muesst uns nachkommen, und sollte es auch mit mancher Muehe und manchem Opfer geschehen."
123. L. Geiger, ibid., p. 123.
124. C. Seligmann, ibid., p. 126.
125. L. Geiger, ibid., p. 122.

126. L. Geiger, ibid., p. 123.
127. Martin B. Ryback, "The East-West Conflict in American Reform Judaism", American Jewish Archives, v. IV, no. I, p. 23.
128. v. IV, p. 321-333.
129. v. IV, p. 329-330.
130. v. IV, p. 327.
131. v. IV, p. 331.
132. v. III, p. 321.
133. v. IV, p. 332.
134. v. IV, p. 332-333.
135. v. VI, p. 66.
136. v. III, p. 5.
137. v. III, p. 13 (footnote).
138. v. III, p. 11.
139. v. III, p. 12.
140. loc. cit.
141. v. III, p. 7-8 (footnote).
142. v. VI, p. 88.
143. S. Stern, ibid., p. 297.
144. C. Seligmann, ibid., p. 127.
145. v. VI, p. 90.
146. v. VI, p. 89.
147. v. IV, p. 328.
148. v. VI, p. 90.
149. L. Geiger, ibid., p. 124.
150. v. VI, p. 5.



151. v. VI, p. 85.
152. v. II, p. 456-457.
153. v. VI, p. 87.
154. v. II, p. 254.
155. loc. cit.
156. v. II, p. 248.
157. v. VI, p. 83.
158. loc. cit.
159. v. VI, p. 5.
160. "Materialien fuer den Commissionsbericht ueber die Speisegesetze" in Der Israelit des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, 1847, nos. 6 and 7.
161. v. VI, p. 41-63.
162. v. VI, p. 43.
163. v. VI, p. 56-57.
164. v. VI, p. 59.
165. The following remarks are based on Geiger's "Nachschrift" to Holdheim's "Materialien zu einem Commissionsbericht ueber die Speisegesetze", v. VI, p. 63-75.
166. v. V, p. 32.
167. L. Geiger, ibid., p. 152.
168. L. Geiger, ibid., p. 146-147.
169. v. VI, p. 85.
170. A. Geiger, Israelitisches Gebetbuch fuer den oeffentlichen Gottesdienst, e. g. p. 63, 65, 71, 131, 159.
171. v. VI, p. 87.
172. v. II, p. 454.

## Bibliography

Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums. v. I; v. II; v. IV.  
Leipzig, Baumgaertner, 1837, 1838, and 1840.

Leo Baeck. Wege im Judentum. Berlin, Schocken Verlag, 1933.

Abraham Geiger, Leben und Lebenswerk. Edited by Ludwig Geiger and others. Berlin, Georg Reimer, 1910.

Abraham Geiger's Nachgelassene Schriften. Edited by Ludwig Geiger. v. V. Berlin, Louis Gerschel, 1878.

Abraham Geiger. Israelitisches Gebetbuch fuer den oeffentlichen Gottesdienst im ganzen Jahre. Breslau, Julius Hainauer, 1854.

Nicolai Hartmann. Das Problem des geistigen Seins. Berlin and Leipzig, Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1933.

Isaac Heinemann. "Samson Raphael Hirsch" (Historia Judaica XIII, part I). New York, 1951.

Jewish Encyclopedia. v. VI. New York and London, Funk and Wagnalls, 1907.

Juedisches Lexikon. v. II; v. IV; v. V. Berlin, Juedischer Verlag, 1928 and 1930.

Kaufmann Kohler. A Living Faith. Selected Sermons and Addresses. Edited by Samuel S. Cohon. Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College Press, 1948.

Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. Ausgewaehlte Werke. Dritter Band. Muenchen, Carl Hauser Verlag, n. d.

Heinrich Mahlberg. Literarisches Sachwoerterbuch. Bern, Francke, 1948.

Benno Offenburg. Das Erwachen des deutschen Nationalbewusstseins in der preussischen Judenheit. Dissertation. Hamburg, 1933.

David Philipson. "Abraham Geiger as Reformer" (Year Book of Central Conference of American Rabbis XX). Charlevoix, 1910.

David Philipson. The Reform Movement in Judaism. Second edition. New York, The MacMillan Company, 1931.

Martin B. Ryback. "The East-West Conflict in American Reform Judaism" (American Jewish Archives IV). Cincinnati, 1952.

Solomon Schechter. Studies in Judaism. Third Series. Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1945.

Caesar Seligmann. Die Geschichte der juedischen Reformbewegung. Frankfurt, Kauffmann, 1922.

Sigismund Stern. Geschichte des Judentums von Mendelssohn bis auf die Gegenwart. Frankfurt, Literarische Anstalt, 1857.

Sulamith. Edited by David Fraenckel. v. I,2; v. IV,1; v. VII,1. Dessau, 1807, 1812, and 1830-1832(?).

Ernst Troeltsch. Der Historismus und seine Probleme. Erstes Buch: Das logische Problem der Geschichtsphilosophie. Tuebingen, Mohr, 1922.

Luitpold Wallach. "Ueber Leopold Zunz als Historiker" (Zeitschrift fuer die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland V). Berlin, 1935

Max Wiener. Juedische Religion im Zeitalter der Emanzipation. Berlin, Philo Verlag, 1933.

Wilhelm Windelband. A History of Philosophy. Second edition. New York, The MacMillan Company, 1901.

Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift fuer juedische Theologie. Edited by Abraham Geiger in cooperation with others. v. I-VI. Frankfurt, Johann David Sauerlaender, 1835-1836; Stuttgart, Fr. Brodhag, 1837, 1839; Gruenberg and Leipzig, W. Levysohn, 1844, 1847.