

THE STRUGGLE FOR RELIGIOUS REFORMS

As Reflected In
Modern Hebrew Literature

ISRAEL BEN DAVID HARBURG

THESIS

Hebrew Union College
Cincinnati, Ohio
1928

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction

1. Definitions of Terms	page 1
2. Predisposing Factors	3
3. The Intellectual Lights of Italian Jewry	6
4. The Awakening in Poland	14

II. The Reform Movement in Germany

1. General Characteristics	21
2. The Cultural Awakening in German Jewry	23
3. The Reforms in Jewish Education	24
4. Mendels ^S ohn and the Biurist Movement	32
5. The Meassfim	42
6. Rabbinic Support for Reforms	49
7. Rabbinic Support for the Reform Movement outside of Germany	54

III. The Controversy of the Hamburg Temple

1. Events leading to the Construction of the Temple	58
2. Eliezer Lieberman	62
3. Aaron Chorin	79
4. Joseph Friedlander	89
5. The Orthodox Protest	91
6. Protests and Counter-Protests	101
7. Conclusion	104

IV. The Galician Revolt against Orthodoxy

V. The Science of Judaism

1. The German School	120
2. The Italian School	121
3. The Galician School	139

VI. Historic Judaism in Germany

1. The Challenge of Neo-Orthodoxy	page 155
2. The New Tendency in the Reform Movement	157
3. Abraham Geiger - The radical historic school	158
4. Zechariah Frankel - The traditional historic school	163

VII. The Culmination of Reform Judaism in Germany.

1. The Prayerbook Controversy of 1842	166
2. The Brunswick and Frankfort Conferences	172
3. The Literary Polemic evoked by these Conferences	178
4. Conclusion.	183

Notes

Appendix A - References to Essays and Poems in the "Measser" favoring educational and religious reforms

Appendix B - Analysis of Reform Prayerbooks

Appendix C - Rabbinic Authority Favoring Reforms

Bibliography

INTRODUCTION

1. Definition of Terms

"Reform Judaism" and "Modern Hebrew Literature" are terms widely used but hardly lend themselves to any clear-cut definition. For cultural and religious movements and schools of thought are like powerful rivers that uproot everything on their way and deposit a conglomeration of many diversified elements as they discharge into the sea. Many tributaries flow into the river and the river in turn splits into numerous mouths eroding their way into far off climes. d Thus the struggles for religious reforms in Judaism and for the humanistic renaissance in Hebrew literature derived their impetus from various sources, absorbed many diversified elements, and in turn branched off into a number of new movements. The Italian Jewish renaissance, the feverish intellectual activity of the Jews in Poland and in Galicia during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the religious and the political radicalism of the French encyclopedists and the dawn of the political emancipation of the Jews in Germany and in Holland during the eighteenth century were all powerful factors that brought about the inner revolution in Jewish life and thought long before the breaking of the Ghetto walls brought about a revolution from without. These various streams of Jewish intellectual activities converge in Germany during the last quarter of the eighteenth century bringing about the "Enlightenment" movement which left its imprint upon the further development of Judaism throughout the world. Like all movements, this "Enlightenment" movement was in a state of turmoil in the period of its inception and only after a century of crystallization did its various component elements become clarified.

The component elements of this movement can be summed up as follows:

1. The revolt against the "Shulhan-Aruch", i.e., against the narrow and stifling interpretation of the legalistic and ritualistic phases of Talmudic tradition.
2. The clamor for secular education as well as for reforms in the religious education of the children.
3. The demand for the esthetization of the synagog services in accordance with Western culture.
4. The emphasis on the theological and philosophical content of Judaism rather than upon its legalistic aspect.
5. The revolt against the Judeo-German as a vernacular and against the petrified Rabbinic style of Hebrew.
6. The demand that the study of the Bible be given pre-eminence above all other Jewish studies.
7. The revived interest in Hebrew poetry.
8. The scientific approach to the historical development of Judaism.
9. The struggle for political, social and economic emancipation which brought to an issue the national-political aspect of Judaism.
 - a. Renunciation of it by the reform movement.
 - b. Evasion by the orthodox.
 - c. Affirmation by the forerunners of Zionism like David b. Dob Baer Gordon and Moses Hess.

The large masses of the Jewish people were as usual indifferent to all these tendencies and as a result the intellectuals of these various tendencies felt a kinship of spirit between them and clung together to overcome the fanaticism of the orthodox opposition. The intellectuals soon began to realize, however, the wide gap that existed between them and the movement of revolt began to branch off into marked and distinct tendencies some of which became even

antagonistic to each other. Thus after the middle of the nineteenth century we find among the liberal Jews four distinct tendencies which grew out of the general intellectual upheaval:

1. The struggle for civil emancipation.
2. The Science of Judaism.
3. The Reform movement..
 - a. Radical.
 - b. Conservative.
4. Humanistic Hebrew literature.

Though all these four tendencies are more or less interrelated, and though many leaders of these movements were also also active in others, yet we must confine ourselves to the last two tendencies in the movement of revolt, namely, the movement for synagogal and ritualistic reforms and Modern Hebrew literature and see the interrelation of the two.

In a general way, it may be said that the Reform movement and the Hebrew literary renaissance went hand in hand in their incipency, and that the latter was the vehicle of liberal religious thought in the various Jewish centres; so much so that the orthodox leaders became antagonistic to modern Hebrew literature just as strenuously as they were to the Reform movement. It is only about 1870 that these two movements part ways on the issue of political nationalism (P. Smolenskin 1869).¹ Nationalism became at that time the central thought of the modern Hebrew writers while the reform leaders were more emphatic than ever in their renunciation of it.

2. Predisposing Factors.

The movement for reforms was chiefly an outgrowth of the

emancipatory efforts of the Jews in Western Europe, and as such was chiefly conditioned by the political and social conditions of the various Western Jews. ✓
Yet there were great inner driving forces that helped to bring about the "Berlin Enlightenment", namely, the dissatisfaction with rigid legalism which reigned supreme then in Poland, Galicia, Germany, and Italy. ✓

As we analyze the Hebrew literature from the very Biblical times to this day, we can discern two distinct component elements: the Halacha--the rigid religious legalism; and the Agadah--the poetic-philosophic interpretation of Jewish life. These two rival elements tended to keep the spiritual equilibrium in Judaism. For whenever the latter gained the upper hand in Jewish life there was a danger of disintegration and demoralization, and on the other hand when legalism reigned supreme there was spiritual stagnation.

Thus when the rigidity of the "Shulhan Aruch" became the guiding force in Jewish life during the eighteenth century, there was a marked dissatisfaction with Rabbinic scholasticism as it is manifest in the ethical works of Moses Hayim Luzzato in Italy,² in the movement for religious reforms in Germany and in the Hassidic movement in Eastern Europe. Though these two religious movements were extremely antagonistic to one another, they had, nevertheless, a great deal in common for they were both in revolt against Talmudic scholasticism and casuistry which could no longer satisfy the religious longings of the masses. The need for a deepened religious consciousness gave rise to the Hassidic movement in Eastern Europe and to the reform movement in Germany, both of which offered the masses a religion easy of understanding. Hence, in spite of the great dissimilarity between these two religious movements, we notice a number of similarities between them, namely:

1. They were almost contemporary movements.

2. The stress on the use of the vernacular for religious purposes.

3. The revolt against the rigidity of legalism.

4. The emphasis on theology and homilies rather than on rabbinic casuistry.

But the immediate cause for the dissatisfaction with rigid legalism was the slow but constant penetration of free thought from the land of the renaissance which made deep inroads into Italian Jewry and in turn to Hungary, Galicia, Germany, and particularly to Poland. Many Jewish students from Poland equipped with rabbinic knowledge sought their medical education in Padua during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and on their return they became the promulgators of free-thought in Polish Jewry, which was then the greatest centre of Jewish learning.³ These Polish intellectuals on the one hand, and the Hebrew poets and scholars of Italy on the other, were the two great streams of liberal thought which paved the way for the Reform movement and for the scientific and historic approach to Judaism in Western Europe. For want of a better name we shall denote these two streams of liberal thought following the renaissance as the "Pre-Mendels⁵ohnian" period in Hebrew literature (1573-1778). The intellectual endeavors of Moses Mendels⁵ohn and primarily those of his disciples, who are usually known as the Maassim or the Biurists, we shall term as the "Mendels⁵ohnian" period in Hebrew literature (1778-1815).

The literature of enlightenment of these two periods which preceded the Reform movement in Germany was exclusively in the Hebrew language, since Hebrew was the only common medium for the Jewish intellectuals in Europe before the emancipation. It is to this literature, therefore, that we must turn for the understanding of the inner motives that led to the Reform movement.

The political, social and economic factors that led to the Reform movement in Germany are well known and have been fully treated already

by Jewish historians. Very little study was made, however, of the inner cultural factors which brought about the liberalization of Judaism. After a careful analysis, therefore, of the Pre-Mendels⁵ohnian Hebrew literature we shall clearly see that liberal Judaism is not an emancipatory and arbitrary compromise with Western environment, as it is usually regarded to be, but that it is a natural outgrowth of the cultural tendencies in Judaism following the renaissance.

3. The Intellectual Lights of Italian Jewry.⁴

While Judaism was culturally on the decline during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and was in danger of becoming a petrified legalism estranged from the scientific and artistic movements of Western Europe, the Jewish liberal thought found its asylum in Italy. Though the civil conditions of the Italian Jews during that time were very deplorable, yet the Jewish scholars there were able to reach a high plane of intellectual development. It seemed as though they had fallen temporary heirs to the culture of the Spanish exiles. Here the scientific and philosophic spirit, as well as the poetic genius of the Spanish Jews, continued to be nursed for nearly three centuries until they were transplanted later on to Germany and Poland, and finally to Russia. This period of Hebrew literature has not been given due attention though it is of outmost importance for the study of the liberal tendencies in Judaism of the nineteenth century and of Reform Judaism in particular. For the influence of Italian Jewry upon the latter was twofold: through direct encouragement and intervention of the Italian scholars and communities during the struggle of Reform Judaism in Germany;⁵ and indirectly by the influence they exerted on the Polish students in Italy who in turn were to become the forerunners of the Berlin Haskalah.⁶

The phenomenal intellectual achievement and free thought of the

Jews in Italy may be accounted for in several ways:

1. The age of Dante and Petrarch could not but exert a profound influence in Jewish circles, and both of these Italian luminaries called forth a number of imitations from Hebrew poets.

2. Despite papal bulls and canonical discriminations, Jews in Italy associated with Christians; hence, the Jews were able to share in the high level of Italian culture. Furthermore, the revival of interest in the studies of ancient Greece and Rome stimulated the study of Biblical literature, and thus amicable relations were established between Jewish and Christian scholars.

3. Hebrew printing was first begun in Italy. By the year 1500 Hebrew presses had been set up in Reggio di Calabria and Naples in the South, as well as in Pieve de Sacco, Mantua, Ferrara, Bologna, Rome, Soucino, Casal, Maggair, Brescio, Barco, and elsewhere in the North.

4. Driven from Germany and from Poland by persecutions, many learned rabbis and Talmudists emigrated to Italy and revitalized Jewish learning there.

All these were determining factors that made Italy the home of liberal Jewish thought immediately after the great Spanish centre was broken up by the expulsion. It is here in Italy that we must seek the seeds of revolt against the rigid Rabbinism that hemmed in the freedom of philosophic and scientific thinking in Judaism. We must, therefore, first give a brief treatment of the post-renaissance Hebrew literature of Italian Jewry in order to establish the link between the free-thought of the Spanish period and the "enlightenment" movement in Germany.

The first outstanding Jewish scholar in Italy who continued the liberal and scientific spirit of the Spanish Jewish scholars was Azariah Ben Moses Dei Rossi. He was born in Mantua in 1513 (or 1514) and died in 1578.

Early in life, he became exceptionally proficient in Hebrew, Latin and Italian literature. He also studied medicine, archeology, history, Greek and Roman antiquities, and Christian ecclesiastical history. His outstanding work is his "Meor Enayim" (Mantua 1573-5). The most important is the second part of this work entitled "Imre-Binah". The whole work is permeated with a thorough scientific spirit and with a liberal attitude to tradition. For our purpose the eleventh chapter of his "Imre-Binah" is of the greatest interest because in it he sought to point out the contradictions that exist between some of the beliefs of the Talmudists and the proved results of scientific research. In his introduction to this chapter⁸ Dei Rossi boldly asserts that it is no reflection upon the wisdom of the sages if their beliefs of old are contradicted by later scientific investigations, because the latter, unlike the interpretations of the Bible, are not to be based on tradition but on rational research. But this bold attitude towards tradition called forth many criticisms on the part of his contemporaries, and Dei Rossi had to contend not only with impartial critics but with the attacks of fanatics who considered his "Meor Enayim" an heretical work.⁹

Another great landmark in Jewish liberal thought was Judah (Leon) of Modena. He was a descendant of a prominent French family and was a distinguished scholar, rabbi, and poet. He was born at Vienna in 1571, and died there in 1648. He was educated by outstanding Jewish and Italian masters and at an early age he was versed not only in Hebrew and in Rabbinic literature but was also conversant with the classics and possessed a fair knowledge of mathematics, philosophy and natural history. There was, however, one weakness in the make-up of this highly gifted youth--the lack of a stable character. Being of a poetical temperament, he lived upon his emotions, and this accounts for his many inconsistencies which brought about a large share of his misfortunes in life.

After the death of his father (in 1592) he settled at Venice where he was appointed as a member of the rabbinate and as a preacher (1594). In the latter capacity he was especially successful, for his addresses in Italian attracted large audiences including Christian priests and noblemen. His successes as an orator and poet won for him the consideration of the Christian scholastic world and admitted him to the highest Venetian circles. These contacts with the intellectual world made him feel keenly the rigid limitations of the rabbinic laws, and this no doubt accounts for his revolt against the narrow legalism of the rabbis of his time. In his commentary to his work "Beth Yehudah" (Venice 1635) which is a collection of hagadoth omitted in the "En Ya'akov", he points out the differences between the religious customs of the Jews in Palestine and of those living in other countries, showing thereby that the rabbis and scholars of any period have the right to modify Talmudic institutions.

יש אלוהים מינוי כל הענינים הנכונים בעולם
אין אלוהים מינוי כל הענינים הנכונים
בעולם אלוהים מינוי כל הענינים הנכונים
בעולם אלוהים מינוי כל הענינים הנכונים

His greatest attack against tradition is to be found in his pseudonymous work "Kol Sakal". The work displays, as Isaac Reggio says, in the introduction to this book, originality of thought and freedom of expression, the like of which was never displayed in Rabbinic literature. In the first treatise of this work he submits the theological dogmas of Judaism to a critical analysis. For our purpose, however, the second treatise is of the outmost importance, for there we find for the first time a bold and radical criticism of the rabbinic interpretation of the Law. He contends that, like the Karaites, the rabbis often followed the letter of the Law to the neglect of the spirit. He asserts

that the use of the phylacteries is not commanded by Biblical law,¹³ that the operation of circumcision is not performed in the manner prescribed, and that its rabbinical interpretation is often in direct opposition to the Law.¹⁴ He also claims that there was no canonical traditional interpretation before Antigonus, as it is seen from the existence of various sects during the time of the second Temple.¹⁵

In the third treatise he enumerates the laws which must be reformed in order to bring the later Judaism into harmony with the Law and render it spiritual and Biblical. He proposes the simplification of the prayers and of the synagogal services, the abolition of many rites, the relaxation of Sabbath and festival laws, of Passover regulations, and even of the ritual for the Day of Atonement.¹⁶ Fasting should not be carried beyond the ordinary physical and spiritual powers of the individual concerned. The dietary laws should be simplified, the prohibition against drinking wine with people of other creeds should be abolished.¹⁷

Though this work of Modena is not of intrinsic value, it had a great influence upon Isaac S. Reggio who later on became a leading spirit in the Biurist movement, and also in the early struggles for moderate reforms.¹⁸ Generally speaking, this work served as a stimulus to freedom of investigation and to scientific research in the accepted dogmas and traditions, and thus paved the way for the historic school in the Reform movement.¹⁹

To quote Reggio from his introduction to the "B'hinat Ha-kahalah":²⁰

"וידועהו אמת ואמת בימים חשש איש איש יאמרו / פניהו האמת
או הכנהו רבני ישראל / פניהו הכנהו רבני ישראל / פניהו הכנהו רבני ישראל
אשר היה שיהיה אמת / פניהו הכנהו רבני ישראל / פניהו הכנהו רבני ישראל
היה שיהיה אמת / פניהו הכנהו רבני ישראל / פניהו הכנהו רבני ישראל
אשר היה שיהיה אמת / פניהו הכנהו רבני ישראל / פניהו הכנהו רבני ישראל

המקראים לא ידעוהו, אמרוהו הפסוקים אינם המורה אלא וסגולתו,
 אלא באשמועות ופסוקים על המלה / שם תראה
 אשר נכתב אמרם שם פסוק, אף כי יחיד המה
 פסוק בזה ואם פסוק זה מלאכה ממש
 בזמן ששם שם זה וזה שם זה
 אומרים אומרים אף פסוקים בזה.

And though this work was bitterly attacked by such men as S.
 21
 D. Luzzato, who declared him to be an avowed enemy of Mishna and Talmud, he
 was staunchly defended by Abraham Geiger, who declared Modena to be an honest
 22
 and fearless champion of truth. Though Modena supposedly refuted this heret-
 23
 ical work by another one entitled "Shar^{at} Aryeh", it is usually accepted by
 scholars that he did so in order to conceal more thoroughly the authorship of
 24
 the first. Of still greater importance is his work "Ari Nohem" in which he
 sought to combat like many other liberal thinkers of his age the spirit of the
 Kabala, as well as some of the exaggerated practices which it introduced into
 25
 the later Judaism.

Noteworthy among the liberal thinkers of that time was also
 Simon (Simcha) Luzzato (1580-1663) who shared the rabbinate of Venice with Leon
 de Modena. Though he did not contribute anything worth while to the progress
 of free-thought in Hebrew literature, his secular erudition and the liberty of
 his spirit which are manifested in his Italian writings are indicative of the
 spirit of the time. To quote Margolis and Marx, "Though for the time the
 structure of tradition stood solid and the depressed minds found solace in the
 very unreasonableness of mysticism, this criticism of the Jew's innermost self

and the hallowed traditions of Jewish life in which the two Venetian rabbis engaged, foreshadowed the internal conflict which was to burst out a century later."²⁶

It is, therefore, not to be wondered at that the cradle of Modern Hebrew literature is to be found in Italy. As we shall see later on, the freedom of religious thought and the renaissance of Hebrew literature went hand in hand in every European country during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; so much so that the first cannot be treated without the latter. Thus, beginning with the seventeenth century, many attempts were made in Italy to emancipate the Hebrew language from the forms and ideas of the Middle Ages. These attempts imparted a certain degree of distinction to the Hebrew literature which later on served as the model for the literary renaissance in Germany, Galicia and Poland. It is only when we bear these facts in mind that we are able to understand the appearance in Italy of a literary phenomenon such as Moses Hayim Luzzato, who was a religious philosopher, a Cabalist, and at the same time a poet and a dramatist of a modern stamp. And though we cannot consider him in a strictly religious sense as a forerunner of the liberal movement in Judaism, yet he was such in a literary sense. For it was he who was the first to tear asunder the chains that hampered the evolution of Hebrew literature by overthrowing the heavy and artificial Arabic rhyme, and, to a great extent, also the meter under which the Hebrew poets had labored since the days of ~~Yonah~~^{Yehonah} Ibn Labrat. Hence, it was he who had given the first impulse to modernism in the Hebrew literature, the fruition of which was the Haskalah movement during and after the time of ²⁷ Menuelsohn.

Moses Hayim Luzzato was born in Padua in 1707, died at Acre in 1747. He descended from a family celebrated for its rabbinic scholars and men

of letters which it had given to Judaism. His education was strictly rabbinic, though he also received a thorough training in Latin and in other languages. Early in his childhood he was initiated into the mysteries of the Kabbalah, and this served as a stifling influence to his poetic talents. But Talmud and mysticism alone did not satisfy Luzzato's versatile mind, and while he pursued these studies he also became acquainted with the Hebrew poetry of the Middle Ages and with the Italian literature of his own time. In the latter accomplishment lies his superiority to the Hebrew scholars of other countries of that time who were
28
shut off from every outside influence and held fast to obsolete forms and ideas. And though Luzzato's fame was primarily that of a poet, dramatist and Kabbalist, yet for our purpose we must dwell chiefly on an ethical work which he published²⁹ while in Amsterdam, entitled "Sefer M'ilat Yesharim" (1740). This work is important for us both for its style and content. The style is simple, lucid and exact; at times beautiful and poetic, which presents such striking contrast to the prevailing style of his time, which was so dry and corrupt. Because of these merits alone this work could be considered as indicative of the new spirit in Judaism. But it is such still more by reason of its content. The whole work is a poetical and emotional treatise of the Jewish conception of piety which Luzzato conceived as the yearning for simple and direct communion with God in thought
30
and in action. This work had a great influence in the reaction against the casuistic commentaries and supercommentaries on the codes, which was the chief intellectual preoccupation of the time. It became particularly popular among the adherents of the Hassidic movement which, as mentioned before, was but another manifestation of the revolt against the fortresses of rabbinic legalism.
31
It was no less admired by the most bitter opponents of Hassidism. It is told of the Gaon of Vilna that when he read this book he became so entranced by it

that he exclaimed, "If Luzzato were still alive I would have walked on foot to him in order to learn from him ethics and morality."³²

Finally, the connecting link between the spiritual renaissance in Italy and that of Germany we find in Isaac Samuel Reggio, known in Hebrew literature as "Yashar". He is, however, so closely related to the activities of the Biurists, of the Haskalah and of the science of Judaism in the beginning of the nineteenth century that we will have to deal with him in connection with these movements. As an indication of the liberal spirit in Italian Jewry, it is worth mentioning that the first school to adopt the reform projects of Hartwig Wessely were those of Trieste,³³ Venice and Ferrara.

4. The Awakening in Poland.

Poland and Lithuania during the sixteenth century became the greatest and most important centre of Jewish life. During that period this North-Eastern centre attained its highest development both economically and spiritually. The Jews of Poland were not tied down to money-lending or petty trades, they were actively engaged in various industries, as producers and manufacturers. Wealthy Jews farmed the tolls and the excise, and were frequently employed as financial agents of the crown. Jewish capitalists worked salt mines or dealt in timber, and Jewish merchant exported agrarian products of the country beyond the border. The poorer classes were traders, craftsmen or tillers of the soil. As a result of these favorable economic conditions, the inner life of the Jews of Poland and Lithuania reached a height such as was sustained in the other centres at the heyday of their existence. Education became widely diffused there, and scholarship was highly prized.³⁴ Hence, Poland and Lithuania gradually became the cynosure of the Talmudic world and the asylum of the Torah. The fame of the Polish rabbis reached distant lands and questions of

Jewish ritual and Law were submitted to them for decision from distant communities in Italy, Germany and Bohemia. However, the Talmudic and rabbinic study of the Law, absorbing as it did the best mental energies of Polish Jewry, left but little room for the other branches of literary endeavor. Among the daring "swimmers in the Talmudic ocean" there were but few with deeper spiritual longings who evinced an interest in questions of philosophy and science. ³⁵ Thus we find Moses Isserles, the "Rema" (1520-1572) and Mordecai Jaffa (d. 1612) dabble in religious philosophy. Though their philosophic grasp was superficial, as we ³⁶ can see from their commentaries to the "Guide" of Maimonides, yet they show an intimacy with the philosophic literature of the Sephardim which was unusual in their time. The favorite book of the theologians of that period was "^Kikarim", the system of dogmatic Judaism formulated by the conservative Sephardic thinker, Joseph Albo. Commentaries to this book were written by Jacob Kappelman of Brest-³⁷ Lit Kayovsk and by Gedaliah Lifshitz of Lublin. ³⁸ The former delved deeply into the knowledge of mathematics for he believed that through it it was possible to prove the existence of God and the correlation of all phenomena. The latter was more inclined toward metaphysics and ethics. Free research, however, was impossible where tradition reigned supreme. For the accepted view then, as voiced by Joel Sirkes (d. 1640), chief rabbi of Crow, was that philosophy was the mother of all heresies, and that he who becomes infatuated with philosophy and science and neglects the secret wisdom of the Kabbalah is liable to excommunication and has no place among the faithful. The only exceptions were the physicians who on account of their profession received a secular education at the universities. Formerly the Jewish physicians of Poland were natives either of Spain or Italy, but as early as the first part of the sixteenth century these foreigners were rivaled by native Jewish physicians who travelled from Poland

to Padua for the special purpose of receiving a medical training. These trips to Italy became very frequent and the number of Polish Jewish students there was on the increase down to the eighteenth century. As already stated, these students who were equipped with Talmudic knowledge, with Italian humanistic thought, and with a familiarity with Sephardic Jewish culture as preserved by the Italian Jewry, ushered in a new spirit in Northern Europe long before the Haskalah period. Thus we find in Poland and Lithuania towards the end of the sixteenth and in the beginning of the seventeenth centuries liturgical poets and grammarians along Sephardic lines. Such were Ephraim of Kelm, Joseph of Kobrin, Solomon Zamosca,³⁹ and Shabbattai Kohen. The last is also known as the outstanding logician of his time and as a very trustworthy historian. His "Megillah 'Agah", written in classic Hebrew, is a valuable source of information concerning his time. His secular attainments won for him the esteem of the Polish nobility. Indicative of the spirit of the time is the Hebrew-German-Italian-Latin-French Dictionary "Safah Berurah" (Prague 1660) by the eminent talmudist, Nathan Hannover, who was⁴⁰ of Polish origin. The person who typifies best the enlightenment of the Polish Jews of the seventeenth century is Tobia Cohn (1652-1729). He was an eminent medical authority, and he practiced medicine at Kamenetz-Podolsk. He is interesting for our purpose because he marks the close of the old and the beginning of the new era. He was familiar with nine languages, and he edited an encyclopedia in Hebrew "Ma'aseh Tobia" (Venice 1707). This work is divided into eight parts devoted to theology, astronomy, pharmacy, hygiene, venereal diseases, botany, cosmology, and chemistry. Tobia Cohn was not only a great scientist and scholar but also a champion of enlightenment and an opponent of superstitious⁴¹ beliefs in miracles.

It is thus that the soil for enlightenment was prepared in Poland

during the seventeenth century. It is only after the Gmelnitzky massacres that the intellectual progress of Polish Jewry was hindered. Only then did Rabbinism become synonymous with rigorism, the coercion of untold customs became unbearable, and the spirit of Judaism became lost in a heap of innumerable rites. And though the progressive empoverishment of Polish Jewry in the beginning of the eighteenth century engendered great suffering, and though their spiritual life was at a low ebb, and though the mental depression drove many a man to mysticism, yet the seeds of intellectuality were still there and the institutions of learning slowly regained some of their former vigor. It is thus that we find at this period such an intellectual giant as Elijah Vilna (1720-1797), known as the Gaon of Vilna, and who was unquestionably one of the greatest talmudic scholars since the close of the Talmud.⁴² For our purpose it is of extreme importance to note the versatility of Elijah outside of Talmudic learning, which indicates that the passion for scientific research and for secular knowledge in Poland was not quenched even during the darkest periods which followed the Gmelnitzky massacres. Elijah Gaon was not only a great talmudist but he was also a Cabalist, grammarian, philologist, and mathematician. He strove to make the Talmud more attractive by making its acquisition easier and by placing its study on a more scientific basis.⁴³ And at a time when the high regard for antiquity produced a belief in the infallibility of the rabbis of former generations (Rishonim) and when most of the scholars wasted days and nights in reconciling difficulties which no logic could harmonize, the Gaon of Vilna did not refrain from making ritualistic reforms. The talmudists he declared were not infallible. Every one may interpret the Mishna in accordance with reason, even if the interpretation be not in keeping with the traditional meaning as construed by the Amoraim.⁴⁴ While all his contemporaries were bound hand and foot by the innumerable regulations prescribed by the "Shulhan Aruk", the Gaon established

the importance of religious customs (minhagim) according to their antiquity or primitivism, regarding those which have originated since the codification of the Shulhan Aruk as not binding at all; those which have been adopted since the Talmudic period to be subject to change by common consent; while those of the Bible and Talmud were to him fundamental and unalterable. ⁴⁵

The Gaon's greatest contribution to the enlightenment of the nineteenth century was his severe criticism of the educational system among the Jews of his day. The mania for distinction in rabbinical learning plunged the child into the mazes of Talmudic casuistry as soon as he could read; frequently he had not read the Bible or studied the rudiments of grammar. The Gaon insisted that every one should first master the twenty-four Books of the Bible, then etymology, prosody and syntax, then the six divisions of the Mishna with the important commentaries and the suggested emendations, and finally the Talmud in general without wasting much time on pilpul which brings to no practical results. ⁴⁶ This course of systematic study the Gaon outlined much earlier than did Wessely ⁴⁷ in his "Dibre Sholom v'Emet", which made such a great stir in Germany. Furthermore, the Gaon exhorted the Talmudists to study secular sciences and he set the example by writing not only on the most important Biblical, Talmudic and Cabalistic subjects but also on algebra, geometry, astronomy, and grammar. ⁴⁸ Another great contribution to enlightenment was his scientific and philological approach to the study of Talmudic and Midrashic texts. By his critical examination of those texts, he was able to overthrow very often by a slight textual emendation all the castles in the air which were erected by his predecessors. He also exhorted his friends and pupils to pursue this simple but sound method ⁴⁹ of study. And though during his lifetime the Gaon could not entirely change the educational system in vogue, yet he served as an impetus and encouragement

to the liberals in Eastern and in Western Europe in their efforts to spread knowledge and enlightenment among the masses.

Thus from the time of Isserles to the time of the Gaon there was an unbroken intellectual chain of master minds in Poland and in Lithuania, which guarded Judaism against the dangers of obscurantism and which laid the foundations of Jewish learning, the fruition of which was the literary movement known as "Die Wissenschaft des Judenthums" in Galicia, Italy and Germany, which in turn had a decided influence on the development of Reform Judaism. For in the end of the eighteenth century, either because of economic conditions or because of intellectual thirst, there was a perennial influx of Polish scholars to Germany. The religious and educational positions in the most prominent communities of Germany, as well as of Austria, from the lowly "melamid" to the honorable chief rabbis, became filled almost exclusively by Polish scholars. It is enough to name but a few of the rabbis like Ezekiel Landau of Prague, Phinehas Horowitz of Frankfurt on the Main, his brother Shmelka of Moravia, Aaron Halevi Horowitz of Berlin, who were all emigrants of Poland and who became the outstanding religious figures in Germany and in Bohemia.

One of the most outstanding figures among those who brought in Polish learning into Germany was Israel Moses Halevi of Zamoscz (c. 1700-1772) who was the instructor of Moses Mendelssohn, and of whom Lessing said in a letter to the latter that he was "one of the first to arouse a love for science in the hearts of Jews." Zamoscz was a great Talmudist, mathematician and a student of science, and was one of the lecturers in the Yeshibah of Zamoscz. He was a versatile writer and in his various works, which he wrote in Hebrew, he displayed a wide knowledge of Rabbinics, religious philosophy and secular sciences. No less prominent as transmitters of Polish Jewish learning to

Germany were Solomon Dubno, who became a prominent co-worker in the activities
53
of the Biurists and of the Meqsfim; and Solomon Maimon, the brilliant but unfortunate philosopher. Both of them were teachers in the house of Mendels^Sohn and exerted great influence upon the "Mendels^Sohnian school" in Germany.

Hence, we see how two Jewish intellectual currents, one from Italy, the other from East-Northern Europe, converge in Germany during the last quarter of the eighteenth century and due to favorable economic and political conditions these currents helped to bring about an era of enlightenment, the
54
reform movement being one of its offshoots.

II

THE REFORM MOVEMENT IN GERMANY

1. General Characteristics.

The reform movement in Germany was not primarily, as it is usually conceived to be, a conscious emancipatory effort to gain political and social prestige. It is true that there were later many reformers who had that aim in view but that does not throw any reflection upon the reform movement as a whole, for it is the nature of every movement to attract followers to diverse types and motives. Nor was the reform movement a conscious effort to denationalize Judaism as it is usually accepted by pro-reform as well as by anti-reform writers on this subject. For, as we shall see later, the concept of "nationality" as of an ethnic entity and of "nationalism" as of a cultural allegiance to that entity is an outgrowth of the political upheaval in Europe after 1848, a half century after the rise of the reform movement.

If we approach the reform movement in Germany from a purely historic point of view, we will find that towards the end of the eighteenth century and in the beginning of the nineteenth it was chiefly an unconscious outgrowth, or a phase, of the cultural emancipation of German Jewry. This same emancipation took place sooner or later in every East-European country, but it expressed itself there in different forms conditioned by different social, political and economic conditions of each country, and by the prevailing philosophic movements of the time in which this "awakening" took place.

That the reform movement in Germany was primarily an outgrowth of a cultural movement and not as a means to emancipation or denationalization can be proven not only from internal evidence from the literature of the time but also from external evidence. The French Jewry went much farther in deeds and in words to renounce the so-called "nationalistic" aspect of Judaism, yet it did

not give rise to a ¹reform movement. Instead, it gave birth to a most petrified clerical orthodoxy. The same is true of the Jews of England to a lesser extent. On the other hand, it is an established fact that the "Berlin Haskalah" which was promulgated by the early reformers in Germany found a most favorable response in Galicia and in Poland where emancipation and denationalization of ²Judaism was not an issue at all. These facts prove most conclusively that the reform movement was motivated primarily by inner cultural needs rather than by mere pressure from without.

But these external facts will be ³later on corroborated by internal evidences from the literary sources of the movement. Before we approach, however, the literary sources of the reform movement, we must turn our attention to the life of the people at the time when the reform movement came into existence. The pro-reform writers attribute this unique phenomenon in German Jewish life to the higher intellectual standards of German Jewry; the anti-reform critics attribute it to the weakening of their Jewish consciousness. But both of these views are decidedly wrong. The German Jews towards the close of the eighteenth ⁴century were Germans only geographically, spiritually and culturally they were part and parcel of Eastern Europe and were in close contact with the Jewish centres there. However, the severe political and economic oppression of German Jewry during the seventeenth and eighteenth century have lowered their intellectual standard as compared to that of the Polish or Bohemian Jews. On the other hand, these depressing conditions of German Jewry have fostered a piety to such an ⁵extent that no parallel can be found in Jewish history. Never before was there such a rigorous emphasis on the observance of Sabbaths and festivals, of religious customs and ceremonies, even of the most insignificant. In order to foster this piety among the men and women of the Jewish masses, a new religious literature sprang up in Judaeo-German which was the vernacular of the German

Jews at that time. This literature was an original creation of the German Jews, and it had a tremendous influence upon the religious life of the masses in Germany, as well as of those in Eastern Europe. Such books as the "Z'enh U'renah" and the "M'norat Hamaor" brought to the down-trodden Jews not only a comforting message but also a popular presentation of the Biblical, Rabbinic and Cabalistic literature, coupled with attractive homilies, legends, fables, and incidents taken from Jewish history. Nowhere did the Shulhan-Aruk find such deep roots in the life of the people as it did in Germany during the seventeenth and in the beginning of the eighteenth centuries, and it is here that the liturgy and the synagogal practices were most rigidly codified during that period. And though religious piety prevailed almost to the same extent in Italy and in Poland, because of a freer atmosphere in the Ghettos of the latter, it was not carried out there with the same vigorousness. Besides in Poland and in Italy, where the Catholic church reigned supreme, there was always a discrepancy between life and creed which allowed for a lighter vein in the religious life of the people; while in Western Europe, where the Protestant spirit prevailed, strict conformity of life and creed was rigidly enforced. It is this extreme vigorous piety and the lack of intellectual free-thought in German Jewry that have contributed to the bitterness which characterized the struggle for the slightest innovations in synagogal rituals, and for the most minute deviations from the rigid constructions of the Shulhan-Aruk. Thus in Italy, in Galicia, and even in Hungary the tendencies for moderate reforms found much readier response than in the birthplace of the reform movement.

2. The Cultural Awakening in German Jewry.

The cultural awakening in German Jewry expressed itself in two distinct tendencies: in the advocacy of educational reforms in the Jewish schools;

and in the establishment of Hebrew journalism. The Haskalah school system in its emphasis on the study of the Bible over that of the Talmud brought to the foreground the ethical and social content of the prophetic Books as against the ceremonial and legalistic aspects of Rabbinism. On the other hand, the establishment of Hebrew periodicals furnished open forums for Jewish lay-scholars who had gradually taken away from the rabbis the exclusive control of Jewish public opinion.⁶ Both, the new school system of the Haskalah and the establishment of the Hebrew press, were the immediate predisposing factors in the renaissance of Hebrew literature, which in turn became the carrier of the revolt against the content and style of Rabbinic literature. Hence, the most moderate educational reforms and the establishment of a Hebrew press became later on the signals of free-thought and the beginning of the downfall of Rabbinic authority in every Jewish centre in Europe. Not that the leaders of either of these two cultural tendencies aimed consciously at the tearing down of legalism, it was rather an unconscious accomplishment on their part. For in their desire to bring content[✓] into the hollowness of the petrified Jewish life about them, the modern Jewish educators and journalists constantly stressed the spirit of Judaism rather than its form, and had thus prepared the way either for the reform of the Jewish Law or for the disregard of it altogether.

3. The Reforms in Jewish Education.

The demand for reforms in Jewish education in Germany during the last quarter of the eighteenth century is conceded by all historians to be the beginning of the Reform movement.⁷ And the greatest champion of that movement was undoubtedly Naphtali Hartwig Wessely (born at Hamburg in 1725 and died there in 1805).⁸ His open letter, or pamphlet, "Dibre Shalom v'Emet" (Berlin 1782),⁹ elicited by the edict of Emperor Joseph II, was the first signal of a new era

in the cultural life of European Jewry. In this pamphlet Wessely ardently advocates the voluntary adoption of the educational and social reforms as outlined in the emperor's "Toleranzedict". This letter ^{was} ~~has~~ been translated into French (Paris 1792), Italian (Goers 1793), and German (Berlin 1798), and was everywhere ¹⁰ accepted with enthusiasm by the youth who yearned for enlightenment. With sage-like modesty and mildness Wessely stated the pressing need for adopting new ¹¹ educational methods, and showed them to be by no means in opposition to the Mos-aic or Rabbinic Law. He claimed that the curriculum and the method of instruction for Jewish children must conform to the practical needs of the new generation. Since it was not possible for all to become proficient in Talmud, the ¹² greater number must be taught a trade. Moreover, it was necessary that Jewish school children should have a knowledge of the elementary sciences, history ¹³ and geography ¹⁴ and, above all, a thorough knowledge of the German language.

Wessely also stressed the crying need for popular works in Jewish philosophy, theology and ethics, which would impart to every Jew in as simple a style as possible the elementary knowledge of the spiritual content of Judaism. ¹⁵ As a poet, he stood for the purity of the Hebrew language and for a rational understanding of the Scriptures along the lines of grammatical rules. ¹⁶ He claimed that the woeful lack of poetic genius in the Hebrew literature of the Middle Ages was due to the fact that the study of the prophetic portions of the Bible had been neglected and even when taught their poetic beauty was not appreciated, because of the ignorance of the elementary rudiments of Hebrew grammar ¹⁷ and syntax. All these reforms Wessely advocated in the name of "Torath Ha-Adam" (Humanism or Universalism) ¹⁸ which he believed would raise the prestige ¹⁹ of the Law as well as of the Jews. His program was clear--economic, intellectual and political emancipation on the one hand, and a fidelity to the Jewish heritage

on the other.

It is interesting to note that as a defense for his liberal views he sets out the Sephardic Jews as an example of emancipated yet loyal Jews. ✓ In Trieste⁶, therefore, where the majority of the Jews were of Spanish or Portuguese descent, there was an enthusiastic readiness to open a school according to Wessely's plan. But at the other end of the Austrian dominions, in Galicia, where the Ashkenazic element predominated, there was consternation. And while the Italian rabbis sided with Wessely, all the others, and among them Ezekiel Landau of Prague, were decidedly hostile to all innovations which they instinctively felt would break down traditional Jewish life. For though there was nothing said in this pamphlet against orthodox Judaism, yet in it, like in all of his works, Wessely lays greater stress upon the ethical and social values of Judaism rather than upon the ceremonial. The first, he calls *תורת האדם* the latter *יקי האלהים / תורה*. The first, according to Wessely, is concentrated in eternal truths which one cannot be commanded to believe, since one must necessarily believe them from proof by reason; the latter is a 20 divine legislation not based on reason for it transcends the human mind. In this Wessely claims no originality. He quotes to this effect from the "Kuzari", the "Hovot Ha-levavot", and the "Guide to the Perplexed" where the religious content of Judaism is classified in more or less the same manner. This, however, must be said--that Wessely did negate the value of the ceremonial unless it be based upon a thorough understanding of the theological and ethical content of 21 Judaism.

"אשר כי דברת האמונה יתכן שיהיה אף לשם דת' ואברהם
ליוה אלהים כי אין כן תפקיד / פה פסוק השם ב"ה"

It is to this emphasis of Wessely on the "Torat Ha-adam", which

he calls at times

"*הנהגת חסידים*", that the orthodox rabbis

tremendously objected. They claimed that the ceremonial and the legalistic phases of Judaism were the essentials. And while Wessely himself conformed to every iota of the ceremonial law, it is true that the men and women about him, who furthered the cause of educational reforms, were casting off the "yoke of the Law" and thus strengthening the position of the orthodox rabbis. Besides, many of those who took up the cudgels for his educational reforms lacked the modesty and the sympathetic attitude of Wessely, and with their embittered and debasing attacks they only helped to antagonize the rabbis of great repute, who were admired even by the liberal-minded people. Of such a nature was the anonymous pamphlet of R. Saul Berlin, entitled "Ketob Yosher", of which we shall speak later. Wessely thought that his second epistle on the subject was final, because in it he challenged the orthodox rabbis to show within three months how his definitions of Judaism and his contentions for educational reforms were in any way contrary to Jewish Law. Since no reply came forth to challenge him, he regarded his arguments as invulnerable. And while Wessely received most encouraging letters from many Italian rabbis, his attention was called to most vituperative sermons held against him by local rabbis on "Shabat Hagadol" of 1784, in which they sought to cast aspersions at him by attributing to him statements taken from pamphlets which were written by some of his followers, who attacked the orthodox rabbis in a most irreverential manner. That led him to write a third epistle in the month of Eyar of 1784, entitled "En Mishpat".²³ Wessely disclaimed all responsibility for the writings of those who have sponsored his program, and which may have offended the orthodox leaders.²⁴

"*אשר אמרתי, אשר אמרתי, אשר אמרתי, אשר אמרתי, אשר אמרתי*"

מן פני הרבנים, וכל הנכבדים ואלה הרבנים ואלה המורים
וגם רבנים גדולים ואלה המורים ואלה המורים ואלה המורים
וגם רבנים גדולים ואלה המורים ואלה המורים ואלה המורים
וגם רבנים גדולים ואלה המורים ואלה המורים ואלה המורים.

He also attached favorable decisions, letters and poems sent to him from rabbis and lay scholars of Trieste^e, Ferrara, Venice, Ancona, Reggio, and Goritz, all of which proclaimed him as the most enlightened and courageous seeker of truth.

This third epistle is an important historic document, because it shows clearly that the first ones to have given Wessely an encouraging hand were the Italian rabbis, while those of Germany who were of great repute, opposed him, or at best were neutral on this most important issue. ²⁵ And though the opposition to his program in Germany gradually abated, and he came out victorious, yet he felt the need for further clarification and he, therefore, published a fourth epistle, entitled "Rehoboth". ²⁶ In it he set forth all the objections raised by his opponents and nullified each in turn. In the last chapter of this epistle Wessely displayed breadth of vision when he deplored the spiritual dichotomy in the minds of the emancipated Jew brought about by the narrow-mindedness of the orthodox rabbis. For, in spite of the opposition of the latter, Normal Schools were established throughout the Austrian Empire according to the edict of the emperor, and for the first time the Jewish youth began to feel keenly the sharp contrast between the nineteenth century Western thought and the old fashioned orthodox "Heder". Wessely's ambition, on the other hand, was not only to introduce Jewish youth into nineteenth century Western culture, as it was with many other educators of the time, but he wanted to bridge over the gap between antiquity and modernity through the medium of a modernized Hebrew literature. He claimed, however, that due to the obstinacy of orthodoxy the Jewish youths had to attend the newly-founded Normal Schools which imbued them

He pointed again to the progressiveness of the Italian community of Trieste^E who
aid modernize the system of Jewish education, and thus ~~unified~~ Judaism with
modern culture.

[illegible]

Wessely was not satisfied merely ^{with} in advocating the modernization of Hebrew literature, but became its most active worker of the time. He published the "Sefer Ha-midot" (Berlin 1788), a popular treatise on matters of psychology, ethics and theology, written in a plain, lucid Hebrew style. It is interesting to note regarding the understanding of the time that Wessely had to apologize for the publication of this work, fearing the fanatics who regarded every pseudo-philosophic work as an attempt to undermine legalistic Judaism. Their fear was not wholly unjustified. For though Wessely in his modest way pays the highest tribute in his introduction to the great Talmudic and Cabalistic scholars of his time, he deplores the fact that there is no one in his age to follow in the footsteps of Saadya, Baḥya, Maimonides, Gabirol, and Moses Hayim Luzzato, who devoted their time to the exposition of the ethical content of Judaism.

"אריבויג מיסקיג דעם צומאט אהרונ'ס שבתורה ואלמאדי חובת האל
אל ישיחא אדם. אויפ'ר נאך אחרת אדם נא מנחם אל ואלאן" ---

The work itself displays no originality nor depth of thought, yet it is a landmark in the literary history of Judaism, for it was the first attempt

of its kind by an Ashkenazic Jewish scholar. The book, as stated above, was written, unlike those of his own time, in a lucid Hebrew style characteristic of the Spanish and Italian Hebrew writers. The tendency then of the early reformers was clearly a revolt against rabbinic legalism, and a return to the literary and philosophic Sephardic scholars. Like them, Wessely also indulged in philological and grammatical research, a study which resulted in an extensive work, "Lebanon" or "Gau-Maul" in two volumes (Amsterdam 1765-66), which is a philological investigation of Hebrew roots and synonyms. These two volumes bear witness to the author's solid scientific attainments, and it is regrettable that their scientific value is obscured by the prolix style in which they are written. Wessely's greatest distinction, however, was in the field of poetry. Though this phase of his creativeness is out of the realm of our consideration, yet it must be mentioned that the style and content of his poems are indicative of the spirit of the time. In his poetry Wessely is clearly a disciple and successor of the Spanish and Italian Hebrew poets, particularly of Moses Hayim Luzzato;³⁰ at the same time he is also a child of his age expressing the yearnings of the modern Jew for freedom and emancipation. Though the classic style of his poetry helped to retard the development of pure art, it ushered in humanism into Hebrew literature, just as the general humanistic movement led the European mind along the paths marked out by the classic languages. No sooner did his work become known in Eastern Europe than it raised up a number of imitators. Particularly was his influence decidedly great upon Abraham Ba'r Lebensohn of Wilna ("Adam ha-Kohen", 1794-1880), who was surnamed "father of poetry", and who was one of the pillars in the movement for emancipation and against obscurantism in Eastern Europe.³¹ Wessely's activity as Bible commentator and as coworker in the Meassef will be discussed later in connection with the activity of the Biurists and the Meassfim.

Hence, we see Wessely's manifold influence upon his contemporaries as scholar, philologist, theologian, journalist, and poet. The criticism levelled against him by S. Bernfeld, who sought not only to minimize his knowledge and abilities but also to cast aspersions upon his character, is wholly unjustifiable. Bernfeld accuses Wessely of joining hands with the avowed enemies of Judaism, of belittling arrogantly the authorities of tradition, and of insincerity and hypocrisy. That this criticism is undeserved can be proven by the fact that when an article was published in the *Meassef* speaking with undue levity about the doctrines of the Talmud in regard to reward and punishment, Wessely wrote a pamphlet, "*Maamar Hakor Din*", in which he denounces the editors for allowing disrespectful statements concerning tradition to be published in their journal. In this pamphlet Wessely analyzes all the Talmudic and philosophic statements concerning reward and punishment which have been collected by Menasseh b. Israel in his "*Nishmat Hayim*" (ch. I, part 13).

Though Wessely incurred the displeasure of the rabbinical authorities of Germany and Poland, and though the latter sought to excommunicate and persecute him, he always championed the cause of Jewish cultural emancipation in a most dignified and modest manner, never attacking tradition nor its authorities.

4. Mendelsohn and the Biurist Movement.

The effects of the Biurist movement which has its beginning with Mendelsohn's translation of the Pentateuch, like the achievements of Mendelsohn himself, have been greatly exaggerated and grossly misrepresented by most Jewish historians and writers. Mendelsohn's German translation of the Pentateuch was hailed as a unique and revolutionary phenomenon in Jewish life, and as the immediate stimulus, if not as the cause, of the "enlightenment" and of the Reform

yet the need of the common people who gradually lost the knowledge of Hebrew invariably overcame the opposition of the authorities. Of such nature were the Aramaic Targumim in Palestine; the Septuagint in Alexandria; the Greek translation of Aquila; the Syriac translation--the "Peshitta"; the Arabic translations (the most famous of which is that of Saadya Gaon which has remained to this day the version for the Jews in Arabic speaking countries); the Persian, the Tartar, the Spanish, and the Italian translations; and finally the Judaeo-German translations. Of course, Graetz, with his exaggerated hatred for the East-European Jews and for their language, denounced the Polish "melamdim" for translating the Holy Book into their hateful jargon---"so that it seemed as if Moses had spoken in the barbarous dialect of Polish Jews." ⁴⁴ It is for this reason that the translation of the Bible into "pure" German by the Mendelsohnian ⁴⁵ school was regarded as a great cultural emancipation from barbarism. As a matter of fact the numerous Judaeo-German translations of the Bible, which were and still are derided by the champions of "enlightenment", are only a continuation of that same tendency which began with the Targumim, the aim of which was to make the Bible accessible to the masses void of Hebrew knowledge. And since all the East and West European Jews from the beginning of the fifteenth till the end of the eighteenth centuries spoke exclusively in the Judaeo-German dialect, it was but natural for the Bible translations of that period to be written in this vernacular. Thus we have a partial Judaeo-German translation of the Bible in Poland as early as the fifteenth century (the manuscript of which was found in the collection of Dei Rossi, dated Mantua 1421). We also have a Judaeo-German translation of the Psalms by Elijah Levita (Venice 1545). A complete Bible translation in Judaeo German was published by Isaac Blitz of Amsterdam (1676-78). Another complete translation was published there in 1679 by Joseph Witzzenhausen, which secured the approbation of the "Council of the Four Lands." A third

complete translation of the Bible into Judaeo-German was edited by Sussman Rouelheim and Menahem Mair Levi (Amsterdam 1725-1729). It is interesting to note that the Judaeo-German into which the Bible was being translated was considered at the time not a "Jewish" dialect but *אשכנזי*, or *אשכנז*, and it was considered as such even by Mendelsohn. Yet there was no opposition to these translations on the part of the rabbis. On the contrary, the editor of the first Judaeo-German Bible translation published a number of approbations (*הסכמות*) of the Ashkenazic and Sephardic rabbis in which they state that the translation will be of great benefit to the Jews of Germany and of Poland, and to those who have emigrated from these countries into Holland.

*"אברהם ברוך אבן אבן יצחק אבן הקדוש אברהם אבן דני
ישראל המהרש"א אבן אבן... כפי אבן דני אבן המהרש"א
אבן תלמיד אברהם אבן הקדוש אבן דני"*

It is also noteworthy that the editor states in his preface that his aim was to give a literal translation of the Bible, according to the rational interpretation of the grammarians.

*"אברהם ברוך אבן אבן יצחק אבן הקדוש אברהם אבן דני
ישראל המהרש"א אבן אבן... כפי אבן דני אבן המהרש"א
אבן תלמיד אברהם אבן הקדוש אבן דני"*

And, in fact, this was a literal translation of the Bible in a language which probably was good literary German at the time when it was published. Only Mendelsohn living a century after found the style of the translation barbaric and repulsive.

*"אברהם ברוך אבן אבן יצחק אבן הקדוש אברהם אבן דני
ישראל המהרש"א אבן אבן... כפי אבן דני אבן המהרש"א
אבן תלמיד אברהם אבן הקדוש אבן דני"*

Therefore, at the middle of the eighteenth century when it became in vogue among the rich Jews of Berlin to study the current literary German, the necessity for a translation into modern German was keenly felt. But since all the Hebrew teachers then were Polish immigrants who spoke Judaeo-German, the

desired change could not be brought about so easily. It is for this reason that Mendelsohn found it necessary to translate the Pentateuch into the current literary German for the use of his own children.

"וזה כאשר חתן ב' יאפים בתים ופנים והגיד דעת אלמנה מזרח
אלמנה פקדי אלהים חיים בבית, רחמיה אמרתי את חמשה
חומשי המורה באופן אשכנזי האמלסל /החמות/ כפי אשר נראה בזמן.
אמלסה האדם הרכוש".

Mendelsohn did not intend, however, to open a new epoch in Bible exegesis, nor did he make any attempt to usher in the "rational spirit of the time," for which he is usually given credit. The translation, as well as the interpretations of the "Biur" are most orthodox, ignoring completely the results of the scientific research made by Spinoza and Elijah Levita. After Mendelsohn, translations of the Bible were made during the nineteenth century in practically every Jewish centre--in Holland, Italy, France, Russia, and later on in America.

We can see, therefore, how unjustifiable are both the commendations and the condemnations of the "Biur". For, as we have clearly seen, the modern German translation of the Bible was a natural outgrowth of the time, just as were all the other translations of the Bible which preceded and succeeded it. It is fallacious, therefore, to attribute to it the outbreaks of reform and the cessation of Jewish learning in Germany, or the progress of Haskalah in Eastern Europe, for its tendency was in no way different from that of all the other Bible translations. Many historians and journalists point to the fact that the Jewish young students made use of this translation for the study of the German language and they consider it, therefore, a primary factor which helped to initiate the Jewish people into German culture, which in turn was the immediate cause for the reform movement and for the "denationalization" of the Western Jews. This argument is but trivial, and those who hold such a view

simply confound "incidents" for "factors". For it was the political and economic conditions of the time which compelled the Jews of Germany to study German, just as the Jews were compelled everywhere to study the language of their country. It so happened that during this "Germanization" process the "Blur" was found to be a convenient means for the study of the German language. If the "Blur" were not then in existence, some other convenient means would have been found for the exigencies of the time, just as there were other means for the "russification" of the Russian Jews.

In fact, Mendelsohn himself did not regard the "Blur" as a revolutionary or epoch-making work. In his introduction, he devotes a whole chapter to the history of Bible translations, from the Palestinian Targumim to his own time, in which he proves that his translation is only a link in the long chain of Bible translations, and that he stands on good traditional grounds from which he would not depart in the slightest manner. There are some who think that in reality Mendelsohn did not stand on traditional grounds, but that he did not dare to express his views for fear of Jewish public opinion. There is not, however, the slightest justification for such a view. As we shall see later on, Mendelsohn's policy in the Blur is in perfect accord with his general attitude to religion. For Mendelsohn did not only cling firmly to tradition but even where he had the opportunity to choose between a more liberal and a narrower talmudic tradition he would side with the latter. Thus he states unequivocally that every letter, vowel and accentuation mark in the Pentateuch is of divine origin and that they were revealed to Moses on Mount Sinai and handed down to us without any change whatsoever.

50

51

"אברהם אבינו ספק שמר'ה מאד לא דברי תורה מפי המורה
בא דבר ויפיק הנקודה והמאמר המיוחד להן בדקדוקיהן וצירופיהן
אשר ציר משה דבר אכן מסרם לו הלאה, והלאה איתנו אכן

שאלה נקבלה דההן פאר זאך פאר" --

And though he is fully aware of the controversial data on the subject from non-Jewish and Jewish authorities, including those of Elijah Levita,⁵² he finally sides with Isaac Halevi Satanow, the author of "Imre-Binah" and⁵³ with Azariah dei Rossi, the author of "M'or Enayim", who upheld the traditional conception of revelation.⁵⁴ His utter lack of critical analysis he shows most clearly when he states that even the Talmudic and Massoretic emendations were revealed to Moses and were handed down by oral tradition.⁵⁵

אגב דמין תקני אפומא נאפא שפאט נא פא, אשה רחל ד'ה
א נא דמיונא כי זא פומא באבא אכאס אסרה אפומא
הב קאמא אפומא אפי תקני אבאדא אז סוף חמאליק אפומא
אמא נאפא פאפא אפי אפי.

The understanding of Mendelsohn's attitude to tradition, as expounded in his introduction to the Biur, is of utmost importance, for it is characteristic of his whole attitude to Judaism, the misunderstanding of which misled the students of Reform Judaism, as well as of the Neo-Hebraic renaissance. For all of the historians of these two movements begin with Mendelsohn as a starting point. The fact is that while he contributed to the progress of these two movements, he had nothing in common with either of them. Instead, he should be regarded as the forerunner of the German orthodox party, the outstanding exponent of which was Rabbi Israel Hildesheimer, and whose platform was defined at the Rabbinical Conference at Budapest in 1869, as follows: "A faithful adherence to traditional teachings combined with an effective effort to keep⁵⁶ in touch with the spirit of progress." In reality, this platform advocates a complete adaptation to the cultural environment from without and an unconditional

adherence to a sealed Judaism from within. It is this very attitude which is reflected most consistently in Mendelsohn's life and works. And Bernfeld is perfectly right when he says of Mendelsohn that he was the first among the cultured Jews to whom the problem of the Jews was primary and that of Judaism secondary.⁵⁷

"אנפאלן נאך דער דאזיקער צייט וואס ער האט געזעהן דאס וואס
וואס האט געווען דאס פאר דער דאזיקער צייט."

Indeed, Mendelsohn was not interested in contributing anything to the progress of Judaism as such, for even the "Biur" which is his only great contribution to Judaism, Mendelsohn himself admits in his introduction was an idea conceived by Solomon b. Joel Dubno.⁵⁸

That Mendelsohn was rather a champion of Jewish rights than of Judaism⁵⁹ is evident from the fact that he was actually disinterested in Jewish problems altogether until the year 1771, at the time when he reached the age of 42, and after having acquired already a great reputation among non-Jewish circles as an outstanding metaphysician. The impetus for his interest in Jewish problems even after that date came also from without, as he was forced to state his views on Judaism by the controversy with the Christian theologian Lavater.⁶⁰ Likewise, Mendelsohn's Jewish activities after that incident show clearly that he was more interested in securing civil emancipation for the Jews rather than in the inner development of Judaism. A complete discussion of this would lead us far afield, but a few instances will suffice. His effort to abolish early

burials,⁶¹ for instance, was clearly not a measure of reform, for there were many other phases of Jewish practice which he regarded with disfavor and for which he did not advocate any change.⁶² His motive for being in favor of this particular reform can be explained only by the fact that he believed that such a reform would facilitate the process of emancipation. The very fact that his interest in this reform came as a result of the Decree of the Duke of Mecklenburg-

63

Schwerin (April 1772) would lead us to this conclusion. Similarly, when in 1777 several hundred impoverished Jews were about to be expelled from Dresden, Mendelsohn interceded in their behalf. In 1778 at the request of Hirschel Levin, chief rabbi of Berlin, he wrote a compilation of the civil laws of the

Gesetz in German, which he called "Ritualgesetze der Juden" to prove

to King Frederick that the laws of Judaism do not conflict in any way with those

64

of the state. As far as the publication of the Biur in 1779 we can mention, in addition to what has been stated above, the letter of Mendelsohn to his friend Augustus Von Heinings, the Danish State councillor (June 29, 1779), in which he states clearly that he never intended to publish it. But since he was led through certain circumstances to do so, he believes that it will be for the best

65

interests of his people.

Mendelsohn's collaboration with Chr. W. Dobin in the publication of the document "Ueber die Bürgerliche Verbesserung der Juden" and his preface to Marcus Herz's translation of the "Vindiciae Judaearum", the famous apologetic work of Menasseh b. Israel, were likewise emancipatory endeavors. Again, his "Magnum opus" "Jerusalem" (Berlin 1783) is surely not a treatise on Judaism, as it is assumed to be, but rather an apologetic work in behalf of the religion of the Jews, which Mendelsohn tried to represent in a most favorable light. Though this work was, and still is, regarded as an epoch-making book, it has but little originality and shows altogether a lack of historic perspective. For our purpose it is enough to mention of this book that in it Mendelsohn regarded every ceremonial law as having eternal validity, unless abrogated by a new revelation.

"The spirit of Judaism," he said, "is freedom of doctrine and conformity in

66

action." Yet, in spite of this, as we have seen above, Mendelsohn, in his introduction to the Biur clung firmly to the most narrow construction of Jewish doctrines concerning revelation. Again, many see in this dual attitude towards

doctrine a glaring duplicity, or intellectual hypocrisy on the part of Mendelsohn. But in justice to him it must be said that there is not the slightest evidence for such an accusation, because Mendelsohn's intellectual integrity was beyond reproach. To understand this seeming inconsistency on the part of Mendelsohn, we must bear in mind that to him, like to the cultured German, orthodox Jew of our own time, Judaism was a closed chapter which cannot allow for any changes except for such minor reforms which would improve the civil status of the Jew.

And though Mendelsohn was an outstanding figure in the Biurist movement, and though he was instrumental in the foundation of the "Meqsef" and gave it even a few anonymous contributions, the fact remains that he did not write a single work in Hebrew setting forth his philosophic views to Jewish readers. This fact is most glaring, because Mendelsohn was a master of Hebrew style, and because the "Hebrew language was known then to about all Jews, with the exception of a few ignorant villagers, and it offered a most excellent medium for propagating European culture." ⁶⁸ This only confirms our conclusion that the reason Mendelsohn wrote at all on matters pertaining to Judaism is because of his desire to gain non-Jewish recognition for his people, rather than to further the development of Judaism. Hence, the one great achievement to Mendelsohn's credit is the civil emancipation of the Jews beginning with the nineteenth century. Indirectly, this achievement helped to further the movement for reforms and for Neo-Hebraic renaissance, but on the other hand, it impeded the progress of both. For each of these movements aimed in its own way to create a modern Judaism which should form a synthesis between Western culture and traditional Judaism, while Mendelsohn's ideology only helped to create a dichotomy in the life of the people which finally led to wholesale

21973
10/24/51
U701
A/18.7

apostasy. And because of his great prestige, both the reform movement in Germany and the Hebrew renaissance in Eastern Europe suffered for a long time from this Mendelssohnian legacy which found its clearest expression in the motto of Joshua Leon Gordon, " *פיהלך ויהיה פיהלך* " - "Be a cosmopolitan man from without and a traditional Jew from within." It is only with the appearance of men like Abraham Geiger and Samuel Holdheim in Germany, and like Peretz Smolenskin in Russia, that the intellectual Jews of Europe began to shake off this Mendelssohnian attitude to Judaism, which can appeal only to people of compartmental minds.

Though Mendelssohn did not occupy a very great place in Hebrew literature, we had to dwell at length on his activities and on his attitude to Judaism for several reasons: First, it enabled us to understand that Mendelssohnian legacy under which both the reformers and the "Maskilim" had to labor; secondly, it proved beyond any doubt how false it is to regard the reform movement concomitant with emancipation as Bernfeld does (*המחלוקת*) and thirdly, it served to corroborate the contention made above that emancipation without an inner cultural awakening leads logically not to "reform" but to a stagnant orthodoxy as it exists today in Germany, France and England, or in the Sephardic communities in Turkey.

The other outstanding figures among the "Biurists" will be treated in connection with the "Meassfim".

5. The Meassfim.

Though Mendelssohn was no doubt the central magnetic figure in the circle of the cultured Jews in Germany, yet it is among his followers and friends that we must seek the true bearers of the Jewish renaissance in the end of the eighteenth century. It was already mentioned above that it was Wessely,

Mendelsohn's closest friend, who sought to bring in Western culture in the life of the Jew through the medium of a modernized Hebrew language and through reforms in the Hebrew education of the children. Both of these movements, in which Mendelsohn himself displayed but a passive interest, became the pivotal issues of the Meassfim and awakened a responsive thrill in the hearts of his young followers and admirers, particularly of his proteges among the Polish immigrants. Of course, Graetz with his well-known prejudice towards the Polish Jews, says of them as follows: "Young Poles, adventurous spirits, thirsting for knowledge with good minds but confused thoughts, both pure and impure elements, forced themselves upon Mendelsohn and brought him into bad repute. The majority had broken not alone with the Talmud, but also with religion and morality; they led a dissolute life, but considered it the mark of philosophy and enlightenment. Out of love to mankind and independent thought, Mendelsohn entered into relations with them, held discussions with them, advanced and 74 aided them, which also cast a false light upon his relation to Judaism."

The fact of the matter is that these Polish immigrants whom Graetz so mercilessly derided made Mendelsohn's position in Judaism what it was, and it was they who brought in the new era of enlightenment into German Jewry. For Mendelsohn was not only taught and influenced by them but it was they who made the Biur accessible to the Polish Jews who were its greatest patronizers, and it was their contributions to the "Meassef", together with those of the Italian 75 scholars, that gave this period any literary value at all.

Among those who have exerted a great influence upon the so-called "Mendelsohnian school" was Solomon Dubno of Poland. Dubno was the outstanding 76 Hebrew literary genius of his time, and it was he who was responsible for the publication of the Biur and for its popularity. It was his edition of

that they should not make the Hebrew language as an end in itself but that it shall ever remain a means for the study of the Torah. ⁸⁴

The purpose of the Meassfim was clearly to bring in a revival in Hebrew literature and culture. Enchel, being one of the very few cultured at the time could not help but deplore the educational status of his people, and with the enthusiasm of a reformer he cried out, "Behold the season of learning has come to all nations; they rest neither day nor night from teaching their children the art of letters; why then sit we idle, folding our hands?" ⁸⁵ Enchel was not calling in the desert, for the best element of the young generation immediately responded with equal enthusiasm. ⁸⁶

The editors of the Meassef sought to avoid one-sidedness and they divided the periodical into five departments: Poetry; essays--linguistic, exegetical and Talmudic; biographical articles; current news; and reviews of current publications. ⁸⁷ And though Bernfeld, like many others, minimizes sarcastically the literary importance of the "Meassef", ⁸⁸ we must not forget that it was the first successful attempt of its sort in Jewish history. It is true that too many of its contributors were shallow intellectuals, lacking breadth of vision, yet it must be admitted that in spite of all their shortcomings, they have brought in a fresh current of life which ran through every Jewish centre in Europe and brought in a new ideal which dominated the Jewish world of letters for the next half century. ⁸⁹ It would be out of our realm to discuss here the literary aspect of the Meassef, ⁹⁰ for we are interested in it primarily as a factor in the struggles for reforms in Judaism. And as such its influence was manifold:

1. For the Meassfim chose as their new sphere of activity the reform of Hebrew elementary education, which, as stated above, was the first step in the

90

movement for synagog reforms.

2. They battled against religious fanaticism and casuistic methods in Jewish learning, seeking to replace them by liberal ideas and scientific

91

research. And though their campaign against straight-laced orthodoxy and against the orthodox rabbis was rather moderate due to the influence of West-

92

sely, yet we find already in the Meassef articles advocating reforms in minor points of Rabbinic practice and synagogal ritual.

3. The Meassef was the first Hebrew literary medium which advocated the study of German and of German culture, and which sought to familiarize the Jews with the social and aesthetic demands of modern life and induce them to rid themselves of the ingrained peculiarities of Ghetto life.

4. As far as the Hebrew language is concerned, the Meassfim succeeded in purifying it from Rabbinic distortions and in restoring it to its Biblical form. And though they went to too great an extreme in that direction, yet it was due to this effort that the secularization of Hebrew literature was brought about. Moreover, through their independent secular Hebrew periodical, the Meassfim were able to disseminate and to interchange the progressive ideas hailing from the liberal Jewish circles of France, Holland, Poland, Galicia, and Germany.

5. But the greatest contribution of the Meassfim to liberal Judaism was, as stated above, the establishment of the first forum, in which educated Jewish laymen could discuss freely problems concerning Jews and Judaism, which in time compelled the orthodox rabbis to share their authority over the people.

It has been the vogue among Hebrew journalists in Russia to criticize very severely the "Meassfim" and to brand their activities as de-

93

structive and negative. As proof for their contention, they would point out to the short duration of the "Meassef" (from 1784-1811). We must bear in mind,

however, that the Meassef was the first experiment of its kind in Jewish literature and though the periodical ceased to function in 1811, the Hebrew journalistic movement which they began continued to this very day and was the most potent factor in the disintegration of the spiritual despotism which the orthodox rabbis exerted in Jewish life. On the ruins of the "Meassef" the "Bik-kure Ha-Ittim" appeared (Vienna 1820-1813), for it was established by one of the former Meassfim, Sholom Ha-Kohen. This periodical was succeeded in turn by others, and so the chain of Hebrew journalism continues to this very day.⁹⁴ The precarious existence of the "Meassef", and its early death cannot be attributed to the policy of the periodical nor to the shortcomings of its collaborators. Every student of Hebrew journalism knows that all the Hebrew periodicals suffered the same bitter fate, and that the existence of Hebrew periodicals today is just as precarious. For to this very day Hebrew periodicals in the Diaspora can serve only as transitional mediums for the cultural emancipation of the Ghetto Jews who were reared in the Hebrew language. As soon as the individual Jew in the Diaspora becomes adjusted to the culture of his environment and conversant with its language, he finds in the periodical literature of the vernacular a more convenient and more efficient medium of information, and finds no longer any vital need for a Hebrew periodical. Hence, as soon as the cultural aim of the Meassfim was accomplished and the Jews did become thoroughly conversant with German culture, the doom of the periodical was inevitable.⁹⁵

These facts must be borne in mind if we are to understand the attitude of the early reforms to the Hebrew language. The early reformers in Germany, contrary to the prevailing impression, were not against the Hebrew language. Rather the contrary is true. For in Germany it was chiefly the

discussion evoked by the movement for religious reforms that created a literature in Hebrew. ⁹⁶

The decadence of the Hebrew learning in Germany after the emancipation is admitted even by Bernfeld to be due chiefly to the political and economic conditions then, rather than to the activities of the Meassfim ⁹⁷

and of the early reformers. It is to meet these critical conditions that the latter began to advocate prayers and sermons in the vernacular in order to keep the uninformed masses, particularly the women, within the fold of ⁹⁸ Judaism. ⁹⁹

Plouschy, commenting on Lieberman's book, "Or Nogah", remarks that it is curious to read pleas written in a classic Hebrew for the abolition of the Hebrew language and against the maintenance of Jewish nationality. ¹⁰⁰

But, as we shall see later, Lieberman and his like entertained no such motives in advocating the use of the vernacular for religious purposes. Instead, they were prompted by motives similar to those of the Hassidic leaders who, in spite of their ardent love for Hebrew, advocated the use of Judeo-German, because of their passion for the popularization of Judaism among the unlearned. ¹⁰¹

Of course, this popularization tendency assumed abnormal proportions beyond the limits contemplated by the early reformers, and it is the abuse of that tendency that proved so fatal to the reform movement. For it is this extreme passion for the popularization of Judaism and the distorted conception of

synagogal democracy that gave supremacy to the "Am-Haretz" in Jewish life, which in turn led to the decline of Hebrew learning among the laity and the rabbinate ¹⁰²

just as it does in our American Jewish communities today. It is only as we exonerate the early reformers from the charge of anti-Hebraic tendencies that we can approach the Hebrew literature of that time without pre-established bias.

6. Rabbinic Support for Reforms.

In analyzing the Hebrew literature evoked by the movement for religious reforms, we cannot follow any other order except that of chronology. It is noted that all the rabbinical approval to the reform movement came from Italy, Westphalia and Hungary. All the German rabbis, save one, were bitterly and uncompromisingly opposed even to the slightest and the most insignificant innovations. The only German rabbi who was in sympathy with the reform movement was Paul Hirshel Berlin (1740-1794).¹⁰³ And though he was one of the few

rabbis of his time who combined great Talmudic learning with secular education, yet the underhanded and dishonorable methods which he pursued in defending the reformers did more harm than good to the cause of reform. Occupying as he did the rabbinate in Frankfort-on-the-Oder it was impossible for him to denounce openly the old order without suffering the consequences, as did his Hungarian colleague, Aaron Chorin. Berlin, therefore, chose to advance his progressive ideas anonymously or under pseudonyms, a course which put him and the cause which he defended in great disrepute.

In his younger days, Saul Berlin came under the influence of the great Polish scholar and poet, Isaac Halevi Satanov. The latter represented a peculiar conglomeration of contrasts--he dressed in the garb of the Polish Jew of that period, yet was a thorough German in his actions and habits. Though orthodox in his beliefs, he nevertheless favored reform in practice. He was one of the greatest authorities on Jewish tradition and lore, and was at the same time the most free-thinking of philosophers. He was a prolific writer, yet most of his works were published anonymously. And even in the most earnest and solemn of his writings there can always be discerned an undercurrent of¹⁰⁴ the most playful humor. Berlin, however, inherited from his master all the

only by Jewish scholars but also by the King of Denmark. He was one of the most zealous advocates of the old order and the most bitter opponent of Menachem⁵sonn's translation of the Pentateuch and of all the cultural innovations in his time. Saul Berlin under the assumed name of "Obadiah b. Baruch of Poland" attempted to ridicule in his work the Talmudic methods of Raphael, and to stigmatize him not only as ignorant but also as intellectually dishonest. ¹⁰⁷ The publishers of the book declared in a preface that they had received this work from a traveling Polish Talmudist, and had considered it their duty to print and submit it to the judgment of specialists. In order to secure the anonymity more thoroughly, Saul Berlin and his father were named among those who were to pass on it. ¹⁰⁸ As soon as this book reached Altona and Hamburg, where Raphael was chief rabbi, the work as well as its author was placed under the ban. The resentment was not so much to the criticism of Raphael's Talmudic methods of interpretation but to the entirely unfounded attack upon the honor and honesty of the foremost exponent of orthodox rabbinism and whose incorruptibility and firmness of character were admired even by his enemies. The introduction, as well as the whole work of Berlin, is written in a most vulgar arrogance, and is full of the most outrageous epithets which find no parallel in Rabbinic literature. Had Berlin been content to illustrate the senseless casuistic methods of the current rabbinic literature, as displayed in Raphael's work, he would have performed a meritorious work. But his venomous attacks and inexcusable levity with which he treated an honored leader in Israel only helped to injure the cause which he desired to further.

Before the excitement over this scandalous affair had subsided, Berlin created a new sensation by another rabbinic work. In 1793 he published at Berlin under the title "Besavrim Rosh" 392 responsa purporting to be by

essential article is that we are all utterly worthless and depraved, and that our only duty consists in loving truth and peace and learning to know God and his works." ¹¹¹ Thus all of Berlin's responsa are injected with phrases that criticize the rabbis of his time for their ignorance, narrow-mindedness, unfounded superstition and stubborn separatism. R. Asher is also alleged to be the author of the two responsa concerning the modification of the ceremonial laws. ¹¹² Thus, for instance, it should be permitted to shave and to drink non-kosher wine (¹¹³ *Pei /" l.*).

Thus, Berlin expressed his own views on the necessity of reforming the laws by ascribing them to R. Asher b. Yehiel who was the most rigorous legalist of the thirteenth century. Berlin could not, however, escape the consequences of such a mode of warfare. As soon as the forgery was found out, he had to resign the rabbinate, and, in order to end the dispute which he had aroused he went to London where he died a few months after his arrival.

Saul Berlin typifies the impetuous youths among the followers of Wessely, who were filled with a burning desire to lead the people toward intellectual freedom but to whom Wessely's timid and modest attempts to inaugurate a new era did not appeal. With their youthful ardor and short-sightedness, they did not understand that a development of the popular consciousness is a slow process. And because an open championship of reform was as yet impossible, they resorted to anonymous works and pamphlets full of debased and embittered attacks upon Rabbinism. Berlin was the outstanding champion of that type, for being really a great Talmudist he knew better than any person the weaknesses of orthodoxy.

7. Rabbinic Support for the Reform Movement Outside of Germany.

While the German rabbis, as stated before, were strenuously opposed to the slightest innovations in matters of religion, a more liberal religious spirit prevailed outside of Germany. The first rabbinic work to approve openly and earnestly the aspirations of the younger generation was that of R. Mendel Steinhardt, chief rabbi of Westphalia and councillor of the consistory which convened in 1807. Mendel Steinhardt was a talmudist of note, and in his collection of responsa, "She'elot u-Teshubot Mibre Menahem" (Offenbach 1804), he shows a thorough knowledge of Talmudic literature which he presented in a very clear and logical manner. His style is not as cumbersome as that of the other rabbis of his time, and from the introduction to his work we can see that he was a modest and progressive scholar who, while clinging firmly to tradition, was ready to meet the spirit of the time as far as tradition will allow.

When Israel Jacobson began to carry out some minor communal, educational and congregational reforms among the Jews of Westphalia, Steinhardt wrote in defense of Jacobson his "Mibre Iggereth" (ed. W. Heidenheim, Rodenheim, 1892) to justify the innovations introduced by the Jewish consistory at Cassel, and to prove that they were undertaken in conformity with Talmudic principles. 114 Jacobson's aims were not to start a new movement in Judaism. He was merely a public-spirited layman who was moved to introduce innovations in order to remove certain abuses in Jewish life. He sought to improve first of all, the Jewish communal affairs, the mismanagement of which caused an undue financial burden upon the people. He also sought to introduce a system in the Jewish educational institutions and a decorum into the religious services that they might appeal to the younger people who were brought up in modern Western culture. In fact, even the opponents of the reformers concede that the

spiritual decadence in the religious services at the time was intolerable and that most of his innovations were absolutely necessary. ¹¹⁵ Jacobson was firmly convinced that reforms of some kind had to be inaugurated at once, but in order not to antagonize the fanatics he proceeded cautiously and began his activity by founding the free school of Seesen (1801), where Jewish and Christian children alike received a modern education. (This close association of children of different creeds was in itself a great innovation at the time.) Jacobson soon perceived the necessity of adjusting the religious services of the school to the aesthetic feelings of these children. He, therefore, erected in 1810 a beautiful Temple within the school grounds and though he made no fundamental changes in the ritual, he showed his reformatory tendencies by introducing an organ, hymns in German were sung by the boys, prayers in German were added to those in the Hebrew, and sermons were frequently given in the vernacular. These slight innovations were the beginnings of the Reform movement as a practical achievement. Jacobson's reformatory tendency was further shown by his strong advocacy in favor of confirmation services. In 1811, Jacobson confirmed for the first time in the Seesen Synagog five Jewish boys.

Steinhardt, who was a member of the consistory, took pains to show that these apparent innovations did not transgress any prescribed rabbinical enactment. In his "Libre Igeret", which consists of ten responsa, Steinhardt defends the following innovations of the consistory: The permission to ¹¹⁶ use pulse, sugar, tea, and tobacco on days of Passover; the abolition of ¹¹⁷ calling people to the Torah by name; the introduction of German hymns in the children's services; ¹¹⁸ the abolition of the custom to go around the altar in procession with the lulab except for the officers and the ministers of the congregation; the abolition of the custom of beating the willows in Hoshana

119
 Rabba, and instituting the shaking thereof instead; the innovation to re-
 cite the ¹²⁰ *שְׁמַח מִלְּפָנֶיךָ* only on Yom Kippur night and the *שְׁמַח מִלְּפָנֶיךָ*
 on Sabbaths and festivals; the innovations that *Kadish* be recited in unison
 by all the mourners; ¹²¹ the omission of the *שְׁמַח מִלְּפָנֶיךָ* piyutim be-
 fore the Eighteen Benedictions, except on Rosh Hashona and Yom Kippur; ¹²² the
 abolition of *שְׁמַח מִלְּפָנֶיךָ* prayers which contain cabalistic doctrines; ¹²³ the
 abolition of a number of prayers and piyutim that refer to the persecution of
 the Jews by non-Jewish neighbors and to the enmity that exists between them
 and the latter.

In each responsa Steinhardt cites statements from Talmudic and
 post-Talmudic authorities to justify the innovations. He was moved, he says, to
 approve these departures from tradition because of the exigencies of the time.
 The arguments for most of these innovations are the current ones in pro-re-
 form literature, and we will have occasion later on to discuss them in detail
 in connection with Lieberman's "Sefer Nogoh Hazeadek", which is the most com-
 plete apologetic work for the justification of synagogue reforms on traditional
 grounds. ¹²⁴ Steinhardt's defense of reforms is characteristic of the time for
 it shows that the opponents then did not understand any more than the propon-
 ents the real issues involved in these departures. All they were concerned in
 was that the innovations constitute departures from established custom. They
 did not differentiate between the introduction of German hymns into the Jewish
 service, and the abolition of beating the willows on Hosahana Rabba. To the
 rigorists both of these constituted unauthoritative departures from the ac-
 cepted ritual which should be condemned. Hence, the whole early literature
 evoked by the movement for reforms with but few exceptions consisted of
 pilpulistic discussions as to points of interpretation of the law, and not as

to principles. For both, the early advocates as well as the opponents of religious reforms, did not understand the political and cultural consequences of the proposed reforms.

125

This first attempt at religious reforms which was begun by the Westphalian consistory was of short duration, for due to the political reverses, of Napoleon it ceased to function in 1813. A more serious attempt at reforms and of more lasting influence was the "Hamburg Temple".

III

THE CONTROVERSY OF THE HAMBURG TEMPLE

year.

1. Events Leading to the Construction of the Temple.

The famous edict of March 11th, issued by the king of Prussia, Frederick William III, marks the beginning of a new period for the Jews of Germany. His emancipatory edict declared the Jews residing in Prussia as natives and raised them to the rank of Prussian citizenship. It gave them permission to settle anywhere in the land and to acquire real estate. It made them eligible for teachers' positions and for communal offices. All restrictive trade conditions were abolished, as well as the special taxes which they had been compelled to pay as Jews. In return, they had to assume all the obligations of citizenship, such as taxes and military service. Rabbinical civil jurisdiction was to cease. There were also a number of inhibitory paragraphs in the edict, but its general tendency was such as made for freedom in so marked a degree that the Jews of Berlin looked upon it almost in the light of their Magna Charta.¹ And though the edict did not touch the religious affairs of the Jews further than to demand that rabbinical jurisdiction cease, and though the leaders of emancipation contended that political rights should not be bought at the cost of religious convictions, nevertheless, the modification of Jewish life went hand in hand with emancipation.

The taste for European culture had developed, the entry into the life without made adjustments in the life within inevitable. There was much precipitate haste; no one calculated what the issue might be. Shortly after the promulgation of this edict, David Friedlander wrote a pamphlet entitled, "On the changes in the service of the Synagog made necessary by the

Sentence?

new organization of the Jewish school in the Prussian states" (Berlin 1812).²

In this pamphlet Friedlander dwelt particularly on the necessity of a reorganization of the schools and of a reform in the service; the chief features of the latter were to be the abolition of all prayers that deplore the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem and that implore its reconstruction, and those that express the hope for the coming of the Messiah. In his opinion there is no justification for such prayers in our time. Likewise, he advocated the introduction of German as the language of the service, particularly for the benefit of the youth who did not understand the Hebrew prayers. A copy of this pamphlet was submitted to Frederick William, but the latter refrained from committing himself on the issue. In Opposition to David Friedlander's views, Rabbi Solomon Pappenheim (1740-1814) of Presslau wrote "Freymüthige Erklärung über die.....Kritik des Gottesdienstes der Juden und deren Erziehung der Jugend" (Breslau 1813). R. Solomon Pappenheimer was one of the few of his generation who combined a thorough knowledge of Judaism with the finest of Western Culture. And while he realized the need for many reforms, he was strenuously opposed to Friedlander's views. Particularly did he oppose the intervention of the government in internal Jewish matters, such as educational and congregational affairs, declaring that "a convention of sensible rabbis for the purpose of remedying these abuses to be highly desirable."³ In regard to the linguistic problem of the Synagog he stood uncompromisingly for the use of the Hebrew in the prayers, but unlike the German rabbis of his time he based his contentions not on more Talmudic authority and custom but on psychological grounds. In his view, it is more effective to use a sacred tongue rather than the vernacular for religious purposes.⁴ Even in this pamphlet we do not see as yet any mention as to the cultural aspect of the linguistic changes in the service.

After the consistorial organization in Westphalia had fallen through, Israel Jacobson removed to Berlin. There he instituted in his home a private service according to the new style, with music, prayers in German and a German sermon. A similar service was called into existence at the home of Jacob Herz Beer, the father of the composer Meyerbeer. Due to orthodox opposition, however, both private chapels were ordered closed by the government, which was averse to sectarian innovations. The young men who acted as preachers at these services were Isaac Auerbach, Eduard Kley, Leopold Zunz, Isaac Noah Manheimer, and C. S. Günsburg. These men succeeded in attracting to these modern services hundreds from among the most cultured classes of Berlin Jewry. in 1817, when the government ordered all private synagogues to be closed, Eduard Kley accepted the post of director of the Jewish free school at Hamburg. There he succeeded in organizing a group of liberals who took steps to introduce the new style of service in a permanent edifice of their own. As a result, the Hamburg Temple was dedicated in 1818. Kley and Gotthold Salomon became the Temple preachers.

The service at Hamburg was ordered very much after the pattern of the Berlin experiments. There was choral singing to the accompaniment of the organ; German predominated in the liturgy, though the main prayers were recited in Hebrew. The Sabbath portion of the Torah was read in the Portuguese pronunciation and without the traditional cantillation.

The prayer book of the Hamburg Temple was edited by Meir Israel Presslau (d. 1839) and Beckel Isaac Frankel (1765-1835),⁵ two noted Hebraists who combined Jewish scholarship and Western culture. Their aim was to preserve the traditional prayers as much as it was possible in the light of modern thought and conditions of life. The work was done with great skill.

On the whole, the prayer book followed the traditional cast. Only late accretions ^{which} have been omitted, such as the mediaeval Ashkenazic piyutim which were substituted by the more poetic piyutim of the Sephardic ritual. ⁶ The excision or rephrasing of those portions of the liturgy which referred to the Messianic restoration were carried out with great skill and with fine insight. They left untouched or merely rephrased such prayers that refer to the future restoration of Palestine, and omitted only those passages that stated unequivocally that all the Jews regarded themselves as foreigners in the lands of their sojourn, and that they hope to be delivered with the coming of the ⁷ Messiah. The editors were accused time and again for being inconsistent in this matter. ⁸ However, from their point of view they were thoroughly consistent. The editors did not abandon the hope that in the remote future there may be a restoration of Palestine as a Jewish country for those who will wish to go there and settle as citizens. They retained, therefore, those prayers which imply such a hope. They omitted only such prayers ^{as} that would reflect on their own loyalty to their country, and which were not in harmony with the civil ⁹ status of the Jew after emancipation.

Though this new prayer book clung very tenaciously to tradition and though it could be well defended on traditional grounds, it aroused a storm of opposition on the part of the rabbis who declared uncompromisingly that the whole prayer book (from *Shema Yisrael* to *U'far*) was divinely instituted, and that no one has the right to temper with it. The moderate intellectuals, such as Eduard Kley, J. L. Riesser, M. J. Bresslau, and S. J. Frankel, and others, sought to arrive at some reconciliation with the orthodox, but their ¹⁰ words fell on deaf ears. The three rabbis of Hamburg, Saruch b. Meir User, Moses Jacob Jaffe and Yechiel Michael Speyer, issued a proclamation denouncing

the heresies of the new movement. As a result, the orthodox party now took the reprehensible step of attempting to induce the senate of Hamburg to close the new houses of worship. This caused the reformers to bestir themselves. The officers of the new congregation requested rabbinical authorities for an expression of opinion on the validity of the reforms which they had introduced. This resulted in the publication of the "Sefer Nogah Hazedek" (Lessaau 1818) which is a collection of rabbinical opinions favoring the new departures of the Hamburg Temple.

2. Eliezer Lieberman - "Nogah Hazedek".

It is noteworthy that Israel Jacobson, the most ardent supporter of the Hamburg Temple, could not get a single German rabbi or lay rabbinic scholar of any standing to support those mild innovations which they introduced into the service. Jacobson, therefore, employed an itinerant rabbi, Eliezer Lieberman, seemingly hailing from Poland, to draw up a rabbinic defense of the Hamburg reforms. Lieberman thereupon collected rabbinical opinions from the rabbis of Italy and Hungary, to be more exact--from the province of Moravia, which was a significant seat of Jewish learning at the time and known as a centre of liberal thought. These rabbinical utterances he published under the title "Sefer Nogah Hazedek", with an appendix "Or Nogah" in which he set forth his own views on the necessity of reforms, and which is a masterpiece in point of style and content. This work marks the culmination of the Hamburg experiment, because hitherto it was led by laymen or by preachers of little Jewish learning, and could, therefore, not wield great influence over the people. Lieberman's work, however, gave the Hamburg Temple the sanction of tradition, and thus gained the confluence of a great number of intellectual Jews who realized the necessity of synagogal reforms, but were not ready to

12
break with rabbinic tradition. This work is by far the most superior of all the Hebrew literature evoked by the reform movement, for it represents on the whole the soundest rabbinic support in favor of moderate reforms, and it has been used as such from the time of its publication to this very day when the same issues arise. We must give it, therefore, a thorough analysis for it covers actually all the arguments in favor of reform from the point of view of Rabbinic tradition.

The editor of this work had been greatly and unjustly abused by the orthodox and had not been given enough recognition by the reformers. For in his "Or Nogah" he indicates clearly his superiority over both the orthodox rabbis and over the shallow impetuous intellectuals. 13 But Lieberman was a poor, itinerant scholar, and because of this he was looked down upon by the orthodox rabbis, as well as by the reformers, who seemingly had not given him due recognition. Thus, only confirming the old Hebrew adage, "The poor man's wisdom is despised." 14 According to G. Wolf, Lieberman was a native of Austria; Jost says that he pretended to be an Hungarian rabbi; but in the preface to his "Or Nogah" Lieberman signs himself, "son of Zeeb Wolf, rabbi of Heunegau" (probably Hagenau, Alsace). Lieberman must have travelled extensively, and thus knew many of the rabbis of his time in person, and therefore he undertook at the request of Jacobson, to collect the opinions of the rabbis outside of Germany whom he knew to be liberal in their religious views. 15 In 1819, Lieberman travelled in Austria to propagate reform ideas and according to the statement of the Chief of Police Sednitzky, to found for that purpose a journal called "Syonia". 16 Nothing else is known of his life. According to Wolf, and Graetz, Lieberman, ^{also Bernfeld} became later a convert to Roman Catholicism, but there is nothing positive to corroborate this assertion. 17

simple but scholarly style of which the rabbis of his time were incapable he explains in his introduction that he is not aiming at the destruction of faith, but rather at the strengthening of it. For true faith, he says, is impossible without a thorough knowledge of secular sciences and philosophy, and if one's faith is shaken by the acquisition of such knowledge, it only proves that it was not sufficiently deep-rooted. In the very opening of his essay he takes to task the religious leaders in Israel who denounce the reformers so bitterly while they do nothing to counteract the destructive influence of those who threw away Judaism altogether. Nor does he spare the intellectuals, the so-called champions of enlightenment, who upon the first taste of Western culture assume a contemptuous attitude to their Jewish cultural heritage. The first he sarcastically calls "The blind who grope in the darkness" (*אנשי תיב*) and the others "misleading lights" (*מאורות מפתים*) about whom he remarks as follows: "Of them may be said, that they are like the apes who rejoice when they set the forest on fire thinking that they see a great light about them."

19

*"ואם המאורות כאלה המאורות שהם מאורות תיב
הם לא יראו חכם אלא חכם המאורות המאורות
המאורות יראו חכם אלא חכם, וישמע כי הוא אינו חכם
מבין."*

Thus Lieberman pleads on both sides. He pleads for the return of the intellectuals to the synagogue and for tolerance on the part of the rabbis who in their obstinacy only helped to alienate the youth from the synagogue. He describes most eloquently his impressions of the Hamburg temple which he hoped would prove the bulwark of Judaism for the youth.

20

in bringing back the cosmopolitan Jew, who ^d has left the fold of Judaism. So did they err in thinking that the religious reformation will improve their civil status." ²⁷ But though the expectations of the reformers were not fully realized, yet it must be admitted by every unbiased student of Jewish history that the reformers did accomplish a great deal in combatting anti-semitism, and in preventing apostasy among the intellectual Jews. Even Graetz, whose prejudice against the reformers is proverbial, admits that the achievements of the Hamburg Temple, commonplace though its origin was, are not to be underrated. "At one stroke, without much hesitation, it banished the rubbish of centuries from the synagogog.....and awakened a taste for a well regulated service, for decorous behavior at divine worship, and for order and simplicity.....the old party had no chiefs, no leaders.....respect for the rabbis vanished in a single generation.....In the larger German congregations the empty rabbinical chairs were permitted to remain unseated. They no longer wished to have rabbis from Poland, because they could not speak the language of the land, and in Germany there were no great rabbis of any recognized authority. ²⁸ And even the best of the orthodox rabbis then, says Graetz, "had not the slightest conception of the new tenaency ^{which} the times and the Jews had developed." One can, therefore, sympathize with Lieberman when he puts the blame for the spiritual decay in Judaism upon the rabbis who stubbornly refused to heed the spirit of the time.

"וְיָדַעְתָּ אִתָּךְ, אִם לֹא לֹא כִּי בְּמַחְשָׁבִי וְשֵׁנִי יָצָא, וְכִי בְּרֹאשׁ
בְּמַחְשָׁבִי וְשֵׁנִי יָצָא, וְכִי בְּרֹאשׁ וְשֵׁנִי יָצָא, וְכִי בְּרֹאשׁ וְשֵׁנִי יָצָא
חֲכָמִים וְאִסְרֵי דָּמָה וְחֲכָמִים, וְכִי בְּרֹאשׁ וְשֵׁנִי יָצָא, וְכִי בְּרֹאשׁ וְשֵׁנִי יָצָא
הַרְבֵּה מְבֻרָךְ, שֶׁלֹּא חָשַׁב אֶת אֱלֹהֵי אִשְׁתִּי" ---

But Lieberman's pathos rises to prophetic heights when he denounces those who oppose modern science, and art, on the ground of Jewish tradition. He emphatically denies that Jewish tradition is opposed to the study of science and philosophy. On the contrary, he asserts that the greatest authorities in Judaism, particularly those of the Sephardim, were well versed in science and in philosophy, and he quotes a number of their statements to the effect that faith must be based on rational grounds.

29

אנחנו ידענו את ישראל! חזקו ונתתם, ואל תנו ידנו לערבים כי
 אף גור המלחמה אצלם קשה לו יותר מזה. חזקו ונתתם,
 ואל תנו ידנו, כלל לא יתנו. המלחמה נא לא יתנו! אלהי אמת
 כל המלחמה אצלם, ואל תנו ידנו. (בזאת אף דבר של אמסר? אף
 משהו כל חכמי מלחמה, את מלחמה של מלחמה אצלם, אצלם
 אצלם חזקו ונתתם, ואל תנו ידנו. חזקו ונתתם, ואל תנו ידנו.
 חזקו ונתתם, ואל תנו ידנו. חזקו ונתתם, ואל תנו ידנו.
 חזקו ונתתם, ואל תנו ידנו. חזקו ונתתם, ואל תנו ידנו.
 חזקו ונתתם, ואל תנו ידנו. חזקו ונתתם, ואל תנו ידנו.

He, likewise, denounces those who are governed in their religious practices and beliefs by sheer inertia, and who are opposed to any innovation not on the ground of reason or of Jewish Law, but because they would not swerve a hair's breadth from established customs. Lieberman illustrates historically the many reforms that had been made in Jewish Law from the very antiquity, and he quotes a number of Talmudic statements that allow the spiritual leaders of each generation to affect such changes as conditions of place and time demand.

30

אנחנו ידענו את ישראל! חזקו ונתתם, ואל תנו ידנו לערבים כי
 אף גור המלחמה אצלם קשה לו יותר מזה. חזקו ונתתם,
 ואל תנו ידנו, כלל לא יתנו. המלחמה נא לא יתנו! אלהי אמת
 כל המלחמה אצלם, ואל תנו ידנו. (בזאת אף דבר של אמסר? אף
 משהו כל חכמי מלחמה, את מלחמה של מלחמה אצלם, אצלם
 אצלם חזקו ונתתם, ואל תנו ידנו. חזקו ונתתם, ואל תנו ידנו.
 חזקו ונתתם, ואל תנו ידנו. חזקו ונתתם, ואל תנו ידנו.
 חזקו ונתתם, ואל תנו ידנו. חזקו ונתתם, ואל תנו ידנו.

To add insult to injury Graetz calls him a "base adventurer", a "gambler" who was bribed to collect rabbinical opinions in favor of reform which he strengthened by his own "pretended learning". "To characterize the man," he says it suffices to note that he afterwards was baptized." Even David Philipson who devotes so much space to much less significant men in the movement does not even mention Lieberman by name. Speaking of his book, "Nogah Zedek", he says, "the most noteworthy deliverance in this controversy is that of Aaron Chorin, rabbi of Arad in Moravia, one of the most interesting figures of the early years in the Reform movement. It is not necessary to diminish the value of Chorin as Bernfeld does, but it is certain that he is by far inferior to Lieberman in intellect, erudition, clarity and style.

Of all the rabbis whose endorsements of the Hambourg reforms Lieberman collected only two were of recognized erudition, namely, R. Moses Kunitz of Budapest, and R. Aaron Chorin. R. Kunitz was a highly recognized Talmudic authority in Hungary, but he cannot be considered in connection with the Reform movement because he was more a pioneer of enlightenment in Hungary, rather than a reformer. ⁴⁰ Kunitz in his responsa on synagog reforms stated very briefly that there were no prohibitions against using the Sephardic pronunciation in prayer, or against the abolition of the silent recitation of the Eighteen Benedictions (the abolition of which was already advocated by Raimonides), nor was there any prohibition against reciting the *שמונה עשרה* in the vernacular or against the usage of an organ if played by a non-Jew. He advises, however, not to discontinue the daily service at the Temple, but to maintain by all means a daily "minyan". He takes occasion to denounce the narrow-mindedness of the rabbis who had extremely exaggerated the import of the Hambourg experiment. ⁴¹

הנה ידוע כי הרב אהרן חורין רב אראד
היה מן המבשרים הראשונים של התנועה הרפורמית.

הרב אהרן יקרי הווינער רב
אשר נפטר ס' ת"ק א' חשוון תשנ"ח
אשר נפטר ב' חשוון תשנ"ח, א"י י"ח.

Of Rabbi Aaron Chorin we must speak more at length for he was active, all his life in advocating religious reforms. This must be pre-
faced, however, that Chorin's importance was greatly exaggerated, and he was greatly overrated by the reform rabbis for his Jewish learning, and by the orthodox for his secular learning.

3. Aaron Chorin.

Being a native of Moravia, which was one of the most important
centres of Haskalah and of Talmudic learning, ⁴² Aaron Chorin (1766-1844) was
naturally influenced by the liberal spirit there, and became one of the
moderate orthodox rabbis of his time who would adhere to the lenient interpre-
tation of the Law (⁴³ *מקור*). In 1789, Chorin became rabbi of Arod
in Moravia, and this position he occupied till his death. In 1798 he published
his first pamphlet "Imre Noam" (Prague 1798) in which he argued that as the
sturgeon had scales it was permitted as food according to the Law. His
opinion, although following that of Ezekiel Landau and Eliezer Fleckels, who
were two outstanding authorities, was strongly opposed by Mordecai Benet and
his partizans. Rabbi Isaac Krieshaber of Paks wrote a refutation "Makkel
Noam" which called forth a second pamphlet by Chorin "Shiryon Kaskassin"
(Prague 1799).

By his lenient interpretation of tradition, Chorin incurred the

hostility of most of his colleagues. At Prague Chorin published in 1803 his "Emek Hashaveh" which Fuerst translated "Reconciliation of Faith with Practical Life". The work is divided into three parts: "Rosh Amanoh", Neshame Chajjah", and "Dirat Aaron". For our consideration the first part is the most important, for in it Chorin voices his opinion as to the "oral law", wherein he establishes, on the grounds of Talmudic principles, that the spiritual leaders of every generation have a right, indeed a duty, to modify the Law according to the exigencies of the time.

"המורה דלמדת או השגיחה דקא דהמורה פולא העלוקא
 ביב למא אפדמא דמאן מן המורה או יספך המורה פולא, ומה
 נאמר פה מורה ד המורה המורה, ומה ד המורה דמא
 דמא דמא דמא דמא, ומה ד המורה דמא דמא דמא
 אפיה ביה המורה דמא, ומה דמא דמא דמא דמא
 ממה דק אפיה ביה דמא."

Chorin also attempted to prove that the study of philosophy is by no means incompatible with religion. And though theoretically he was not opposed to Kabbalah, he most emphatically denounced "the mob who believe that there are many who by means of senseless combinations of spoken or written letters, are capable of forcing the laws of nature to be changed from their regular course. It is clear, however, that this believe is incompatible with sound reason." The fact that the Talmud speaks of the efficacy of amulets (Sabbath 61) does not influence Chorin in the least. He thinks that such efficacy is only imaginary and must be taken allegorically.

אמנם המורה דמא דמא דמא, ומה דמא דמא דמא דמא
 דמא דמא דמא דמא, ומה דמא דמא דמא דמא

בן עמרם היה יושב ראש הוועד אשר הוציא את
 הספר הזה בלתי חסר, במחשבתו, במחשבתו, במחשבתו
 ומה שיש בו לא יחיד במינו בלתי חסר, בלתי חסר
 כפי מה שהיה...
 "הוא לא היה אף הוא יושב ראש הוועד אשר הוציא את
 הספר הזה בלתי חסר, במחשבתו, במחשבתו, במחשבתו
 ומה שיש בו לא יחיד במינו בלתי חסר, בלתי חסר
 כפי מה שהיה...
 אבן עמרם לא היה אף הוא יושב ראש הוועד אשר הוציא את
 הספר הזה בלתי חסר, במחשבתו, במחשבתו, במחשבתו

This work of Chorin, though permeated already with a liberal spirit, intrinsically it shows little advance over the usual rabbinical works of the time which are full of casuistry, sophistry, prolixity of style and pseudo-philosophy. The exposition of this first chapter of "Emek Hashaveh" was later on reprinted in his essay, "Hillel" (Ofen 1837).

This work led to much opposition, though it was printed with the approbation of Rabbi Moses Munz and with a eulogistic poem of Rabbi Moses Kunitz. The book gave great offense to the orthodox party, which thwarted the publication of a second edition, for which Chorin had prepared many corrections and additions. Mordecai Benet wrote to the Arad congregation that the book contained heresies and that it must be burned. The congregation, however, stood by their rabbi; but some of its members who sided with Benet caused him great unpleasantness. The Arad board applied to Moses Munz to certify that the book contained no heresies. On the other hand, Munz was urged by the fanatics to condemn it. Being in a great dilemma, he concluded to invite two rabbis to come to Alt-Ofen to form with him a tribunal before which Chorin was

summoned (Sep. 1, 1865). The sentence of the tribunal was that "Chorin must retract the contents of his book. Should he refuse to do so, his beard should be cut off as a penalty for his heretical transgressions." Thereupon, Chorin whom the populace had stoned in the courtyard of the synagogue, declared that he subordinated his views to those of the rabbis and desired that his book be suppressed. The court also decreed a reduction of Chorin's salary, but the board of his congregation indignantly rejected this decree. This fact is interesting, for it throws light on the various shady methods by which the rigorists were accustomed in those days to intimidate their moderate colleagues. Not enough that the rabbis compromised their colleague in the eyes of his congregation, but they even sought to undermine his meager livelihood. To avoid further trouble Chorin determined to give up writing.

When the movement for synagogue reforms began in Hamburg it met Chorin's hearty approval. In his "Kinot Ha-emet", a responsa which he wrote on April 7, 1818 and published in Lieberman's collection, "Nogah ha-Levek", he declared himself in favor of synagogue reforms, such as the introduction of German prayers, ~~the use of the organ and a number~~ the use of the organ and a number of liturgical modifications. The principal prayers, the "Shema" and the ⁴⁸ ~~Sixteen~~ ^{Eighteen} benedictions, however, should be recited in Hebrew, he declared, as the Hebrew language helps to keep alive the belief in the restoration of Israel. Like R. Kunitz, he also pleaded for maintaining in the Temple a ⁴⁹ daily service. (For his other opinions on the Hamburg reforms see Appendix C).

No sooner was it known that Chorin's responsum favored the Hamburg reforms, than Rabbi Muenz of Alt-Ofen directed a strong missive to Chorin, in which he placed the alternative before him, either to recant his

opinion or to lose his position as Rabbi. Chorin was a poor man and a father of a large family, and he could choose but one alternative. He, therefore, recanted his opinions in February 19, 1819. His recantations, however, were of no avail for he was determined to advocate reforms at all costs. A year later he published "Dabar be-Itto" (Wien 1820) in Hebrew and in German, in which he reiterated the views expressed in his "Kinqt Ha-Emet". The German edition of this pamphlet directed upon him the attention of the progressive party in Austria and in Germany. In 1821 the government of the grand duchy of Baden asked Chorin for his opinion on the duties of a rabbi and on synagogue reforms in the Austrian states. In answer to this inquiry, Chorin wrote his "Iggeret Alasaf" or "Letter of an African Rabbi to his colleagues in Europe". In it he stated that the Torah comprises religious truths and religious laws, the latter partly applicable only in Palestine, partly obligatory everywhere. These may be temporarily suspended, but not entirely abolished, by a competent authority, such as a synod. Only ordinances and precautionary laws which are of human origin may be abrogated in conformity with the circumstances of the time. As for mere customs and usages (*minhagim*), the government, after having consulted Jewish men of knowledge, may wholly modify or abolish them; but in no other way may it interfere with religious affairs. Chorin also pleaded for the establishment of consistories, of modern schools and of a theological seminary, and for the promotion of agriculture and professions among the Jews.

In the Hebrew appendix to the "Iggeret Alasaf" he deplores the demoralization of the synagogue service in his time, which, he contends, no longer represents the true spirit of Jewish worship. Chorin claims that the Temple at Jerusalem was primarily a house of prayer and not merely a sanctuary

of the sacrificial cult; hence, all the laws regarding decorum at the Temple
are applicable to every Jewish house of worship wherever it be. He labors⁵⁶ ✓
most strenuously the rabbis of his time for permitting the prevalent distur-
bances at the synagog which only desecrate the sacredness of the service.⁵⁷ ✓
He also attacks violently the Hassidic rabbis, their Zadikism and their faith
cures.⁵⁸ He advocates most enthusiastically, that the hats be removed during
the services, that the worship in the synagogue be in keeping with Western cul-
ture, decorum, proving that it is not contrary to Jewish Law.⁵⁹ Moreover, he
fought most strenuously against the notion which was ingrained among the or-
thodox masses, that according to Jewish Law the understanding of the prayers
is unnecessary and that decorum at services is not essential.⁶⁰ It is strik-
ing to note how much effort the early reformers had to put forth to prove that
which is seemingly a truism in Jewish Halacha, namely, that prayers must be
understood and that decorum is essential in the service. It is only as we
read some of the perverted interpretations on this subject in the orthodox
response of "Ele Libre Habrit"⁶¹ that we can understand how these perversions
became ingrained in the minds of the masses and how difficult it was for the
early reformers to combat them.⁶²

Chorin anticipated all the arguments against reforms on the
ground of "Lese Majeste", and he proves most conclusively that the Jewish
Law is flexible enough to allow all the reforms which he advocates.⁶³ Finally,
he pleads for the abbreviation of the liturgy in keeping with the needs of the
time and with Jewish Law, and he actually outlines in detail such a synagogue
decorum and ritual which could satisfy the highest aesthetic standards of the
modern Jew and yet be in keeping with the Law.⁶⁴

Some of these ideas Chorin carried out in his own congregation,

which included a great number of mechanics. He succeeded in founding a modern school, and in introducing minor liturgical reforms into the synagogue; even an organ was installed at his instance in 1840; he permitted the eating of rice and pulse during the days of Passover; and he was also instrumental in abolishing, through governmental interference, the law which prohibited married women to enter the synagogue without the "Scheitel" (perruque).⁶⁵

Chorin was strongly in favor of a synod with power to decide questions concerning the Jewish religion and its relation to the exigencies of the new age. To this theory Chorin always adhered. In his "Treue Sothe" (in German) he declared himself against the transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday, but expressed the opinion that, considering the requirements of our time, synods might mitigate the severity of the Sabbatical laws, especially those in regard to travelling and writing.⁶⁶

In his Hebrew appendix to this work, "Zir Neemon", Chorin published his correspondence with Isaac S. Reggio⁶⁷ which is of great interest, because it shows how much more profound was Reggio's understanding of Jewish philosophy than that of the rationalists of that time. Chorin was, of course, much superior to the average rabbi of his time in cultural attainment, but his philosophic grasp was most superficial. He sought honestly to adjust Judaism to the spirit of the time both in practice and in creed. He was, therefore, not only in sympathy with the efforts of the German rationalists to enact a number of reforms in Jewish Law, but he also uncritically accepted all their rationalistic ideology which he voiced in his "Emek Ha-Shaven",⁶⁸ and reiterated later on in his "Hillel" and in the "Igeret Elassar". Reggio, though a warm friend of Chorin, and though a sympathizer of the movement for reforms in Jewish practice, took him severely to task for being swayed by the

philosophy of the rationalists. Reficso claimed, and with justification, that if one regards the ceremonial law only as a temporary means of discipline, he negates its intrinsic value and thus rationalizes it out of existence altogether. He, therefore, warns Chorin to shun the prevailing tendency of the rationalists as expounded by the rationalist radical leaders, like Judah L. Mises in his "Kinat Ha Aret".

70

Reficso is especially wrought up over Chorin's failure to realize that to regard the vicissitudes of the Jews throughout the generations as a mere preparation for a "mission to the nations" is a mere insult ~~to~~ to Jewish history and a distortion thereof. Reficso insists, therefore, through-

71

out all his correspondence, that Chorin should ~~make~~ it clear that the existence of the Jewish people and of its legalism are of intrinsic and eternal value, and need not be justified on any rationalistic grounds.

Chorin published this correspondence with Reficso as an "apologia pro vita sua" claiming that he was misunderstood by the latter.

72

Reficso, however, boldly contended that he did not misunderstand him and that if Chorin did not mean exactly what he said, he should have said what he meant, and he expressed the hope that Chorin would clarify these matters to himself and to others in order to remove any doubt as to his position.

73

In another chapter of the appendix, Chorin defended himself

against an anonymous attack directed against him by one of the parasites, accusing him of undermining the authority of the Jewish law.

74

He reiterated and elucidated, therefore, all the rabbinic data on the question of authority in Judaism, to prove conclusively that in his plea for reforms he stands on a

75

sound traditional basis.

Indicative of Chorin's broad sympathies is the last chapter of

his "Zir Ne-emon" in which he seeks to mitigate as much as possible the legal status of deserted wives in order to alleviate their unfortunate situation. He contends that the Law gives the rabbis enough leeway to enact such
77
mitigations.

In 1839 he published his "Yeled Zekunim" (Vienna) partly in Hebrew and partly in German, with an introduction of his biographer, Leopold Löw, in which Chorin makes another plea for reforms in Judaism. In the Hebrew part of this work he deplored the fact that the services in the large synagogues turned into concerts of professional cantors and choirs, which in
78
his view is contrary to all Jewish Law. He suggests, therefore, that the service be conducted by a choir composed of the children of the congregation and accompanied by an organ, for according to his view, only such a service can conform to modern æsthetic taste and yet be true to the Jewish concept-
79
ion of worship.

Chorin also strongly advocated reforms in regard to railroad travelling on Sabbath and on holidays, and he indicated the rabbinic data which
80
may be interpreted as favoring such reforms. He also pointed out the need for the abridgment of the seven days of mourning in modern times and the
81
justification for it in rabbinic Law. In the last chapter of this work, Chorin advocated again the need of an authorized synod to enact the reforms which were necessitated by modern times, by illustrating from Jewish history and literature that Judaism had always sought to adjust itself to the exigencies of time and place, and that it is because of this flexibility of the Jewish
82
law that Judaism was saved from decay.

On July 16, 1844, during the last weeks of his life, Chorin wrote from his sick-bed a declaration expressing his full accord with the

rabbinical conference at Brunswick, and on August 11th of the same year he sent an address to the conference of the Hungarian rabbis at Paks which had decided reformatory tendencies.

Chorin labored all his life in the cause of the emancipation of the Jews of Hungary in spite of the fact that the Pressburg rabbinate headed by Moses Sopher put all obstacles on the way of Jewish emancipation for fear lest such a consummation might deal a deadly blow to the authoritative position of orthodoxy.

Though Chorin was not in the centre of the Reform movement he had a great influence upon its further development through his extensive correspondence with the reformers in Germany. For he was the only authoritative rabbi who identified himself all his life with the aspirations of the reformers and had always sought to give them traditional rabbinic sanction. His legalistic advice was, therefore, sought by all the advocates of various reforms in Jewish life. Thus an anti-reform writer summing up Chorin's life activity says the following of him:

"אמרו ד' יום אחר יחד בל כח אסתר אש, חבנין ל
כ' ד' ספרו אפאמרו וכן ד' ספרו, ומה ד' ספרו, ומה
כ' ד' ספרו, ומה ד' ספרו, ומה ד' ספרו, ומה
א' ד' ספרו, ומה ד' ספרו, ומה ד' ספרו, ומה
א' ד' ספרו, ומה ד' ספרו, ומה ד' ספרו, ומה
א' ד' ספרו, ומה ד' ספרו, ומה ד' ספרו, ומה

4. Joseph Friedlander.

Another liberal rabbi hailing from the Austrian Empire was R. Joseph Abraham Friedlander, the nephew of David Friedlander. He was born at Kalin, Bohemia, in 1783, and received his elementary education under Ezekiel Landau and his advanced Talmudic education at Pressburg. In 1794 he became

(Prilun 1836) containing a correspondence with A. Chorin concerning it.

5. The Orthodox Protest - "Dibre Ha-brit".

Lieberman's "Or Nogah" was published before the Hamburg contro-
versy began, and it made a tremendous impression on the public. For as
Graetz says, "The orthodox party in Hamburg who imagined that no rabbi in the
whole of Europe would approve of the reforms, were bitterly disappointed;
owing to the activity of Jacobson and Lieberman, the Jewish public discovered
that many rabbis in various districts upheld them." Of course, the ortho-
dox rabbis immediately condemned the work as an heretical work "1100 7000"
but they did not find it necessary to refute it. Only when the Temple was
dedicated did the rabbinate of Hamburg address itself to the rabbis of Germany
and of adjacent countries, asking them to express their opinions regarding
the reforms introduced in Hamburg and to refute the arguments set forth in the
"Moshav Haredek" and in the "Or Nogah". The old rabbis were listless in the
matter, and had to be twice addressed before they pronounced judgment against
the Temple. In the first excitement the Hamburg rabbis condemned the most
trifling innovations, such as the introduction of the Portuguese pronunciation
or the omission of the Bible cantillations. However, they soon realized that
it would be better to limit their complaints to three points, namely, the
abridgment of the prayers especially those having Messianic implication, the
use of the German language in prayer, and the use of the organ. To this pro-
gram the agreement of about thirty-five rabbis and rabbimates were secured.
Four in Germany (Furth, Mayence, Breslau and Hanau); five in Italy (Trieste,
Modena, Padua, Mantua, Leghorn); three in Prussian Poland (Posen, Lissa and
Rowitz); and two in Moravia (Nicklsburg and Brieten). The German rabbis in

Amsterdam and the French chief rabbi of the consistory of Wintzenheim also signed the document of protest. Samson, a would-be rabbi of Leghorn, and A. Jhorin, who endorsed Lieberman's "Nogah Ha-Zedek", signed a retraction of their statements in this document, probably under moral compulsion. The most distinguished among the protesting rabbis were R. Moses Gopher of Pressburg, R. Mendel benet of Mickolsburg, R. Azka Eger of Posen, R. Eliezer of Trietch (Moravia), R. Abraham Eliezer Halevi of Trieste, R. Eliezer Flekeles of Prague, R. Abraham Fiklin of Breslau, and R. Jacob of Lissa.

All the responses of these rabbis were collected and edited by the Hamburg rabbinate under the title of "Ele Libre Ha-brit" (Hamburg 1819). As to the impression of this document upon the Jewish public, Graetz says that it did not produce the desired results. "It had been delayed too long, more than seven months having elapsed before their sentence of heresy was promulgated; and meantime the Temple Union had established itself. Eighteen antagonistic rabbinates (in all forty rabbis) did not seem many; and the most eminent of all, the central consistory of France, had remained silent. The signers of the protest asserted that more opinions had been received; but this belated statement was of no avail. The arguments adduced by the rabbis against the Temple service were for the most part void, some were thoroughly childish. The letter of the Law spoke against them."

In fact, it would be amusing were it not so tragic to think that of all the eminent orthodox rabbis in Germany in the beginning of the nineteenth century, many of whom arrogated to themselves the title "Gaon" and who in their philippistic pyrotechnics were known as " *מגדולי הדור* ", could not defend their position in a single document in Hebrew or in any other language that would appeal to reason. All they could write in answer

to Lieberman's book is an array of words, of abuse, and of calumny, and their only strong whip was *either 2-10-6*, "we cannot make any changes!" regardless as to what the changes were.

The bigoted spirit of the rabbis can be seen already in the

92

Introductory ~~statement~~ of the Hamburg rabbinate:

אשר החזיק אצלם, אלא כי בארץ אשכנז חזקתו
אין אמת נכח פה אלה אחריו כי זה שיהיה
נכחיה יתבאר אצלם אצלם קהלתו אשר אין
אור חרפה, לא כדרכו אלא אשר יגידו ויהיו
ידיהם חזקתו אצלם אצלם (אשר) חזקתו
אצלם אצלם אצלם אצלם אצלם אצלם אצלם

In one breath they condemn the most insignificant liturgical omission and the rival cultural issues of reform, namely, the use of the vernacular in religious service and the omission of the Messianic prayers.

Most vituperative is the condemnation of Moses Sopner who shows no restraint in words of abuse against the innovations. He calls them little foxes, heretics, rebels, liars, falsifiers, and the like. Of course, we can sympathize with him at times, when he rises to a pathos against the weakening of the Hebrew language and of Palestine as important factors in Jewish life, for he seemed to have felt instinctively the implications of these issues, but his argumentation in favor of these is most amusing. The organ must not be used, he says, because we live now in a strange land; Hebrew must not be abolished because it is God's language, and just as a subject would not address his king in any other language except that of the latter, no Jew can address God but in God's own language. Moreover, he claims, that all the words and the letters in the liturgy have important religious mystic implications, which

would be entirely lost if translated into any other language. 94

In another responsa he argues most bitterly, and most ingenuously against the abolition of the Loran cantillations, for it is tantamount to a denial of the doctrine that the cantillation signs were revealed on Mount Sinai, and that in turn would lead to a denial of every other doctrine. 95

"אמר לו רבינו זצ"ל במתן תורה שהיה נאמר
לא נאמר (לפיכך) כל דאסורא מאשה רבא דיה איהא כהן ספר
קציה פליגת --- פתח הלא יאמר כן אמר ואמר מי ראה
אשה כזו דיה תורה תפלין אה ומתקין על אה ראה ואלה בשר
כזו אה אמר געגוע ופדיון קולות ואלה דם שואב
בא איהא / רב איהא."

He particularly rebukes the reformers for resorting to outside rabbinical authorities instead of consulting their own rabbis. 96

Of the same nature are the accusations of Mordecai Benet, who practically repeats the same arguments and concludes that R. Aaron Chorin is disqualified to pass rabbinical decisions because he is not an authority in Talmud or on codes, but that he indulges all the time in "secular philosophy". 97

"ד"ר אהרן חושניצר, רב בארזא, חת"א, אפרת חגרי יפה חסד
דבר כי אהרן אהרן אהרן אהרן אהרן אהרן אהרן אהרן אהרן
אמר רבינו זצ"ל..."

Eliezer of Arictch, however, though having full faith in his pilpulistic power, sees no reason why the rabbis should not resort to the "arms of the Law" which God has bestowed in his great mercy upon the merciful, just and pious rulers of the country. 98

לכן אתה אל ידק אדברים, כי ב' אל הוצא מדת אלהים
 ומה נא בחי' העמים ילד' חלו נא מהם שחנן ימים ידק
 אל יתן יד אלה נשעה, ואי יתן יד אלה נשעה אלה
 כל מלך בלשן מקדש יתן אל יד, ומה נשעה נשעה נשעה
 ואי תשעה, הנה העמים ילד' חלו נא מהם שחנן ימים
 ומה יד, אלהי מלך אלהי מלך אלהי מלך אלהי מלך
 נא כל מלך נשעה נשעה נשעה נשעה נשעה נשעה
 ומה אלהי מלך נשעה נשעה נשעה נשעה נשעה נשעה
 ומה, ומה נשעה נשעה נשעה נשעה נשעה נשעה.

The same pious advice is given by R. Abraham Shmuel Halevi
 of Triest who urges the orthodox rabbis and laity to persecute the reformers
 relentlessly with the "arm of the Law" and with any other possible means.

"אד אלהי מלך אלהי מלך אלהי מלך אלהי מלך
 נשעה נשעה נשעה נשעה נשעה נשעה
 ומה נשעה נשעה נשעה נשעה נשעה נשעה."

Much milder in character is the answer of Akiba Sger of Rosen.
 Though he, too, stood uncompromisingly on the basis of tradition and rigor-
 ously opposed the least departure from the accepted usage, yet he set forth
 at least here and there more reasonable arguments. He speaks of the literary
 value of Hebrew and of the importance of its study. Every people learns its
 language, and why should we not study ours? Particularly, our rich people who
 teach their children foreign languages as well as the classics, why can they
 not teach them also the Hebrew language at least sufficiently to understand
 the contents of the prayers.

ומה נשעה נשעה נשעה נשעה נשעה נשעה

כע כדצחא דר אר אר, ארצות ארצות, ארצות ארצות, ארצות ארצות
 ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות
 ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות
 ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות
 ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות
 ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות

Likewise, does he try to reconcile the new civic conditions of emancipated
 Jewry with the prayers for the return to Palestine, and for the coming of the
 Messiah. Regardless as to what one may think of his line of reasoning, one
 can see at least an honest attempt on his part to reconcile a flagrant contra-
 diction in the religious life of the Jews since the emancipation. He says
 that though we are loyal citizens in the countries where we live, it is our
 duty to pray for our return to Palestine, not because of any material avan-
 tage but because of spiritual and even of universalistic interests, for there
 are many religious practices and rituals that cannot be observed outside of
 Palestine and universal salvation cannot come unless Palestine be restored and
 the sacrificial cult reinstituted.

100

ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות
 ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות
 ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות
 ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות
 ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות
 ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות
 ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות ארצות

Were there more such answers as these the book would not have

antagonized the reformers as it did. But even Ager drowns these seemingly reasonable views in a number of petty pilpulistic arguments against the slightest innovations in the minutiae of the liturgy.

But such answers as Ager's were few. On the whole, the answers are most insulting, and the rabbinate of Padua did not refrain from using against the reformers such epithets and phrases as: fools, a company of wickedness, the ignorant of the people, the ^{ru}harlotry of their heart, and the like. Of the same nature is the epistle of R. Samuel the German rabbi of Amsterdam whose answer is permeated with phrases such as evil-doers, scoffers, seeds of wickedness, destroyers of the faith, apostates, empty-headed men, brazen rebels, and many others of the same character. R. Samuel is particularly wrought up over the rejection of the Messianic doctrine and that of the resurrection as evidenced from the new prayer book of the reformers. He insists that these beliefs are cardinal doctrines in Judaism, and are the very foundation of our faith. It is interesting to note that as support to his arguments, he quotes Moses Mendelsohn, Wessely, and Herz Homberg, to show that they too considered these doctrines as essential in Judaism. The fact that a rigorist among the rabbis should seek support for his views not only from rabbinic sources but also from the pioneers of the Haskalah is in itself a sign of the time. Not only does it prove the old adage that "the heretics of yesterday are the canonized saints of today" but it also indicates that the opinion of these lay scholars had to be reckoned with already at that time, for otherwise Rabbi Samuel of Amsterdam would not have quoted such works which were
101
condemned but a few years ago by all the rabbis as rank heresies.

The same arrogant tone we find in the letter of the consistory
105 of Wintzenheim. A much more tolerant letter came from Rabbi Eliezer of Trietch, Moravia, endorsed by the rabbinate of that city. Rabbi Eliezer admits that the Law permits liturgical changes, and that there were various liturgical codifications such as that of the Ashkenazim and the Sephardim, but since these have become the accepted traditional liturgical codes throughout the various countries, no individual or group of individuals have a right to make any further changes, in the liturgy, for it may disrupt the unity of the communities. He regards, therefore, the action of the Hamburg leaders as an act of "Lese Majeste" because they should have subjected themselves to the local rabbis and not have solicited rabbinic support for their actions outside of their community. He points out that the whole purpose of the reformers in their elimination of the Messianic prayers was to find favor with the civil authorities. He contends that the latter no longer question the loyalty of the Jews nor have any objection to the prayers for the return to Jerusalem.

R. Eliezer, very naively, threatens the innovators with punishment after death and imploringly exclaims: "What will you do in the Day of Judgment, for God is a God of Justice?" The most redeeming feature in this letter is the warning he gives to the orthodox rabbis and leaders that they should look into themselves to find the cause of the reform movement. He claims that if the synagogues were conducted with order and decorum, there would have been no cause for reforms. The orthodox rabbis, therefore, should see to enforce order, to urge the people from talking and quarreling during the services, to have someone preach to them on the propriety of manners, and
106 of the proper behavior in the synagogue.

In the end of the book there is a retraction of Aaron Chorin

prefaced by Moses Sopher who expresses his satisfaction in that Chorin "bent his head before the Wise men of his generation."

This collection of responsa follows with a Judaeo-German translation, and is prefaced by the following statement:

"Be it known that these letters were published for the glory of God and His Torah and not for the purpose (God forbid) of antagonizing any one in Israel. Moreover, these letters will vindicate the honor of our Jewish communities by showing that all the members of our communities are holy, pious, God-fearing and upholders of the Torah, and that only a few of them are misled by seducers and perverters who aim to destroy the heritage of God. May the good Lord forgive them and bring piece into our congregations, that they may serve Him in unity."

C. Protests and Counter-Protests.

The responsa in the "Libre Ha-Brit" did not give, however, the reformers an impression that it was an epistle of peace. As we have seen above, the book is full of calumny, of abuse, of sophistry, of presumptuousness and of unrestrained ill-temper. It is not to be wondered at that the finest spiritual leaders of the Hamburg Temple went out with a bitter protest against these rabbis such as was never before expressed in the history of Judaism.

The writer of the reform protest was Meir Israel Bresslau (1785-1839) who was the secretary of the Hamburg Temple. Bresslau was a German notary and a lay scholar, steeped in Jewish learning. He and Isaac Sockel Frankel were the editors of the "Seder Ha-Abodah" (the prayer book of the Hamburg Temple of 1819). He was also instrumental in counteracting the

extreme rationalistic and Germanic tendencies of Gotthold Salomon and of Eduard Kley, the rabbis of the Hamburg Temple, who were ready to discard most of the traditional modes of Jewish worship to give it a Protestant exterior

107

form. Bresslau and Frankel, however, both being influential laymen and great Hebrew scholars, succeeded in editing a prayer book which preserved the traditional form to a great degree and thus gave the reform movement historic continuity.

However, when the "Dibre Ha-Brit" of the orthodox rabbis was issued it provoked Bresslau to compose a short pamphlet "Hereb Nokemet N'kam Brit" (1819) in which he scourged the rabbis most satirically and mercilessly. Speaking of this pamphlet, Graetz characterizes it as follows: "This Hebrew letter was written in a beautiful Hebrew style, and with such skilfull manipulation of biblical verses, that it seemed as though the prophets and psalmists themselves were scourging the delusions of the obtuse rabbis. Bresslau treated them now as ignorant boys, now as false prophets, and especially as disturbers of the peace. Every sentence in this seemingly earnest but bitingly satirical epistle was a dagger-thrust against the old perversions and their defenders."

108

The leaders of the Hamburg Temple received literary reinforcement also from the various centres of Haskalah in Galicia. The old party,

109

however, did not remain silent. In 1820, a polemical pamphlet against Bresslau was published by M. R. Reinitz, entitled "Lshat Ha-Hereb Hamitha-pehat". This work contains nothing new by way of argumentation against reforms. It is a mere rehashing of all the arguments contained in the "Dibre Ha'Brit" though the author claims that he did not have the opportunity to

110

see that rabbinic document. The author is particularly wrought up over

the insolence of Bresslau and his colleagues who hurled unheard of insults against the rabbis, but instead of showing an example of humility for the benefit of the reformers he merely heaped up still greater insults upon the leaders of the Temple.

A great number of pamphlets attacking the Hamburg leaders and reform in general were published at that time, most of which were anonymous and of very little literary value. Such is a pamphlet entitled, *אמרי*

פירק אמת ואמת (Berlin 1818) which seeks to defend the strictly orthodox point of view on rational ground. Another one of the same tendency is the *ספר אמת ואמת* by R. Abraham Zaitra (?) (Hannover 1836).

A most expressive attitude was taken by an obscure writer, J. S. Ashkov of Bresslau, who published a pamphlet against the reformers entitled "Dibre Shuman Omen" (Bresslau 1821) condemning most strongly those who favor synagogue reforms. He claimed that the whole aim of the reformers was to destroy Jewish unity in order to quicken the process of assimilation and of the disintegration

111

of Judaism. He criticizes the reformers most severely for having published articles in German, in which they pointed out the abuses of orthodoxy and the inconsistency of the latter with German citizenship; and he claims

112

that these articles have only helped to strengthen the anti-semitic position.

"הפטרס סרה א צא פ' גאוי און האט אים אומגעמאכט מ'ר
 י פ'ט פ'נאגער חרד בקרבן, וואס יאטא וואסו האט
 נחאס ינחא א דברית אסר כחא אונא מקרב, דאמאס האט
 אפ'האס יצא א דבר צאם."

To sum up the literary controversy evoked by the Hamburg reforms, we must say that for the most part it is void of all content. The pathetic condition of the orthodox party was that they were unable to present a single

Hebrew writer to defend their cause. The Hebrew style used in the documents of the best rabbis then was rugged and coarse. Nor could they write in any other language. When the ~~Layanim~~ of Hamburg had to translate their testimonial against the reformers in the German language, they had to employ Shalom Cohen 113 who had formerly belonged to the ranks of the reformers.

Nor were the writings of the early reformers of much greater literary value. As already stated before, the only document of that whole controversy which is of any literary value is that of Eliezer Lieberman, who was an ostracized scholar with no standing in any Jewish community.

7. Conclusion.

The literary productivity of the early reform movement is indicative of the movement as a whole. It had no positive program nor any motivating ideals. Every one felt that some great changes in Jewish life must necessarily take place after the emancipation, but the issues were so obscure then that neither the reformers nor their opponents could realize their implications.

As to practical results, this whole controversy was of no avail. All the condemnatory response of the orthodox rabbis were in vain. The orthodox party did not succeed in having the Hamburg Temple closed by the government, as they had hoped to be able to do. The reform congregation continued to flourish. Shortly after the dedication, Gotthold Salomon was called from Jessen to fill the office of preacher in conjunction with Eduard Kley. In 1820, the Hamburg reformers established a branch synagogue at Leipsig, where services were conducted during the great yearly fairs. Merchants from all over Europe gathered at these fairs, and the ideas expressed in sermons preached in the reform synagogue were spread through many distant communities.

and frequently became an incentive to work along the lines of reform. I. L. Auerbach of Berlin was the preacher of this cosmopolitan congregation.

During the third, fourth and fifth decades of the nineteenth century, many congregations in Germany, Austria, Hungary, France, and Denmark introduced reforms to a greater or less extent. These reforms were usually in the direction of greater decorum in the synagogue, fewer piyutim in the festive liturgy, music by a regular choir, and sermons in the vernacular. Such was the so-called Vienna program which was adopted by the Vienna congregation under the guidance of its preacher Isaac Noah Mannheimer and its cantor Solomon Sulzer. A number of governmental edicts were issued during these years containing instructions to the heads of the Jewish communities to remove the abuses which had crept into the synagogues and to introduce reforms. Among such edicts may be mentioned those of Saxe-Weimar (1823), Anhalt (1825), Hanover (1827), Baden (1828) Middle Franconia and Saxe-Meiningen (1829).

IV

THE GALICIAN REVOLT AGAINST ORTHODOXY

The renaissance of Hebrew literature in Germany which began in the end of the eighteenth century was short-lived. Its only concrete result, as far as Western Europe is concerned, was the Reform Movement. It must be stated, however, that the high hopes entertained by the inaugurators of this movement had not been realized. One of the chief reasons for its failure was that the so-called "Berlin Haskalah" was German in name only. As we pointed out before, the "Messiah" and "Biblist" activities as well as the entire Reform movement was promulgated through, and supported by, intellectual forces and influences outside of Germany. Hence, German Jewry was not capable of becoming the bearers of the Jewish cultural renaissance. The orthodox rabbis there, who were steeped in Jewish Law and Lore, were completely ignorant not only of modern culture but even of Jewish philosophic thought, and were, therefore, hopelessly dead to the cultural demands of the times. On the other hand, the reform rabbis like Aley, Günsberg and Amerbach, though they possessed modern culture, were not sufficiently grounded in Jewish learning to seek in it inspiration. For the most part, the reform leaders were shallow imitators of the liberal Protestant preachers. Besides, being as they were passionate, but not very clear-sighted, humanists, they permitted themselves to be dazzled by modernity and by its promises of light and liberty. The consciousness of fellowship in a united world Jewry was pushed to the background, the Messianic hope, to which the masses clung was undermined, and the leaders were unable to formulate new ideals to take the place of the tottering traditions of the past and of the faltering hopes of a messianic future. An entire generation was to pass before historical Judaism came to

its own again through the creation of the "Science of Judaism" and the conception of the spiritual mission of the Jewish people. These new motifs which formed the positive ideology of the reform movement in its second stage, and which helped to save it from decay, were again created not in Germany but outside of it, namely, in Galicia and in Italy, as we have seen before the enlightenment movement in Germany was carried on by Polish scholars who combined Jewish learning and modern culture and was aided by the moral influence of the Italian and Hungarian scholars. Their own native countries were not yet ripe politically for such a movement. The Napoleonic wars, however, ushered in the cry of liberty throughout Europe, the echo of which was heard in the remotest ghettos of Eastern Europe. And though the first flush of joy died away as soon as the post-Napoleonic reaction had set in, nevertheless, the seeds of revolt were already there. The clash between received notions and the new conceptions produced a ferment of ideas and created new tendencies in the ghettos of Eastern Europe. Thus the Hebrew renaissance which was created by the Polish scholars who were domiciled in Germany, began to be transferred to Poland, where it produced a much more lasting effect.

The "Measser" which had been edited in a new series in Germany by Shalom Ha-Kohen (Dessau 1809-11) but without much success, was revived at Vienna and later in Galicia, and succeeded, first under the title of "Bikkure ha-Ittem" (1820-1831), and then under "Kerem Hemed", in gathering together¹ many writers, the large proportion of whom were Polish.

In Poland, however, where the Jewish population lived apart, the "Maskilim" could not even aspire to the dreams of equality and liberty of the Hebrew writers in Germany. The reforms of Emperor Joseph II, which affected the Jews in the part of Poland annexed by Austria, especially the

extension of compulsory military services to them, had paved the way to a spiritual reaction among the Jewish masses who threw themselves into the arms of Hassidic mysticism.

Hence, the intellectual Jews of Poland, found that their first task was the tearing down of Zadikism and all the superstitions that went with it. This first task, therefore, was essentially negative in nature, for they had to do the same work which the early reformers carried on in Germany a generation before them.

The first outstanding champion of enlightenment was "Herz Homberg" (b. Luben near Prague 1749; d. 1841). He was a passionate reformer, but in his overzealousness he unfortunately employed undesirable methods by exerting great influence upon government authorities to force certain religious reforms upon the Jews of the Austrian Empire. Homberg received a Talmudic education till the age of 17. The reading of Rousseau's "Emile" awakened in him the desire to devote himself to pedagogy. He prepared himself at Berlin, where he became tutor to Mendelsohn's eldest son, Joseph (1779). During the three years in which he lived with Mendelsohn he was greatly influenced by the latter, and became one of his favorites. When the normal schools were to be opened for the Jews of Austria under the Edict of Joseph II, he was highly recommended by Mendelsohn and was appointed as superintendent of all the German-Jewish schools of Galicia (1784). In 1793, he was called by Emperor Francis II to Vienna to formulate laws regulating the moral and political status of the Jews in Austria.

As a practical reformer, he was a negative character, and as such, he antagonized greatly the Jewish masses who could not forgive him for his efforts to carry out his religious reforms through government intervention.

Homborg, however, made some contributions to the Hebrew literature and to the furtherance of the movement for reforms by his merciless campaign against the obscurantism which prevailed in Galicia at this time.

He was one of the contributors to the Measser, took active part in the biurist movement, and wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch, Job and Jeremiah. His commentary ⁹in Deuteronomy is included in Mendelsohn's Biur. In his later years, after the normal schools of Galicia were placed under the general direction of the district schools, Homborg retired to Vienna, where he occupied himself with preparing Jewish school books and catechisms, which the government forced upon all Jewish elementary schools. Among these, his outstanding contribution is his "Imre Shefer" (Vienna 1806) which is a religious and moral reader for young people. His Hebrew is of pure biblical style, but very dry and prosaic. It presents, however, a pleasant contrast to the prevailing Hebrew of the time, for his language is very concise and grammatically correct. In the very title page of the book we see already the spirit of the time, for it states that the book was written for young men and women, something unusual for a Hebrew book at that time.

"כוללם דתני מורה / איסר חילופי בני ישראל / אהבה"

Though the whole work is seemingly based on good traditional grounds, yet it is permeated throughout with the author's rationalistic spirit. Particularly uncharacteristic of Homborg are his last chapter, wherein he imbues the youth with patriotic zeal by showing that patriotism to one's country is an essential principle of the Jewish faith. This over-emphasis on patriotism and loyalty indicates that Homborg in his educational reforms was more interested in obtaining political emancipation rather than in the spiritual uplift of the masses.

Of course, we need not exonerate Homborg of the charges made

against his negative and arbitrary methods in introducing reforms in Galician Jewry, but both Graetz and Bernfeld seem to abuse him unjustly in refusing to recognize the Galician fanaticism Homberg had to contend with in the introduction of the slightest innovations. The opposition which he had to face at every step could very easily explain the bitterness with which he sought to carry out his rationalistic ideas.

One of the most prominent Maskilim of Galicia was "Judah Löb Miseses" (d. Lemberg 1831).⁴ He was a man of wealth and education, and made his house the centre of a literary circle. He encouraged and aided Isaac Arter and other young men who showed eagerness for knowledge and self-culture, and he offered them the use of his valuable library.

Miseses was a fluent Hebrew writer, a master of Hebrew style and a strong opponent of rabbinic authority and particularly of Hassidism. He was the author of "Kinot Ha-Emet" (Vienna 1820; 2nd ed. Lemberg 1879) containing an introduction and three dialogues between Maimonides and Solomon of Jerusalem, in which he satirically derides the superstitions of mediaevalism. Of much greater interest for our purpose is his "Tekumat Ha-Rabanim" which was published by David Caro as a part of his "Berit Emet" (Lessaau 1820). In this work, Miseses traces historically the various forms of religious leadership in Israel and particularly the rabinate, and comes to the conclusion that with the civil emancipation of the Jews in Europe the rabbis have outlived their usefulness and have, therefore, no longer any reason for authority in the life of the people.⁵ After analyzing modern conditions, he points out the dire need of spiritual leaders in the communities who should be versed in the various phases of Jewish literature and secular knowledge, who will be able to expound the content of Judaism before the people. Miseses describes most

poignantly the spiritual decadence of Galician Jewry of his time. He points to the fact that the rabbinical offices are bought for money and are, therefore occupied by men who are utterly unfit for the office. He decries⁶ mercilessly the ignorance, the hypocrisy, and the arrogant tyranny of the rabbis of his time who only retard the progress of the people. He blames the rabbis for the perverted educational methods of his time, for the disorderly services in congregations and for the distorted conceptions of piety among the masses.⁸ He also denounces the rabbis for allowing ignorant cantors and choirs to convert the religious service into theatrical performances, and above all for tolerating announcements of thefts and losses in the community during the services, and for commercializing the synagog service by the sale of "Mizvet".⁹ He points also to the many social evils that prevail in Jewish life, because of the rabbis' ignorance of the language of the country and because of their inability to represent properly the interests of their people before the authorities.

Mises claims that as a reaction to the fanaticism of the rabbis who refuse to heed the spirit of the time, the semi-intellectuals turn to the French encyclopedists for guidance and as a result cast aside all religious beliefs and practices and become thorough-going atheists.¹⁰ He condemns most severely the Jewish school system which aims to give the children a knowledge of obscure Talmudic passages instead of preparing them for useful careers in life. Mises claims that the educational system which prevailed in his time is conducive only of spiritual and moral deterioration.¹¹ He criticizes the rabbis very severely for breeding hatred towards the non-Jew, and for preaching against the compulsory military service laws, the obstruction of which, he claims is contrary to all Jewish practices.¹² He condemns the intolerance of the rabbis who do not allow for any freedom of

expression, an attitude which is altogether foreign to the true spirit of

¹³
Judaism. He claims that the rabbis are opposed to the introduction of secular education, not on the ground of Jewish Law but because they themselves are
¹⁴
ignorant, of all secular knowledge.

Mieses comes finally to the conclusion that it is hopeless to expect any relief from the rabbis and he, therefore, appeals to the intellectual Jewish laity in every country to take the situation in their own hands and to enact all the necessary reforms in Jewish life to adjust it to modern
¹⁵
conditions.

Another outstanding figure in the early struggle for reforms in Galicia was David Caro (b. Foron 1782; d. Posen 1839) who was an intimate friend and coworker of J. L. Mieses. Caro was an educator and a highly talented man of letters. He devoted his great literary talent to the cultivation of the Hebrew language and to the advance of the reform movement in
¹⁶
Galicia.

Under the pseudonym of *דאס נאכער יארג* / *דאס נאכער*
Caro published a most effective anti-orthodox work entitled "Berit Emet"
¹⁷
(Dessau 1820). The first part of this work entitled "Berit Elohim" he wrote himself, and the second part contains the "Tekunot Ha-Rabanim" of J. L. Mieses.

In his "Berit Elohim" Caro defends most emphatically all the Hamburg reforms on the grounds of Jewish tradition. The defense is preceded by an assumed correspondence with a friend from Berlin the aim of which was to set forth the cultural advance of the Jews in Germany over those in Poland and Galicia, and the economic and political advantages of the Jews in the West as a result of their cultural emancipation. Indirectly, Caro intimates

throughout the correspondence that the plight of the Eastern Jews is due to the fanaticism of the Galician rabbis which seeks to retard the progress of the people.¹⁸

Like Wessely, a generation before him, Caro advocates that the Jews of Europe cast off the shackles of fanaticism in the name of Humanism

and the social advance (*ח'בת האדם / ח'בת המהדר*).¹⁹ He advocates that

the Jewish people adopt the aesthetic and cultural standards of modern life which, in his opinion, are in no way conflicting with the true doctrine of Judaism once divested from its superstitious construction. In short, he de-

mands the thorough Westernization of Galician Jewry along the program of the Measssim and the German reformers.²⁰

Caro anticipates the opposition of the orthodox rabbis in Galicia and he sets forth the same arguments which were used by Lieberman in his "Nogah Zedek" and in his "Or Nogah".²¹

Caro never saw Lieberman's work but he knew of its content through the orthodox protests in the "Libre Ha-Orit". He devotes a whole chapter in his book pointing out the fallacies in the responsa of the orthodox rabbis concerning the Hamburg reforms.²³

In this chapter Caro takes the orthodox rabbis to task for not having acted judiciously in this matter by not investigating the complaints lodged against the reformers before they pronounced their judgment of anathema against them. He criticizes them particularly for having employed words of abuse in their reponsa which are altogether out of keeping with rabbinic

uignity.²⁴

"אך כל דברים אלו הם דימוני אחר, זקלא ואחר, ואם שיהיה
החובשים הנהגה והנהגה זמם אפיקורסים, רשעים וז' א"ל
ס'ם שמה מנהג משיח, ולא ידעו אולם א"ל פ'ת
מ'תם א'תם א"ל א"ל ב'תם א"ל מ'תם א"ל
א"ל א"ל ח'תם א"ל פ'ת, ו'תם א"ל ח'תם א"ל
מ'תם א"ל פ'ת."

He also points out with indignation that Moses Sofer misquoted Lieberman by stating that the latter disbelieved in the restoration to Palestine when as a matter of fact Lieberman merely said that in prayer one's native country should be given precedence over Palestine. And Caro holds the same
25
opinion. As regard the linguistic problem, Caro sarcastically remarks that those very rabbis who fight so zealously for the use of the Hebrew in the service take no trouble in learning it, and write their responsa in a most un-
26
grammatical Hebrew which is a strange conglomeration of many languages. He also criticizes very severely R. Jacob of Lissa for his unbecoming methods of warfare. Instead of refuting Lieberman's arguments, he merely accused him of indulging in card-playing. Caro contends that according to Jewish Law, card playing does not throw any reflection upon a person's integrity unless it be proven that it was done for professional purposes, a point which R. Jacob
27
failed to prove. He attacks him, moreover, for desiring to base Judaism on blind faith, for Caro can see in this desire only an attempt to exert a
28
tyrannical control over the ignorant masses. In conclusion, he defends the position taken by the leaders of the Hamburg Temple in not consulting their local rabbis as to the reform measures which they enacted. He asserts that there is no use in consulting them because their uncompromising and intolerant attitude to reforms of any sort is only too well known. He hopes, however, that in time the rabbis will acquire a spirit of tolerance which will allow for a mutual understanding, and that a rabbinical assembly will sooner or later be convened to satisfy the necessary reforms for the spiritual welfare
29
of Israel.

One of the most interesting characters among the champions
30
of enlightenment in Galicia is undoubtedly Isaac Erter. (b. Janishok, Galicia; d. Brody 1851). The early part of Erter's life was full of struggles and

?
insert

marriages. After having been associated for many years with the Hassidim, his innate love of the beautiful made him revolt with disgust at the sight of the cultural degradation of the masses in his native city, and he settled at Lemburg in 1813. Through the efforts of Rappaport, Krochmal and others he obtained pupils whom he instructed in Hebrew. There he was soon excommunicated by the local rabbi together with a group of Maskilim, and he, therefore, had to move to Brody (1816). After a long struggle there he resolved to study medicine and he entered the university of Budapest (1825) where he studied for five years. Thereafter he practiced as a physician in various Galician towns, including Brody, where he became very popular among the poor for his great generosity and sympathy. The fanatic persecutions directed against him and the spiritual struggles which he had to undergo made him the outstanding satirist in Hebrew literature. His satirical descriptions of the bigotry and fanaticism of the Hassidic rabbis of his time are to this day masterpieces in point of humor and of style.

Graetz has the following to say of him: "Borne and Heine would certainly never have credited it, but they heard that, hidden away in Poland among the bearded Jews, there lived a brother artist as capable of making filigree-work of finest words, of weaving a wire-net for the souls of gnats or pointing a satire so sharp that it could penetrate through the pores of glass. As they had improved, refined and polished the German language, so Erter improved the Hebrew tongue....In his faithful and touching descriptions there is a store of magic poetry and humor which, like the offspring of Heine's wit, attracts and enchants the mind."

Erter did not write much, but what he did write is of lasting value. His fame rests chiefly on his satires published under the title of "Hazofeh le-Bet Israel" (Vienna 1856). They are six in number and they are

of the purest modern Hebrew literature. Though this work was not meant to be Reform literature, yet it was such in its effect. His merciless criticisms of the ignorance and hypocrisy of the "miracle workers", of the prevailing social injustice which was coupled with extreme piety and of the mysteries and superstitions of the Kabala that obscured the ethical phase of Judaism made a lasting impression upon the young men of the Yeshiva and particularly upon the intellectuals among them. To quote Klausner, "For the first time were their eyes directed to see the bruises and the wounds in the social structure of the Jewish people. Only then did they realize that a radical change of values took place outside the Ghetto walls, that a new life was being created there, a life free from the shackles of tradition, full of emotions, desires, outlooks, and demands altogether different from those of the past."³² It is no wonder then that his work was immediately put under the ban of the rabbis though their ban was of no effect. Erter harmed the rabbis and the zealots with his pen much more than the bans of the latter could harm him. For just before his death, Erter began to edit the Hebrew periodical "Ha-Halutz" which strove to dispel the darkness that set in among the Jews of Galicia and to promote culture and enlightenment among them.

Among those who waged literary warfare against obscurantism with their satirical genius was also Joseph Perl (b. Tarnopol, Galicia, 1774; d. there 1839).³³ He was the son of a wealthy family, and was imbued with the rationalistic ideology of the German Measssim. From his very youth he devoted himself to the cause of emancipation and of education. Due to his great influence upon the Czar of Russia and the Emperor of Austria he could intercede in behalf of his people who suffered from Christian persecution and from Hassidic obscurantism. Convinced that only rationalism could change their

deplorable condition, he worked tirelessly for religious and social reforms. His first step in this direction was the establishment of the first modern Jewish school in Galicia; and in 1815 he built near it at his own expense a reform synagogue and formed a choir. To counteract the influence of the Hassidim he gathered around him talented men of letters. He befriended such men as Krochmal, Rappaport, Letteris, and Erter, and it was due to his influence that Rappaport was appointed Rabbi in Tarnopol. Moreover, he provided ambitious young men in Lemberg with money, counsel, and what was of especial value to them, with an excellent library of Hebrew and European books.

But Perl was not only a macenas of Hebrew literature but was himself a man of letters of considerable talent. Under the pseudonym, "Obadiah ben Petachiah" he published a parody on Hassidism entitled "Maggalah Temirin" (Vienna 1819). This parody is a collection of fictitious correspondence between Hassidic rabbis in which Sadikism and all its superstitions are most cleverly exposed and ridiculed. Perl manipulated the style of the Hassidic rabbis with such skill that for a long time the Hassidim thought that it was written either by the "Besht" or by one of his disciples. Of the same nature are his letters *על פני האדמה* and his *פני האדם* in which he attacked most satirically not only Hassidism but all the social and economic phases of Jewish life in the Ghetto.

A younger contemporary of Perl who succeeded him in the battle against obscurantism was Joshua Heshel Schorr, known also as Osias Schorr (b. ³⁵ 1814 d. there 1895). Schorr was also born to rich parents, but owing to the fanaticism of the latter he received an ordinary "Heder" education. Prompted, however, by an invincible desire for knowledge, the boy became acquainted with Isaac Erter, under whose guidance he studied Hebrew, Talmud, foreign languages and secular sciences. It is from Erter that Schorr acquired

his brilliant style, his critical acumen as well as his sarcasm. Schorr was also greatly influenced by the writings of S. D. Luzzato though the latter became his most bitter opponent because of his negative attitude towards Talmudic Judaism.

Schorr began his literary activity in Hebrew with articles on the history of Jewish literature for the periodical "Ziyyon".³⁶ When Erter's newly founded scientific periodical "He Haluz" was interrupted by sudden death, Schorr undertook to carry out his master's plan with greater vigor and with youthful enthusiasm. Schorr distinguished himself by his pungent and satirical style, with which he attacked his opponents. He was undaunted in his criticism of anything or any one that opposed the spread of modern civilization. In his battle against obscurantism he went much farther than any one among his predecessors or contemporaries. He fought not only against Hassidism but even against many phases of Talmudic Judaism. His radical attitude to the Talmud aroused great opposition and while in his early volumes of the "He Haluz" Schorr had as collaborators men like Geiger, Abraham Krochmal, Steinschneider, Samuel David Luzzato and Reggió, he remained almost alone in his work in the later volumes. In his boldness Schorr spared no one who was not in accord with his views and with the exception of the works of Krochmal and Geiger, no work escaped his satirical shafts. Schorr did not refrain from applying his critical faculty even to his Biblical studies. In the later volumes of the "He Haluz" he became even more radical, and it is because of this that Rappaport began to wage a bitter war against him.³⁷ And though Schorr's attitude was at times most negative and destructive yet it was his thorough-going radicalism that evoked a large polemical literature which in turn compelled the Jewish scholars in Germany and Galicia to ponder over the problems of religious reforms and give them their serious study.³⁸

Among the leading progressive Hebrew publishers in Galicia we must mention also Isaac (Ignotz) Blumenfeld, (b. Brody Galicia 1812). He was a wealthy merchant and he took great delight in encouraging and spreading the new Hebrew literature. He was in constant correspondence with I. S. Reggio and with S. D. Luzzato. Blumenfeld rendered a great service to modern Hebrew literature and to the science of Judaism by publishing in Vienna the scientific periodical "Ozar Nechmad" (1856-63). This periodical made accessible to the average Hebrew reader the scientific articles of Rappaport, Luzzato, Geiger, and others. By giving currency to the scientific works of the highest quality, such as were never published before in Hebrew periodicals, he has helped to arouse a scientific study of Judaism in Eastern Europe which in turn gave rise to freedom of expression in religious thought.

39

The champions of Haskalah, however, soon realized that their work of enlightenment will have to assume a more serious nature than it did in Germany if it is to influence the life of Polish Jewry. For, to quote Slouschz, "To attract the intelligent Jews of Poland, permeated as they were with deep knowledge of rabbinic literature, more was needed than witty sallies and childish conceits in an affected style. The appeal had to be made to their reason, to their convictions and to their constant longing for intellectual occupation. Their minds could be turned away from a most absurd mysticism only by setting a new ideal before them, calculated to engage feelings and attract hearts, yearning for consolation, and left unsatisfied by the pursuit of the Law, the nourishment given to all who thought and studied in the Ghetto." The two men who succeeded in meeting these spiritual needs were Nachman Krochmal and Solomon Judah Rappaport, who together with their Italian contemporaries were the founders of what is known as the "Science of Judaism".

V

THE SCIENCE OF JUDAISM

1. The German School.

This literary movement known as the Science of Judaism was in fact inaugurated in Germany as a result of the Reform movement. In order to justify their departures from the prevailing customs, the leaders of Reform sought to establish historically the evolutionary process in Judaism. ¹ Of such a nature was the "Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden" by Leopold Zunz (1794-1886). In fact, it was Zunz who coined the expression, "Wissenschaft des Judentums" which meant an understanding of Jewish antiquity in all its parts as far as it is expressed in literary documents. While yet a university student in 1819 together with Eduard Gans and Moses Moser, Zunz founded a society for Jewish culture and study ("Verein für Cultur und Wissenschaft der Juden"). ² It was hoped that familiarity with Jewish literature and history would stem the tide of apostasy which once more was ripe. It was also hoped that the scientific works on Judaism would prove the strongest weapons against the anti-semitic scholars who constantly reviled Judaism and its followers. Thus Isaac Marcus Jost was moved repeatedly to delve into scientific research of Judaism as an apologist against political reactionaries and detractors of rabbinic literature. ³ But German Jewry at the time was too busy in reaping the first fruit of emancipation to support such a movement, and because of the general lack of interest this literary movement could not attain any measure of success in Germany. Hence, Graetz and others look upon Solomon Judah Rappaport of Galicia as the real founder of the Science of Judaism. ⁴ "What gave these researches (of Rappaport) an especial value," says Graetz, "was the fervor and love with which they were undertaken....So far as the Jews took

an interest in these labors, they saw themselves reflected in them, and considered the history of their mental development as laid down in them, as their own work, or the guiding line to be followed in the future....The scientific movement within Judaism which since his time has constantly grown in force must be entirely attributed to him."

5

The great fault with Zunz and his scholarly contemporaries in Germany was that they regarded Hebrew literature as having reached its conclusion; a closed period lay behind them which demanded an appraisal. But Hebrew writing was by no means defunct as Zunz had been led to believe. At the two ends of the Austrian Empire, in the Italian provinces and in Galicia, the Hebrew scholars took up the new literary movement which was ushered in in Germany, and used for its vehicle the Hebrew language and thus took up the thread where their predecessors left it.

2. The Italian School.

One of the most outstanding Jewish scholars in Italy in the nineteenth century was Isaac Samuel Reggio (Goritz 1784-1854).⁶ Reggio was to Italian Jewry what Mendelsohn and Wessely were to the German Jews. Taking these men as his guides, he made himself famous in the development of Jewish thought and in the field of Jewish education. Reggio's father, Abraham Vita, one of the liberal rabbis who supported Hartwig Wessely, paid special attention to giving his son a religious as well as a secular education. Reggio displayed an unusual aptitude in Hebrew and in other Semitic languages, as well as in Italian, French, German and Latin. He possessed also a phenomenally clear intellect, and was a profound mathematician. When the province of Illyria (1810) became a French dependency, Reggio was appointed by the French

governor as professor and chancellor of the lyceum at Goritz. But three years later Illyria became once more an Austrian province, and Reggio was compelled to resign. He then devoted himself exclusively to Jewish literature and cognate subjects. He studied even the Cabalah but the more he studied it the greater grew his aversion to its mystical and illogical doctrines.

In 1822 an imperial decree having been issued that no one might be appointed Rabbi who had not graduated in philosophy, Reggio published at Venice an appeal, in Italian, for the establishment of a rabbinical seminary. This appeal resulted in the founding of a rabbinical college at Padua, for which Reggio drew up the statutes and the educational program.

Following the example of Men~~del~~sohn, Reggio translated the Bible into Italian and wrote a commentary thereon. Although he believed, like Men~~del~~sohn, that in the main the text of the Bible has been well guarded against corruption, yet he admitted that scribal errors had slipped in and that it would be no sin to correct them. To the objectors to Biblical ~~amendations~~ Reggio answered that every one was permitted to interpret the text according to his understanding provided such interpretations were not in opposition to the halacha.

הנה אלה חסדנות ואלה אכזריות
לחם חמם תלסם גלגליו בלילות
שומע. אמר לו מפי כן נאטם אנניו
הלפרים כי כל מה ארבע בפק
שם וניו שרי קא הדוק במלה
המחשבים הקדמנים הן בדל
אשר אפניהם או מפי אפניהם

אצלו נאסחגה מחלוקתו הספסח אלס מהפ המעשה
 אלס ד"ר אל נפחיה קמח פלים בקמח המעשה והתק
 נמן ד"ר אל במחג אמקמל אל נאמר לט אל
 אלס אלס פסלים בקמח מחלוקת אל המעשה בקמח אלס
 אלס אלס חמח המעשה אלס אלס -- אלס אלס
 אלס אלס המעשה אלס אלס אלס אלס אלס אלס

An opponent of casuistry, Reggio rejected the haggadic Biblical interpretations and the pilpulistic study of the Talmud.

On account of his liberal views Reggio was persecuted by many German rabbis. Even his father did not wholly approve of his methods. Nevertheless in 1846, after his father's death, the community of Goretz insisted upon his accepting the rabbinical office. Reggio was a voluminous writer in Hebrew and in Italian, and he constantly wrote on Biblical, exegetical, Rabbinical, philosophic and historic subjects. He was also an indefatigable contributor to most of the Hebrew journals of his time, and his contributions added to the value of these periodicals. He was also the editor of the *קול תורה*, the Hebrew part of Bursch's "Jahrbücher" (Vienna 1845) and of *מגזין תורה*, a supplement to the "Central Organ für Jüdische Interessen" (Vienna 1849). It may be added that Reggio was proficient in music and a painter of considerable ability. There are more than two hundred drawings and paintings by him, including portraits of many Jewish celebrities, and a map drawn by him is preserved in the library of Trieste. He left also a great number of unpublished sermons and poems in Hebrew and in Italian.

One of his most important works in his "Hatorah v-Harilosofiah", which is a religious philosophical treatise in four chapters. This treatise was written in answer to the rabbis who protested against the establishment

Talmudic ordinances were not intended for perpetual observance; they were practiced only by the rigorous Pharisees. It was not until much later, he declares, that the "Poskim" established these ordinances as a part of the Law. Consequently, he claims, Modena was wrong in attacking the Talmudists in being over-rigorous.

But Reggio's historical insight and his liberal spirit is best seen in his approach to the Bible, where he shows a much more progressive view than the one held by Mendelssohn. In his "Yalkut Yashar" Reggio defends the opinion which attributed Isaiah 40-66 to an author who lived after the
16
captivity.

It would be out of our scope to give a full appreciation of Reggio's literary, philosophic and scientific works. Instead, for our purpose, it must be pointed out that Reggio was one of the first pioneers who set out to base Judaism not on blind adherence to tradition nor on the line of convenience, but on a historic-scientific investigation. As Isaac Hirsh Weiss stated in his memoirs, Reggio's aim was to preserve the essence of spiritual Judaism and to harmonize it with modern thought. And holding this position, he was one of the boldest and staunchest workers in the field of the Science of Judaism.

"הלא דבר מואב נחל החרה והחמור את בניו העם גלו
העמים, נבם מע, מלכ נחמ אסרם אקרא יום מל
החכם אשם נקרא בזה ומי לא יודע כי אלה הספרים
האלה הם אנתים מוסר מחקרין דגמל המאמץ
ואין כן אדם אשם אלה או דאמא יאמר תכלה מלך
אשמן אשם דגמל."

In his introduction to the "B'hinet Hakablah", Reggio practically sums up

the aim of his life in a few words:

"הנה הסכמתי ופניתי בחכמת חזק ופלא שני החלקים יחד
 חסר בחינת הקבלה ואלו חפצתי שיהיה הוא וזהו מופת
 הקבלה הטהור שנקראת חסד שיהיה זה מה ואפילו
 שגמר ארץ ארצה שכל יפה זה כח לחיות הוויש פשוט
 כשמי רחוק, אם בשלש שנים אם פועל חזק, אשר אולי
 ממש ממש וממש המדון בחלק השני יתחבר כל פה נפש
 אפשר מלקח חלקן רב המדן חזק, כל חלואי אולם
 בישותי חזק אדמו".

The very publication of works as those of Modena which were considered heretical at that time is indicative of the bold spirit of Reggio. He explains that he edited these works to serve as a guide for both orthodox and Reform leaders, that in discussing the validity of Rabbinic tradition they may have the advantage of the most critical work written on this subject. 19

Reggio's influence upon the liberal spirit of Judaism in the nineteenth century was manifold. Through the various Hebrew periodicals in which he was most active, he had constant correspondence and polemics with Rappaport, Jost, Geiger, Zunz, Luzzato, as well as with Ignatz Blumenfeld of Brody who later on settled in Odesa, Russia. He thus exerted a tremendous influence upon the Reform movement in Germany as well as on the Haskalah movement in eastern Europe, but chiefly upon the scientific literature in Judaism.

Of much greater influence in the religious development of Judaism in modern times was Reggio's younger contemporary and countryman, Samuel David Luzzato, known as "Shadal". 20 (b. Triest 1800; d. Padua 1865).

His father was a carpenter and a poor man, yet he was educated and respected.

The childhood years of Luzzato were passed in poverty and in study. He finally emerged a conqueror from the struggle of life and knowledge. As early as 1829 he was appointed rector of the Rabbinical seminary at Padua. Thereafter he could devote himself without hindrance to science and to the education of disciples many of whom became celebrated. Luzzato possessed a thorough Jewish and secular education, and became not only a distinguished Biblical scholar and Talmudist but he manifested also extraordinary ability in Hebrew philology as well as in the acquisition of ancient and modern languages.

Luzzato was one of the most voluminous Hebrew writers and stands in the first rank as a Jewish philosopher. He has thus exerted great influence on every modern tendency in Jewish life and thought. For, to quote Klusner, "There is no department in Jewish thought or creative work which did not come under the influence of Luzzato. He was versed alike in philology, poetry, philosophy, archeology, history and journalism, and he was productive in each of these departments with great success." ²¹ Besides attaining a vast Jewish and secular learning, Luzzato possessed also a literary taste superior to that of any of his contemporaries. But his greatest advantage over the latter was that he possessed the Jewish feeling to an extent which was not to be found among his contemporaries whose feelings were chilled by the cold rationalism which seized the intellectual world of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

In Luzzato, due probably to his Italian environment, feeling had the upper hand of reason, and he was thus the pioneer of the romantic school in modern Hebrew literature, which in turn gave birth to the conservative trend in Reform Judaism in the West and to cultural Zionism (*יהודי ספרד*) in the East. As a romantic and patriotic Jew, he revolted against the heartless attacks upon Jewish traditions and upon Jewish nationalism by most of the

German and Galician scholars. He was hostile all his life to this sort of rationalism and opposed it with all his might. Though a great Talmudist, he had no fondness for dry dogmatism, nor for detailed prohibitions, and Rabbinic philological controversies, nor did he look upon the research of the Science of Judaism as an adequate substitute for it. What he cherished in Judaism was its poetry, and he was attracted to it by its moral elevation. He did not seek to solve the problem of modern Judaism by external reforms but sought to bring in it a spiritual renaissance by bringing to the foreground the poetic spirit of Judaism and thus sweep away the dust that accumulated upon it throughout the ages. With this purpose in mind, he published excellent editions of the Hebrew masters of the Middle Ages, and he found Judah Halevi's poems most instrumental for his purpose. In 1864 he published the first scientific edition of the religious poetry of Rabbi Judah Halevi with an introduction, commentary and critical notes. In his introduction Luzzato makes it clear that he appreciates the secular as well as religious poetry, but that he desires to separate the two and to publish the latter first.

22

"הנה פלאות אלה כולם במחלוקת אלה קדם ואמר חור
/ רשעים במה קדם -- ארצות במה חור -- אולם במה הדבר
אפשר בין הקדם בין החור והחלוקת אלה מתקן הפואמה
שבו קדם שרצו בו / להסביר את הסדר שבו נמצאים
אל שיהי חור שיפוצם בלשון תחלת אפס חור"

Luzzato's interest in Judah Halevi is of great importance, because the latter represents the intuitive philosophy of Judaism with which Luzzato sought to wage war against the rationalistic tendency which was so dominant in his day. And for that very reason he waged a life-long war against Samonides who became the mainstay of all the rationalists in modern

times. He opposed the influence of Maimonides chiefly because the latter sought to rationalize Judaism in order to harmonize it with Greek philosophy, and thus became the shield of those who sought to rationalize Judaism in order to harmonize it with German philosophy. Luzzato's opposition to philosophy was not the result of fanaticism nor of lack of understanding. He claimed to have read all the ancient and modern philosophy but that the more he read them the more he found them deviating from the truth. The study of philosophy, to his mind, not only robs the joy of life but it causes the average person to lose the intuitive common-sense attitude towards life, the loss of which leads one to pessimism, mesentrophy and suicide.

[illegible]

In short, Luzzato disqualifies the rationalistic philosophy of Western Europe because it leads to no practical results, and for this same reason he fought bitterly the rationalism of Ibn Ezra and of Spinoza. 24

Luzzato attacks most bitterly the spurious universalism of Ludwig Philipson who expressed the hope that when the Christians will overthrow their superstitious doctrines and the Jews their ceremonial laws, then there would be a united society and mankind would reach the messianic age. Luzzato sarcastically thought Europe would never allow the Jews to assimilate, even if they wanted to, except those who were willing to accept Christianity. Moreover, he says, those who seek to overthrow the ceremonial law only help to strengthen the opponents of Israel who negate legalistic Judaism. He, therefore, urges a bold and militant position which shall make Judaism independent of non-Jewish philosophy and scholarship.

27

But though he was a militant foe of rationalism and a staunch champion of Jewish tradition, Luzzato did not refrain from a critical study of Judaism.

Already in 1820 when he was only twenty years of age he wrote an essay *ל' חק דת* disproving the antiquity of the Zohar and deriding all the gross superstitions that grew out of cabalistic literature. He particularly attacked most poignantly the famous work of Joseph Caro, "Magen Avraham" (Amsterdam 1708) which is full of miraculous accounts and which boldly lays claim to supernatural revelation.

29

Unlike most of his contemporaries Luzzato did not refrain from applying his critical studies even to the Bible. In fact, he was the first Jewish scholar who permitted himself to amend the Biblical text and his emendations, which he published in various periodicals (between 1829 and 1833) met with the approval of Christian scholars. Through a careful examination of the Book of Ecclesiastes, Luzzato came to the conclusion that its author was not Solomon, but someone who lived several centuries later and whose name was

Kohellet. At the same time, he also came to the conclusion that the vowels and accents did not exist in the time of the Talmudists, a conclusion which only corroborated his theory that the Zohar, speaking as it does of vowels and accents, must necessarily be of later composition.

This critical faculty of Luzzato frightened even such a liberal scholar of J. Solomon Dappaport who thought that bible emendations are brought with great danger as far as the preservation of Judaism is concerned, and he therefore urged him not to tamper with the massoretic text. Luzzato, however, contended fearlessly and unequivocally that the truth must be worshipped above all, and if errors have crept in to the traditional texts of the Bible it is the duty of a truly religious scholar to remove them regardless of the consequences.

30
 "אמתו בן ישרא אלה אמת אלהינו, אשר לא אפנו חסד וחסד
 והוא בקולן ופיהן יראת... ולכן מחמדה אשר לא טהורה הוא
 במחשבת אלהים מעל מה אפנו וזה טהורה הוא במחשבתו בואת
 אברהם רבש צדק בקול רב ולא ניה חסרת אמת"

However, when the Bible emendations began to be a sport for half-baked bible scholars and journalists who would get hold of every new emendation published by Christian scholars and promulgate them among the Jewish masses, Luzzato protested most bitterly against the crude handling of Biblical texts. He claimed that bible text criticism must be left to men who have a critical faculty and who are masters of Hebrew style and syntax.

31
 "כל מי לא הכיר אמת ולא ראה אמת אינו אמת בדין, וחסדו,
 כי הנהגתו אמת ופניה במקרה המעולה, אמת אלהים בזה
 האמת וכלי אמת בזה אמת המעולה, וכלי אמת, וכלי אמת,
 חקירה אמת, אמת אמת המעולה, חלקו או חלקו בזה אמת אמת"

rationalism they did not understand the nature of religion which is essentially poetry. Likewise, in one of his letters to Sacks in 1842, he says: "The truth of the matter is that philosophy aims at the truth and religious worship seeks to arrive at goodness. Man is not only a rational being but also poetic. And the poetry is the essential thing in man, for that is life and the very soul of man. Therefore, religion was given to mankind as a means to bring forth and guide the poetic instinct in man which is inclined towards the Good Life. But if philosophy is to guide religion, both will inevitably stagnate."³³

And though Luzzato himself was an ardent student of philosophy and science, he had no regard for such scientists and philosophers³³ who regarded their study as a mere vocation that has nothing to do with the welfare or the progress of mankind. This sort of wisdom he denounced most vehemently, and he gives voice to his resentment to such dispassionate study even in his³⁴ poetry.

"Cursed be science if it teaches us only artifice and guile
But does not stimulate righteousness;
Perished be philosophy, perished be wisdom if kindness
And mercy does it remove and hatred and intrigue does it sow
To awaken jealousy and warfare.
No, only for this was wisdom and knowledge endowed
To sow peace and to plant kindness."

Disinterested study Luzzato regards to be truly Hellenic and he calls it Atticism, the entrance of which into Jewish literature he most strongly deplores. To him the essence of Judaism is Justice, truth, goodness, and self-abnegation, and whatever goes with them. He, therefore, does not

the purpose of hastening the first redemption, that is, the political emancipation. It cannot survive the emancipation of the Jews, or the death of those who studied the Torah and believed in God and Moses before they took lessons from Eichhorn and his disciples."

"The true science of Judaism, the science which will last as long as time itself, is that which is founded on the faith which endeavors to understand the Bible as a Divine work, and the history of a unique people whose lot has been unique, which finally dwells upon those moments in the various epochs of Jewish history when the innate Divine spirit in Judaism wages a conflict with the genius of humanity in general and masters it....For the day in which the positions shall be reversed and the spirit of humanity shall conquer that of Israel....that day will be the last in the life of our people." 36

We see thus in Luzzato's trend of thought the embryonic form of the idea of the "Mission of Israel" which was later on formulated by his Galician contemporary Nachman Krochmal and promulgated by the reform rabbis in Germany of the second generation. Luzzato was not, however, a chauvinist. He recognized the value of the Hellenic element in humanity which aims at the conquest of nature through exactness, preciseness and order in study, all of which are desirable qualities deserving to be emulated. 37 What he does object in Hellenism is to its ethics because it is based not on a divine passion for absolute justice but on a utilitarian philosophy of life. 38 It is the invasion of this Hellenic spirit into the study of Judaism which he so strongly deplored:

"When, my dear German scholars," he cries out vehemently. "when will the Lord open your eyes? How long will you fail to understand that, carried away by the general current, you are permitting national feeling to

become extinct and the language of our ancestors to fall into desuetude, and are thus preparing the way for the triumphant invasion of Atticism?.....For so long as you will allow our people to regard the aim of perfection no more than to become one with your environment and to be respected by their neighbors, so long as you are not filled with the Divine zeal for truth and for loyalty to your brethren, so long as you do not teach that the Good is not that which is visible to the eyes but that which is felt within the heart, and that the prosperity of our people is not dependent upon civil emancipation but upon the love of man for his neighbor....so long as you continue to say that the lands of France, Belgium and Holland are the promised lands for Israel....you will necessarily become in the end but hewers of wood and drawers of water."

39

Thus we see in Luzzato the beginnings of modern Jewish Nationalism, and of Cultural Zionism, which were later on taken over and developed by Peretz Smolenskin and Ahad Ha-am. He stimulated sentiment for Zion not only through his translations of Judah Halevi's Zion poems but also by a number of original poems on the love for Zion. He also advocated practical measures by which Palestine could be reestablished through colonization work. But to Luzzato Palestine colonization was not merely a means for political emancipation, he regarded the reestablishment of Palestine as being of universal importance in that the new Palestine will become a guide to the world towards social justice and righteousness.

40

41

"We must establish," he writes, "a school in every city (in Palestine) where the laws of Moses and the rabbis should be taught and from which there will go forth righteous judges to whom Jews and non-Jews alike will turn for advice, and from whom there will go forth a unified Torah of righteousness and truth."

42

We likewise find in Luzzato one of the earliest champions of

modern Hebrew as a spoken and literary language. He regarded the Hebrew language not only as a means for the preservation and the rejuvenation of Judaism, but as the only unifying bond of World Jewry.⁴³ He realized, however, the inadequacy of Biblical Hebrew for modern purposes and he, therefore, employed Talmudic and mediaeval words that are not found in the Bible, as well as foreign words wherever necessary. Moreover, he ~~coined~~ many new words and advocated the development of many Hebrew roots which ^{were} ~~have not been~~ developed in literature.⁴⁴ In this he anticipated Eliezer Ben Yehuda by more than a generation.

Luzzato could foresee the trend of (nineteenth century) Judaism better than any of his contemporaries, says Klausner, because the latter approached every Jewish problem from a rational point of view while Luzzato's views on Judaism sprang from a Jewish heart.⁴⁵

Luzzato's influence on every modern trend in Judaism is due not only to his works but also through his vast correspondence. He was in constant touch with such outstanding men like Rappaport, Munk, Krochmal, Reggio, Jost, Geiger, Albert Cohn, Zunz, Carmoly, Dukes, Fürst, Sachs, Letteris, Pinsker, Kayserling, Frankel, Graetz, Steinsneider, Kirchheim, Jellineck and many others.

3. The Galician School.

While Luzzato was the founder of the romantic movement in modern Judaism it was the gift of the Galician scholar Nachman Krochmal to furnish it a positive ideology. Nachman Krochmal was born at Brody, Galicia, February 17, 1786, and died at Tarnopol, July 31, 1840.⁴⁶ Nothing of importance is recorded of his youth, save that he entered the mercantile profession,

struggling at the same time to attain a rabbinic and secular education in the pursuit of which he encountered great obstacles. From the wonderful knowledge and brilliancy which he afterwards displayed, we may fairly assume that a large portion of his youth was spent in deep study and research. When barely fourteen he was married to a daughter of a wealthy merchant at Zolkiev in whose house he lived till 1808. In this period Krochmal became thoroughly acquainted with the outstanding Jewish philosophic works, particularly with Maimonides' "Moreh Nebuchim".⁴⁷

Krochmal studied also German and German philosophy with great avidity, particularly that of Kant. He likewise mastered Latin, French, Arabic, and Syriac. On account of feeble health, he went in 1808 to Lemberg for medical treatment and there he formed the intimate friendship with Solomon J. Rappaport, whose teacher he became and it is Krochmal's influence on the latter that proved most fruitful for the Science of Judaism. On his return to Zolkiev, he again took up German philosophy, reading Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and subsequently Hegel, whose system chiefly attracted him and exerted a great influence on his views. Krochmal led a sad life^{de} void of pleasures and filled to overflowing with privations, suffering and persecution. He led a retired life and while he lived nothing of his writings was published. On account of the precarious state of his health, he never left the small town where he was born. However, his house became the gathering place for young scholars who came from everywhere to profit from the fruit of his labor.⁴⁸ Among those who visited him frequently was Solomon J. Rappaport, whose relations to Krochmal, Schechter correctly defines as "Talmid Chaver". Indeed, says Schechter, Krochmal's method of teaching was rather that of a companion than that of a professor. He gave no set lectures on particular subjects, but conveyed his instructions

rather by means of suggestive conversations with his younger friends. His usual habit was to walk with his pupils in the neighborhood of the town, and to try to influence their minds each in accordance with his bent. 49

In 1814 his wife's parents died and he was compelled to earn a livelihood for himself as a merchant. He was not out out, however, for the business world and he failed miserably in his business. Things went from bad to worse and he was compelled in 1836 to seek a position as bookkeeper. In spite of failure in business, of poor circumstances and of loneliness he refused an invitation to the Rabbinate in Berlin for fear that the rabbinical office would deprive him of his intellectual freedom. 50

For a long time Krochmal could not be persuaded to publish any of the results of his studies. 51 His oral influence, however, was later on reinforced and perpetuated after his death by the publication of his only work, the "More Nebuche Ha-zman" (Lemberg 1851), edited according to the writer's last will by his friend Leopold Zunz. This work is divided into seventeen chapters or "studies", and they form for the most part unfinished sketches. The historical digressions in this book touch the profoundest problems of Jewish science, and it remains their indisputable merit to have paved the way for critical studies in Jewish history. The work really became, as intended by the author, a "guide" to students of Jewish science in the nineteenth century. 52

The first six studies of his book form a general introduction to the problems of religion. In these introductory chapters Krochmal indicates the opposite dangers to which men are liable in their religious thinking. On the one hand, men are exposed to emotionalism or extravagant phantasy (Schwärmerei), superstition (Aberglauben) and ceremonialism (Werkheiligkeit). On the other hand, some people in their endeavor to avoid these dangers fall

culture. Moreover, Judaism to him represented the quintessence of all Culture. Because while every culture in the world is particularistic and forms only a single item in Universal Culture, the Jewish Culture is universal in its nature and, therefore, represents that spiritual factor which strives towards the perfection of mankind. However, while Judaism always aspired to an absolute spiritual expression of universal significance it also sought to exist at the same time as an independent particular organization as all other cultures. 59

Like Hegel, Krochmal saw in the development of every culture the manifestation of the "Universal Reason" which follows an inevitable triad: the idea, the object, and the intelligence. In other words, each culture passes through the stage of youth, maturity, and then when it reaches the very height of its development it decays. For the organism of a people is just like that of an individual, whose spiritual capacity deteriorates in accordance with the weakening of its physical strength. The only difference is that when a people disappears it dies only politically, spiritually every culture is immortal because its values become universal property. 60 The Jewish people, however, presents a unique phenomenon in world history, for as a bearer of a culture, universalistic in nature, it goes through phoenix-like successive resurrections which follow an ascendent progression, and tend to the spiritually Absolute and thus render it an external progression. 61

Hence, though Judaism has lost its political milieu, it succeeded to exist as a unique entity; consequently, its existence is no longer conditional on place or time. 62 Judaism succeeded to reach this lofty stage only after a long succession of experiments and spiritual trials. The Jewish people also began at first as a natural nation like any other people. In time, however, the spiritual element in it prevailed and it is that element which

saved it from inevitable decay. Moreover, while the political experiment of Israel in Palestine was a pronounced failure, its spiritual life in the Diaspora proved to be extremely successful.

"אדם כל החסידים הזה קמץ אל ימי הקדש והואשן הנח
 נחבש יתב בואמה היוכל כל הגאולות שכן צדמות רחמיאל
 נדבש גפלה שגירה אשה אהלם בכל רוח חכמה אברה, רוח
 צדק אגילה רוח פער אורא פ'... יד מתחנקה והחורה ביד
 כל גולה אגולה ואמורה אהילת אשה אה, כל יתרה נשי
 פועל זה קומצות מקורה. כל זה המראה דגפלה שכן
 מה שמתן בו יום שחלום אלו גלות, כח קאה אלו
 הדגמה מכלל המנה (פסיכא) --- הן שמה העם
 שמתדי רחמיאל האמה עד שגיר מה אלו רחמיאל ביד
 ה' אהלם מנצח."

Most of the second half of Krochmal's work is devoted to studies in Jewish history which illustrate through historic facts the main thesis outlined in the first nine chapters. It would lead us far afield to give a thorough discussion of Krochmal's work and outlook upon Judaism, though it is of outmost importance for the understanding of every movement in Judaism and of Reform Judaism in particular. We will only attempt to sum up his philosophy of Judaism which later on became the basis of the whole ideology of the Reform movement in Germany. And though some of his points of view regarding the destiny of Judaism and of the Jewish people have been misunderstood or exaggerated by many reform rabbis, as to render them grotesque, they are in the main still valid in the light of modern Jewish history.

Krochmal regarded every people as a cultured organism which was also a distinct manifestation of Universal reason. Every cultural organism

is subject to the laws of growth and decay; hence, we have the rise and decline of nations. Every national organism has a distinct faculty, unique to its group, which accounts for the particularistic tendency in each nation. Once that faculty reaches its highest attainment the group no longer feels the urge for its existence as such. The Jewish people began its existence like any other people as a narrow particularistic cultural organism, but its men of genius have conceived for it a universal function, namely, the attainment of the Spiritual Absolute (*ה'אמת האמיתית*). While the Jews lived as a political entity in Palestine, the national aspect of their lives was so strong that it obscured their spiritual gift. It is only with the destruction of the Temple and with the dispersion in the Diaspora that the spiritual gift of the Jewish people came to prominence, being as it was the only common bond left to the for self-preservation. Hence, it was the extreme particularistic tendency of the Jewish people that led them to uphold their national gift which is universalistic in nature, and it is the latter, in turn, which strengthens the particularistic existence of the Jewish people. ✓

Hence, Krochmal was the first modern Jewish scholar to regard Jewish life in the Diaspora not as a divine punishment or as an unfortunate historic episode but rather as the greatest blessing to the Jewish people and to the world at large, because it is only in the Diaspora that Judaism found its highest expression. For only as Judaism succeeded in transcending its national existence in Palestine that it became an eternal, universal and spiritual phenomenon, independent of time and space. The ceremonial and legalistic laws are to Krochmal only the particularistic aspects of Judaism which like all particularistic manifestations are subject to the law of growth and decay; hence, are transitory and changeable. Only the central idea of

Judaism, the Spiritual Absolute, is eternal. Hence, the continued existence of the Jewish people is secured only in corresponding to its attachment to the Absolute, i.e., to its religious ideals.

Krochmal's philosophy of Judaism, stressing as it does its eternal spiritual factor as against its transitory form, and rendering as it does the particularistic existence of the Jewish people in the Diaspora of universal significance, could readily become the ideology of the intellectual leaders of Reform whose chief aim was to preserve the group life of the Jew in the Diaspora and give it a modern form as well as a universal aim.

Thus we find this ideology reached in most of the works of Geiger who understood Krochmal better than any one of his German contemporaries. In his "Nachgelassene Schriften", urging the necessity for reforms in the light of Jewish History, Geiger says as follows: "Every era in the history of Judaism is of importance; the present can break with the past as little as any separate limb can disassociate itself from the body without suffering serious injury. Such a connection with the past means not the dominance of dead custom but the persistence of living idea which permeates all ages with its vigor, and if it leads to different developments this does not
64
justify a disregard for its origins."

And though Ahad Ha-am condemns this outlook upon Judaism as an
65
ideology created by men who seek to escape their duties as Jews, he accepts it unconsciously in toto when he makes the national ethical idea of Judaism, independent of ceremonial or legalistic expression, as the central point of
66
Jewish existence in the Diaspora.

Consequently, both reform Judaism, as expounded by Geiger, and Spiritual Zionism, as expounded by Ahad Ha-am, find their common origin in Krochmal's writings and oral teachings.

Solomon Judah Rappaport (1790-1867).

What Krochmal conceived philosophically Solomon Judah Rappaport sought to establish scientifically. Rappaport was born at Lemberg of a family of rabbis. His studies were purely rabbinic, but his alert mind grasped every opportunity of acquiring other knowledge and in this incidental way he became familiar first with French and then with German. His first literary work consists of poems, translations and essays of a light character. His critical talent, however, soon revealed itself. In 1824, he wrote for "Bikkure Ha-ittim" an article on the independent Jewish tribes of Arabia and Abyssinia. ⁶⁷ Already in this article Rappaport reveals the patriotic motive in his work. His aim is not to deal with antiquarian material for scholarly purposes, but to throw light upon the past of his people. In his preface to the article, he pleads that all the other Jewish scholars should follow in his footsteps.

"שמעתי אחי אשתי! כל איש מכם אשר לא הפליק לבו מעליו וזכרו
והזכור, ולא נתק מוסכית הדברים, וקשרו בזה כל בני ישראל
איש במהלו, אשר לאו בקלות החל דבר ויהא מעל וכל הקורות
והזכור לא בני. ומהו בוסכיות החוקות ואמאנים שונים
בפניהם לא רח אבאגים ימצא נחמ ישר אצל וישם וג עקבות
מאמאם, אשר המורה עליהם פה, ואולי ימצאו אחרים לאו
במקומם המורה, ואמצא את המצא מאתו לאו, כי אף
ישו חכם מכל ארצו בית ישראל, ואמאם סג לאו מאמאם
אברהם אשר בקרואם לאו גס אתו ובמאמאם המורה."

In 1829, Rappaport published in the same journal a much more important historic essay on Saadya Gaon and his period. In this essay Rappaport displays an unusual historical critical acumen to be compared only with that of Azariah de Rossi. Luzzato, upon reading this essay became full of

enthusiasm for his Polish colleague and in one of his letters to him he greets
68 him as "a man after his own heart." Rappaport continued enthusiastically his

historic research and soon published the biographies of R. Nathan (author of
69 the Aruch), Hai Gaon, Eliezer Ha-kalir, R. Hananel, and A. Nissim. 70 These

biographical works which, followed by many others, were of greatest importance
for they were lauded and acknowledged by Jewish and Christian scientific

71 scholars as mines of information. His profound knowledge of Talmudic lit-
erature and its sequel in the tenth and eleventh centuries, coupled with crit-

ical acumen enabled him to reassemble the scattered data from sources known or
recently discovered. Thus he revitalized eminent figures in the past by

evaluating their significance in the nexus of events, and by introducing into

Jewish history the notion of development, or to use a more modern expression,

"the concept of historic evolution". Thus in a letter to Luzzato, who opposed

the study of Greek philosophy, Rappaport insisted that Judaism has borrowed

from the environment in every age all that it could absorb and that in this

assimilative faculty consists the excellency of the Jewish spirit. It always

knew how to assimilate the best from the environment in order to bring it

back to the world in a more purged form. Rappaport believes that were it not

for the constant revitalization from foreign cultures Judaism would have

72 stagnated long ago.

"אניני אורח חיים דאס דערפאר, צו זיין, אז דערמאנט אונז
באר? צו איר דער פאר איר אונז. נאך די פראגן אונז
זא אקרא איר פרייט אונז יא, דערפאר אונז אז דערמאנט
באר דערמאנט דערפאר? דערפאר בן און פאר אונז אונז
איר יא? דערמאנט די דערמאנט די דערמאנט אונז אונז

תמיד לבדו מלי קרות מאלה מציין ומריא? אחרת יתכן
 כדרכו ההתנחלה פועלת צליל בן יתכן, כי פסחא יתכן
 פל קדו, אצל, אצלן מבי נאמא מלך פה אצל פה ממקלן
 לעבד נביא מלכין אחרים אצל הממלכות תורתו השליטה
 השליטה והמלכות לעבד אצל יתכן יתכן אצל יתכן
 כלם אצלן מלך בלדו יתכן מלך פל. אחרת כדרכו
 אצלן מלך מלך מלכין, במלכותו אצלן מלך אצלן מלך
 אצל מלך (מלכות מלכין) אצל מלך אצלן אצלן
 אצל מלך מלך מלכין אצלן מלך מלכין אצלן
 אצל מלך מלכין אצלן מלך מלכין אצלן
 אצל מלך מלכין אצלן מלך מלכין אצלן
 אצל מלך מלכין אצלן מלך מלכין אצלן

Hence, we see here in Rappaport the idea of the "mission of
 Israel" in the Diaspora as expounded by Krochmal established in historic facts.
 Like the latter, Rappaport regarded the dispersion of the Jewish people in the
 Diaspora to be not a curse but a blessing, and not only to Israel alone but to
 the world at large; that through the dispersion Israel was saved from decay
 by the revitalization that resulted from assimilating foreign cultures; and
 that Judaism thus revitalized was able to exert greater influence upon the
 world in spreading the ethical content of Judaism.

Most every historian seems to agree with Graetz that what gave
 especial value to the critical works of Rappaport and distinguished them
 from the pedantry of the rationalist school was the fervor and love with which
 they were undertaken. Rappaport's emotional fervor produced a richness of
 content which made his works incomparably superior to those of the rationalists
 of the type of Isaac Marcus Jost who approached their work with scientific

detachment. It is exactly what the latter signally failed to understand that Rappaport fully comprehended--namely, that the past must be judged by its own standards, that each age developed that which was necessary for the safeguarding of Jewish life and existence, and that Jewish history, like the history of every other people, is a sequence of unfoldments each standing in relation to that which preceded it. Rappaport approached the story of his people from within and Graetz, therefore, regarded his works as national performances. ✓

It was unfortunate that such a great scholar had to support himself through farming the meat-tax and even this humble source of livelihood was taken away from him by his fanatical enemies who persecuted him because of his scientific heresies. With the aid of his friend Zunz and Luzzatto he endeavored to secure a rabbinate in Berlin or in Italy; but for a position in the former he was not sufficiently proficient in German and for one in the latter he had not the required university diploma. ⁷³ The intellectual Jews of Brody, ⁷⁴ therefore, established a business and made Rappaport its superintendent.

Finally, through the endeavor of the enlightened party at Tarnopol, Galicia, ⁷⁵ Rappaport was appointed as Rabbi there in 1837. Two years later he became Rabbi of Prague. ⁷⁶ Rappaport's life in the rabbinate, however, was not a very cheerful one because he would not allow the fanatic heresy-hunters to intimidate him. But in spite of all the bitter persecution directed against him from all sides, Rappaport never lost his scientific courage to defend openly the truth recognized by him as such. Particularly, did he bring upon himself the hatred of the fanatics by a pamphlet "Ner Mitzvah" which was directed ⁷⁷ against the Hassidim and their wonder-working rabbis.

Rappaport was a prolific writer and all his works have a direct or an indirect influence upon the modern trend in Judaism. It would be

impossible to give even a passing mention of his outstanding works. We will dwell, therefore, only on those works which had a direct relation to the movement for reform. Rappaport, though most radical in scientific research, was most conservative in his views on religious practice. And though he fought all his life for Haskalah, he was most vehemently opposed to that sort of enlightenment which in his view led only to assimilation. Thus he led a most rigorous campaign against Joshua Heshel Schorr, the editor of the "He Halutz", and against Judah Miseses, the author of "Kinot Ha-Amet". He opposed with the same vigorousness the reform ideas of Germany, for he believed that they would inevitably split the people into sects, and sow the seed of disunion which in turn would result in indifference to national institutions. He likewise fought all his life against the ideas of Geiger. In a pamphlet entitled "Or Torah" Rappaport wrote a most scathing criticism of Geiger's masterpiece "Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel" (Dresslau 1857). And though the severity of his criticism is conceded by many to be unjustifiable, it must be stated in justice to Rappaport that his opposition to Geiger was not due to the latter's liberalism in Bible criticism but rather to the "reform tendenz" which is apparent in Geiger's work and which, he claims, has led Geiger to force many Biblical verses out of their context.

78

79

80

81

82

83

"כי אלהי ישראל אחד והקדוש אחד נפלא בעתותיו רבים ורחוקים אחד
מבית רק בעל אחד או אלהים אחדים -- אלהי ישראל אחד
אחד העל והקדוש אחד תפלות (שלוש) (רמב"ם אמונה).
ואיך יערע לנו אומר בדתנו כי אלהי אחד ואין אלוהים אחרים
להתקדש אחר אלהי פתח של השופטים כפי פניו אלה
הקדוש".

Rappaport's wrath against the reformers found their full sway
84
in his pamphlet "Tochachat Megulah" directed against the reform rabbis who
convened in Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1845. The pamphlet is a very strong
plea for conservatism in the reform movement, and will be treated later on
85
in connection with the Brunswick Conference. And while Rappaport derided
most mercilessly the extreme reformers he was at the same time just as strongly
opposed to the neo-orthodoxy of Samson Raphael Hirsh. When the latter accused
Zechariah Frankel of departing from traditional Judaism in his Talmudic work
"Darke ha-Mishna", Rappaport published a pamphlet entitled "Libre Sholom
V'Emet", in which he defended most ardently the religious position of Zechariah
Frankel by proving conclusively that though the views expressed in that work
86
are unorthodox, they are based nevertheless on sound traditional principles.
In this pamphlet Rappaport showed clearly that he had little sympathy for
that German neo-orthodoxy which was headed by Samson Raphael Hirsh. The
controversy with the latter embittered greatly Rappaport's life in his old
age.

Thus we see the man fighting on all fronts and with equal zeal
and truthfulness. At times his attacks were rather personal and severe, yet
always frank and candid. In Galicia, he fought against the obscurantism of
the Hassidim and against the irreverent levity of the Maskilim; in Germany
he fought against the irrationality of neo-orthodoxy and against the rational-
ism of the reformers; in the science of Judaism he fought the radicalism of
Joshua Herschel Schorr and against the undue conservatism of Samuel David
Luzzatto. As far as his religious views are concerned, Rappaport upheld the
position taken by Zechariah Frankel whom he defended most ardently on every

occasion. He is thus greatly responsible for the advance of the conservative trend in the Reform Movement in Germany.

VI

HISTORIC JUDAISM

1. The Challenge of Neo-Orthodoxy.

The intensive penetration into the history of Judaism by Zunz and Jost in Germany, and by Reggio and Luzzatto in Italy, and by Krochmal and Rappaport in Galicia, ushered in a new tendency into the Reform movement. Thus in the latter half of the fourth decade in the nineteenth century, the reform leaders began to realize that it is not enough to negate certain phases of orthodoxy, but that they must also create some positive ideology to replace that which has been discarded. But the immediate cause that forced the leaders of Reform to formulate a positive ideology was the fact that orthodoxy itself, in spite of its static character, began to assume unconsciously a different complexity which in turn compelled the leaders of Reform to assume a more serious attitude towards orthodoxy. For in the beginning of the fourth decade we meet already with orthodox rabbis in Germany who combine a thorough Rabbinic training and a profound secular education, and who are imbued at the same time with modern German culture. These men came out boldly and unequivocally in their attack upon the Reform movement not with silly casuistry nor with words of abuse, but with the weapons of modern culture.

It would lead us far afield to give an adequate account of the neo-orthodox movement in Germany. We will only mention a few of its representative leaders: Hakam Isaac Bernays (Mayence 1792-Hamburg 1849),¹ Solomon Flessner (1797-Posen 1868),² Jacob Ettlinger (Carlsruhe 1798-Altona 1871),³ Samson Raphael Hirsch (Hamburg 1808-Frankfurt-on-the-Main 1888),⁴ Jehiel Michael Sachs (Glogau 1808-Berlin 1864),⁵ Benjamin Hirsh Auerbach (Nemvied

6
1808-Halberstadt 1872).

These men were imbued with the historic-romantic thought of Herder, and with that of Appaport and Luzzatto, and they could point out to the shallowness and the weakness of the extreme rationalism of the reformers. Thus Jacob Ettlinger established in 1845 the first organ of orthodox Judaism, "Der Zion wächter" with a Hebrew supplement *הציון* *החדש* *החדש* in which the reformers were strongly attacked. He also established a modern school which was attended by a great many students preparing for the rabbinate, many of whom became modern leaders of orthodoxy, equipped with rabbinic and secular knowledge, the most prominent of whom was Israel Hildesheimer (Halberstadt 1820-Berlin 1899).

7
Likewise, Hakam Bernays began to reform the Talmud Torah schools in Hamburg. And while formerly the children were taught there only Hebrew and arithmetic, he introduced as important parts of the curriculum courses in German, natural sciences, geography and history. On the other hand, among the orthodox most powerful orators, Solomon Flessner waged a most effective battle against the reformers. In his extreme ^{by}orthodox sermons he adopted the expressions of the most eminent Christian preachers of the time, interspersing his sentences with verses from Schiller and Goethe. During the same period, Samson Raphael Hirsh, who was at the time chief rabbi of Oldenburg, published his "Neunzehn Briefe über Judentum" (Altona 1836). This work made a profound impression in German Jewish circles because it was something new--a brilliant, intellectual presentation of orthodox Judaism in classic German, and a fearless uncompromising defense of all its institutions and ordinances. From the appearance of these "Letters" dates the origin of the so-called Neo-Orthodoxy in Germany.

2. The New Tendency in the Reform Movement.

This new challenge of modern orthodoxy in Germany and the literary influence of the Hebrew scientific periodicals outside of Germany ushered in a new tendency in the Reform movement. For its leaders began to realize that the solution does not lie merely in external reforms but in a thorough revaluation of Judaism in the light of its newly rediscovered past.

This new historic tendency among the reformers gave rise to two distinct schools. The one which could be best termed as the liberal school chief among whom were Geiger and Holsheim, and the other the traditional school the chief exponent of which was Zechariah Frankel. The program of the liberal school is best defined in the words of Geiger: "The problem of the hour is this--to determine what are the spirit and the teachings, the doctrines and the duties of life peculiar to Judaism and inherent in it," for "we wish to be, we should be, children of our time, and as children of the age we must strive to realize for our contemporaries the true standpoint of Judaism, which has never been content to be a faith divorced from life or a practice at variance with belief."⁸

In other words, Geiger sought to apply in practical life the results of the Science of Judaism. He sought to determine ^{the} research and investigation, what Krachmal called the inherent spirit, of Judaism and to bring it in harmony with the challenged conditions of the environment and time in which the people were placed. And although Geiger also recognized the necessity of external reforms in the service, and strongly advocated them, yet to him they were only incidents, but not the ¹⁰ essence of reform. Geiger's program was to establish reforms on a scientific basis, to investigate the validity of every doctrine and every form, to determine which religious

institutions had outlived their usefulness and were only hindering the religious life of the people by being in conflict with the spirit and the needs of the time.
11

Zechariah Frankel, like Geiger, also maintained that reason, based on scientific scholarship, and not the whims of the laity, must be the justification for reforms. Frankel realized, however, that the life of a people is not guided by logic, but by sentiment, and that if any reform is extremely objectionable to the sentiment of the masses, one must disregard logical consistency and give in to the feelings of the masses. And though Frankel was just as scientifically minded as Geiger, he would not allow his scientific conclusions to be the sole arbiters, instead he would take into consideration the people's romantic love for the past and its institutions. This sympathy with mass sentiment made Frankel the typical expounder of the traditional or conservative school in reform which became known as the "Breslau school".
12

These two distinct tendencies in the Reform movement as represented by Geiger and Frankel came to a definite clash in the controversies of the New Hamburg Prayer Book of 1842,
13
and of the Frankfurt-on-Main rabbinical conference (July 15th-28th, 1845).
14
From that last clash dates the origin of the conservative trend in Reform Judaism. A study, therefore, of the lives and characteristics of Geiger and Frankel is indispensable for the understanding of the further development of the two distinct trends in Reform Judaism, namely, the radical and the conservative.

15
c. Abraham Geiger - The radical historic school.

Geiger was born at Frankfurt-on-the-Main in 1800 and died at

Berlin in 1874. His father was Rabbi Michael Lazarus Geiger. When a mere infant of three years Abraham Geiger mastered the Hebrew and German alphabets. At four he took up the study of Mishna. At six his father introduced him into the Talmud. At the age of thirteen he acquired a good Talmudic training, and at the same time a desultory knowledge of history, latin and Greek. After the death of his father Geiger continued his Talmudic and secular studies under the guidance of his brothers and other teachers. His religious views, however, underwent a great change, partly as a consequence of his reading, partly as a result of the influence of his associates. When the choice of his profession was considered, he disregarded the wishes of his family who expected him to become a Rabbi, and chose to study oriental philology. In 1829, he entered the University of Heidelberg, where he remained one semester, devoting his time to courses in the classics while privately mastering Syriac. He also continued working on a grammar and a glossary of the Mishna which he had begun two years earlier. The next semester he went to Bonn to study Arabic. Here he met and became intimate with S. R. Hirsén who became subsequently his colleague and opponent, and who influenced him in many directions. Here Geiger founded among a number of Jewish scholars a society for the practise of preaching, and it was to this society that Geiger preached his first sermon (Jan. 21, 1830). Later the exercises consisted of regular divine services.

While a student at Bonn, he prepared his essay on the Jewish elements in the Koran, in competition for a prize offered by the faculty. 16
In 1832, Geiger preached at Hanau as a candidate for its vacant pulpit, but he did not succeed in being elected. In the same year, after he received the prize for his essay on Mohammed, he was called as Rabbi to Wiesbaden, where he stayed until 1838. While there, he introduced certain changes in the

synagogal services with a view of heightening their impressiveness, and he did his utmost to induce the government to amend the laws affecting the civic standing of the Jews. A plan to publish a Jewish theological review soon took root in Geiger's mind. It was carried into effect in 1833 when he began to publish his "Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für Jüdische Theologie" (1833-1838). Through this periodical he was brought into close relations with Zunz and Rapaport. Among the articles published in this periodical the one entitled "Ueber die Errichtung einer Jüdisch-Theologischen Fakultät" merits special mention. It pleads for the recognition of the Science of Judaism and for the placing of Theology on an equality with other sciences in method and freedom. In 1834, the University of Marburg conferred on Geiger the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. While in Weissbaden he succeeded in bringing together a number of rabbis (1837) for the purpose of discussing measures of vital concern to Judaism. In 1838, he resigned his office and he was thereupon asked to preach in Breslau where the office of associate rabbi to S. A. Tiktin became vacant. Rabbi Tiktin, in order to forestall this, invoked the intervention of the police on the plea that the king had prohibited German sermons in the synagogue. But the chief of police, Heineke, was a man of liberal ideas and he did not
17
prevent Geiger from preaching. Geiger's sermon led to his election. He was chosen "Rabbinatsassessor" and second rabbi. The first years in his new office at Breslau were disturbed by the agitations against him by S. A. Tiktin and his partisans who resorted to all sorts of schemes to induce the government to depose Geiger. This led to the publication of a vast polemical literature on
18
what is known as the Geiger-Tiktin affair. After the death of Rabbi Tiktin (1843) Geiger became the first rabbi, but the factions in the congregation became so intolerable that in 1849 two congregations were constituted, one with

Geiger as rabbi, the other with G. Tiktin the son of S. A. Tiktin. Geiger's congregation willingly sustained their leader in his efforts to reconstruct the ritual on a modern basis. In 1854 his prayer book *"ספר התפלה דברי אהרן דאורייתא"* "Israelitisches Gebetbuch" (Bresslau 1854) was officially adopted. The underlying principles of this prayer book Geiger formulated in 1849 in his "Grund-¹⁹ züge und Plan zu einem Neuen Gebetbuche".

While in Bresslau Geiger often took the occasion to emphasize his religious views in his "Judische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben", the editorials of which are for the most part dedicated to the exposition of reform principles. From the year 1844 Geiger became the outstanding personality in the movement for reforms, and he defended its principles as historian, journalist and preacher. As a historian, Geiger fought bitterly the radical²⁰ program of the "Frankfort Reform Verein", for he stood for gradual evolution.

Thus in all of his historic works Geiger sought to establish the view that Judaism is not a given quantity nor a national law but that it is a process still in flux; tradition itself was the result of this continuous process of growth. The theory of the evolution in Judaism, to which Krochmal arrived through philosophic study, Geiger, like Rappaport, sought to establish on the²¹ basis of a thorough scientific investigation. Moreover, Geiger applied this

principle of evolution also to Biblical and Talmudic researches and because of²² this he aroused against him the antagonists of Graetz and Rappaport. Likewise, Jewish mediaeval literature engaged his attention, and he published a series of scientific editions and translations of medieval literature and biographies and studies of their creators. Thus he published in his "Melo Chofnaim" (Berlin[✓] 1840) and his "Nite Naamanim" (Bresslau 1847) which are studies in the literature and in the men of letters of the Middle Ages. He edited scientifically

the "Igereth Ha-shmad" by Maimonides (Bresslau 1850). He wrote a treatise on the exegetical school of northern France entitled "Parschanaata" (Leipsig 1855). He published a scientific edition of Hebrew poetry in Spain and in Italy which he called "Zizim U-prochim" (Leipsig 1856). He also contributed articles to most of the Hebrew scientific periodicals of the time. These Hebrew articles of Geiger had a tremendous influence upon the advance of liberal thought among the Jews of Galicia, Lithuania and Russia. For though they were essentially scientific and historic essays, they touched upon the most vital problems concerning Biblical and Oral traditions and pointed to the evolutionary process in Jewish Law. Particularly is that true of his articles in the "He-Halutz" (VI:13) and in the "Ozar-Nehmad" (III:1f.) concerning the main thesis of his "Urshrift",²⁴ wherein he discusses the controversies between the Pharisees and the Sadducees and between the Samaritans and the Judeans. In these articles Geiger set forth briefly and at times casually his underlying view of the development of tradition, namely, that the growing Jewish religious consciousness is already reflected in the readings of the Biblical text. He also proved the absolute falsity of the ^{current} notions concerning Pharisees and Sadducees. He was the first one to point out that the Pharisees comprised the people, the aristocracy of learning, and the men of piety, and that they always stood for progress in religion; while the Sadducees were the aristocrats by birth and the sacerdotalists who were opposed to any modification of the Law. In the Malakah itself Geiger distinguished between the younger and the older, and in the latter, according to his view, is reflected a divergence of opinions within Pharisaism itself. It is this distinction that throws light on the oldest documents of post-Biblical literature, namely, the Mekilta, Sifra and Sifre.

as presented by Geiger in his "Urshrift" as well as in his

Hebrew periodical particles, Judaism represents the full expression of the higher life of the people. Thus ideas and institutions in Judaism came to be that had not been before; hence, they were subject to change and in turn could pass away and be replaced by newer modes of expression. It is no wonder then that whenever Geiger's Hebrew essays reached, particularly in the centres of Hebrew learning in Eastern Europe, they exerted a tremendous influence in undermining the rigid orthodox ideology. For his articles elevated Judaism above the fixity of the written Law and pointed out to its capacity for new development.

4. Zechariah Frankel - The Traditional Historic School.

Zechariah Frankel was born at Prague in 1801 and died at Breslau in 1875. He was a descendant of an old Rabbinical family in Austria, famous for its Talmudic learning. Frankel received his Talmudic training at the Yeshiva of Bezalel Ronsperg. In 1825, he went to Budapest where he prepared himself for the University from which he graduated in 1831. In the following year he was appointed by the government as "Kreisrabiner" of Leitmeritz, being the first Rabbi of Bohemia with a modern education. In 1836, he was called to Dresden where he held the office of Rabbi until 1854 when he was called to the presidency of the Breslau Seminary. There he remained until his death.

Frankel's literary career began rather late. All his scientific treatises dating from 1847 to 1859 were published in German and most of his studies had a political motive in that they aimed either to abolish civic discrimination against the Jews or ingrained prejudices against Judaism. It was only when he assumed the leadership of the Breslau Seminary that his Hebrew literary career began. His duties as professor of Talmudic literature

showed him the necessity of modern scientific text books on Rabbinical literature and archeology. There he published in 1859 his "Darke ha-Mishna" with a supplement and index under the title of "Tosofot u-Mafteah le-Sefer Darke ha-Mishna" (1867). This book caused a great storm and created quite a large polemical literature. In this work, Frankel sought to establish scientifically that not everything which is called a "law", and which is reputed to be an "halaka l'Moshe m'Sinai" was actually of Mosaic origin. On the contrary, he contended that most of the rabbinic traditions are of human origin and that many of their enactments were decided upon by certain devices common in parliamentary bodies.²⁶ The first attack against Frankel began with the letter of Rabbi Gottlieb Fisher published in S. R. Hirsch's "Jeshuran" (1860). S. R. Hirsch himself began in the following year a series of articles in which he accused Frankel of heresy in that he denied the divine origin of the Oral Law. Though Rappaport was not wholly in accord with Frankel's view, he published his "Libre Shalom ve'emet" attacking Hirsch's fanaticism and defending Frankel's main point of view.²⁷ This defense of Rappaport called forth another criticism of Frankel's work from Rabbi Solomon Klein of Colmar, France, who criticized it severely in his "Mipne Koshet" (Frankfort-on-the-Main 1861) and also in his reply to Rappaport entitled "Ha'emet Ve Hoshalom Anehu" (ibid).²⁸ Benjamin H. Auerbach of Halberstadt also sided with Frankel's opponents defending the view of the divine origin of Rabbinical law.²⁹

Though Frankel wrote many other treatises in Hebrew which are of great scientific value it would be out of place to discuss them here, for we are interested primarily in Frankel as a reformer. Frankel, as the man of the "Golden Mean" sought to uphold a conciliatory attitude and he therefore met with opposition from the extreme reformers like Geiger and Holdheim, and from

the leaders of neo-Orthodoxy like S. R. Hirsch and J. M. Sachs. And while in the main Frankel's position was the most wholesome for the future development of liberal Judaism, he was, nevertheless, guilty of many inconsistencies and equivocations. Thus when challenged, during the controversy over his "Darke na-Mishna", to state his religious views and to define what "tradition" meant to him, Frankel answered with too vague an explanation, evading a clear definition and failing to give an outspoken exposition of his views. ³⁰ Even Bernfeld who is a staunch supporter of the conservative position of Frankel, admits that in his polemic in the Prayer Book controversy he was guilty of evasion and of equivocation.

VII

THE CULMINATION OF REFORM JUDAISM IN GERMANY

1. The Prayerbook Controversy of 1842.

In 1842 the Hamburg Temple became again a storm center. For in 1839 a committee had been appointed to revise the prayerbook used by the congregation, that it might conform more to tradition and be acceptable to every modern Jew. In 1841 when the revised edition entitled "Seder Mo-Abodah" was published, Hakam Isaac Bernays the chief Rabbi of the orthodox community at Hamburg issued a proclamation (נ/א/א) warning all Israelites not to use the book and declaring that any one doing so would fall short in his duty as a Jew. This brought forth a counter declaration from the Temple officers, rebuking Bernays for his presumptuous act. Both these documents were ordered removed from the synagogue by the Senate of the city. This unprecedented act of Bernays caused such a commotion that the Temple directorate found it necessary to secure from accredited theological authorities favorable opinions in regard to the new prayerbook. The position of Mechariah Frankel in this controversy called forth particular attention. Frankel rebuked Bernays for his arbitrary action and pointed out the harm which might be caused to the unity of Israel by such procedures. On the other hand, Frankel criticized the editors of the prayerbook for not taking sufficiently into consideration popular sentiment and for indulging in unauthorized eclecticism in the omission and in the insertion of prayers. Thus Frankel's opinion in the matter displeased both parties; the liberals were dissatisfied because Frankel, instead of merely declaring that their prayerbook was in accord with Jewish tradition, pointed out inconsistencies from the historic and dogmatic point of view; on the other

hand, the orthodox were dissatisfied because he declared that changes in the traditional ritual are permissible.²

It would not have been worth while to dwell on this 1841 edition of the Hamburg Prayerbook were it not for the important consequences that ensued therefrom. For, as Berenfeld pointed out, the 1841 Hamburg Prayerbook is so conservative in its form that with but a few trifling details it could have been well defended on the ground of the most rigid interpretation of the "Shulhan Aruk".³ But due to Bernays' arbitrary action, this prayerbook became the cause for a controversial literature which was the beginning of the analytical approach to Jewish theology. For though the publication of the 1819 Hamburg Prayerbook caused a considerable literature as to doctrines of faith, it cannot compare with the 1842 controversy which was based on a more profound study of Judaism and elevated to a much higher intellectual level.

For our purpose, therefore, we may regard the Prayerbook chiefly ✓ as a formulation of theological doctrines. For it is the controversy over the theological implications of the prayerbook that led to the clarification of the divergent trends among the intellectual Jews of Europe during the second half of the nineteenth century. The chief point of controversy was that the prayerbook denied basic Jewish doctrines, notably the doctrines of a personal Messiah, of bodily resurrection, of the restoration of the Temple in Jerusalem and its sacrificial cult, and of the redemption of all Israel in Palestine. Dr. G. Salomon in his essay, "The New Prayer Book and its Persecution", defended the position of the editors towards the Messianic prayers in that they do not believe that the restoration of Palestine is conditioned by the bodily personal presence of each and every Israelite in the land of Palestine. We can desire with all our hearts the re-establishment of an unfortunate fatherland; we can

even make supplication to God for this, and become enthusiastic for the idea; and together with this we can remain in the land wherein Divine providence has placed us, continue to live there and obey, serve, and give allegiance to its ruling powers." ⁴ As to the inconsistencies which Zecharian Frankel pointed out regarding the prayers that have references to sacrificial cult, the editors correctly pointed out that they cannot deny Jewish history. Those prayers which refer to the sacrificial cult in the past, they had to leave untouched, but those that refer to the restoration of this cult in the future they omitted because it is contrary to all rationality.

⁵ Thus even Isaac Noah Mannheimer, the famous preacher of Vienna, who was extremely conservative, had the following to say in regard to the attitude of the editors to the sacrificial cult: "Although I usually plead for historical continuity and tradition, yet I cannot but agree with the stand taken by the authors of the book in the matter of the omission of prayers for the re-institution of the sacrifice; they have merely expressed what all modern enlightened theologians think, even such as cling with all their hearts to the inherited traditions and forms; I am one of those who do not rationalize the Messianic belief; I believe in and defend the national interpretation of this hope and hope for a national restoration; yet I am free to openly confess that the re-institution of the bloody sacrificial ritual does not form part and parcel of these hopes and promises; see the many expressions of the prophets, the sages, notably Maimonides who declares that the sacrifices were intended ⁶ only for the childhood of Israel's development."

On the other hand, Geiger attacked the editors of the Prayerbook for not being consistent enough in their rationalism. Particularly did he criticize them for their adherence to the expediency of the Via Media.

Geiger contended that if we pray for the return to Palestine and for the restitution of the Temple there, it implies that we wish to return to Palestine and to enjoy its bliss. He, therefore, held that all such prayers which imply the return to Palestine or the sacrificial cult should be entirely omitted. Instead, he said, we ought to rejoice and be thankful to Providence for having opened our eyes to understand that true worship does not require sacrifices. In regard to the re-institution of the Hebrew prayers, replacing their German translations of the 1819 edition, Geiger says that it was an unwise procedure because Hebrew is no longer understood by the masses. In his opinion, the ritual should be as much as possible in the vernacular which is understood by everybody.⁷ The reading of the Torah, Geiger contended, should also be in the vernacular as at least it be read in Hebrew and translated into German. He also criticizes them for re-introducing the daily ritual into the Prayerbook thus upholding the editors of the 1819 edition who claimed that public worship is only obligatory on Sabbaths and Holidays. Geiger also vehemently criticizes the leaders of the Temple for pretending officially to adhere to Talmudic tradition while they privately and publicly violate it, thus only creating a chasm between life and creed. He concludes his criticism with an appeal to the leaders of the Temple to stand in the foremost ranks of the reform movement and not be content with some superficial reforms in the Prayerbook, but instead attempt at a harmonious reconciliation of life and creed. For after all, the aim of the reform movement is not to introduce a few liturgical changes, but to make it known publicly that we have departed from the state of petrification in which Jewish life was steeped for so many years. Instead, he claimed, the new Prayerbook looks entirely too much like a compromise; there is apparent⁸ the desire not to surrender the old view but to evade its injurious effects.

The weakness of Geiger was that he was rational and consistent to a ^a fault. He would not allow, in the least, for popular prejudices and historical sentiments. We must not conclude, however, from this, as Berenfeld does, that Geiger in his rationalism sought to destroy completely the national existence of the Jewish people and transform Judaism into a mere religious cult. ⁹

For, as Berenfeld himself points out in another work of his, Geiger had a profound understanding of Jewish pasts, a fine appreciation of the innerent genius of the Jewish people, and a lofty conception of its future destiny. And though Geiger would at times speak bitterly against rabbinic Judaism, his very "Urschrift" is the greatest testimony to Geiger's belief that both the "written" and the "oral" Law are the full and gradual expression of the national genius of Israel. ¹⁰

In maintaining that Judaism was a spiritual product which was weaved by the people of revelation, Geiger quotes Judah Halevi to the effect that "Israel is the heart of mankind which in its unity ever preserved its higher susceptibility and that its several distinguished men were the heart of that heart." ¹¹

In Geiger's view, the revelation of Israel assumed different forms throughout the ages, yet behind all these forms there is an unseen thread uniting them all and this thread Geiger calls "Judaism", which he defines as ¹²

"the full expression of the revealed doctrine". Geiger maintains that the reason the Jews could survive as a distinct group in the Diaspora, while all other nationalities disappeared once removed from their native land, is "because they were more than a nation, because they were a community united by ¹³

the band of an idea.The creative spirit had not altogether vanished from Judaism, there was no complete conclusion, so that nothing could be renewed, nothing ennobled--the living spirit continued to flow through the times. Though the complaint is heard: 'There is no more prophet among us',

yet the same holy, ennobling spirit continued its work. Tradition is the developing power, continuing in Judaism as an invisible creative agent, as a certain something which will never obtain its full expression; but which will ever work and create. Tradition is the life-giving soul in Judaism; it is the daughter of Revelation, enjoying the same rights with her mother. Tradition never did, never will, vanish from Judaism; it is the fountain that will ever fertilize the times, and, whenever it will come in contact with the outer world it will create new formations according to the everchanging wants and necessities of life." ¹⁴ Hence, as we read through the whole series of Geiger's lectures on Jewish history we can sum up his view on Judaism, that it is more than a nationality (in the political sense); that it is more than a mere Mosaic legislation (which was Mendelssohn's view); and more than a mere religion (in the Christian dogmatic sense of the word); but, that it was a living spirit of revelation inherent in the "community of Israel" (*Am' noy*) which is conditioned by the unity of Israel throughout the world.

It is because of this ardent faith in the eternity of Israel, which is apparent in every line of Geiger's writings that he was not concerned so much with the preservation of this or that particular form or phase of Judaism which may fall into oblivion in the course of time. And though Geiger became known by his friends as well as by his opponents, as the destroyer of Jewish nationalism, he may be regarded, without any doubt, as the father of the Nationalistic movement in Eastern Europe. It is his ideology which spread rapidly among the reformers of Russia, that gave birth to "spiritual nationalism" which found its clearest expression in Simon Dubnow, who defines Judaism as being the spiritual, historic bond which unites all the Jews throughout the world regardless of their political loyalties to their respective countries and

15

independent of a Jewish state in Palestine. It is on these premises that Geiger demanded the removal of such passages in the Liturgy which refer to the political unity of Israel. This position he persistently maintained in his 1854 edition of the prayerbook "Seder Lephilah D'bar Yom B'yomo".

Berenfeld correctly pointed out that Zechariah Frankel and his followers entertained exactly the same view as Geiger did, but that he refrained from admitting those passages which implied that the Jews are in a state of exile in their respective countries, not because of nationalistic motives but because they would not tamper with liturgical passages which became hallowed by tradition. Berenfeld characterizes such an attitude as a distortion of logic and of truth.

16

This Prayerbook controversy was instrumental in stirring up the already vexing problems in the Jewish communities in Germany, and brought keenly to the attention of the liberal rabbis the necessity of a forum where these vital questions could be analyzed and discussed. This gave rise to a number of epoch-making Rabbinical Conferences which have stamped the further development of Reform Judaism in Germany and particularly in America. And though the details of these Conferences are not within the scope of this treatment, mention must be made of them that we may understand the Hebrew literature, evoked by them, and which is in the main antagonistic to the aspirations and activities of the Rabbis who convened at these Assemblies.

2. The Brunswick and Frankfort Conferences.

Assemblies of Rabbis to determine common courses of action or common principles of faith attended exclusively by officiating rabbis are a new phenomenon in Jewish life which has no precedent in Jewish history. The first

Rabbinical Conference took place at Wiesbaden in 1837, in answer to a call

17
issued by Geiger. In his appeal Geiger stated that "it is not intended to create a new Judaism, nor yet to assume the authority of a Synod; it shall merely give honest men the opportunity to discuss the proper methods of conducting their office, and shall be the beginning of the restoration of the al-

18
most vanished spirit of Judaism." Though this Conference did not arrive at any important decision, it is of greatest significance as a pathfinder in the formulation of Reform Judaism, for the rabbis present at this Conference resolved to discuss the practical questions which were agitating the Jewish communities at that time in Geiger's "Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für Jüdische Theologie". Thus in 1842 when the friction between orthodoxy and reform became very acute, the discussions of this periodical became of greatest importance to the reform rabbis who were attacked from two sides; on the one hand, by the orthodox rabbis because of the prayerbook controversy, and on the other

19
hand by the radicals of the "Friends of Reform", whose radical measures the reform rabbis refused to endorse. This two-sided struggle forced the rabbis of liberal and reform tendencies to organize themselves and convene from time to time to discuss the vexing problems that arose in Jewish life as a result of changing conditions, and to reach at some decisions for the guidance of the troubled communities. The call for such a conference was issued by Ludwig
20
Philippon, editor of the "Allg. Zeit. des Judentums", on Jan. 15, 1844.

In this call, Philippon wrote: "Let us speak plainly. The issue is no longer the permissibility or non-permissibility of this or that synagogal institution, of this or that alleviation for civil or social life; the issue before us is concerned with the entire content of our religion, which we must present and strengthen in its purity in order to rescue it from deadening rigidity on the

one hand and from benumbing unfaith on the other. Judaism is losing influence day by day and every layman is asking us 'What are you doing?' The objects of the Conference shall be: (a) to bring the rabbis into closer relations and acquaintanceship; (b) to promote unanimity in the conduct of the rabbinical office; (c) to further the founding of communal institutions; and (d) to deliberate on all Jewish affairs."

21

Philipson's call was very timely. It met with the sympathy of a number of rabbis and it resulted in the convening of Rabbinic Conferences at Brunswick in June 1844 and at Frankfort-on-the-Main in July 1844, and at Breslau in June 1846.

It would lead us far afield to enter into a discussion of these Conferences. We would, therefore, limit ourselves to the pivotal problems that arose at these sessions and to the attitude taken by the various groups on these problems. The two outstanding points of discussion were: (1) the Question of Authority in Reform Judaism, i.e., the authoritative validity of the decisions reached at these rabbinical conferences; (2) the correlation of the national (political) and the religious aspects in Judaism, namely how far can the national (political) aspect of Judaism be removed without destroying its religious structure.

(Note: The issues raised there regarding the reforms in marriage laws ^{are} is too important a subject to be treated in casual fashion, and will, therefore, be given special consideration in the further study which I contemplate making on the subject for my Doctor of Divinity Thesis.)

a. The Question of Authority.

As stated above, the very nature of a conference of officiating rabbis only is in itself a departure from Traditional Judaism. For as Geiger himself pointed out in his "Urshrift", one of the essential differences between the Sadducees and Pharisees is that the former were sacerdotalists and clerical while the latter was a progressive lay movement and continued as such throughout Jewish history until the Talmudic tradition ~~has~~^{had} become so petrified that we now have Talmudic Karaism (Geiger's favorite term for Orthodoxy), which considers the rabbinic qualification as the final word in Judaism. He claimed, therefore, and with justification, that the reform movement in its fight against rigid rabbinism is aiming to restore the true nature of Judaism by allowing the "people of revelation" to interpret in every age the true essence of Judaism, and to give it that form which is most acceptable to them. The intellectual critics of the reform movement, therefore, correctly contended that these conferences, which allow only officiating rabbis to participate in deliberations, will only lead to the creation of a new clericalism in Judaism. Their contention was that if Judaism is to be adjusted to the demands of the time, it should be left in the hands of recognized Jewish scholars whether they be officiating
22
rabbis or not.

In justice to Geiger, however, it must be stated that since he was unable to be present at the opening session, he addressed a letter to the members of the conference in which he urged that their deliberations be merely preparatory and not resolutory--that it concern itself with practical problems of the rabbinate and not with theoretical discussion regarding Jewish
23
Law, and that it avoid laying down any hard-and-fast rules.

Indeed, the rabbis had a right to convene on a platform as

outlined in Philipsson's call, namely, to create closer relationships among themselves, to promote unanimity in the conduct of the rabbinical office, to further the founding of communal institutions, and to deliberate on all Jewish affairs. It had no authority, however, to endorse the resolutions adopted at the French Sanhedrin, particularly such an important resolution as the one regarding intermarriage without consulting the opinions and the sentiments of recognized authorities of the Jewish people. ²⁴

At the very outset of the Brunswick Conference we notice clearly a departure from the original program which was outlined by Ludwig Philipsson, for the first paragraph of the rules governing the Conference defines its purpose to be as follows: "The Rabbinical Conferences have as their purpose that the members shall take counsel together in order to determine by what means the preservation and development of Judaism and the enlivening of the religious consciousness can be accomplished." ²⁵ And Serenfeld is correct in agreeing with the critics of the reform rabbis who contended that to a conference the aim of which was the preservation of Judaism they should also have called such outstanding lay scholars as Luzzatto, Zunz, Reggio, Fost, and others, whose scholarship lent them more authority than the rabbinical office gave to the rabbi. For it is recognized Jewish scholarship ²⁶ and not a rabbinical office that makes one an authority in matters of Judaism. And in this respect we must side with Zechariah Frankel, who, in opposition to the rabbinical conferences, advocated in his monthly, conventions of recognized ²⁷ Jewish scholars.

b. The Political Aspect of Judaism.

With regard to the second important point of issue, we find a great deal of misunderstanding and a deliberate or mistaken confusion. The

mistake which is usually made by most writers on the subject in treating the nationalistic controversy in Reform Judaism, is that they either forget or ignore the fact that the concept of nationalism during the controversy was altogether different from that which resulted from the social reawakening in Europe during the second half of the nineteenth century. For, as we read the German as well as the Hebrew literature of the time, we find the terms "national" and "political" invariably interchanged, as if they were synonymous.

28
Nationalism, as understood today, as defined in our thesis above, was as yet unknown at that time. It, therefore, indicates a lack of historical perspective on the part of pro or anti-reform writers when they state that the conferences have taken a definite step against the nationalistic aspect of Judaism. What the reformers were actually seeking to remove was the political implications of traditional Judaism, because they regarded themselves politically at one with the German people. Thus Frankfurter speaking on the subject at the conference of Brunswick, declares "nichts ist wichtiger, als dass von uns selbst
29
Religiöses und Politisches genau unterschieden wurde." Their aim was

clearly to adapt Judaism to the modern conditions of life that it be no impediment on the way of every Jew to become at one with the body politic of his native country. They, therefore, sought to abolish such laws which would interfere with their duties as citizens and to remove such references in the liturgy which expressed a desire for the return of the Jews as a body to Palestine, and which regarded the Jewish life in the Diaspora as a temporary
30
state of exile.

And since language was then regarded as a political rather than a national characteristic, they saw no valid reason for its retention in the service, particularly when it works a hardship on a great majority of the people who do not understand the Hebrew language. Even Holoheim, who favored

the retention of the Hebrew language, and Zechariah Frankel, who fought bitterly for it, and who left the conference in protest on the issue of the Hebrew language in the ritual, advocated its retention not on "nationalistic" grounds, but because they believed that the Hebrew language would strengthen the religious solidarity of the people (³¹ *לשון קודש*). And in his letter of protest to the President of the Conference, Frankel contended that the removal ³² of the Hebrew language would undermine the Hebrew religion, but no mention was made anywhere to Jewish nationalism. Likewise, in the protests from the orthodox wing against the Brunswick Conference, including that of Samson Raphael Hirsch, we find no mention to the effect that the removal of Hebrew from the ritual would weaken the national consciousness of the people. Only vaguely we find here and there some expressions in the responsa of the orthodox ³³ rabbis which may be interpreted as nationalistic.

3. The Literary Polemic Evoked by these Conferences.

The Brunswick and the Frankfort Conferences made a greater stir among the men of Jewish learning than among the masses, because such conferences were a new phenomenon in Jewish life which involved many academic problems. All the Hebrew writings on the subject with but few exceptions ³⁴ take a negative attitude toward these conferences, declaring that the actions of the reform rabbis were void and unauthoritative. Hundreds of Hebrew pamphlets were written at the time warning the people not to accept the decisions of these conferences nor to recognize the leadership of the rabbis who participated in them. Most of these protests are of very little literary value. It is noteworthy, however, that the very publication of these hundreds of pamphlets against the conferences is indicative of the extent to which the Hebrew

language was still predominant in the life of the Jewish people of the time. Rappaport was, therefore, justified to a certain extent in his resentment against the leaders of the conference for not having read his communication to the convening rabbis on the ground that it was written in Hebrew which renders the reading of it at the conference impractical.

36

"ווייזט אים יענע איד וועלכע פארקראמט זיין און פארטורט
אומט כי זאל זיין איד און אומט כי זאל אומט
באשטענדענדיג? היינט צו טאג ביי אונזערע אידן
עס האט זיך געפונען."

The orthodox rabbis in their accustomed manner collected a great number of responsa from over 116 rabbis condemning the conference. These reponsa were edited by two wealthy laymen of Amsterdam under the title, "Torat na-Kanaut" (Amsterdam 1845). The style and the content of most of these reponsa are not much superior to those of the "Libre Ha-Brit". We meet with practically the same phrases of abuse and with the same wholesale and uncritical condemnation of every action of the reformers, whether it be an important reform in marriage laws or a removal of some minor liturgical passage in the prayerbook. The only communication in this collection worthy of mention is that of Samson Raphael Hirsh. Hirsh takes the reformers severely to task for their action permitting intermarriage, and accuses them of playing to the gallery by legalizing every desirable departure from tradition on the ground that the leaders must submit to the "consciousness" and "spirit" of the time. Hirsh claims that these phrases which were glibly used at the conferences were only subterfuges of cowardly leaders who dared not lead; hence, they choose to be led by the laity and legalize every whim of theirs by declaring that the leaders must submit to the "spirit" of the time.

37

38

39

40

He accuses the leaders of the reform movement in undermining the authority of Judaism by their declaration that the Talmud and even some parts of the Bible are no longer binding. He, therefore, emphatically declares that the rabbinical conferences of the reformers have no validity whatsoever as far as Jewish Law is concerned, and that the men who participated in it are unfit for Jewish leadership.

[illegible]

Hirsh is careful, however, not to make sweeping generalizations about the reformers as the rest of the orthodox rabbis did. He knows that among those who participated in the conference there was also a minority opinion which was more favorable to tradition and he wants it to be understood that what he said in regard to the conference in general does not apply to every participant individually.

42

Likewise Hirsh is not blind to the fact that deplorable conditions of Judaism in modern times are due to many outside forces that tend to disintegrate Jewish life and not to the activities of the reformers as it

from the reformers and not intermarry with them, for they are worse than the Karaites and because their neglect of Jewish marriage laws renders their children illegal according to Jewish Law.

Another rabbinical protest similar to that of S. R. Hirsh, though not as tolerant, came from David Deutsch, Rabbi of Sonrau, O. S., who was one of the most cultured orthodox rabbis in Germany and a prolific rabbinic writer.⁴⁷ His protest against the conference is entitled "Asaf Assefah" (Presslau 1845), and is written in a lucid and faultless Hebrew. Deutsch dwells particularly on the doctrine of "Torah Min Ha-Shamaim"--of the Divine revelation of the Pentateuch, which, he claims, was rejected by the rabbis present at the conferences though it is a cardinal doctrine in Judaism. In this respect, he says, the reformers have gone further than the Karaites because the latter have only denied the Divine origin of the "Oral Law" while the reformers have denied even that of the written Law.⁴⁸ Deutsch accuses the reform rabbis not only of theological heresy but also of usurpation of the rabbinic office. He claims that they are disqualified for that office for three reasons: first, they are not ordained nor are they ratified by the authorities of the "Kehilat"; secondly, they are not versed in Jewish law; and thirdly, they do not observe Jewish practices, the neglect of which disqualifies them automatically from making any reforms.⁴⁹ Like Kappaport, Deutsch takes the leaders of the conferences to task for not having invited to the assembly authorities in Jewish Law who are not officiating rabbis. Moreover, the reform rabbis who convened at Brunswick were not content with merely a theoretical discussion of the desired reform but also resolved to carry them into practice; an act which Deutsch claims they had no authority to perform.⁵⁰ In regard to the liturgical change Deutsch is not as fanatic as the rest of his colleagues, but he

contends that the reformers in their omission of certain liturgical portions took into consideration only their intrinsic value and failed to realize that certain prayers have become hallowed by tradition and possess a unique emot-

51

ional appeal for the people. As to the linguistic problem of the liturgy, Deutsch claims that the reform rabbis are guilty of distortion of logic, for if it is true that the majority of people do not know the Hebrew language sufficiently to understand the traditional prayers, the only logical remedy for is to teach them the Hebrew language, but not to throw it out of the service. Otherwise, one could conclude from their utterances that the reform rabbis have come to the point where they no longer regard the knowledge of Hebrew as essential, in such a case they would be guilty of a much graver error.

He points out that the Hebrew language is the only medium which keeps up Jewish unity and secures the transmission of the cultural heritage of the Jewish people. The writings of the Arabic-Jewish philosophers, he says, would have long been forgotten by the people and would have had no effect upon their lives were it not for the fact that the greater part of it was translated into the Hebrew language. The removal, therefore, of Hebrew from the synagogue can accomplish only one thing, namely, the disruption of Jewish unity throughout

52

the world. As to the Messianic prayers which the reformers have omitted, Deutsch points out that it is not only a disregard for an essential theological doctrine but that it is a contradiction to the religious mission of the Jewish people which the reformers so proudly assert. For if we do want the nations "to follow in our light" we must certainly have a country where the Jewish people could live a life according to its religious ideals and which could serve as an example to the world. The desire for emancipation does not in the least conflict with the hope for the return to Palestine, since the Jewish

Messianic hope is universalistic in its nature. Deutsch argues very ingenuously that to regard one's residence in a country as temporary is not in conflict with one's citizenship, for if this were the case then every man who regards his life in this world as transitory and worthless and who prays for a life in a world to come should be denied citizenship on the ground of dis-
53
loyalty to one's country. He takes the reformers to task particularly for the permission of inter-marriage which he claims would destroy the last thread
54
which keeps us from disintegration. In conclusion, he charges most of the reformers with equivocation and insincerity: he claims that they are only interested in making a religion of convenience and that they seek to obscure their real motives with many philosophic and rabbinic argumentations, as if they
55
were interested in the preservation of Judaism.
56

Almost in the same strain is the protest of S. J. Rappaport entitled "Tahahat Megulah" (Frankfort-on-Main 1845). Rappaport's greatest weakness was that he could never transcend his own personal grievances and it is this fault of his that weakens his protest against the reformers, which otherwise contains many valid arguments. Like Deutsch, he claims that the sole aim of the conferences was to legalize the life of convenience of the emancipated and pleasure-hunting Jews.
57
He accuses the rationalistic rabbis of lacking appreciation for the psychological genius of the Pharisees and of the Talmudists who with their hermeneutic devices were able to preserve Judaism
58
from disintegration throughout the darkest ages of persecution and oppression. If there are discrepancies between traditional Judaism and modern conditions of life, Rappaport does not believe that arbitrary reforms can remove them,
59
instead he believes that these discrepancies will be reconciled in time. He claims that the reformers are removing what they consider unessential in

religion and they have only rendered Judaism void of content and of soul and have deprived the Jewish people of the mystical element in religion for which they will begin to seek in other religious cults.

60

"כי זמן יספק יוצאנו אשר פס נולד אלה וקחלו יום אומה
ברח העמים (אשר מהם) דגש מקליחתו אקראת אשר זמן
קאשר נפס בד וכל רוח זמן קקונה כי זמן פס בד
אשר יקורר אלוהן אשר יקשרו אל ע."

Rappaport asserts that the reformers delude themselves in thinking that the westernization of the Jewish religion will solve the problem of anti-semitism. He contends that the Christian world will never become reconciled with the Jewish people unless the latter accept Christianity in its entirety and that the gentile world will have greater contempt for the de-Judaized Jew than for the adherer to Jewish tradition.

61

"אין אמת ואמת אהתקל אמת כי זמן העקרין וכל
פס, וכל קוד און נפס כמעשה, זמן זמן קקונה,
אולי קקונה און יום האמת און אשר כל אמת זמן
און יקורר און אמת (יכולת רכס בעקרין)."

It is the bitter irony of fate, he says, that just at the time when the world is willing to recognize us as citizens at our own terms that the reformers begin to announce one essential doctrine after another in the hope of attaining illusory bliss. Rappaport takes the reformers severely to task for declaring that Reform Judaism is in line with Talmudic tradition, while in reality they disregard its most essential principle. For the essential Talmudic principle regarding authority in Judaism is that a Synod can only enact reforms in civil matters (בדברים שביד אדם אקרא) or in such religious practices which fall under the caption of "בשר און תעשה". The reformers,

62

however, either overlooked or neglected the primary limitation of a Synod and enacted illegal reforms. Rappaport, also, points out the weakness of the position of the reformers in that they seek to establish the validity of the Jewish laws on the basis of antiquity, as it is apparent in their disregard of the rabbinic enactments of talmudic and post-talmudic authorities. Rappaport argues very forcibly that if we are to follow such a course there is no logical stopping point in abolishing the Law. In his view, it is the intrinsic value of a law and not its antiquity that gives it its binding power. ⁶⁴ He, therefore, warns the reformers that by disregarding the ceremonial law they will only undermine the solidarity of the Jewish people, and he pleads with them to retract before their actions lead to harmful results. ⁶⁵ To the rabbis who claimed that they are not fighting against Talmudic tradition but only against the "yoke" of the "Shulhan Aruk" Rappaport ironically says, that those rabbis who seek to free themselves from the "yoke" of the "Shulhan Aruk" will in time become enslaved to the "yoke" of the Parnassim. ⁶⁶ He also criticized the leaders of the conferences most severely for not having invited to their deliberations scholars and laymen many of whom overshadowed the rabbis in Jewish learning. ⁶⁷

"הנה אנו רבנים נאצים אשר לא ראש הנה, רק בקל מקרא, אל
שעור רבים בישראל, ואנחנו באנו ברחמים ואלו שנה משה
רבנים, ולא אנו בישראל אלא גם בלשון יקרת חכמים בחכמה ואלו
הנה מבקש ישראל, קראו גם זהו ואלו ארץ השם, ואלו
הנה אנו יקראו הפלסטים אנו, המקראות ואלו
אנו אנו השמים אנו ואלו"

Rappaport also pleads that religious and Jewish internal polemics should not be carried on in the German language, but in Hebrew, for

the accusations thrown against each other by the opposing parties only furnish welcome material for anti-semitic agitators. As an example of such material, he quotes a sermon delivered by one of the reform rabbis during the conference in a synagog at Brunswick, which was attended by Jews and gentiles. In his sermon, the rabbi concludes as follows: "For many hundreds of years the Jewish people have turned away stubbornly from the search of truth. Their intellect and emotions have become stagnant because their life was motivated only by mechanical actions, the purpose of which was unintelligible to them. As a result, they began to sink in the mire until our generation came and saved them from it."

Rappaport accused this rabbi of inexcusable ignorance of Jewish history, and he points out historically that the Jews have always been abreast of the spirit of the time when they were prevented from doing so by outside forces.

He expresses his utter indignation against the action of the reformers in permitting intermarriage, in their renunciation of the traditional Messianic prayers. However, his arguments on these points are practically the same as those of Hirsh and Deutsch and need not be reiterated. As to the common neglect of the religious practises among emancipated Jews, Rappaport claims that the rabbis cannot help but take a more firm stand in their insistence on the observance of the minutiae of the Law, because according to a Jewish law, religious practices cannot be reformed. The rabbis may change some civil laws according to necessities of time, but as to religious practices they must only bide their time until the conditions become more conducive for the observance of the Law and until such time they must assume a most tolerant attitude towards non-observers, so as not to alienate them from the fold of Judaism.

In conclusion, Rappaport criticized severely the personnel of the reform rabbinate. He points out that not only is their knowledge of

Judaism very superficial but they are also unfamiliar with Jewish life. He claims that most of the reform rabbis of his time are men who in their childhood had little or no Jewish training, who derived their elementary and higher education in non-Jewish schools, and who spent most of their lives in cities which have a negligible Jewish population. Only after having reached maturity did they acquire a smattering of Jewish learning mostly from non-Jewish textbooks, and have, therefore, no feeling for nor understanding of Judaism.

Rappaport contends, therefore, that if what the reformers claim is true, namely, that Judaism must be adjusted to the aspirations of the Jewish people, the adjustment must be made by men who know Judaism and who know the Jewish people. Most of the reform rabbis, however, are unqualified for such a task and have no authority to tamper with it.

72

4. Conclusion.

The struggling years after 1848 so engrossed the Jewish people in the political events of the time that little attention could be paid to anything else. Because of the political changes in Europe after the middle of the nineteenth century, the gravity of Jewish problems shifted from the purely religious phases to the political, economic and cultural. Hence, during the six or seven decades of the nineteenth century very little was done to advance the cause of reform in Western Europe. Consequently, the polemics concerning the religious reforms in Germany subsided. True, synagogal reforms of a moderate kind continued to be introduced in many congregations, but they no longer

attracted public attention. Besides, after 1848, the Hebrew language in Germany declined more and more even among Jewish scholars, and it no longer served as a medium for discussing vital Jewish problems throughout Western Europe. From that time on the center of Jewish life and literature shifted from Germany to Eastern Europe, namely, to Galicia, Lithuania, Poland, and Russia.

(Note: The material concerning the struggle for reforms in Russia was omitted for lack of time, and will be included in my Doctor of Divinity Thesis on this subject.)

Finis.

1

ABBREVIATIONS

A. Z. u J.	- Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums
H. M. R.	- The Haskalah Movement in Russia
H. of J.	- History of the Jews.
R. H. L.	- The Renaissance of Hebrew Literature
R. M. J.	- The Reform Movement in Judaism
T. R. B.	- Toldot Ha-reformazion Hadatit Be Yisrael
T. H. H. H.	- Toldot Hasofrut Haivrit Ha-hadasha
W. Z. J. T.	- Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für Jüdische Theologie
Zeitlin Bibl. Heb. Post. Mendels.	- Zeitlin William Bibliotheca Hebraica Post-Mendelssohniana

2

NOTES

CHAPTER I

1. The issue of Nationalism will be discussed fully in connection with Peretz Smolenskin's attitude to the movement for reform.
2. See Thesis p. 13.
3. Dubnow, S. M., "History of the Jews in Russia and Poland", vol. I, Philadelphia 1916, pp. 131-2; also Faisin, J. S., "The Haskalah Movement in Russia", Phil. 1913, pp. 40f.
4. Margolis M. L. and Marx A., "A History of the Jewish People", Phil. 1927, pp. 479-81, 510, 511, 574-77; also Dubnow S. M., "An Outline of Jewish History", vol. III, pp. 207-11.
5. See Thesis p. 14.
6. Ibid, pp. 14, 16.
7. J. E., vol. VII, p. 3.
8. Dei Rossi, "Sefer Meor Enayim", Vilna 1806, p. 154.
9. Zunz, "Keren Hemed", V, pp. 131-158; see also J. E., I, p. 485.
10. Modena da L., "Bet Yehudah", Venice 1635, p. 10a.
11. B'hinat Ha-kabalah (includes Kol Sokal and Sha'agat Aryeh) edited by I. S. Reggio, Gorizia ~~and~~ 1852, p. IV. 2
12. Ibid, p. 22.
13. Ibid, p. 26f.
14. Ibid, p. 58.
15. Ibid, p. 25f.
16. Ibid, p. 50.
17. Ibid, p. 55.
18. See Thesis, pp. 122f.
19. Ibid, pp. 124-5.

NOTES

CHAPTER I

20. Op. cit. p. IV.
21. Luzzato S. D., "Igrot Shadal" *Przemysla*, 1879, p. 980.
22. "Ozar Nehmad", vol. 1, Vienna, letter 36, pp. 128-31.
23. See note 11.
24. Published by Fürst, Leipzig 1840.
25. J. E. vol. VIII, p. 5; also Liebowitz N. S., Raabi Yehudah Aryeh Modena, Vienna 1896.
26. Margolis and Marx, p. 511; also J. E., vol. 1, p. 226.
27. Slouschz R. H. L., pp. 32,33; also Thesis p. 31.
28. Ibid, p. 18-28; also Waldstein A. S., "The Evolution of Modern Hebrew Literature", N. Y. 1916, pp. 3-4; also Klausner J. T., H.H.R. Jerusalem 1920, p. 6.
29. Sefer Msilat Yesharim, edited by Joseph Wahlgemuth, Berlin 1906.
30. Ibid, ch. 26, pp. 76-9.
31. Kahana A., "Rabbi Moshe Hayim Luzzato", Warsaw 1896, p. 58.
32. Ibid, p. 55.
33. Wessely H., "Dibre Shalom V'emet", Berlin 1783, letter II; see also J. E., vol. 7, p. 10; Graetz, "History of the Jews", vol. 5, Phil. 1891, p. 369.
34. Margolis and Marx, pp. 532-546.
35. Dubnow, "History of the Jews in Russia and Poland", vol. 1, pp. 86-138.
36. Isserles Moses b. Israel, "Torat Haolah", Prague 1569.
37. Ohel Yaakov, Cracow 1599.
38. 'Ez Shatul 1616.
39. Haisin J. S., "The Haskalah Movement in Russia", Phil. 1910, pp. 31f; see also J. E.

NOTES

40. J. S., vol. 6, p. 220.
41. Ibid, vol. 4, p. 162.
42. Aliyot Eliyahu (Vina 1861) Stettin 1861; Raisin J. S. H. M. R. pp. 70-5;
J. S. vol 5, p. 133.
43. Aliyot Eliyahu, Stettin 1861, pp. 37, 75.
44. Ibid, p. 59; Toldoth Haposkim, Warsaw 1910, pp. 43-44; Plungian M. b.
Solomon, Ben Porat, Wilna, 1858, p. 33.
45. Aliyot Eliyahu, p. 41f.
46. Jatzkan S. J., "Rabenu Eliyahu M'Vilna Warsaw 1900, ch. 4, pp. 78f.
47. See Thesis p. 24.
48. Toldot Haposkim p. 44; Aliyot Eliyahu pp. 34, 35; Levinson I. B., "Zerubabal"
vol. I, Warsaw 1901, p. 68.
49. Aliyot Eliyahu, p. 75.
50. Raisin, H. M. R. pp. 78-9.
51. J. S. vol. 12, p. 633.
52. Raisin, H. M. R. pp. 77.
53. See Thesis pp. 40-4.
54. Ibid, pp. 43, 45-6.

CHAPTER II

1. Graetz, H. of J. vol. 5, pp. 489-93; Philipson, R. M. J., p. 630.
2. Slouschz, R. H. L. chap. III; Klausner T. H. H. H. chap. I.
- 3 See Thesis pp. 41-2.
4. Shreiber E., "Reformed Judaism", Spokane 1892, p. 13.
5. Berenfeld, S., "Dor Tahapuhot", Warsaw 1897-8, pp. 27-31.
6. Slouschz R. H. L. p. 46.
7. Philipson David, "The Reform Movement in Judaism", N. Y. 1907, p. 17; see
also note 3.

5

NOTES

CHAPTER II

8. Ha-Assif, vol. 3, Warsaw, pp. 404-16.
9. Graetz, H. of J., vol. 5, p. 368f.
10. Klausner, J., Geschichte der Neuhebraischen Literatur, Berlin 1921; also J. E. vol. 12, p. 507.
11. Wessely H., Dibre Shalom V'Emet, Berlin 1782, Letter I ch. 8.
12. Ibid, ch. 6.
13. Ibid, ch. 1.
14. Ibid, ch. 7.
15. Ibid, ch. 6.
16. Ibid, ch. 5.
17. Ibid, ch. 7.
18. Ibid, ch. 3.
19. Ibid, ch. 4.
20. Ibid, second letter entitled _____
21. Wessely H., Gan Na'ul, vol. 12, Warsaw 1888 f (82).
22. Berlin S., Ketab Yosher, Berlin 1794.
23. Wessely H., Miktabein, Warsaw 1886.
24. Ibid, p. 133.
25. See Thesis p. 14.
26. Published in Wessley's "Miktabim", Warsaw 1886.
27. Ibid, pp. 360-1.
28. Ibid, pp. 361-2.
29. Wessely's, "Sefer Ha-miut", Warsaw 1888, p. III.
30. Slouchz, R. H. L. p. 35.
31. Ha-Assif, vol. III, p. 417; Slouchz, R. H. L., pp. 104, 112-6.

6

NOTES

CHAPTER II

32. Bernfeld, S. *Dor Tahapuhst*, Warsaw 1897-8, pp. 100-112.
33. Ibid, p. 102.
34. Ibid, p. 104 "מחברת חכמי ישראל" *"מחברת חכמי ישראל"*
35. Ibid, p. 106.
36. Meassef yr. 1786, Nissan number.
37. Wessely H., *Maamor Hakor Din*, Berlin 1788 p. 5.
38. Slouschz, R. H. L., p. 33.
39. Philipson, D., R. M. J., p. 9.
40. Graetz, H. of J., vol. 5, p. 335.
41. Landau E., *Sefer Zion L'nefesh Hayo*, Prague 1791, Brakot p. 28b.
also Fleckeles Eliezer, *Olat Hodesh*, Prague 1787, p. 13f.
42. Bernfeld S. *Dor Tahapuhst*, Warsaw 1897-9, p. 97, Graetz H. of J., p. 331.
43. J. E. vol. III, p. 185 f., Bible translations; Bernfeld S., *Dor Tahapuhst*
Warsaw 1897-8, p. 95.
44. Graetz, H. of J., p. 328.
45. Philipson, H. R. J., p. 9.
46. Blitz, S., *Judaeo-German translation of the Bible*, Amsterdam 1676-8, Preface.
47. l.c.
48. Mendelsohn, M. *Sefer Ntivat Hashalom*, vol. 1, Berlin 1780-3, Intr. f (12).
49. Ibid f (12).
50. Ibid, see chapter "מחברת חכמי ישראל" *"מחברת חכמי ישראל"*
51. Ibid f (3).
52. See Thesis p. 49.
53. Ibid, p. 8.
54. op. cit., intro. f (6).
55. Ibid, f (7).

7

NOTES

CHAPTER II

56. Ha-Maggid, Lyck, 1869, III, n. 26.
57. Bernfeld, Dor Tanapahot, Warsaw 1897-8, p. 67.
58. Mendelsohn, M. Sefer Nativat Hashalom, vol. 1, Berlin 1730-3, intr. f (12,13).
59. Bernfeld, Dor T., Warsaw 1897-8, p. 61.
60. Graetz, H. of J., vol. 5, p. 310.
61. Meassef, Königsberg, yr. 1785, pp. 184, 189, 179f.
62. Graetz, H. of J., p. 317.
63. Ibid, p. 318.
64. Eichel I, Toldot Moshe B. Menahem, Vienna 1814, p. 40f.
65. Bernfeld S., Dor Tah. Warsaw 1897-8, p. 87.
66. Mendelsohn, M., Jerusalem, vol. 2, Lond. 1838, pp. 89f.
67. Bikura Ha-ittem, vol. 2, Vienna pp. 82-3; Graetz H. of J. vol. 5, p. 399.
68. Graetz H. of J., vol. 5, p. 402; Bernfeld S., Dor. Tah., Warsaw 1897-8, p. 82.
69. Slonschz R. H. L., p. 172-205; see Thesis p. 131 as to Luzzato's opinion.
- Re traces assimilation direct to Mendelsohn.
70. Philipson, D., R. M. in J., pp. 60-1; Bernfeld, Toldot Ha-reformazion
Hadratit B'yisrael, Krakow 1900, pp. 123-4.
71. Slonschz, R. H. L., p. 265; Rasin J. S., R. M. R., p. 261 f.
72. Bernfeld S., T. H. R. S., p. 25.
73. See Thesis p. 22.
74. Graetz, H. of J. vol. 5, p. 317.
75. Slonschz, R. H. L., pp. 39-48; Rasin J. S., R. M. R., pp. 98-101.
76. Delitzsch, Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie, Leipzig 1836, p. 118.
77. Slonschz R. H. L., pp. 23, 33.
78. See J. E. Biurists, vol. III, p. 232; Meassfim vol. VIII, p. 397.
79. See J. E. vol. 5, p. 265; HaMeassef 1784, Königsberg, pp. 41-7.
80. J. E. vol. 3, p. 373.

NOTESCHAPTER II

81. Ha-meassef, 1784, Konigsberg, pp. 1 f.
82. Ibid, p. 5.
83. Ibid, pp. 4-5.
84. Ibid, pp. 6-10.
85. Ibid, p. 13.
86. For a detailed account of the Meassef see Israel Davidson, "The Genesis of Hebrew Periodical Literature", Baltimore 1900.
87. Ha-meassef, 1784, Konigsberg, pp. 1-3.
88. Bernfeld, Dor Tah., vol. 2, Warsaw 1897-8; pp. 84-5.
89. Slouschz R. H. L., p. 56.
90. See Appendix A #8.
91. Ibid, #4, 5.
92. Ibid, #1, 2, 6, 7.
93. Hashiloah vol. 1, Berlin, pp. 483-503.
94. Ahisssof, yr. 1900, Warsaw, pp. 225-239.
95. Slouschz, R. H. L., p. 44.
96. Ibid, p. 97.
97. Bernfeld, S, Dor Tah., Warsaw, 1897-8, p. 97.
98. Ibid, p. 44; See Appendix A, #3.
99. See Thesis, pp. 62-5.
100. Slouschz R. H. L., p. 77.
101. R. Nachmun of Breslau who raised the Hebrew language to cosmic importance advocated most urgently the use of the Judeo-German vernacular for religious instruction, for homiletical purposes and for the intimate communion with God. In his "Likute Manaran" speaking of the Hebrew language, he says:

"כי גבול יקר חידק אל זמן הקדש אין נשא תמלא אכ"ל (ליטא'א'ג)

CHAPTER II

Yet in spite of this veneration for Hebrew, he advocates in the same book the use of the vernacular for practical purposes.

י. בשלום איזה חסד של אברהם הדור באמת ושלך ממך
להלן שלם לעולם / היותו מה מאמרו שבידיך אברהם הדור
באמת ממך כי אינו זה / עשה בחינת חול... אלך בזה
הלוא פשוטו פוקד כי מחמת פשוטו אלך ימי מביאים
הפסוק רק בדור חול.

102. See Bernfeld, S., Ahiassof, 1898-9, Warsaw pp. 39-41.
103. Ibid, Der Tah., pp. 68-77.
104. J. E., vol. XI, p. 71.
105. Berlin Paul, Sefer Ketab Yosher, Berlin 1794 f (6).
106. J. E., vol. X, p. 318.
107. Berlin, Sefer Mizpeh Yotkel, Berlin 1789, Author's intr., (f) 2, 3.
108. Ibid, Publisher's intr., (f) 1.
109. Berlin S., "Schalot u'Tschuwot ssamim Rosh", Krakow 1851, Responsa #251.
110. Compare Asher's genuine responsa *עניני חילוקי דעות*
Constantinople 1417 Responsa #58. In his respons #55, 9, he said of
philosophy *"גילוי חילוקי דעות"*. See Weiss I. H., Dor
Dor v'Dorshov, vol. 5, p. 65.
111. Berlin S., "Schalot u'Tschubot ssamim Rosh", Responsa #251.
112. Ibid, Responsa #18.
113. Ibid, Responsa #36.
114. For Israel Jacobson's reform activities see Philipson, R. H. J., pp. 1726;
Bernfeld, S., T. R. B., pp. 58-62; J. E., vol. VII, p. 47; Graetz, H. of
J., vol. 5, pp. 561-83.
115. Bernfeld S, T. R. B., p. 60.

NOTES

CHAPTER II

116. Steinhardt, M., Libre Igeret, Roedelheim 1812, Responsa 1, 2.
117. Ibid, Resp. 3.
118. Ibid, Resp. 4.
119. Ibid, Resp. 5.
120. Ibid, Resp. 6.
121. Ibid, Resp. 7.
122. Ibid, Resp. 8.
123. Ibid, Resp. 9.
124. Thesis, p. 64 f.
125. Bernfeld S., T. R. B., pp. 84-5.

CHAPTER III

1. Philipson, D., H. R. J., p. 31f.
2. Ueber die neue organization der Juenschulen in den preussischen Staaten
nothwendig gewordene Umbildung ihres Gottesdienstes in den synagogen.
Berlin 1812.
3. Geiger A, Gesch. der Juden in Berlin, vol. 2, pp. 218-9.
4. J. E., vol. 9, p. 512.
5. See Thesis, pp. 101-2.
6. This change of Piyutim was made for several reasons: (1) The content of
the Sephardic piyutim is much simpler and lend themselves much easier to
translations than the Ashkenazic which are full of Cabalistic, Talmudic and
biblical references; (2) the meter of the Sephardic piyutim is much better
than that of the Ashkenazic and lend themselves better to musical arrange-
ment; (3) the poetic style of the Sephardic piyutim is much superior to

CHAPTER III

that of the Ashkenazic and more correct grammatically and syntactically.

7. For a detailed discussion of the Hamburg Prayerbook see Appendix B.

8. See Weiger, Nachgelassene Schriften, vol. 1, Berlin 1874, p. 162; Philipson D., R. M. J., p. 45.

9. It is well worth while to compare the position of the editors on this point with that of the present day Zionists in Western countries. The latter declare time and again that they are hoping and working for the restoration of Palestine for those Jews who wish to go there, but that they consider themselves loyal citizens of their respective countries to which they are bound culturally, economically and politically.

10. Bernfeld S., T. R. B., p. 74.

11. See Thesis, p. 79; also note 42 of this chapter.

12. Graetz, H. of J., vol. 5, p. 566.

13. Bernfeld, S., T. R. B., p. 75.

14. Wolf G., Isaac Noah Manheimer, Vienna 1863, p. 10, note.

15. Lieberman S., Nogah Zevek, Or Nogah, Dessau 1819, ch. II, p. 29; Dibre Haorit, Altona 1819, p. 11.

16. Wolf G., I. N. Manheimer, p. 10, note.

17. J. E. vol. 3, p. 80; Bernfeld S., T. R. B., pp. 76-83; Jost, Culturgesch.

III, 24-25; Shreiber S., Reformed Judaism, pp. 76-7; Graetz vol. 5, p. 566.

18. Lieberman, Nogah Zevek, Or Nogah, ch. II, p. 7.

19. Ibid, p. 14.

20. Ibid, pp. 19-20 (quotation from p. 19).

21. Ibid, pp. 21-2; as to the veracity of his description see R. Mendel

Steinhardt, Dibre Igeret; A. Chorin, Igeret Elassef, Prague 1826 (f) 15.

22. Ibid, p. 23.

NOTES

CHAPTER III

23. loc. cit.
24. Ibid, p. 28.
25. Ibid, p. 29.
26. Ibid, p. 30.
27. Bernfeld S., T. R. S., 81.
28. Graetz, H. of J., vol. 5, pp. 565-6.
29. op. cit. pp. 31-3 (quotation from p. 31).
30. Ibid, pp. 36-41. For the references quoted see Appendix C.
31. Ibid, pp. 41-4 (quot. from pp. 41-3).
32. Ibid, pp. 48-9.
33. Ibid, p. 51.
34. Moses Sopher in Ele Libre Habrit, Altona 1819, p. 45.
35. Ibid, p. 77.
36. Chasom Sopher, Sheloth u'Tshuvot, Pressburg 1864, vol. VI, Responsa 91.
37. Bernfeld, S. T. R. S., p. 81, note 1. *והוא מרחיב את האמירה כי לא הייתה חילוק בין חכמים ופוסקים.*
38. Furst A., Christen und Juden, Strassbourg 1892, p. 181; Bernfeld T. R. S., pp. 76, 80 (notes).
39. Philipson, D., H. R. J., p. 47.
40. J. S. vol. 7, p. 583.
41. Lieberman S., Nogan Sedek, p. 28.
42. Spreiber, S., Reformed Judaism, pp. 61-6; Wunwald Y. Judah, Sofer Korat Hatora v'ha'emunah b'ungaria, Budapest 1921, pp. 35-36; J. S., vol. VIII, Moravia p. 685.

NOTESCHAPTER III

43. Bernfeld, T. R. B., pp. 77-8.
44. Chorin A., Emek Ha-Shaveh, Prague 1803 (f) 37.
45. Ibid, (f) 25.
46. Ibid, (f) 9.
47. Ibid (f) 33. For this view, Chorin was later taken to task by I. S. Reggio.
48. Lieberman B., "Nogah Hazedek", pp. 17-8.
49. Ibid, p. 25.
50. Chorin, A., Igeret Elassar, publ. by M. I. Landau, Prague 1826.
51. Ibid, pp. 28-9.
52. Ibid, p. 30.
53. Ibid, pp. 31-46.
54. Ibid, pp. 38f.
55. See note 21 of this chapter.
56. Igeret Elaser (f) 4. See Appendix C.
57. Ibid, (f) 15.
58. Ibid, (f) 12, 13.
59. Ibid, (f) 17; (f) 26. See Appendix C.
60. Ibid, (f) 33f.
61. See Thesis p. 99. For the statement of R. Jacob of Lissa.
62. Even to this very day, there are many seemingly intelligent Jews who hold the same perverted views and go even as far as criticizing the reform synagogues for introducing decorum in the service which they claim is contrary to the true "Jewish Spirit".
63. Op. cit. (f) 30-31. See Appendix C.
64. Ibid, (f) 33 f. See Appendix C.
65. Loew Leopold, Der Yuedische Congress in Ungarn, Pest 1871, p. 158.

NOTES

CHAPTER III

66. Chorin A., "Der Treue Bothe", Prague 1831, pp. 1-12.
67. See Thesis, p. 124.
68. Ibid, p. 81.
69. Chorin, A., Ziv Neeman, Prague 1831, p. 11.
70. See Thesis, p. 110.
71. Op. cit. p. 24.
72. Ibid, p. 8.
73. Ibid, p. 13.
74. Ibid, p. 34.
75. See Appendix C on the question of authority in Judaism.
76. Op. cit., pp. 34-58.
77. See his chapter in "כח ב"ה פה התורה והגולה"
78. See Appendix C.
79. Chorin C., Yeled Zekunim, Vienna, 1839, p. 2.
80. Ibid, pp. 3-4.
81. Ibid, pp. 4-5.
82. See Appendix C. The Flexibility of the Jewish Law.
83. Weil Dr., Aaron Chorin, Szegedin, 1863, pp. 102-8.
84. For a detailed account of Chorin's reform activities and correspondence see J. E., vol. 4, pp. 43-4.
85. Grunwald Y. Judah, Sefer Korat Hatorah V'ha-emunah b'hungaria, Budapest 1921, pp. 41, 44.
86. See J. E. vol. 5, p. 516.
87. Friedlander, J., Shoresn Yoseph, Hannover 1834, p. 6.
88. Ibid, p. 10.
89. Bernfeld, S., T. R. B., p. 82, note 2.

NOTES

CHAPTER III

90. Graetz, H. of J., vol. 5, p. 571.
91. Ibid, p. 572.
92. Ele Libre Habrit, Hamburg 1819, p. III.
93. Ibid, p. IV.
94. Ibid, p. 6-11.
95. Ibid, pp. 35, 36.
96. Ibid, pp. 38, 39.
97. Ibid, p. 16. Bernfeld with his fine sense of humor remarks that R. Chorin was in this regard most unjustly accused because he was not guilty of having studied much philosophy, and the accusation only indicates the extent of Benet's philosophic attainments. P. R. B. p. 85.
98. Ibid, p. 25.
99. Ibid, p. 26.
100. Ibid, pp. 27, 28.
101. Ibid, p. 55.
102. Ibid, p. 69.
103. Ibid, p. 77.
104. Ibid, p. 79.
105. Ibid, pp. 83-87.
106. Ibid, p. 95.
107. Bresslau was also one of the founders of the Measser and of the "חברת חכמי אשכנז"; Graetz, H. of J., vol. 5, pp. 398-9.
108. Ibid, p. 572.
109. Ibid, p. 573. See Caro and Mises, below, Thesis, p. 112 f.
110. Reinitz M. L., Lahat Hanereb Hamithapchat, 1820, p. 3.
111. Rashkov J. Ziskind, Libre Amunah V'omen, Bresslau 1821, p. 22.

NOTESCHAPTER III

- 112. Ibid, p. 25.
- 113. Graetz, H. of J., vol. 5, p. 573.
- 114. Philipson, H. R. J., pp. 49-56.

CHAPTER IV

- 1. J. E., vol. 7, p. 468.
- 2. Ibid, vol. 6, p. 450.
- 3. Homberg Herz, Lore Shefer, Vienna 1808, pp. 172-192.
- 4. Sikkure Ha-Itim, vol. 11, Vienna 1830, pp. 126-142; Slouschz R. H. L., pp. 60, 75-6; J. E., vol. 8, p. 582.
- 5. Caro D., Berit Amet, vol. 2, Dessau (Constantinople?) 1820, p. 136.
- 6. Ibid, p. 96.
- 7. Ibid, p. 107.
- 8. Ibid, pp. 110-11.
- 9. Ibid, pp. 111-2.
- 10. Ibid, p. 120.
- 11. Ibid, pp. 122, 123, 126.
- 12. Ibid, pp. 130-3.
- 13. Ibid, pp. 134-5.
- 14. Ibid, p. 136.
- 15. Ibid, pp. 142-6.
- 16. J. E. vol. 3, p. 582.
- 17. On title page it is stated that it was published in Constantinople 1820.
- 18. Caro, Berit Amet, Dessau 1820, p. 8.
- 19. Ibid, p. 10.

NOTESCHAPTER IV

20. Ibid, pp. 12-9.
21. Ibid, pp. 21-40.
22. Ibid, pp. 2, 41.
23. Ibid, pp. 41-88.
24. Ibid, pp. 48-6.
25. Ibid, p. 66.
26. Ibid, p. 69.
27. Ibid, p. 77.
28. Ibid, p. 79.
29. Ibid, pp. 87-8.
30. For a detailed biography see Meir Halevi Letteri's introduction to Isaac Erter's "Hazofeh L'bet Israel", Vienna 1864.
31. Graetz, H. of J., vol. 5, p. 616.
32. Klausner J., Tolaot ^{Hasofat} Hasofat Haivrit Mahodasha, Jerusalem 1920, p. 9.
33. Graetz, H. of J., vol. 5, p. 612; J. E., vol. 9, p. 641b; Klausner, T. H. H. H., p. 9; Zeitlin W., Kiryat Sefer, vol. 2, Leipzig 1891, p. 264.
34. See Kerem Hemed vol. 2, Vienna, pp. 16-39; ibid, vol. 4, pp. 45-57.
35. Klausner T. H. H. H. pp. 9-10; J. E. vol. XI, pp. 108f.
36. Frankfurt o M. 1841, 1842, edited by Jost and Greiznoch.
37. Bernfeld S., Tolaot Shir, Berlin 1899, pp. 120, 129; see Thesis p. 152.
38. Zeitlin, Bibl. Heb. Post. Manuel, vol. 2, Leipzig 1891, p. 350; Slouschz R. H. L. p. 208.
39. J. E., vol. 3, p. 273; Slouschz R. H. L., p. 56; Klausner T. H. H. H., pp. 10-11.
40. Slouschz, R. H. L., p. 57.

NOTESCHAPTER V

1. Bernfeld, T. R. B., p. 99.
2. Graetz, H. of J., vol. 5, pp. 583 f; J. E., vol. 12, p. 419b.
3. J. E., vol. 7, p. 297 b.
4. Graetz, H. of J., p. 619.
5. l. c.
6. Kastilioni I. H., Yad Joseph, Krakow 1889, *"נחלת חיים ביה"ר יוסף קאסיליוני"*
Weiss I. H., Zichronotai, Warsaw 1895, pp. 152-8; J. E. vol. X, p. 360b. f.
7. The program of this college is outlined in one of Reggio's Hebrew articles in the Bikure Haim, Vienna, vol. 11, pp. 5 f.
8. Reggio I. S., Igrot Yashar, Vienna 1854, Letter V, p. 31. He expatiates on this in another essay in answer to Meir Randagger, Ibid, Letter XXX.
9. Reggio, Hatorah V'La'filosofiah, Vienna. 1827, p. 41.
10. Ibid, pp. 74-9.
11. Ibid, pp. 79-81.
12. Ibid, p. 107.
13. Ibid, p. 132.
14. Ibid, pp. 143f. and 137f. See Thesis p. 86 for his correspondence with Chorin on this subject.
15. See Thesis p. 10.
16. Reggio, Yalkut Yashar, vol. 1, Goritiae 1854, ch. 12, p. 78f.
17. Weiss, I. H., Zichronotai, Warsaw 1895, p. 158.
18. Reggio, Shinat Hakabalah, Goritiae 1852, p. VI.
19. Ibid, p. IV, V; Klausner T. H. H. H. p. 11.
20. Klausner J., Yahadut V'Anishint, Warsaw 1905. See chapter on Samuel David Luzzato; Slouschz R. H. L. p. 84-92; J. E. vol. 8, pp. 224-6.

NOTES

CHAPTER V

21. Klausner T. H. H. H. pp. 11-12.
22. Luzzato, Diwan of R. Judah Halevi, Lyck 1864, p. 4.
23. Luzzato, Pnine Shadal, Przemysl 1888, pp. 410-421. (Quotation from p. 417).
24. Ibid, p. 423, 426, 445-7.
25. Ibid, Yesode Hatorah, Lemberg 1880, pp. 11-2.
26. Ibid, Igrot Shadal, edited by I. S. Greber, Przemysl 1882, p. 661.
27. Ibid, Pnine Shadal, Letter 85, pp. 436, 438.
28. l.c.
29. Ibid, Igrot Shadal, letter 23, pp. 78-81.
30. Ibid, letter LIX, p. 173.
31. Ibid, letter CXXIV, pp. 351.
32. Ibid, letter LXIII, p. 153.
33. Ibid, vol. 2, letter CCXXVIII, p. 779f. — ?
34. Luzzato, "Kinor Naim", vol. 1, Padova 1879; חלק בחור יצחק p. 119;
published first in "Konahe Itzhok" XIV, Vienna, p. 18.
35. Ibid, Pnine Shadal, p. 41.
36. Ibid, Igrot Shadal, letter DCXLVI, p. 1367.
37. Ibid, Pnine Shadal, p. 153.
38. Ibid, Yesodei Hatorah, Lemberg 1880, p. 15, note C.
39. Ibid, Igrot Shadal, letter 267, p. 660.
40. Ibid, Kinor Naim, vol. 2, Padua 1879 חלק בחור יצחק (p 64); חלק בחור יצחק
p. 241.
41. Ibid, Igrot Shadal, letter CXXLII, pp. 1070-71.
42. Pardes, Edited by Ravnitzko, vol. III, Odessa, Italian letter os Shadal
p. 118.

NOTES

CHAPTER V

43. Luzzato, Igrot Shadal, vol. 2, p. 1253.
44. Ibid, letter CLXXVIII, p. 406f.
45. Klausner J. Yahadut V'Anushint, Warsaw 1905, p. 92.
46. For Krochmal's biography see J. E. vol. 7, pp. 576-7; also Lett¹⁵ervi's
"Toldot R. No^Cshman Krochmal" in Wertheimer's Jahrbuch fur Israeliten, vol.
1, Vienna 1854.
47. Ibid, p. 3.
48. Ibid, pp. 13-4.
49. Schechter S. S., Studies in Judaism, Phil. 1896, p. 52.
50. Bernfeld S., Dor Unochom, Warsaw 1896, pp. 14-5. Schechter, pp. 55-6.
51. Except for a few Hebrew essays in Sulamith 1818; Ha Zephira, Zolkiev 1824,
and Kerem Hemed, vols. 4 and 5, Vienna.
52. As to Krochmal's influence on the Science of Judaism see the introduction
of Davidovitz S., to Kitve R. No^Cshman Krochmal, Berlin 1924, pp. 219-225.
53. More Nebuche Ha-zman, edited by Zunz, Lemberg 1851, ch. 1, see also editor's
introduction.
54. Ibid, pp. 10-11.
55. Ibid, pp. 4-6.
56. Ibid, pp. 7-9 (quotation on p. 8).
57. Ibid, p. 22.
58. Ibid, ch. VI (quot. from pp. 23, 26).
59. Ibid, p. 30; see also Bernfeld S., Deat Elohim, vol. 2, Warsaw 1899, p. 592.
60. Op. cit. p. 29.
61. Ibid, p. 32.
62. Ibid, ch. VII.

NOTESCHAPTER V

63. Ibid, p. 42.
64. Geiger A., Nachgelessene Schriften, vol. 1, Berlin 1875-8, p. 205.
65. Ginsburg Asher, Al-Parashat Drachim, Berlin 1921, vol. 1, p. 128.
66. Ibid, vol. 2, pp. 82f.
67. Printed in Bikkure Ha Ittim, vol. 4, Vienna, pp. 61-77; as to his early work see Bernfeld S., Toldot Shir, Berlin 1899, p. 20f.
68. Ibid, p. 32, 33. Luzzato S. D., Igrot Shadal, p. 165.
69. Bikkure Ha ittim, Vienna 1830-1.
70. Ibid, 1832.
71. Bernfeld, Toldot Shir, Berlin 1899, pp. 41-3.
72. Rappaport S. J., Igrot Shir, edited by S. I. Grebber, Przemyśl 1885 pp. 107-108.
73. Ha Shanar, vol. 11, Vienna p. 268.
74. Rappaport S. J., Igrot Shir, p. 259.
75. Kerem Hemed, vol. 4, Vienna, p. 241 f.
76. Bernfeld S., Toldot Shir, Berlin 1899, p. 95.
77. Published by David Rappaport in "Nachlat Yehudah" part 1, Krakow 1868.
78. For a complete account of Rappaport's works see Bernfeld's Toldot Shir, Berlin 1899, appendix *חכמת ישראל*; also J. E., vol. 10, pp. 322-3.
79. Bernfeld, Toldot Shir, pp. 121 f.
80. Ibid, pp. 123, 122.
81. Ibid, p. 33.
82. Published by David Rappaport in "Nachlat Yehudah", vol. 2, Krakow 1868.
83. Ibid, Introduction.

28

NOTES

CHAPTER V

84. Published by Raphael Kirchbein, Frankfurt, 1846.
85. See below. 192
86. Rappaport S. J., *Livre Shalom V'emet*, Prague 1861; see also Weiss I. H., *Zichronotai*, Warsaw 1898, p. 103f.

CHAPTER VI

1. J. E. vol. 3, pp. 90-1.
2. Ibid, vol. 10, p. 89.
3. Ibid, vol. 5, p. 264.
4. Ibid, vol. 6, p. 417.
5. Ibid, vol. 10, p. 613.
6. Ibid, vol. 2, p. 299.
7. Ibid, vol. 6, pp. 395-6; also Hamelitz vol. 39, St. Petersburg, pp. 142-3.
8. Geiger A. *Der Hamburger Tempelstreit in Nachgelassene Schriften*, vol. I, Berlin 1875, p. 194.
9. Geiger A. Ibid, vol. 2, p. 265, also in W. A. J. T., vol. II, p. 220.
10. loc. cit.
11. Geiger A., A. 2d J., IX, p. 340.
12. J. E., vol. 5, pp. 482 f.
13. Rabinowitz, S. P. R. *Zechariah Frankel*, Warsaw 1898, pp. 75-82; Philipson R. M. J. pp. 100-21.
14. Philipson R. M. J. pp. 231 f. Bernfeld T. R. B. pp. 187f.
15. For a full biography see J. E. vol. 5, p. 584-7.
16. *Was Hat Mohamed aus dem Judentume Aufgenommen* (Bonn 1804).
17. Published in *Nachgel. Schriften I*, 358-69. For a discussion of this

NOTESCHAPTER VI

- sermon see Bernfeld T. R. B. note 1, p. 131.
13. Philipson R. M. J., pp. 72-101; Bernfeld T. R. B., p. 132 f.; J. E. vol. X, p. 352 h..
19. Nachgel. Schriften I, pp. 203-229.
20. Philipson, R. M. J. pp. 160 ff.
21. Bernfeld, Der Chochom, Warsaw 1896, p. 69.
22. See Thesis p. 152.
23. He contributed to the following periodicals: Omer Nehmad, Vienna, vol. I, pp. 97-119, vol. II, pp. 98-9, pp. 17-24, pp. 157-173, vol. III, p. 10f., vol. IV, p. 45f, pp. 92f; He Haluz, Lemberg, vol. III, p. 74f., 188f.; vol. VI, p. 10f; Merem Hamed, Vienna, vol. VIII, p. 41f., p. 61f.; Ha Karmel, year 1875, Wilna, p. 9f.
24. Urshrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel (Bresslau 1857).
25. J. E. vol. 5, pp. 482-484.
26. Franckel Z., Darke Ha-mishna, Leipsig, 1859, pp. 19-21.
27. See Thesis p. 153.
28. Zeit. Bibl. Post. Mendels vol. 1, p. 174.
29. Auerbach, "Hasofeh Al Darke Ha-mishna", Frankfurt a. M., 1861.
30. Monatschrift fur Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums, year 1861, Bresslau, pp. 159ff.

CHAPTER VII

1. Philipson, R. M. J., pp. 102-21, Bernfeld T. R. B., pp. 133-148.
2. Orient III, Leipsig, pp. 352, 363; pp. 377-384.
3. Bernfeld, T. R. B., p. 136.

NOTESCHAPTER VII

4. Philipson, R. M. J., p. 114. Philipson characterizes this lucid explanation of Salomon as begging the question.
5. J. E. vol. VIII, p. 295 f.
6. Theologische Gutachten über das Gebetbuch etc. Hamburg 94 ff., see Philipson R. M. J., p. 118.
7. In 1854, however, when Geiger proceeded himself to edit a new Prayerbook entitled "Seder Tephilah -bar Yom B'Yomo", he inserted more Hebrew than the editors of the Hamburg Temple did, declaring that the public worship should be in Hebrew almost in its entirety because in public worship it is immaterial whether the individual understands each prayer or not, as long as the group reiterates in a body the prayers which relate the history and vicissitudes of Israel.
8. Geiger A., Der Hamburger Tempelstreit eine Zeitfrage, Wachse. Schriften, vol. I, Berlin 1875, pp. 180f.
9. Bernfeld, T. R. B., p. 144.

"דאס חכמה ו' בר און אר פערקערט בויט פילט איהר (ראדן)
 במה אמת הרישומאט אסר הנס ו' אר איהר פילט האלאמט
 אעצת איהר פילט, פילט איהר איהר פילט איהר
 סגולה האלאמט איהר פילט איהר פילט איהר
 איהר איהר איהר פילט איהר פילט איהר

10. Bernfeld, Der Schochom, pp. 62-77.
11. Geiger A., Judaism and its History, vol. 1, p. 63-4.
12. Ibid, p. 126.
13. Ibid, p. 132.
14. Ibid, pp. 135, 136.

NOTES

CHAPTER VII

15. See Dubnow's Theory of Jewish Nationalism in Friedlander I., "Past and Present", Cincinnati, 1919, pp. 371-98.
16. Bernfeld, T. R. B., pp. 163-9.
17. Philipson R. M. J. pp. 197-202.
18. W. Z. J. T., vol. III, p. 321.
19. Philipson, R. M. J. pp. 147-196; Bernfeld T. R. B., pp. 153-160.
20. loc. cit., p. 27.
21. Philipson R. M. J., pp. 200-201.
22. Bernfeld, T. R. B., p. 183.
23. Ibid, p. 184; Philipson, R. M. J., p. 202; W. Z. a. J. vol. VIII, pp. 337-9. Wach. Schriften vol. I, pp. 197-202.
24. For the opinion of Moritz Veit (Berlin 1808-48) who was one of the most intellectual Jews of the time, regarding the reform movement, and the Brunswick Conference in particular, see Bernfeld, S., "Michael Sachs", Berlin 1900, pp. 49; also pp. 9f., 26-7.
25. Protokolle der ersten Rabbinerversammlung abgehalten in Braunschweig XIII, Braunschweig 1844 #1; Philipson R. M. J., pp. 202, 203.
26. Bernfeld S., T. R. B., p. 183.
27. Zeitschrift für die Religiösen Interessen des Judentums, Leipzig, yr. 1844, pp. 239 f., yr. 1846, pp. 3 f.
28. See Thesis, p. 21.
29. Protokolle p. 27.
30. Bernfeld, T. R. B., p. 189.
31. Ibid, p. 191; also note (1).
32. Ibid, pp. 194-5.

NOTESCHAPTER VII

33. ^{u/}Torat Hakanant, Amsterdam 1845, particularly pp. 305.
34. There were only two men who defended these conferences in Hebrew literature:
 A Chorin in his "Yeled Zekunim" (see Thesis p. 89), and J. Herschel Schorr
 in his periodical He Haluz (see Thesis p. 118).
35. Bernfeld, T. R. B., p. 202, note 2.
36. Pappaport, S. J., Tonahat Megillah, p. 31.
37. Hirschel Lehrn and Aaron Prinz.
38. Torat Hakanant, (f) 3-5.
39. Since we do not treat this subject in our thesis we will not dwell on this
 issue here.
40. Ibid f(f).
41. loc. cit.
42. Ibid (f) 5.
43. l. c.
44. l.c.
45. l.c.
46. Ibid, (f) 9.
47. Sibl. Heb. Post. Mendels. vol. I, p. 66.
48. Deutsch D., "Asor Asifah", Bresslau 1845, p. 9.
49. l. c.
50. Ibid, p. 10.
51. Ibid, pp. 16-7.
52. Ibid, p. 17.
53. Ibid, p. 19.
54. Ibid, p. 20.

NOTESCHAPTER VII

55. Ibid, p. 21f.
56. Ibid, p. 24 f.
57. Rappaport S. J., Tonahat Megulah, p. 1.
58. Ibid, p. 2.
59. Ibid, p. 3.
60. l.c.
61. l.c.
62. Ibid, p. 4.
63. Ibid, p. 7-12.
64. Ibid, p. 12.
65. Ibid, pp. 12-3.
66. Ibid, p. 14.
67. Ibid, pp. 14-5.
68. Ibid, p. 17.
69. l.c.
70. Ibid, p. 18.
71. Ibid, pp. 26-7.
72. Ibid, pp. 32-34.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Auerbach, B. H.

Hazofeh Al Darke Ha-Mishna
Frankfort-a-M. 1861.

Berlin, Saul

Sefer Sh'elot U'tshubot Bsomim Rosh
Krakow, 1881.

Sefer Ketob Yosher.

Sefer Mizpeh Yokt'el
Berlin 1789.

Bernfeld, S.

De'at Elohim
Vol. 2, Warsaw 1899.Dor Tahapuhot
Warsaw 1897-8.Mina'el Zaks
Berlin 1900.Toldot Ha-reformazion Hadatit BeYisrael
Krakow 1900.Toldot Shur
Berlin 1899.Dor Chochom
Warsaw 1896.

Brainin R.

Peretz Ben Moshe Smolenskin
Warsaw 1896.

Bresslau, N.

Likute Maharan
Lemberg 1876.

Caro, David

Berit Emet
Dessau (Constantinople?) 1820.

Chorin, Aaron

Yeled Ze'umim
Vienna 1839.Zir Ne'emon
Prague 1831.Sefer Emek Hashaveh
Prague 1803.Igeret Elsassof
Prague 1826Der Treue Bothe
Prague 1831

Deutsch, D.

Asaf Asifah
Bresslau 1845.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Davidson, I. The Genesis of Hebrew Periodical Literature
 Baltimore 1900.
- Dei Rossi A. b. M. Sefer M'or 'Enaim
 Vilna 1866.
- Delitzsch, Franz Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie
 Leipsig 1836.
- Dubnow, S. M. History of the Jews in Russia and Poland
 Vol. 1, Philadelphia 1916.
- An Outline of Jewish History
 Vol. 3, New York 1925.
- Erter, Isaac Hazofeh L'bet Israel
 Vienna 1864.
- Euchel, Isaac Toldot Moshe b. Menahem
 Vienna 1814.
- Fleckeles, Eliezer Olat Hodesh
 Prague 1787
- Frankel, J. Marke Ha-mishnah
 Lipsiae 1859.
- Friedlander, J. Shoresch Yoseph
 Hannover 1834.
- Furst, A. Christen und Juden
 Strassburg 1892.
- Geiger, A. Israelitisches Gebetbuch
 Berlin 1870.
- Judaism and its History
 New York 1866.
- Kebuzat Ma'amarim
 Berlin 1877.
- Urschrift- und Uebersetzungen der Bibel
 Bresslau 1857.
- Gesch. der Juden in Berlin
 vol. 2.
- Nachgelassene Schriften, Vols -
 Berlin 1875-8.
- Seuder Terila D'var Yom B'Yomo
 Berlin 1854.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Ginsburg, Asher | Al Parashat Brachim
Vol. 1, Berlin 1921. |
| Graetz, H. | History of the Jews
Vol. 5, Philadelphia 1891. |
| Grunwald, Jekuthiel Judah | Korot Ha-torah v'ha-emunah b'hungariah
Budapest 1921. |
| Hamburg Temple | Gebetbuch des Neuen Tempels in Hamburg
Hamburg 1841. |
| Hamburg Rabbinate | Mibre Habrit
Altona 1819. |
| Heshel, J. | Aliot Eliyahu
Stettin 1861. |
| Homborg, H. | Imre Shefer
Wien 1808. |
| Hones, S. M. | Toldot Ha-poskim
Warsaw 1910. |
| Isserles, Moses b. Israel | Torat Ha-olah
Prague 1569. |
| Jatzkan, S. J. | Rabenu Eliyohu M'vilna
Warsaw 1900. |
| Jost, I. S. | Culturgeschichte
Vol. III, Berlin 1847. |
| Kahana, A. | Rabbi Moshe Hayim Luzzato
Warsaw 1896. |
| Kastilioni, I. Ch. | Jad Josef
Krakau 1889. |
| Klausner, J. | Geschichte der Neuhebraischen Literatur
Berlin 1921.

Toluot Hasofrat Haivrit Ha-hodasha
Jerusalem 1920.

Yehadut V'Amashint
Warsaw 1905. |
| Krochmal, N. | More Nebu'e Ha-zeman
Lemberg 1851. |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Landau, Ezekiel | Sefer Zion L'nefesh Hayoh
Prague 1791. |
| Lebowitz, N. S. | R. Yehudah Aryeh Modena
Vienna 1896. |
| Levinsohn, I. B. | Zerubabel
Warsaw 1901. |
| | Te'udah B'Yisrael
Warsaw 1878. |
| Lieberman, E. | Sefer Nogah Hazedek
Dessau 1818. |
| Loew, Leopold | Der Yuedishe Congress in Ungarn
Pest 1871. |
| Luzzato, M. H. | Sefer M'Silat Yesharim
Berlin 1906. |
| Luzzato, S. D. | Levau, R. J. Halevi
Lyck 1864. |
| | Prine Shqdal
Przemysl 1888. |
| | Yesode Ha-torah
Lemberg 1880. |
| | Igrot Shqdal
Przemysl 1882. |
| | Kinor Naim
Padua 1879. |
| Margolis M. L.
Marx, A. | A History of the Jewish People
Philadelphia 1927. |
| Mendelsohn, M. | Sefer Ntivat Hashalom
vol. 1
Berlin 1780-3; Prague 1836. |
| | Jerusalem
Vol. 2, London 1838. |
| Miseses, J. L. | Brith Ameth
Vienna 1828. |
| Modena, da L. | Bet Yehudah
Venice 1635. |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Plungian, M. b. Solomon | Ben Porat
Wilna 1858. |
| Perl, J. | Megaleh Temiwin
Venice 1819. |
| Philipson, David | The Reform Movement in Judaism
New York 1907. |
| Rabinowitz, S. P. | R. Zechariah Frankel
Warsaw 1898. |
| Raisin, Jacob S. | The Haskalah Movement in Russia
Philadelphia 1913. |
| Rashkov, J. Z. | Dibre Emunoh Omen
Bresslau 1821. |
| Rappaport, David | Nah'lot Yehudoh
vol. 1, Krakau 1868. |
| Rapaport, S. J. | Igrot Shir
Przemysl 1885. |
| | Tohanat Megulah
Frankfort-a-M. 1845. |
| | Dibre Shalom v'emet
Prague 1861. |
| Reggio, I. S. | Igrot Yashar
Wien 1834. |
| | Hatorah v'harilosofiah
Viennae 1827. |
| | Bhinat Ha-kabalah
Goritia 1852. |
| | Yalkut Yashar,
Goritia 1854. |
| Reinitz, M. L. | Lahat Ha-hereb
Wiena (?) 1820. |
| Schechter, S. S. | Studies in Judaism, Series -
Philadelphia 1896. |
| Schreiber, E. | Reformed Judaism
Spokane 1892. |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Slouschz, N. The Renaissance of Hebrew Literature
Philadelphia 1909.
- Sofer, Moses (Chasom) Sh'elot Utshubot
Pressburg 1864.
- Steinhardt, M. Dibre Igeret
Rudelheim 1812.
- Walustein, A. S. The Evolution of Modern Hebrew Literature
New York 1916.
- Weil, Dr. — Aron Chorin
Szegedin 1863.
- Weiss, I. H. Zikronotai
Warsaw 1895.
- Dor Dor v'Dorshov
vol. 5, Berlin 1924.
- Wertheimer, Joseph Ritter von Jahrbuch für Israeliten
Vol. 1, Vienna 1854.
- Wessely, H. Dibre Shalom V'emet
Berlin 1782.
- Gan Na'ul
Warsaw 1886, vol. I.
- Miktoqim R. N. H. W.
Warsaw 1886.
- Sefer Hamidot
Warsaw 1888.
- Ma'amar Hakor Lin
Berlin 1788.
- Wolf, G. Isaac Noah Manheimer
Wein 1863.
- Zeitlin, William Bibliotheca Hebraica Post-Mendelssohniana
Leipzig 1891.
- Zutra, Abraham Sefer Milhamot Adonai
Hannover 1836.
- Ordnung der Andacht des Neuen-Tempel-Verein in Hamburg Hamburg 1819.
- Protokolle der ersten Rabbiner-Versammlung Braunschweig 1844.
- Torat Hakana'yt Amsterdam 1845.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PERIODICALS

- Ahissaf, yrs. 1898-9, 1900, Warsaw.
- Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, vol. 8.
- Bikure Haitim, vol. 2, 11, 12, Vienna.
- Der Orient, vol. 3, Leipzig.
- Hassif, vol. 3, Warsaw.
- Hakarmel, yr. 1875, Wilna.
- Hamaqid, 1869, Lyck.
- Hameqqaf, yrs. 1784-8, 1788-90, 1704, 1809-11, Konigsberg.
- Ha-Meliz, vol. 39, St. Petersburg.
- Ha-Shanar, vol. 2, Vienna.
- Ha-Shiloah, vol. 1, Berlin.
- He-Haluz, vol. 3-4, Lemberg.
- Keren Hemed, Vienna, vols. 2, 4, 5, 6.
- Kochbe Jitschak, vol. 14, Wien.
- Monatschrift fur Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, yr. 1861, Bresslau.
- Ozar Nehmod, vols. 1-4, Vienna.
- Pardes, vol. 3, Odessa.
- Sulamith, yr. 1818, Leipsig.
- Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift fur Judische Theologie, A. Geiger, vol. 2.
- Zeitschrift fur die Religiösen Interessen des Judenthums, yr. 1844, Leipzig.

APPENDIX A

REFERENCES TO ESSAYS AND POEMS IN THE "MEASSEF" FAVORING EDUCATIONAL AND RELIGIOUS REFORMS.

1. ON THE EARLY BURYING OF THE DEAD.

A correspondence from Schwerin	vol. 1785	p. 87
An article by Moses Mendelsohn	" "	154
" " " " "	" "	169
" " " " " (anonymous)	" "	179
An article by a Polish Rabbi	" 1786	78
Another correspondence from Schwerin	" "	183

2. ON THE PERMISSION OF VACCINATION.

Article by Moses Mendelsohn	" 1785	5
(reprinted in Bekkure Ha'itim 1822/3, p. 23)		

3. FAVORING THE USE OF THE GERMAN LANGUAGE IN THE SYNAGOG.

Apologetic article by Isaac Euchler	" 1786	205-10
A Review of David Friedlander's "Tephilath Israel"	" "	141
Criticism of mechanical Hebrew services due to ignorance of people	" 1790	125

4. APPROVAL OF NON-JEWISH BIBLE SCHOLARSHIP.

Article favoring Bible criticism	" "	57
" " " "	" "	87

5. ATTACK ON RABBINIC OBSCURANTISM.

" 1794 16

6. CIVIL LAW VS. CEREMONIAL LAW.

Editorial letter concerning the conflict between military conscription		
and the observance of the Ceremonial Law	" 1788	331
Correspondence between the rabbis of Trieste and those of Vienna on		
this subject	" "	386
A letter to the Jews of Westphalia concerning the function of the		
consistory, its religious authority and its attitude to reforms	" 1810	9

7. HEBREW PRONOUNCIATION DURING RELIGIOUS SERVICES.

Wessely's preference for the Sephardic

vol. 1809 p.269

8. ON JEWISH EDUCATION.

Elijah Morpurgo of Italy

" 1786 66

Yosel Rachnowe

" 1789 176-87

Aaron Wolfsohn

" " 373

An address by Zimmerman in the Wilhelm School

" 1794 78

A letter from the Education Society of Amsterdam to that of Berlin

" 1809 188

A letter of the same society to the Jewish communities in Holland

" " 282

Another letter to the Jews of Poland urging them to study the

language of their country

" " 286

An article on education

" 1810 22

A sermon on Jewish education

" 1811 14,40

A series of articles on modern Pedagogy

" 1810 18,63

" " " " " " "

" 1811 26,56

APPENDIX B

ANALYSIS OF REFORM PRAYERBOOKS

1. HAMBURG PRAYERBOOK.

The first Reform prayerbook for public religious worship was the Hamburg Prayerbook (1819) entitled, "Ordnung der Oeffentlichen Andacht für die Sabbath und Festtage des ganzen Jahres nach dem Gebrauche des Neuen Tempel-Verein", in Hebrew and in German. Previous to this edition there were several prayerbooks in more or less abridged form, in the vernacular, but, being intended for private devotion they aroused no opposition on the part of the orthodox Jews. The first Reform prayerbook was the one used at the first confirmation service at the home of Israel Jacobson at Berlin in 1815. This Prayerbook contained no textual changes of any sort except that some prayers were translated into the vernacular and, the "Musaf" prayer was completely omitted. This Prayerbook was later on published in pamphlet form not indicating the year and place of publication. It served as a temporary ritual for the new form of service. At first they published the ritual for Sabbath and New Year only, and later on they published rituals for the three festivals and Yom Kippur (Bernfeld T. R. B. pp. 240-3).

In 1817 Ginsburg and Kley prepared a new temporary ritual which was used in the Berlin reform community till 1823. This Prayerbook followed the traditional ritual except that it was abridged and that many prayers were translated into the vernacular. However, in none of these Prayerbooks were the obligatory prayers (*שמונה עשרה*) tampered with, nor were there any omissions of prayers which had reference to the redemption and to the reconstruction of Palestine (Ibid, pp. 243-7).

There were several other Prayerbooks, more or less, of the same

form, notably among which is the one published by Abraham Kahar (Ibid, pp. 70-1; J. E., vol. 9, p. 104).

Not until the "Hamburg-Tempel-Gebetbuch" was there a consistent Prayerbook of a specific Reform ideology. The editors of this ritual were S. I. Frankel and I. M. Presslau. Being of a conservative temperament and possessing a fine appreciation for traditional forms, they succeeded in producing a Prayerbook true to the traditional spirit yet satisfying the needs of the time. The outstanding outer characteristics of this Hamburg ritual were: That the reading began from the left side of the Prayerbook and the Hebrew was pronounced in the Sephardic style. As to the content of the prayers, the editors had primarily five aims in view, namely: (1) To eliminate the "Pesuke D'Zimra" as much as possible in the Hebrew in order to make room for the German hymns; (2) To abbreviate and to translate into the vernacular non-obligatory prayers and to eliminate the silent recitation of the Eighteen Benedictions in order to make the service understood and unburdensome to the average person of limited knowledge of Hebrew; (3) To substitute the Sephardic piyutim for the Ashkenazic because of the superiority of the former (see note chap. 3-6); (4) To eliminate such references and prayers which imply that the Jews regard themselves as strangers in their native land (they did not discard, however, the belief in the restoration of Palestine and in the reconstruction of the Temple); (5) To eliminate such references which imply theological doctrines no longer tenable in the light of modern thinking; namely, the beliefs in a personal Messiah and in the restoration of the sacrificial cult. But those prayers which referred to the sacrificial cult as having been practised in the past were left untouched, because these were historic facts which need not be denied.

In order to understand the tendency of this Prayerbook it would suffice to give a detailed analysis of the Sabbath and Festival prayers.

(Every prayer which is written in the vernacular is marked with an asterisk)

I. ON THE EVE OF SABBATH AND OF THE THREE FESTIVALS.

* (for holidays they sang instead (German hymn): *אין זונט און אויף פארשטאג*)
דינא; חרבי קדיש; סג אבדולאף; שטי קיטל מאנהאפערס;
דינא קדיש; מאנהאפערס; אבדולאף; חרבי קדיש;
 (including the phrase *קדיש אהרן*)
 (according to the Sephardic ritual) *קדיש יתנו וקדיש דינא*
 begins as follows: *יחיה ויתקדש שמו כבודו לעולם ועד ויהיה שמו כבודו לעולם ועד*
 in order to
 have some reference to immortality, and instead of the *קדיש דינא*

they substituted the Sephardic ritual which reads as follows:

2 *א ייטש ואל פריקא ואל פריקא פריקא פריקא פריקא פריקא*
פריקא פריקא פריקא פריקא פריקא פריקא פריקא פריקא
אברהם אן קדיש מאריה שיה אברהם אברהם אברהם
 * *אברהם אברהם*

II. MORNING PRAYER FOR SABBATH AND FESTIVALS.

1. * *אויף דינא חסד*
2. * *דינא חסד*
3. * *הלל דינא*
4. * *אברהם חסד חסד חסד*
5. * *דינא חסד*
6. * *אברהם חסד חסד חסד*
7. * *אברהם חסד*
8. (German Hymn).

3. GEIGER'S ISRAELITISCHES GEBETBUCH.

Strikingly enough, Geiger's Prayerbook entitled, "Seuer Ovar Yom B'Yomo" or "Israelitisches Gebetsbuch für den öffentlichen Gottesdienst im Ganzen Jahre" (Dresslau 1864) is the most conservative in form of all reform prayerbooks. Geiger's prayerbook reads from right to left and contains almost the whole Hebrew text of the orthodox prayerbook. The changes are so few and insignificant that it could easily pass for an orthodox prayerbook. There are even the benedictions for Talit and Tephilin (page 7). We also find the Mincha and Ma'arib for daily services. He even retained the *יְהוָה* benediction except that he changed the word *יְהוָה* for *יְהוֹשֻׁעַ* (p. 42).

The book contains also the prayers for the close of Sabbath (*וְעַתָּה*), for the Ninth of Ab (p. 148) and for Hoshana Rabba (pp. 253ff.). In the New Year's prayer is included the Shofar service (pp. 321-323) and the Musaf of Yom Kippur has nearly the complete list of the Al-Het.

Nearly all the references to the restoration of Palestine remain untouched. Only references to the coming of the Messiah and of the sacrificial cult he eliminated throughout. Also all the passages which imply that the Jew regards himself as a stranger in his native land were eliminated or modified.

2. Concerning Prayer in the Vernacular.

תפלה בלשון אשכנזי "תפלה רחמי הוה / רחמיך אבא זכור".
 וְ הַמֶּלֶךְ, אֵלֶּיךָ סִתְּרָא סִתְּרָא; סְפִיר הַחֲסִידִים סִתְּרָא
 וְ תַּגְמִינֵם בְּאֵי וְלִי הַמַּלְכוּת הַדְּמוּת לְמִנְיָן מַמְשֵׁ:
 יִסְמַח אֵל אֲדָמָה מִתְּפִלָּה וְיִסְמַח אֵל מִן הַתְּפִלָּה בְּלִשְׁוֹן
 מִנְיָן מִתְּפִלָּה בְּלִשְׁוֹן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן
 אֲדָמָה קִרְבָּן קִרְבָּן נָא זֶה לְמִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן
 לְמִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן
 אֲדָמָה יִרְמִיָּה אֲדָמָה מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן
 אֲדָמָה מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן
 חֲרָמִים אֲדָמָה - אֲדָמָה מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן
 שְׂמִינִי מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן
 אֲדָמָה מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן

בְּלִשְׁוֹן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן
 מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן
 אֲדָמָה מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן
 יִרְמִיָּה מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן

בְּלִשְׁוֹן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן
 מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן
 אֲדָמָה מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן
 מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן
 אֲדָמָה מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן מִנְיָן

אוריאל מלכות ושמע באפצית בפסוקים האלו המיוחדים
האמורים.

ע"כ א"כ משיק בט"מ"ס קא'.

הע"ז (אלי צמח) ס"ק ב'

ס' החסידות תתק"פ

המג"ז ס' נ"ס ק"ב

המג"ז ס' ק"א ס"ק ב'.

א"כ גם בחשבוני דרכי פ"ב א"ל זכרם רב ונעצו
האורחות רחוקה בראשית, וה"ה בריב"ל ועל במה א"ל.
אחרי כן כיון שהיה פחיתות ומה נאמר בא"ה
א"כ נראה הנשים אהרן בראשית, שהוא א"ל הם חושבים
אהרן? אולי כן, כי כן י"א: שיו"ל מהר"א.
המחבר הסביר בריב"ל דמי. וזו נראה פ"א האמורה
על אהרן וזו במיד, ורק לא בלשון ושמע י"א.

ד"כ א"ה (הקדמה) ס' ק"ה א"ל אהרן, ומה
מישהו מיום מניח בא"ה, וז"ל אהרן בראשית
שמע"ל א"ל קדוש וז"ל יקדש בא"ה י"א

ע"כ גם ד" (דור יא"ל) ס' ק"א א"ל אהרן: ע"א אהרן
בראשית מעשה א"ה בריב"ל, ועל במה א"ל מה
א"ל בא"ה. א"ה ד"ה נשאל א"ה, כיון מהר"א
א"ה א"ל ד"ה א"ל ד"ה א"ל ד"ה א"ל ד"ה
המחבר א"ל מהר"א. ח"ב וז"ל א"ל בראשית, א"ל
ד"ה ח"ב נשאל ד"ה וז"ל א"ל מעשה י"א.

הנה, ואפני ענין זה תקרא כל הדיבור והתפלות מאפני
 בפי כל ישראל כפי מהו ענין כל ברכה וברכה בפי
 הדיבור.

(ה) תפלה בלחש.

וְכָתוּב שֶׁמֶלֶךְ כִּי־ס' הָאֵל שׁוֹמֵר הַיָּעָרָה מִחֻקֵּי יוֹדָא
 בְּשֵׁף דִּם הִקְדָּשׁ יִהְיֶה בְּקוֹל רִמָּה.

בְּזֶה מִנְהַג רַחֲמֵי בִּלְלֵי אֲדָמָה וְזֶלָּה: כְּעֶבֶר אֱלֹהֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי
 חֲפִיזִים וְכִי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי
 מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי
 אֲבִיחֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי
 אֵל מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי
 כִּי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי
 חֲפִיזִים וְזֶלָּה מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי.

בְּזֶה מִנְהַג בִּרְכַּת מִן הַבְּרָכָה מִחֻקֵּי יוֹדָא וְכִי מִלְכֵי
 אֲבִיחֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי
 אֲבִיחֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי
 כִּי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי
 אֲבִיחֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי.

(ו) תפלה ביחוד חור.

וְכָתוּב שֶׁמֶלֶךְ כִּי־ס' הָאֵל שׁוֹמֵר הַיָּעָרָה מִחֻקֵּי יוֹדָא
 חֲפִיזִים וְזֶלָּה מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי
 אֲבִיחֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי
 כִּי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי
 אֲבִיחֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי מִלְכֵי
 בְּזֶה מִנְהַג בִּרְכַּת מִן הַבְּרָכָה מִחֻקֵּי יוֹדָא וְכִי מִלְכֵי

הפועל י' זה קצוה וס'ק, למלך בן. ולאו נחמד בכתב יד יד
המקרא י' זה אומדן ממלך בן דל אצל י'ק
א' הרמז ב' חסדו (ס' כ') ב' מ' מ' ק' ז' : ב' מ' מ' מ' מ' מ'
ב' מ'
א' מ'
ב' מ'
ב' מ'

א' הרמז ב' מ'
ב' מ'
א' מ'
ב' מ'

א' הרמז ב' מ'
ב' מ'
א' מ'
ב' מ'

7. א' מ'
ב' מ'
א' מ'

8. א' מ'
ב' מ'
א' מ'
ב' מ'

12. Proper Decorum At Services Indispensable According to Jewish Law.

וְהַרְחֵק פֶּה אֶת מַעֲבָדֶיךָ: זֶה כְּסִילֹת - זֶה לְהִתְנַחֵם
 בְּהַי קֹלֹר הַאֵשׁ כִּי אֵין שְׂחֹק לְהַחֲלֹל וְשִׁמְרָה בְּשִׁמְרָה, וְזֶה
 אֲנִי בְּרַחֲמֵי אֱלֹהִים מִחֵן בִּפְנֵי אֱלֹהִים וְאֵין בְּרַחֲמֵי אֱלֹהִים
 מִחֵן בִּפְנֵי אֱלֹהִים, וְזֶה לְכַסֵּת הַבֶּן בְּחִמָּה מִכִּי הַחֲמִידָה מִכִּי
 הַגִּישָׁה.

בֶּן שִׁלְשִׁים בְּסִפְרֵי חַיִּים בְּלִי לְ: מִחֵן הַלֵּב בְּהִיכָר אֵלֶיךָ
 גִּבּוֹר הַלֵּב.

בֶּן מִתְנֶה (מִגְלֶה-כִּי סֵעָה) זֶה כְּסִילֹת מִחֵן בְּרַחֲמֵי אֱלֹהִים
 קִדְּשָׁה הַיְּקָרָה אֶת.