

THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE ... CINCINNATI
JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION ... NEW YORK

40 W. SIXTY-EIGHTH STREET · NEW YORK 23, N. Y.
TRAFALGAR 3-0200


June 4, 1953

Report on "Abraham Krochmal and his Role in the Haskalah"
by Philip Hiat

This thesis is a study of the role played by Abraham Krochmal in the Haskalah period. Special emphasis is laid upon his religious ideas and their sources. The work contains five chapters. Chapter I gives a general history and analysis of the state of Jewish scholarship in the middle decades of the nineteenth century. Chapter II contains a biography of Abraham Krochmal largely (if not exclusively) based upon the very thorough biography of Klausner in his History of Modern Hebrew Literature. The third chapter is devoted to an analysis of Krochmal's books and the fourth to his articles. The thesis closes with a discussion of A. Krochmal's place in the history of modern Hebrew literature.

While Mr. Hiat relies very heavily upon Klausner's study of A. Krochmal, his more detailed digest of שפת אמת and Theologie der Zukunft adds somewhat to our knowledge of A. Krochmal's works. The thesis fails in its attempt to describe the various influences on Abraham Krochmal. No clear picture is given as to the influence of Nachman Krochmal upon his son, nor of the rather close relationship with Osaias Schorr. In addition, the candidate hardly discusses the socio-economic milieu which gave rise to a Maskevitz of A. Krochmal's type.

Despite the weaknesses enumerated above, I feel that the candidate wrote a satisfactory thesis and is therefore entitled to the degree of Rabbi. This thesis, however, is not recommended for publication.


Ezra Spacehandler
Referee

ABRAHAM KROCHMAL
and
His role in the Haskalah

by

Philip Hiat

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
degree of Rabbi and Master of Hebrew Letters.**

**Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
New York School**

1953

54911

Introduction

Appreciation is due, first and foremost, to Dr. Joseph Klausner and his monumental ^(בסיומו) הספח הדברי הימים both for its sound scholarship and for its keen insight. He ushered the present writer into the understanding of the spirit of the man and his philosophy more so than any other. Further, I should like to thank Dr. H. H. Glantz for assisting me in the translation of Krochmal's Theologie der Zukunft. And most of all I should like to express my sincerest thanks to Dr. Ezra Spicehandler for his patience and understanding, two characteristics which mark ~~the~~ the scholar and teacher that he is. His guidance was the sine qua non of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I - The Jewish New Learning of the
Nineteenth Century

Chapter II - Biography of Abraham Krochmal

Chapter III - Digest and Analysis of Krochmal's Books

Chapter IV - Digest of Krochmal's Articles

Chapter V - Why Krochmal was Forgotten in the

~~Modern Hebrew Literature~~
Modern Hebrew Literature

Chapter I

THE JEWISH NEW LEARNING

OF THE

NINETEENTH CENTURY

By the term New Learning I designate the historico-critical literature on Judaism produced by the Jews in Central and Eastern Europe during the nineteenth century. This New Learning differs from the Old Learning not only in its modern scientific methods, but also in its aims and tendencies. The Old Learning studied the Torah mainly in order to know how to regulate the life of the Jew in the present. Its interest in the past extended only so far as that past had any direct bearing upon the present and the future. Or, more correctly, the Old Learning did not draw any sharp distinction between the past and the present. The two formed one continuous, indivisible, living whole. The New Learning, on the other hand, sharply distinguished the past from the present. The former belonged to a period now fully terminated. It had,

indeed, transmitted some of its possessions to the present, and consequently had also a direct connection with, and a great importance for, the present. But, nevertheless, the chief and primary interest of the New Learning in the study of the past was of a historical, one might almost say of an archaeological, nature.

I have purposely avoided the use of the term 'Jewish Science', by which the New Learning is commonly known. I consider this term to be not only incorrect and misleading, but also absurd. 'Jewish Science' can only mean science as pursued by the Jews, just as the corresponding terms 'English Science', 'German Science' only mean science as pursued by the English and the Germans in their own characteristic methods. Nor is the more original expression 'Science of Judaism' much better. The

study of Judaism embraces not one science only, but an innumerable host of independent sciences. Judaism is co-extensive with human thought, and to speak of a 'Science of Judaism' is just as absurd as to apply the term 'Science of Germanism' to the study of things relating to the past and present of the Germans. The term 'Science of Judaism' is not permissible even in the narrow sense of Judaism as the Jewish religion. For nobody could speak of a 'Science of Christianity' or a 'Science of Mohammedanism'. I have been obliged, therefore, to avoid the expressions 'Jewish Science' and 'Science of Judaism' as incorrect, in spite of their obvious convenience. With this prefatory remark I will now pass on to my proper subject.

The eighteenth century was in Jewish, as in general history, a period of transition. It

witnessed the decay and gradual termination of an old epoch in the life of the Jews and Judaism, and the beginning of a new one. The mighty convulsion produced by the compound of mysticism and nationalism, which in the previous century had shaken the whole Jewish world to its very foundations, I mean the pseudo-Messianic movement of Sabbatai Zevi, continued to be the dominant force in the Judaism of the eighteenth century. This force manifested itself in the life of that noble but erratic genius, Moses Chaim Luzzatto, at the beginning of the century, in the conflict between Emden and Eybeschutz, and in the Frankist movement in the middle of the century and, in a purified and ennobled form, in the Chassidic movement at the end of the century. Its violence had, indeed, been spent before the commencement of the nineteenth century, and it worked no longer openly, but rather in an underhand

fashion, yet it was still active everywhere, moving the minds of men in active sympathy or arousing bitter opposition. Sabbataism was finally suppressed in Western Europe by the rise of another force equally violent, but far more powerful by reason of its wide extent, that being the great intellectual and social movement which culminated in the French Revolution, and in Eastern Europe by two mutually hostile Reform movements within Judaism itself, Chassidism, which destroyed Sabbataism by absorbing its permanent elements, and the New Rabbinism introduced by the Gaon of Wilna, which removed the ground from under Sabbataism by its sane and robust intellectualism. A time of such mental agitation and restlessness is not favorable to the production of a literature of a permanent and abiding value. It can only reflect

its own agitated and unsettled mind, its wavering between the past and the present, between old and the new, and at the same time sow seeds, the fruit of which will only come to maturity in a more settled and a happier future. This is, on the whole, the character of Jewish literature in the eighteenth century. The old and the new, the decayed and the vigorous appear in this literature side by side or mingled together, often in one and the same author. Thus in the domain of Talmudical studies we have the old casuistical *Novellae* and the fictitious *Responsa* side by side with the sane and critical annotations of an Elijah Gaon; in the domain of theosophy the old charlatan, miracle-mongering Kabbalah, together with the intense and profound ethical mysticism of M. Ch. Luzzatto, and later of the Chassidim. The voice of Hebrew song,

which had long been silent, suddenly broke forth in a truly noble and almost classical note in the same Luzzatto, a note which found no worthy response till almost our own day. Grammar and exegesis revived in Zalman Hanau and Solomon Dubno, and promising changes were to be observed also in other fields.

But whilst this literary and intellectual activity was proceeding within the bosom of Judaism, drawing its whole vitality from Jewish soil, there arose another movement also within Judaism, which, however, drew its force and driving power entirely from the outside. I allude to the movement for the occidentalising of the Jews, and Judaism, the beginnings of which are usually, and with some justice associated with the name of Moses Mendelssohn. This movement produced in Judaism the only great funda-

mental change since the fall of the Jewish State. The change was primarily of a political character, but of so radical a nature that it involved either a complete break with the whole past, or, if possible, a readjustment of Judaism to the new life. Throughout the centuries that lay between the fall of Bar Kochba and the French Revolution Judaism existed and developed on the lines laid down by the rabbis of the school of Jabneh. The underlying political principle was that the dispersion was of a temporary character, and that the restoration of the national policy might be expected at any moment. Hence the Jews looked upon themselves everywhere merely as temporary settlers in the countries in which they happened to live, and as forming not an integral part of the inhabitants of those countries, but rather a compact unit distinct and separate not merely in religion, but also in social, cultural,

and, if one may apply this term to the Middle Ages, in national character. Thus Judaism adapted itself easily and without the least difficulty to every age and to every country. Jews sometimes felt the need of harmonizing their religion with new philosophical conceptions, but never and nowhere did they feel the need of harmonizing their religion with social and political conditions. Whether in Babylon or in Spain, in Germany or in Poland, the Jews ever proved themselves capable of fully observing and cultivating the religion and literature which they had brought with them from Palestine; because in all ages and in all countries they continued to remain the same people, with the same individuality, and with the same consciousness. But from the French Revolution onwards Jews began in ever-increasing numbers to regard themselves no longer

as temporary sojourners, but as permanent citizens, in the countries in which they lived, and as forming an integral and inseparable part of the nations of those countries. Their ancestors had, indeed come from Judea, but the ancestors of their fellow-citizens also had come originally from some remote region in the East. Having been settled in these countries for generations, Jews had as much right to regard themselves as real sons of these countries as their non-Semitic neighbors. This, then, was in short the great change in the political basis of Jewish existence effected by the end of the eighteenth century.

The causes which produced this change were the disappointment and the despair in the hopes of the people, which followed the Sabbatai Zevi DEBACLE, on the one hand, and on the

other, the spurious cosmopolitanism and the shallow scepticism which spread in the middle of the eighteenth century from Paris over the whole of the Continent, and made an easy prey of the Jewish youth in Germany. The part played in this movement by Moses Mendelssohn has been grossly exaggerated by his admirers as well as by his opponents. He did nothing more than accelerate a change which was bound to come as a historical necessity, and of which he himself was but a product. He did not create the new era, but he ushered it in. He was both the first and the most typical of modern Jews. Mendelssohn was the first Jew who identified himself with another nation and yet remained a Jew. The best part of his life's work was devoted to the service of the German nation. He became one of the creators of the literary language of modern Germany,

and one of the founders of her national literature. Yet for all that he remained all his life a warm-hearted and pious Israelite, sincerely devoted to his religion and to his people. Before his time, Jewish scholars brought the learning which they had acquired from external sources to their own people, incorporating it into Judaism and thereby enriching and developing the intellectual wealth of their own nation. Mendelssohn, on the other hand, brought the products of his great mind and of his fine taste not to the Jews, but to the Germans, enriching not the literature of Judaism, but that of Germany. The Germans he taught philosophy and literary criticism, the Jews he taught to translate the Pentateuch. Judaism, which hitherto had embraced the whole mental activity of the Jew, secular as well as religious, had thus been narrowed down by

Mendelssohn into a mere religion, in the strict sense of the term. He introduced into our life a dualism which was contrary to the whole spirit of Judaism. He dissolved the old synthesis into its component parts, and separated the man from the Jew. In our activities as men, we share the life of Germans, French, or English, as the case may be, and only in our relations to God are we Jews. This was the new teaching which Mendelssohn exemplified in his life and in his work.

Now this kind of life was perfectly easy for one with Mendelssohn's gift of mind and heart, who, moreover, had been trained in the old Jewish synthesis. But to Mendelssohn's followers, to his children, disciples, and imitators, who possessed neither his intellect nor his virtues nor his training, such a dual life became extremely difficult, if not actually impossible. Traditional Judaism did not easily lend

itself to be compressed and squeezed down into a small bundle, which you could keep quietly in a convenient corner of your bosom, making use of it only when and where you pleased. It claimed precedence over everything else, and demanded possession of the whole man, body, soul, and mind. And so, Mendelssohn's followers experienced the conflict between Judaism and Germanism at every step and every moment of their lives. The two forces were apparently incompatible. One had to be given up, and naturally the easier and more convenient course was to give up Judaism and retain Germanism. Thus it came about that practically all the followers of Mendelssohn threw up the burden of Judaism and exchanged the master's dualism for the German unity. But it was not to be thought that Judaism, with its wonderful vitality and pertinacity, would allow itself to be wiped out by any force, however powerful.

Unable to stem the tide of Germanism, Judaism sought to effect a compromise, and to devise a MODUS VIVENDI whereby both Judaism and Germanism might abide together in one and the same heart. So the period of the Great Apostasy, following on the death of Mendelssohn and the French Revolution, was itself followed by a period of Religious Reform, or the readjustment of Judaism to the new conditions of Jewish existence. The different tendencies of thought ultimately resolved themselves, about the middle of the nineteenth century, into three distinct schools: the Neo-Orthodox under the leadership of Samson Raphael Hirsch, the Radical Reformers under the leadership of Abraham Geiger, and the Moderates or Evolutionary Conservatives under Zachariah Frankel. These schools, however widely they differed in doctrine and practice, were to all intents and

purposes at one in accepting the new political principle of Jewish existence which I have described above, viz. that the Jews formed an integral part of the nations among whom they lived, and that Judaism was nothing more than a religion in the strict sense of the term.

But Mendelssohn's influence upon modern Judaism was displayed also in another direction through the efforts that he made to improve Jewish education. To this end he issued a German translation of the Pentateuch, accompanied by a Hebrew commentary called BIUR, written partly by himself and partly by other scholars under his supervision. This work, though it possesses little or nothing of permanent value, was yet a notable performance for that time, and its influence upon Jewish education was very great and far-reaching. It spread beyond the confines

of Germany, and penetrated into Galicia and Russia, where it sowed the seed of a new literary revival. To the German Jews, Mendelssohn's Pentateuch served mainly as a means of transit away from the Ghetto, with its disfigured jargon, into the wider German world, with its pure speech and its young and flourishing literature. To the Eastern Jews, too, the Mendelssohnian Pentateuch opened up a new world, but one which by the nature of their surroundings they had to incorporate into their own old Jewish world, thus widening the confines of the latter and introducing into it a fresh, life-giving atmosphere. Now Mendelssohn addressed himself in his educational work not to the intellect, but to the feelings. He did not seek to introduce among his brethren scientific and critical methods of study, but he sought to develop their taste, and to awaken in them a sense

for the simple and the beautiful in language and in thought. Hence also his followers and his imitators confined themselves exclusively to linguistic and purely literary pursuits. Thus there arose a school of translators and exegetes, or 'Biurists', and of writers in prose and verse who introduced into Hebrew literature new themes and new style - the 'Meass'phim'. Their writings possess no intrinsic value whatever, but they served in their time a useful educational purpose in drawing away the minds of the Jewish youth from the dry casuistical studies of the YESHIBOTH. Still, the eager and subtle intellect of the Polish Jew could not be satisfied for long with the puerilities and the platitudes of the 'Meass'phim'. It soon craved for something more solid and more nourishing than the wretched verses and the empty, bombastic rhetoric offered to it by

those LITTERATEURS. To satisfy this craving, the Polish Talmudist returned to his native studies, and began to apply to them the system and method which he had acquired through the agency of the Mendelssohnian school, and thus he evolved the new critical and historical study of Judaism.

The founders of this Eastern or Hebrew school of modern Jewish scholarship were the two Galician Jews, Nachman Krochmal and Solomon Lob Rapoport. Krochmal (1785-1840) was the older and the greater of the two. He was a typical Jewish student, modest, gentle, shy, and reserved to a fault. To him study was an object in itself, a great and holy object, which alone made life worth living. Equipped with a profound and all-embracing knowledge of the vast range of Jewish literature and thought of all ages, and deeply versed in the modern systems of German

philosophy and logic, Krochmal set himself the great task of tracing the development of Jewish thought and of constructing a philosophy of Jewish history. His dread of publicity and his want of confidence in his own powers kept him back from committing his thoughts to writing, and it was only at the repeated and urgent requests of his friends and disciples that he began, late in life, to jot down his ideas. Before his death he ordered his children to send his notes to Zunz, and after a lapse of ten years, the latter succeeded in presenting to the world a slender Hebrew volume, entitled THE MODERN GUIDE OF THE PERPLEXED. The book contains a series of philosophical studies in the history of Judaism, on the age and character of several biblical books, on the Jewish sects, on Gnosticism and Jewish Alexandrian philosophy, on the character of the

Agadah, and kindred subjects. The book is worthy to stand side by side with its great namesake - the GUIDE OF MAIMONIDES. That its influence upon Jewish thought has not been commensurate with its greatness is due partly to the overpowering influence of Rapoport and Zunz on the development of Jewish studies, and partly to the ever-growing estrangement of the Jewish public from Hebrew literature. But the great mind of Krochmal left its impress upon modern Judaism not so much by his writings as by the direct and personal influence which he exercised upon a select band of young friends and disciples, all of whom became prominent in Jewish literature, and all of whom owed their first inspiration, as also their subsequent intellectual acquisition, to the shy and delicate Sage of Zolkiev.

The greatest and most renowned of Krochmal's

young friends was Solomon Jehudah Lob Rapoport (1790-1868). Unlike his master, Rapoport was of a frank, lively, sociable, and enthusiastic disposition, and this was the cause of many of his troubles at the hands of the Chassidim and other fanatics. After dallying for some years with poetry and general literature, as was the fashion of the age, Rapoport began in 1829 a series of biographies of Jewish worthies, which laid the foundation of the school of historical research. These little biographies were perfect models of style and arrangement, but their chief value lay in the critical notes appended to them. In these notes Rapoport sought to substantiate the statements in the text, and to show how he had arrived at his novel and striking conclusions, and in doing this he had to collect all the historical data, scattered pellmell over an

immense range of unexplored literature, which had any connection, however remote, with his main subject. These data he had to disentangle, to arrange, to classify, and to elucidate; he had to submit them to a critical examination, distinguishing the gold from the dross, the real from the apparent, the true from the fictitious, and the historical from the legendary. To this herculean task, Rapoport brought an erudition, a power of systematization, a critical acumen, and a genius for combination of a truly extraordinary character. Unlike the philosophic Krochmal, who was mainly interested in broad and general principles, Rapoport revelled in the small details and the minutia of history, and by his critical treatment of these seemingly trivial but really very important details, he opened up a pathway in the hitherto chaotic and labyrinthine

field of Jewish history, and became both the guide and the model of all subsequent investigators. The five little biographies, covering but a few dozen pages of Hebrew print, are referred to by Zunz in his book on Jewish Homilies, published one year later, no less than one hundred and ten times. Of Rapoport's other productions, the most notable is his *פירוש קדמון*, a cyclopedia of which only the letter *ק* has been published.

But Rapoport and his friends were not bookworms, dry-as-dust scholars whose chief interest lay in the dead past, and who were oblivious of the present and its needs. On the contrary, their chief interest was the present, and it was for the illumination of the present that they searched for precious stones in the deep quarries of the distant past. These Galician scholars were *פ'סענ*, or humanists, men whose

great object in life was to bring to their people the *נִסְיוֹן*, or enlightenment, and to dispel the darkness and superstition and ignorance in which their contemporaries were steeped by revealing to them all that was good and noble in other nations, and more especially, in their own great past. Unfortunately, the salutary influence of their labors did not extend to the broad masses of Austrian Jewry. The Haskalah movement in Austria was throttled between the bigotry and the fanaticism of the Chassidim on the one side, and anti-Jewish Germanism on the other side. Yet within a narrow circle the scientific Haskalah produced a rich harvest of goodly and delectable fruit. It produced men like Isaac Hirsch Weiss, the author of

דרכי חיים, a stupendous work on the history of the Oral Law; Meir Friedmann, the learned and acute editor of the Halachic Midrashim;

Solomon Buber, the industrious and erudite editor of the Hagadic Midrashim; and a large number of other scholars, who, however, did not always preserve the Hebrew traditions of their masters, but wrote their works in non-Jewish languages. Moreover, the influence of the Galician Haskalah did not remain confined to its native country, or to the narrow circle of professional scholars. It crossed the border into Russia, and there, in conjunction with the Berlin Haskalah, it produced the great Hebrew revival which still flourishes in unabated and ever-increasing force and vigor. The Haskalah literature in Russia was, from its very beginning, of a more general and more comprehensive character than the literatures of the Berlin or the Galician Haskalah. It appealed to a wider public, and took, therefore, deeper roots in the life of

the Jewish people, so that it has gradually become truly national and regenerative; and this explains its great vitality and its undoubted success.

With this eastern school of Jewish scholars, must also be counted the small but talented group of Italian scholars and writers, the greatest of whom was Samuel David Luzzatto (1800-65) a man distinguished alike for his wide and profound learning, and for his strikingly original conception of Judaism. He was pre-eminent as critic, as philologist, as Bible commentator, as editor of medieval Hebrew poetry, and above all, as an independent Jewish thinker. He adorned everything that he touched. His commentary on the Bible is, with the single exception of Geiger's *URSCHRIFT*, the only lasting contribution made by nineteenth century Judaism to Biblical science, just as his linguistic studies

form, with the exception of Barth, the only serious contribution of modern Jews to Semitic philology. But greater even than these services was the service that he rendered to Jewish literature by his discoveries and editions of medieval Hebrew classics. It was he who made the treasures of the Spanish period accessible to the modern world. Living, like most Jewish scholars, a life of poverty and privation, he denied himself and his family the barest necessities of life, in order to gather together a rich store of ancient Hebrew manuscripts, which he either edited himself, or bestowed freely, together with his guidance and advice, upon any one who showed the least inclination or ability to publish them. His great object in life was to serve the cause of Judaism by promoting Jewish learning. He was at the beck and call of every one, whether great or small, who sought his help and assistance.

His extensive correspondence with all and sundry fills many volumes in Hebrew and Italian, and forms a rich mine of information on every conceivable subject connected with Jewish learning, besides presenting a graphic picture of this remarkable personality and of his learned correspondents. A fearless and independent critic who shrank from nothing in his eager search for truth, Luzzatto nevertheless retained all his life a profound and ardent faith in traditional Judaism. He was passionately attached to everything truly and genuinely Jewish. He cultivated the Hebrew language with loving care and devotion, believing this to be the only safeguard against assimilation. The eagerness of his contemporaries for emancipation, and their readiness to sacrifice to it so much of their Jewishness, he stigmatised as downright treachery

to Judaism. Luzzatto conceived Judaism as a system of ethics and morality which alone could make mankind truly happy. Atticism, by which he designated the Hellenic spirit, which served only to gratify the intellect or the senses, was the abhorrence of his soul. The vaunted progress of modern civilization was to him but a sham and a lie, inasmuch as it only ministered to our physical comforts and rendered us more sensuous and more selfish. His ideal Jew he found in the simple, sincere and pious Franco-German Jews of the type of Rashi. He savagely attacked Ibn Ezra and Maimonides for introducing Hellenic speculation into Judaism, and he did not even spare his beloved Jehudah Halevi, with whom he had so much in common. Such, in brief, was Samuel David Luzzatto, the greatest Jew in an age so peculiarly rich in great Jews. His contemporaries

loved and adored him without understanding him. He was an enigma to his friends, an anachronism in his age. Only we of a later generation can begin to comprehend him and to appreciate the real greatness of the man and his place in Jewish thought.

The task which the Eastern School set before itself was a comparatively easy one. Writing exclusively in Hebrew, its members addressed themselves solely to their own brethren, and particularly to those who were still attached to and familiar with the national language and literature. They sought to humanize the Jews and to modernize their studies by introducing new ideas into Judaism, and by applying modern critical methods of research to the elucidation of the Jewish past. The Western or German School, on the other hand, had a far more complicated problem to deal with. In the one short

generation which followed on the death of Mendelssohn the whole of German Judaism was transformed beyond recognition. The YESHIBOTH, which had been maintained by the Rabbis in every congregation, were closed, the BATHE MIDRASHIM deserted, and the study of Hebrew and Jewish literature fell into desuetude. The intellectual youth of the Ghetto flocked to the German universities, and became estranged from everything Jewish. Almost everybody looked down upon Judaism as an antiquated relic of a barbarous age, quite useless, and even harmful, to a German of the nineteenth century. The highest perfection, which the modern Jew should seek to attain, was to be indistinguishable from his non-Jewish neighbor, and the greatest and noblest prize, which he should strive with all his might to acquire, was civic and political equality. Assimilation and emancipation

were to be the final goal of all Jewish existence. The German nation, however, did not take at all kindly to this sudden zeal for Germanism displayed by their Jews. They repelled the overtures of the Ghetto with redoubled hatred and disdain. Moreover, it was not easy for every Jew to shake off completely the whole inherited past. Some of it, at least the most essential and permanent elements, had to be retained, though in a form compatible with Germanism. But what elements in Judaism were essential and permanent, and what non-essential and transient? Only a scientific and critical examination of the whole of Judaism, as revealed in its entire history and literature, could offer a satisfactory answer to this great question. Hence Leopold Zunz (1794-1886), the father of the German school of the New Learning, set himself to perform this threefold task;

to regain the love and devotion of the Germanized Jews for their ancestral faith and literature; to reveal to the German world the real character of Judaism, and thus secure their respect for, and their goodwill to, their Jewish fellow-citizens; and, lastly, to ascertain for Jews themselves, as well as for their rulers, on what lines Judaism could be successfully reformed from within and from without. In addition to these three objects, Zunz conceived the noble ambition of establishing what he termed a 'Science of Judaism', which should take its place in the German universities as a recognized mental discipline alongside of classical and theological studies. Now there are fundamental differences of character between these four objects, and consequently different methods must be pursued in order to attain them. The first two belong to distinct branches of

Apologetics, the third belongs to practical politics, and the fourth to strict and abstract science. Each of these has to be pursued separately along its own lines, and in accordance with its own methods.

Zunz, however, thought that he could attain all these four objects at one and the same time, and by one and the same method. He was a great idealist, and had strong faith in the power of abstract truth. He had only to proclaim to the world the bare, unadorned and unalloyed truth regarding Judaism, and the Jews would immediately hasten to restore their former love and allegiance to the old faith; the German nation and its rulers would immediately acknowledge the greatness and nobility of Judaism, and would hasten to embrace the despised inhabitants of the Ghettoes as their honored brothers; and the haughty, supercilious German universities would immediately

establish chairs for the cultivation of the new Science of Judaism. Alas, none of these miracles has yet come to pass. However, such were the aims and objects of the New Learning as laid down by Zunz, and such they have remained to this very day.

In what follows, I must confine myself to a very brief sketch of the literary activity of the chief exponents of the German school. Zunz, as I said, was the founder of this school. He was a man of encyclopedic knowledge, of astounding industry, of wonderful powers of systematization, of an exact and painstaking precision, and withal a man of wide and generous sympathies, and a master of a chaste, noble and almost classical style of expression. He started his scholarly career in 1818 with an essay, entitled ETWAS UBER DIE RABBINISCHE LITERATUR, wherein he laid down the lines on which the edifice

of the 'Science of Judaism' was to be raised, and which served him as a program for his long and noble career. In 1822 appeared, in the pages of the organ of his unfortunate 'Culture Society', the now classic biography of Rashi. Forestalled by Jost in the writings of a general history of the Jews, Zunz, devoted himself entirely to the study of their inner life, in particular of that of the Franco-German and Italian Jews, to the history of Jewish literature, Jewish worship, and Jewish ethics. In 1832 appeared his epoch-making book, DIE GOTTESDIENSTLICHE VORTRAGE DE JUDEN. This work was occasioned by the prohibition by the Prussian authorities of German sermons in Jewish worship, and was written, ostensibly at least, in the interests of the the Reform movement, of which Zunz was in his youth an ardent supporter. Zunz set out to prove

in this book that sermons in the vernacular were not a revolutionary innovation in Judaism, and at the same time to describe the nature and character of Jewish homilies in general. But the book does much more than this. It really gives a history of Jewish homiletical, ethical, and devotional literature from the Babylonian captivity down to his own day, with a series of minute disquisitions on kindred subjects. In 1845 appeared ZUR GESCHICHTE UND LITERATUR, a series of detached studies in the inner history and the literature of Franco-German and Italian Jewries. His last three great books deal with the Jewish liturgy and liturgical poetry. They are: SYNAGOGALE POESIE (1856), RITUS (1859), and LITERATURGESCHICHTE DE SYNAGOGALEN POESIE (1865). It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the work of Zunz for the history of Judaism, or to over-

estimate its influence upon the subsequent development of Jewish studies. His books form an inexhaustible mine of the most precious information on everything connected, however remotely, with the religious, social, and literary history of the Jews. Each of his studies has become the forerunner and the originator of a long series of books and dissertations by later investigators and disciples. There is not one among the host of scholars and workers in the vast field of the history of Judaism and its literature who does not owe the best part of his knowledge and his enthusiasm for his studies to the noble, pious, and modest Leopold Zunz.

While Zunz has exercised this potent influence upon modern Judaism solely through the medium of his books, another of his great contemporaries has wielded an equally potent influence through the

medium of his literary work combined with the direct and immediate force of his personality - I mean Zachariah Frankel (1801-1875), the founder and for twenty years the director of the first Jewish Theological Seminary. Frankel was a great man in more than one sense. He was, at least in Western Europe, the last representative of a long line of great Rabbis, who were not only scholars, preachers, and teachers, but also the secular and political leaders of the community. This is not the place to describe the important part which Frankel played in the history of Jewish emancipation, or in the religious movements of his day. I can only say here a few words about his literary activity. How extensive this activity was may be judged from the fact that a full list of his writings prepared by his pupil and successor, Dr. M. Braun, contains

no less than three hundred and twenty-five items, including a goodly number of large volumes. Frankel was the founder of the scientific study of the Halachah and Jewish jurisprudence. Like Zunz's great book on JEWISH HOMILIES, Frankel's first important work, THE JEWISH OATH (DIE EIDESLEISTUNG DER JUDEN) published in 1840, was called forth by the political exigencies of the time. The government of Saxony forced the Jews to take the oath for the constitution in the degrading and barbarous form known as 'more Judaico'. Frankel, who was at that time Chief Rabbi of Saxony, protested energetically against the humiliation to which the Jew had thus been subjected, and the invidious distinction made between them and other citizens. In vindication of the credibility of the Jew, and of the sanctity of the Jewish oath, he wrote a critical history of the

Jewish oath, from the earliest Biblical times down to the SHULCHAN 'ARUCH, and its relation to the oath in other systems of jurisprudence. His other works in the same field are his epoch-making JEWISH LAW OF EVIDENCE (1846), PRINCIPLES OF JEWISH MARRIAGE LAWS, MOSAIC LAW AND HINDU LAW (1860), and a number of minor studies. To the field of Halachah belong the three great works which he wrote in Hebrew:

Sefer Chofetz Chaim (1859), a book which called forth such fierce attacks from S. R. Hirsch and other representatives of ultra-orthodoxy; *Meikot Chofetz Chaim* (1870) and his very fine commentary on the Jerusalem Talmud, modelled on the commentary of Rashi on the Babylonian Talmud, which unfortunately extends only to the first three tractates.

In those fields, Frankel found a goodly number of followers who continued, extended, and supplemented

his studies and researches, such as Weiss, Oppenheim, Brull, Hoffmann, Schwartz, and others. But of another important branch of Jewish learning Frankel, among modern Jews, was not only the first, but, to our shame be it said, he has also remained the only exponent; I allude to the study of the Septuagint. The three books which he devoted to this subject are still, after the lapse of ninety years, of the utmost importance to the student. His work on the text and history of the Septuagint has, of course, been superseded in many respects by the researches of later Christian scholars, but his contributions to the elucidation of the exegesis and the Halachah of the Alexandrian Pentateuch still remain our only source of information on this important subject.

Frankel further rendered an inestimable service to Judaism by conducting till the day of his

death: the Breslau Seminary, which trained most of our able scholars of the second half of the nineteenth century, and the MONATSSCHRIFT FÜR DIE GESCHICHTE UND WISSENSCHAFT DES JUDENTUMS, which for more than ninety years became one of the chief depositories for Jewish learning.

Space does not permit me to refer to the other pioneers of modern scholarship, such as the historians Jost and Graetz, Solomon Munk, the discoverer of the Jewish Arabic philosophical literature, Steinschneider, Jellinek, Sachs, Gudemann, Levy, and others. But I cannot forbear from making mention, however brief, of one of the principal figures in nineteenth century Judaism, and one of its most gifted and most original scholars, viz. Abraham Geiger (1810-74). I can only allude here to two aspects of Geiger's many-sided

literary activity, an activity which extended over the field of Bible, Talmud, and medieval literature, over history, theology, philology, exegesis, poetry, and polemics. First, Geiger was the founder of the modern scientific Jewish theology. His lifelong struggle against orthodoxy and ceremonialism compelled him to subject Jewish theology to a historico-critical analysis. The conclusions at which he arrived, though not free from personal bias or controversial partisanship, proved, nevertheless, fruitful and stimulating both to friends and to opponents. Secondly, Geiger was one of the very few modern Jews who have permanently enriched the science of Biblical Criticism. His *URSCHRIFT UND UEBERSETZUNGEN DER BIBEL* (1857) will forever remain a monument to his vast learning, to his wonderful

subtlety and acuteness, his keen and penetrating criticism, and above all to his daring, dauntless, almost audacious, spirit. But the URSCHRIFT will also remain a perpetual warning to scholars never to carry a pet theory to its full limits. Geiger had a theory that the whole course of the post-exilic history of Judaism had been dominated by the internal struggles between the Zadokite priestly aristocracy, the Sadducees, on the one hand, and the popular or democratic party of the Pharisees on the other. As this struggle began presumably even before the destruction of the first Temple, traces of it ought to be found in Biblical literature. But Geiger was not satisfied with discovering mere traces. He explains by his theory all the textual and other difficulties to be found in the Bible. I believe I am correct in asserting that Geiger

received his first inspiration from Ferdinand Christian Baur, the founder of the famous Tübingen school of Christian Theology. Baur sought to explain the internal difficulties and inconsistencies in the New Testament and other early Christian literature by the theory that they reflected the struggle between Paulinism, Judaistic Christianity, and Gnosticism. He wrote many years before Geiger, and the latter, who was a keen student of Christian theology, must have been familiar with Baur's theory before he set to work on his URSCHRIFT. There are important elements of truth both in the Tübingen theory respecting the New Testament, and in Geiger's theory respecting the Hebrew Bible, but both these theories were carried by their respective authors to extravagant lengths. The influence, however, of Geiger's theory upon the study of the Bible and of

earlier Jewish history has been as great and as farreaching as that of Baur upon the study of the New Testament and early Christian history. But among Jewish scholars, Geiger's URSCHRIFT found no followers. Its very boldness and audacity deterred Jews from engaging in the critical study of the Bible.

This, then, must conclude my sketch of the rise of the New Learning, and of its principal exponents. The time has not yet come for forming a correct estimate of its effects upon Jews and Judaism. But so much may be said: its immediate results have not realized the great hopes of its founders. The great literary activity of the nineteenth century has failed to reach and to influence the general Jewish public. Its results are not to be seen in life, but in the libraries. The modern Jew of to-day still

remains estranged from Judaism, and indifferent to its demands. If signs of an improvement are to be detected here and there, this improvement has been produced not so much by the New Learning as by the New Nationalism. Further, no one can be so bold or so sanguine as to assert that the attitude of the Christian world towards Judaism has materially improved during the nineteenth century. No doubt there are to be found here and there a few Christians who entertain a genuine respect and admiration for Judaism and for Jewish virtues. But this was also the case in the eighteenth century. The general attitude of the non-Jewish world towards Judaism continues to-day, as a century ago, to be that of mistrust and depreciation. Finally, the problem of how to harmonize traditional Judaism with the new political principle of Jewish existence still remains

unsolved, and is daily becoming more difficult and more complicated. The fact is, as I have pointed out before, that the New Learning attempted to do much at the same time. The combination of apologetics and science had led to confusion, and has proved harmful to both objects. The educated layman has been frightened away from this literature by its technical and scientific character, while the professional Christian scholar has distrusted it as presenting merely a subjective and biased picture of Judaism. How far this distrust has reached may be seen from the fact that a SAVANT of such undisputed eminence as the late Professor Lazarus felt it necessary, in the introduction of his **JEWISH ETHICS**, to take a solemn oath that all the statements in his book were in strict accordance with the truth. In the interests, therefore, of both, apologetics and science should in the future be kept strictly separate and distinct.

Chapter II

Biography

of

Abraham Krochmal

In investigating the life of an individual, recourse must be had to standard encyclopedias to draw his picture. Yet the encyclopedias are frequently inadequate. Such is the case with Abraham Krochmal. So little is known, and so little has been written regarding his life and works, that the writer has found it necessary to try to reconstruct it.

Abraham Krochmal, maskil and scholar who though poor and sick had to fight his entire life for the barest subsistence, was born to Sarah and Nachman Krochmal in Zolkiev, Galicia (now Russia) in the year 1817 or 1818.^①

Krochmal, one of three children, was the only child to follow in the footsteps of his father in the Science of the "New Jewish Learning". It is possible to fix the date of his birth since we know that his mother died in 1826 when he was 10 years

old.⁽²⁾ In his introduction to Theologie der Zukunft published in Lemberg the 15th of May 1872 he says, "in meinen vorgeruckten lebensalter", "in the beginnings of my old age". If he were born in 1823 as stated in Jewish, German and Russian Encyclopedias, he would then have been only 49 years old, and it is doubtful if 49 can truly be considered old age. If, however, he was born in 1816, then he would have been 55 years old and this can be considered at least the beginning of old age.

Krochmal was raised by his father Nachman, without the tender and loving care of a mother, who had died when he was yet young. We can see reflected in his writings the sour note resulting from the neglect and forlornness of his youth. It seems that in his younger days his father was his teacher. He also received instruction from Rabbi Zevi Hirsch Chajes, the Rabbi of Zolkiev.

Among his other teachers were Solomon Rapport and Solomon Kluger.⁽³⁾ In general, the major portion of his studies and the counseling of his ways, he received from his father whom he greatly admired and respected to the end of his days, even after he disagreed with him on the basic concepts of Jewish life and the Philosophy of Judaism.

When his father left Zolkiev in 1836 to go to Brody and later from Brody to Tarnopol in 1838,

Krochmal was left in the care of רבי צבי הירש חיות⁽⁴⁾

It was during this period that ר"ק wrote letters to his son and these letters from the year 1837 to 1840 are still extant.⁽⁵⁾ From these letters

we learn that ר"ק recognized the capabilities of his son and told him ישר ונאמן ונאמן ישר⁽⁶⁾

but he further counseled him against becoming arrogant and cautioned him to read books of musar

(201N). ⑦

In 1837, his father wrote him and said, "You are well versed in the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmud and in their commentaries, do not put them aside but continue with your learning." He further advised him in a letter in 1840 saying, "Now that your youth is behind you, see that you enter the Normal school and get a secular education, with special emphasis on German." From this letter we can ascertain that Abraham Krochmal at the age of about 23 attended the Normal school in order to get a secular education. ⑧ With regard to his German he says, *אני לא ידעתי שום דבר* ⑨ "I never excelled in languages."

When Krochmal was 28 years old, he left Zolkiev and went to Lwow. While at Lwow, rumor

had it that he permitted himself to smoke on the Sabbath.⁽¹⁰⁾ We are well aware that in 1843, Lwow was still an orthodox city and therefore, it is difficult to believe this, but it is possible that he did permit himself to smoke on the Sabbath after he wrote his article (11) תיקונים קצת

While at Lwow, he devoted all of his efforts to the publication of his father's work מורה נבוכים הנח which Leopold Zunz prepared for publication. During his three year stay at Lwow, Krochmal met and befriended such great maskilim as Mordecai Dubs, Hillel Lechner, and Michael Wolf who printed almost all of Abraham Krochmal's works. While at Lwow, he also befriended such celebrated persons as Solomon Buber, editor of the מנחת תנחומים and Issachar Lowenstein. This is all we know of

Krochmal while he was in Lwow.

Our scene in the life of this wanderer now changes to Brody, a center of traffic for all maskilim and the hotbed of Haskalah in Galicia.

Krochmal arrived in Brody in 1846, staying at the home of Jonah Byck, the son of his father's sister, where he married a local girl

ש"ל צדק ה"ר יוסף ראובן ב"ר ברוך ש"ן

and dedicated his book

יחזקאל חב"ד

(published in 1867) to his father-in-law

הרב החכם המופלג רב יוסף ראובן ב"ר ברוך ש"ן

While in Brody, Krochmal started to work with Osaias Schor in publishing the Hechalutz, but in 1859, for reasons unknown, Krochmal stopped writing for the Hechalutz.

Michael Wolf, long time friend of Krochmal, published a periodical entitled

עפר פריים

(Lwow 1860) in which there appeared two articles
 by Abraham Krochmal. They were *הנהגת החינוך*
 and *הנהגת התורה*. In 1865, Krochmal finished
 his work on his book *הנהגת החינוך* and on page 25
 of the book, we find,
וידעו כי כל המעשים הנכונים והטובים הם

We can see from this that if there had been strained
 relations between Krochmal and Schor, they had been
 resolved by 1865, or else that Krochmal was trying
 in this manner to apologize to Schor. There is a
 possibility that Schor attacked Krochmal for copy-
 ing some of his material, but there is not conclusive
 evidence that this was the case or that was the
 reason which caused Krochmal to leave the Hechalutz.

We know that Brody was a lucrative center for
 both merchants and scholars, and that a man with
 the capabilities of Krochmal could not find a means

of support while at Brody leads to the belief that Krochmal could not find the type of work which suited him best. It was during the ensuing years between 1865 to 1876 that Krochmal left and returned to Brody. In 1876, he met ⁽¹³⁾ נפתלי צבי אהרן author of the Hatikvah in Brody and aided him in the publication of his first book.

In a letter by Lillienblum from Odessa to Gordon, February, 1870, we read:

⁽¹⁴⁾ ה"א קטאכמאל'ס דער קאסיר דא האט דער קאנצלער/

"This man Krochmal is a cashier in one of the banks here." He goes on to tell Gordon that his wage was 75 rubels a month and that he intended to bring his wife and child to Odessa. It was in Odessa that Krochmal found supporters to publish his book

Theologie der Zukunft, which according to Lilienblum in a letter to Gordon on February 3, 1870, was written in Odessa. Lilienblum writes,

"כתב אהין קראמאל אה ספרו זי הזרמנה (15)
 חכמי של ספר אהר הפס' הלפ' דבר ה' בלוי
 חסדן כ"ס"

While at Odessa, Krochmal befriended two of the greatest Hebrew writers, who have influenced the course of Jewish life and literature, and both of whom were influenced more or less by him.

The first was Peretz ben Moses Smolenskin, who lived in Odessa from 1862-1867. Brainin relates how Smolenskin and Krochmal met, and spoke to each other for hours at a time regarding the New Jewish Learning, and he says their conversation was only in Hebrew. (16)

If Lilienblum's letter of 1870 is correct in stating that Krochmal was in Odessa his second year, and if the dates of Smolenskin's stay in Odessa are correct, there is apparent confusion in the chronology. For Smolenskin was supposed to have left Odessa in 1867 and Krochmal arrived there in 1868. We can say that these dates are correct for there is a possibility that Krochmal was in Odessa more than once: Once on a visit and once to settle. We can say that in the summer of 1867, he came to Odessa and met Smolenskin. Lilienblum considered the 1868. ⁽¹⁾ We are also aware that Krochmal met Lilienblum in 1870.

It was after Krochmal met Smolenskin, that Smolenskin published in his "Hashachar" Krochmal's work on the Philosophy of Spinoza under the title *חשבונו / פק*. It was during this period that Krochmal wrote his friend Solomon Buter

in Lwow urging him to write to Albert Cohen to give money to Smolenskin for the further publication of the Hashachar and also for money to publish his book אבן חכמה (18)

The second writer, Moses Leib Lilienblum, was possibly more influenced by Krochmal than had been Smolenskin. Lilienblum mentions Krochmal many times in his books חשמה נחמיה and דרך חכמה and even more in his personal letters to Gordon.

Lilienblum's language clearly depicts the influence Krochmal had upon him and his beliefs, and ideas. (19)

In his book חשמה נחמיה , Lilienblum calls

Krochmal

היה חכם, גורם חכמה חכם אבן קרא חכמה (20)

Regarding his scientific method of investigation,

Lilienblum says, "This wise man Krochmal has a wonderful scientific approach to the Bible, and has method to his ideas of Reform in Jewish life which

he would like to see accomplished. But alas, all those who believe that the Torah is divinely inspired cannot comprehend this approach and method in his study of the Torah.⁽²¹⁾ "At first it was difficult for me to try and understand his arguments for saying that the Torah was written in the days of the Prophet Jeremiah, and that the Priests in those days wrote it to enlighten the people as to the influence of sacrifice and Temple Cult, but after eight months, I too became convinced that this giant is correct, and all at once the learning of my life became as nothing to me. Our Theology became open and clear and I was as one who had a better understanding of Jewish problems. It was then that I felt that the God who watched over me was the God of Spinoza and I found myself adrift in the living cosmos."⁽²²⁾

This then was the influence that Abraham Krochmal had upon Lilienblum. Lilienblum did not occupy himself with the study of philosophy, he was able to better understand the God of Spinoza from the conversations he had with Krochmal and accepted his views concerning not only the philosophy of Spinoza but also his views concerning the Torah.

It is through the letter of Lilienblum to Gordon, that the relationship between Lilienblum and Krochmal is revealed, whereby we are able to learn more about the life of Krochmal.

The Hechalutz had as much influence on Gordon as it did on Lilienblum, and Gordon in a letter to Lilienblum asked that the Hechalutz be published in Odessa with Krochmal as its Editor. ⁽²³⁾ This of course was during that period of time that permission was given for the publication of the Melitz (מליץ) and the Hakarmel (הכרמל), two Hebrew papers.

It was then on Gordon's request that Lilienblum approached Krochmal on two separate occasions.

Once on *אחרון של פסח* and then on *שבועות הגדול* in 1870. He told Krochmal of Gordon's idea, but Krochmal's answer was a negative one. He said, "I am too old to undertake the task".⁽²⁴⁾ He further said, "I am without a library, and I live in Russia". This latter answer referred to the fact that he would not receive permission from the government to be an editor, because he was not a Russian citizen. Moreover the important fact was that Schor was still editing the Hechalutz and this led him to decline the offer, for this might have led to a conflict between the two.

Simon Bernfeld, author of *הזיכרון של משה* who was a younger contemporary of Krochmal, says in his book "This poor man whom we used to see wandering from place to place to get a piece of bread". He

also says, "This scholar was unable to establish a Yeshiva of Modern Learning".⁽²⁵⁾ Krochmal himself says in his book *דברי הגדולי* published 1876,

"איש מטה אחרונים גדולי ונחמסו אנכי
אלה הם אנשי תלמוד האמת בן העליונים האלה
לוי' 31"

This then was the attitude and feeling of Abraham Krochmal toward the end of his life.

Little more is known of the life of Abraham Krochmal. We do know that his daughter lived in Hanover, Germany, and in 1924 she was 69 years old.⁽²⁶⁾ If she is alive today, she would be 97 years old, but we have no detailed information concerning her.

Abraham Krochmal came to Frankfurt-am-Main in 1880. We deduce this from the fact that in his book *דברי הגדולי* published in Lwow in 1881, he mentions with deep respect the Reform Rabbi of

Frankfurt, Brüll

הרב החוקר ר' נחמן הכ"ץ

While at Frankfurt, he lived on personal contributions of the community and personal gifts.

It was in Bokenheim, a small town near Frankfurt-am-Main, that on September 18, 1888, he died. He was buried in Frankfurt-am-Main on September 19, 1888. Dr. Adolph Brüll delivered the Eulogy at his funeral. In no magazine or journal of the period, either in Hebrew or in German do we find the text of the Eulogy delivered. (27)

This is the total of available biographical data concerning Abraham Krochmal, son of Nachman Krochmal one of the fathers of Wissenschaft-des-Judentum. It was Krochmal who in his earlier days was one of the great contributors to the Hechalutz. It was Krochmal who had a marked influence on Peretz Smolenskin and Moses Leib Lilienblum. Lilienblum

cited him in a letter to Gordon dated February 3,
1870.

"האיש הנקרא וואלף
אשר לא יצד חבל ודרכה"

Chapter III

Digest and Analysis

of

Krochmal's Books

Abraham Krochmal during his life span found himself under three strong influences. He was first and foremost under the influence of his father Nachman, whom he mentions with great respect and admiration in many of his works. In his book Theologie der Zukunft, Krochmal says that "Leopold Zunz and my father Nachman saved Judaism during the period of conversion after the days of Mendelsohn." He continues and says, "the commandments found in the Torah are universal commandments for all of Israel and because of them did God enter into a covenant with Israel at Sinai". On the basis of their investigation and study can we better understand that these commandments are the keys to all religions.

He further relates how his father brought students from all parts of the world to Zolkiev, those who had renounced their Judaism, that they

might start anew their study of Judaism. The Torah, the Prophets and the Writings were studied in a scientific manner and when they were mastered by them, these students then started their study of the Talmud and of the Philosophy of religion.^① We can now perceive how growing up in such an environment could have done nothing else except leave an everlasting impression upon Krochmal.

The second to have a marked influence upon Krochmal was Osaias Schor. What Krochmal learned from Schor was method of intensive investigation in Bible, Mishnah, Talmud and Religion.^②

The third influence under which Krochmal labored in his lifetime was that of Abraham Geiger. If his father ever awoke in him the desire to investigate the historic and philosophic aspects of Jewish life and Judaism, then it was Geiger who

awoke in him the desire to search in the history of Israel for that individual pragmatism which so many of the German historians of his day were investigating. It was from these two, Schor and Geiger, that Krochmal learned method in scientific investigation of Bible and Rabbinics, in order to be able to answer the questions and needs of Judaism of his day. (24)

Together with the above influences, Krochmal was also under the influences of Spinoza and Kant. He says, "I am a student of Rabbi Imanuel Kant and my teacher Rabbi Baruch Spinoza". (25) Regarding Spinoza, Krochmal says "No individual came closer in understanding the God concept of אלהים אמת than did my teacher Rabbi Baruch Spinoza. (26)

The foregoing influences are reflected in

Krochmal's writings, which can be divided into three sections.

1. Contemporary Problems, that have a distant relationship to questions of his times as reflected in

- a) ורואים הבטחה
- b) כירושים והדחף לאגודה בקהל
- c) הכנה והחכמה

2. Jewish Theology that relates to questions of Religion in general and Judaism in particular can be seen in:

- a) צדק אלהים האור
- b) דין המפלה
- c) אהל האלה
- d) Theologie der Zukunft
- e)

3. Talmudic history dealing with the Jewish problem from a social and religious viewpoint:

- a) וריצה האומה הגולה האמורה

- b) כתב פתיג'אן
- c) תלפוד ממאל ירח'אן
- d) גולדו כבי יחודי הנשיאן

The articles themselves can be divided into two definite sections. The first three dealing with questions of reforms in religion and the last two dealing with changing beliefs of his concept of Judaism.

A digest and analysis of Krochmal's works follow.

In his book *יחודי הנשיאן* ^{HA} published in Lwow 1867, Krochmal tries to fix an exact date for the completion of the Jerusalem Talmud. In opposition to Schor, he does not think that the Babylonian Talmud is unique in language and formation, and in

its pilpulistic sharpness, but opines that the Jerusalem Talmud is the equal of the Babylonian in all phases except one, the enjoyment of greatness and its wide use among the masses. He endeavors to point out that the basic difference between the two is that the Babylonian Talmud was written with the idea of a universal Israel, temporally and spatially whereas the Jerusalem Talmud limits itself to its own time and place.

⑤ לא כן אמוראי בבל המה היות אמוראי כבו
 ידמו כפי מה שהיה חבטו כבו והיה מקום וחבטו
 משה דברים חסונים מופלים בחוש.

⑥ לא כן אמוראי אף וטול מדימות גמלי' היות
 היה דם דמאון דפין לירג איהם.

The rest of the book is devoted to trying to explain certain ideas of the Jerusalem Talmud, in a historical

and philological sense. Joseph Klausner in his History of Jewish Literature, Vol. 4A says, "If it was the author's intention to try to answer questions of the period by examining the Jerusalem Talmud and drawing certain conclusive proofs from it, then the author has failed, and all the philology explained by the author is rather difficult to swallow."¹⁷ In but one section of this book can we find a possible reference to Krochmal's trying to respond to a question of the period. In the Jerusalem Talmud, Tractate Ketuboth, there is a discussion regarding the majority as opposed to the minority in Halachah.

Abraham Krochmal says,

⑤ "אלו הרבנים לא יראו לנכבש בני דין שאלהם
כי דעה בחוג גדולה וכלו יתעשרו לפסדמים
לפינו נאמנים ארוב עם סבור המוסר המקור
ולא פוכחנו לפינה נגזרים בהרוב המוחזקים"

At this point, I would like to inject the thought that Krochmal possibly overlooked the Rabbinical injunction which says,

אין בית דין יכול להטיל דבר בגז' דין חמור
אלא אם כן שית מנהיג וקמח

and that if a controversy arises between the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmud, the Babylonian ruling controls. This then is in keeping with Abraham Krochmal's original premise that the Babylonian Talmud reflects the spirit of the Jewish people at all times and in all places. This I think he overlooked when he inveighed against the Rabbis. I believe that Krochmal, with his extensive Talmudic knowledge, missed this important point and fails to show us any definite answers to questions of the period. It is not my view that the Jerusalem Talmud has the necessary answers which were sought by the maskilim in general and Krochmal in particular

during those hectic years. If any answers could be derived then they would be found in the Babylonian Talmud and not in the Jerusalem Talmud.

The second book which deals with Talmud is his, *ע'ר'ט'ק והדרכה ליהלומי הגל'י*. The work deals with the many phases of Jewish History as extracted from the Babylonian Talmud.

1. A History of the Patriarchate
2. A Philosophy of the Hermeneutical Principles
3. General Problem of Jewish Philosophy and Jewish law.⑨

In his numerous twists and interpretations, Krochmal disagrees with the classical commentators of the Bavli such as Rashi, Rashbam and the Tosafists and even Maimonides.⑩ His general view was that the Amoraim did not understand the Mishnaoth or the Braitoth.⑪ It is because they do not understand the

original Mishna that the commentators misinterpret the Talmud. The general aim of this work was to continue his fight for חכמת ישראל Wissenschaft des Judentums in accordance with the spirit of Geiger. (12) It is due to this constant struggle that Krochmal on many occasions attacks רבי יחזקאל הנגיד for his failure to understand Judaism and his forcing upon the people of his code of laws, namely the Mishna. (13)

Simultaneously with Krochmal's assaults on רבי יחזקאל הנגיד he praises Abraham Geiger for his clear and precise understanding of Judaism and Jewish problems and for his constant struggle for חכמת ישראל. (14)

Krochmal has no soft spot in his heart for the Rabbis of his day. He declares as he did in his book יחזקאל הנגיד that the Rabbis are truly afraid of the Jewish problem, and refuse to try to

against him for his attacks on *יב' דק'א' ויב' ומוצ'ה*.
 His labors in these two books never bore the fruit
 that Krochmal intended them to bear.

The first two books which attempted scientific
 investigation of Jewish law were with Talmudic
 sources. The third and last of the series

האמנה והאמנה published in Lwow in 1873 deals
 with the *ש"ס*. This book was dedicated
 to Hillel Lechner whom Krochmal befriended during
 his stay in Lwow. It is written in the typical
 style of Josef Perl full of satire and mockery. In
 his opening chapter, Krochmal relates an absolutely
 fantastic story.

"There was a man who lived with Spinoza and his
 name was Mann. Mann was from Poland and he had come
 to study with Spinoza. During his life time Spinoza
 had written certain emendations to the Bible, and

before his death, he wanted to burn them. Manndid not let him burn them but instead he took them and brought them to the Baal Shem Tov. The Besht in turn took these emendations and placed them in an iron box and sealed the box. Upon the seal he wrote: 'The box will be opened fourteen years after the death of Nicholas I of Russia, and it will be opened in the presence of Abraham Krochmal". The

אברהם קרוכמל was written in 1869, which was fourteen years after the death of Nicholas I (in 1855) and published four years later at Lwow. The reason the Baal Shem would allow Abraham Krochmal to see this was that Krochmal was a relative of Rabbi Nachman of Breslov. When Abraham passed through the city of the Baal Shem on his way from Odessa to Lwow in 1869, he found the box. ⁽¹⁹⁾ There were four spirits guarding it, so he chased them away and opened it. Therein, he found the

emendations of the Bible as handed down from Spinoza to Mann to the Besht. Krochmal says, "I found the emendations of the Bible of Rabbi Baruch Spinoza, the actual Bible according to the Messorah on one side and Spinoza's emendations on the other side."

Obviously, this story is ridiculous. Much doubt can be raised as to the authenticity of the emendations, and the question may be asked if the said emendations are all Krochmal's. ²⁰ ~~Schor~~ in a review of the *אורח חיים* in the Hechalutz Vol. 10, points out that not all the emendations are Krochmal's. It is amusing to note that Krochmal would have all believe that these emendations are actually Spinoz's, for actually they are not all Krochmal's but more probably a compilation of the emendations of Schor. For this reason Krochmal would

like to credit these to Spinoza rather than to himself. (21)

We will now turn to his philosophical works. The first of these philosophical works is his book *פירוש חזקוני* published in Lwow in 1863. In this first section of his philosophical works, Krochmal tried to imitate his father Nachman's work *מנחת נחמן*. After a short philosophic introduction, Krochmal spans the gamut of the History of Israel from *אברהם אבינו* to *הגלות* to the *תנאים ואמוראים* to *הזמנים האחרונים* and to the Golden Age of Spain. Krochmal tries to prove that the development of the God-idea in Israel was a continuous one, and that in each one of these ages the development did not come alone but always with the outside influences; as he says it

ה'הוה ה'הוה. This God concept of Israel was a continuous process always finding new impetus with each new generation.

Krochmal compares אברהם אבינו to אלה and says, "Our father Abraham recognized God in a subjective sense, but Moses our Law giver recognized God in an objective sense. The manner in which Moses recognized God was the same manner as which Baruch Spinoza our teacher, recognized Him in a logical and scientific manner." (22)

It was during the period of the Babylonian exile that the religion of Israel was plagued with the religious concepts of Zoroaster, and the Prophets fought against this, but the nation unwittingly accepted many of the Zoroastrian principles, as Schor pointed out in his article of the Hechalutz

Vol. 10. Schor says that Zoroastrian daemonology entered the Talmud with such concepts as

(23) שנים ומציקים לו עדן איהינוס, אחיה ממחנה
דורס הבא, משה

All of these concepts, held to be in a strict sense truly Jewish concepts, have their roots in another religion.

The next culture to have a marked impact on Israel was the Greek culture, starting with Alexander and extending to Philo. To Philo, God was no longer the absolute good (*טובו נאמן*) but God now became Logos. The Tannaim kept clear of this new concept of the Godhead and expressed themselves in this manner

(24) וְהִי רַעוּן מִלִּפְנֵי
וְחִטָּא לִפְנֵי (וְלֹא אִמְרוּ לִי)

The reason for this is that the Tannaim did not want to express the Godhead in secular and humanistic terms. (25)

In the Babylonian Talmud Tractate

ברכות - משנה ז - ה

there is a Rabbinical injunction

האומר הן קין קריבור יאיו רחמיך משמקין אמת

The reason for this is that the one who says this phrase is saying that all that God is, is nothing more than mercy while in truth, it is law. From this Rabbinic injunction, Krochmal expresses himself and says, "The law and institution of Israel are not derived from feeling, but rather from reason. (26) For the commandments of God are

categorical and in category there is neither love nor hate, good nor evil, nice nor ugly, joy or

sadness, but only truth or deceit. Therefore, every Israelite should obey the commandments not because they are good, but because they are commandments and because their foundations are truth. On the other hand, Israelites should not sin, not because sin is bad, but because sin has neither substance nor being. No Israelite must think that the sum total of deeds are for the good of the community, but rather that the sum total of deeds are truth and truth stems from spirituality. Because of the basic truths and spirituality have we been chosen." This is a complete thought extracted from Kant.⁽²⁷⁾ This is Klausner's survey of Krochmal's book.

With regard to the question of the redeemer, the Messiah, we see Abraham Krochmal in the same light that we see so many of the maskilim of the 19th century. The general feelings of the maskilim

of this period were that each was a Messiah in his own right.

For them the concept of the redemption of the land is not at all important, for they deal with the problem of individual redemption. Abraham who is no different from all the other maskilim of his time, feels that he too is the redeemer, the one who brings enlightenment to the people **אור לאדם**. To the maskilim of this period, redemption meant enlightenment and therefore, to them this aspect was the one redeeming factor of the people. The writer does not feel that each maskil thought that he was the Messiah par excellence, but rather, had the feeling that their combined elements of enlightenment helped the people to better understand the true concept, as they saw it, of Messiah Redeemer.

(**אור לאדם**) In the closing remarks of

this book, Krochmal says that *רוח אלהים בארץ* is the spirit of God on earth in accordance with the spirit of place and time. ⁽²⁸⁾ This expression of Krochmal is in keeping with the general philosophic concepts of German Romanticism (Volksgeist). It places him in the same category as those who demanded reform in their days.

רוח אלהים בארץ was an attempted imitation of *מורה נבוכי הדן* but it falls far short of the goal Krochmal aimed at reaching, that goal being an imitation of his father's classic.

Another of Krochmal's books that falls under the subheading of philosophic investigation is his book *אברהם אבינו*. ^(28A) This work was written as a defense of the philosophy of Spinoza. Krochmal tries to prove that Spinoza was not a disbeliever, who in any manner or form thought of God in a

derogatory manner. Krochmal goes to great lengths to prove that he does not necessarily accept all of Spinoza's philosophy, nor, for that matter does he follow it, although he calls Spinoza his teacher. (29) Krochmal feels that the critics of Spinoza did not truly understand him and, therefore, do not have the right to criticize him and his philosophy.

As has already been stated, *השקפתו של ספינוזה* was intended to be a defense of Spinoza and his philosophy. A work of this type should give us all the pros and cons regarding the philosophy in order to understand it in a correct prospective. This book gives us a rather subjective picture of Spinoza, as is usually the case whenever an apologetic work is written.

Perez Smolenskin thought enough of this work to publish portions of it in his Hashachar in 1871. He corrected some of Krochmal's Hebrew style and grammar. Indeed all of Krochmal's Hebrew works were lacking in style and grammar. In the original text itself, we find an opening introduction by Perez Smolenskin.

One of Krochmal's more interesting works (one which I found more pleasing than all of his other books) is *פירוש חזקוני*. It is pleasing both in language and in style. It is possible that the reason for this is that this work was written in 1885, three years before Krochmal died. I presume that by this period in his life his philosophic ideas had crystallized more than during the periods when he wrote his *פירוש חזקוני* and *פירוש חזקוני*.

ספרו /" contains a broad picture of the
 history of Israel. It also explains in a philosophic
 manner the thoughts and concepts of the Rabbis. The
 main theme of the book is that the Rabbis of his day
 have the right to bring about changes in the broad
 framework of the already existent Jewish Law. (30)

Krochmal breaks down the values of the Torah
 into four basic ones, those being *אמת, צדק, רחמים, וחסד*
 and not thirteen as Rabbi Akiva thought or fourteen
 according to Maimonides. These four values then
 are the fundamentals of society according to
 Krochmal. All the laws of the Torah are based on
 them, provided that these values suit the present
 social structure.

He gives examples of the values in the Torah,

that were without objection on the part of the Rabbinate.

Maaser was abolished during the days of the Second Temple because there were very few Levites.

The אנשי כנסת העצומה reinterpreted the lex talionis because they felt that the law should suit our natural values as expressed in the basic principle: כי יראה לך חמור Therefore, only one value cannot be changed that being כי יראה לך that is eternal and self-sufficient (independent).

The distinction between מצוות שמעיות, מצוות עניות, comprehensible laws and blind mandates, which ~~the~~ Maimonides רמבם invented never occurred to the אנשי כנסת העצומה. To them all the laws were logical, but that some of these were logical only

at a given time and situation. If the given time and situation were taken away these laws would not be applicable. Therefore, Krochmal says, "these laws are temporary laws and as such they may be changed. The Rabbinate of my time argue that if you take away one stone the entire structure would collapse. This is absurd. I say that all laws which contradict these two values *און* and *פאן* should be changed."

These are a few examples of *reforms* (פּוּרָאן) for which Krochmal fought.

He discusses four individuals in this book:

1. Rabbi Akiva
2. Rabbi Judah the Prince
3. Elisha Ben Avuya
4. Jesus

Abraham shows utter contempt for the two Rabbis while he showers complete admiration upon the two rebels of Israel.

He despises Rabbi Judah for codifying the Mishna and forcing Israel to accept this code in regulating their lives. This is directly against the spirit of the law, both the written and the oral. He shows further contempt for Judah for not including the B'raitoth in his code. (31)

His displeasure in Rabbi Akiva stemmed from the idea that he felt that Akiva was a nominalist. In the eyes of Krochmal, Akiva is responsible for the degeneration of the Torah in its present form. To him Akiva is the true founder of Kabalah, because he dealt with *אימנ'ל'א*

Akiva was foolish enough to think that the God

that created this universe needed Israel's help and Akiva decided to give it to him. He aided God by supporting Bar Kochba and causing the total defeat of Israel. There were also occasions that he spoke of Akiva in a good vein but these were few. (32)

Elisha is important to Krochmal because it was Elisha who was opposed to Akiva and his idea of rebellion against Rome. Elisha was a student of Greek and Latin and a politician in his own right. He knew the power of Rome and counseled against the revolt.

In 1879 Lilienblum wrote an article

חשובה מאד להבנת חשיבותו של אקבה

This was six years before חשיבותו של אקבה was published. As has already been stated, Lilienblum was an astute student of Krochmal and it is possible that the material for his book was taken from what Krochmal told him during their long discussion periods.

Regarding Jesus, Krochmal says:

at King Alexander Jannai was accused by the
Pharisees of being the son of a (ג'ילל) captive. (33)
He then started persecuting them and a large
number of Pharisees fled to the desert. Jehoshua
ben Parachia went along with them and became their
spiritual leader. This is the same Jehoshua who
wrote Psalm 119. His disciples became a separate
sect of Pharisees and were called ארנע פאריסעס
early morning baptists or ארנע פאריסעס
or ארנע פאריסעס (34)

While the main group of Pharisees were performing
all the ceremonies religiously and following all
the small details of the Torah, the ~~Pharisees~~ *Isseles*
were indulging in witchcraft and became less
interested in worldly things such as family life. (35)
They had a book of medicine they called ארנע פאריסעס
which is mentioned in the Mishnah Pesachim. The

Mishnah says that King Hezekiah of Judah concealed it but I believe that it was Hezekiah ben Garon who concealed it. ⁽³⁶⁾ Jesus was a pupil of Jehoshua ben Parachia. ⁽³⁷⁾ Jesus brought a tremendous amount of good to the human race as did Mohammed. The Torah says

ה' מסינו בא וברח מלמדנו
 הוסיף מבר פאן / ואתה מרבה קדש
 דברים עמוה

Krochmal says, מוסינו is Moses. ⁽³⁸⁾

ברח מלמדנו refers to Jesus.

הוסיף מבר פאן refers to Mohammed and
 ואתה מרבה קדש Is for the "End of Days" (אחרית הימים)

Jesus called himself the son of God because it says

הניק אתם לה אלף הכח - דברים י"ד
 Krochmal says, "I am objective and look for the truth alone. I am not a Rabbi or a teacher. I live in poverty but I will not be afraid to tell the truth because I am

a follower of Rabbi Imanuel Kant and Rabbi Baruch Spinoza. ⁽²⁹⁾ Jesus emphasized the importance of baptism, just as the ^{Essenes} ~~Jesus~~ did and just as Rabbi Akiva did

-ווא-

צדו לפני מי אתה מטהר, לפני אבות שבשמים
אתה מטהר, ומי מטהר אותך אבות שבשמים
מטהר אותך גמאח וצדקתי עליכם מים טהורים
ושחרתם מכל טומאותכם ומכל איטולוכם אטהר
אתכם ואומר מקור ישראל מטיהר

It is significant to note that Rabbi Akiva uses the term ^(מקור - תקור) here not as ^{referring to} hope, but ~~uses it~~ as the baptism, ~~that being the~~ salvation of Israel. The reason for this was that during his period there was a general Messianic atmosphere alive among the people. We see the same thing in the Mishnah Sota.

נקיות מביאה לידי פרישות פרישות מביאה
 לידי טהרה, טהרה מביאה לידי קדושה
 קדושה מביאה לידי רוח וקצט, רוח
 וקצט מביאה לידי תורה ומצוות.

John the Baptist, the teacher of Jesus, was
 accepted as a good Jew; his son is Rabbi Zecharia
 ben Kabutal who is mentioned in the Tractate Yoma. ⁽⁴¹⁾
 Jesus was a good Jew for he said, "I didn't come to
 add anything to the Torah or to abolish anything."
 The Rabbis saw nothing wrong in his teachings and,
 in fact, considered him and his disciples as Jews,
 but they were forced to bring forth a verdict of
 guilty (not to sentence him to death because they
 were not authorized to do so) by Judas Iscariot and
 Pontius Pilate, but rather to say that he was not
 the Messiah. Jesus was sent by God to bring ⁽⁴²⁾
 Monotheism and ^{לפי} to the gentiles.

This is Krochmal's view regarding Jesus.

To the followers of Jesus and the Essenes, God now became a God of mercy. ⁽⁴³⁾ Raban Jochanan saw the danger in this vein of thinking and said that the *attribute* ^{אֲתִיבִּי} of God are not ^(decrees) ^{פְּרִימִי} and ^{שֶׁנֶּה} but rather ^{אֲמִי} ⁽⁴⁴⁾ Krochmal says that if you analyze the component parts of God's will, it would be like analyzing a rainbow. A rainbow is one, although it is composed of six colors. These colors in turn are actually three; ⁽⁴⁵⁾ so too, is the composition of God a three fold composition; ~~that being~~

אֲמִי הַבִּינִי, אֲמִי הַמַּחֲמִי, וְרוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ

These mean: Evolution, Reaction, and Revolution. *unclear*

The ^{רוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ} of God is the synthesis between ⁽⁴⁶⁾ the ^{אֲמִי הַבִּינִי} ^{וְאֲמִי הַמַּחֲמִי} ⁽⁴⁶⁾

This is a pure Hegelian theory, following the pattern of thesis, antithesis and synthesis. Now Krochmal goes one step further. He says that the ^{רוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ} is the creative will of God. If we say that we cannot

influence the will of God what is the use of praying and asking his help and what is wrong in doing wrong.

In factum, prayer is important for it helps the decision of God. Therefore, if God is employing *the attribute of mercy* *חסד*, a prayer will help and give the

additional power necessary for the *חסד*

On the other hand, if God employs the *חסד* *the attribute of justice* *דין*

?? wrong-doing will give it additional power in coming to a conclusion. This proves that there is freedom of the will for man. (47)

Krochmal's evaluation of Jesus and his period is not unique to us today, but I believe that for *sympathetic approach to* his period it was rather rash; his ~~feeling for~~ *approach to* Jesus ~~in such a good light~~ could have brought down the wrath of the Rabbinate upon him. ~~It is difficult to form a definite opinion from what he says about Jesus.~~

Krochmal's favorable opinion of Jesus, as expressed in this portion of *מנחת הכהן*, was promulgated in an age and a society which could not receive it except with the utmost hostility. Since this book was written after the 1881-1882 pogroms in Russia and the time when the air was saturated with violence and bloodshed, when Jewish men, women and children were being slaughtered in cities and towns, it was inevitable that any view portraying Jesus in a favorable light would be violently rejected, and its author villified. No sensitive Jew of that period could believe that Jesus was good when so much evil had been perpetrated in his name. His evaluation of prayer and what it means to Israel is in keeping with the philosophic ideas of Judaism.

*did any
one attack
it?*

Krochmal's Views of Laws and Ethics

Krochmal says that both laws and ethics are obligatory. He disagrees with Kant and says that Kant is not correct in saying that only law is necessary for society. Krochmal says that without ethical values a society will degenerate and its members will not progress spiritually. Krochmal lists four standards of ethics.

The first is,

זה רשע, זה רשע

What is mine is mine and what is yours is mine.

This is the ethical standard of a people whose concepts are only objects. They cannot think of anything that is not real. Therefore, they are able to conceive the meaning of "you", "he", "she" but not of "I".

Krochmal says that is the meaning of the saying

אין אדם יודע מהו אדם אלא כפי שרואה אותו

Since they lack self consciousness, they can think of themselves only in relation to something else which belongs to them. They identify themselves with objective things such as their possessions. This is the closest stage to that of animals. An animal, such as a dog for example, has intelligence and can be trusted to do all sorts of things, but he does not understand what he is doing. (48)

The second is

ה' ה' ו' ה' ה'

What is mine is mine and what is yours is yours.

This is considered the

א' ב' ג' ד' but

Krochmal thinks this is a mistake for instead of

א' ב' ג' it should be considered א' ב' ג' ד'

(gangster like) for the man who thinks so, thinks only of himself just as ^{the people of Sodom} א' ב' ג' ד'. An attitude of this sort causes the disintegration of society. (49)

The third is

ה' ה' ו' ה' ה'

This is communism. Man loses his creative urge because he draws on the support of others and cares only for the materialistic things. Spiritually he cannot progress. (50)

The fourth and the best attitude according to Krochmal is

pk pk, ple le

This is the attitude of a creative mind which can progress spiritually and others may benefit from his creativeness in science, medicine, music, technology and political organization. Such people as the pious ruler of North America, George Washington, or the great and wise ruler of Germany, Otto von Bismarck, caused others to benefit while benefiting themselves. (51)

Krochmal says that the aristocrats follow the first standard; the workers and peasants follow the second standard; the rich follow the third and the

pkpk follow the fourth.

Krochmal's disagreement with Kant, as to what is necessary for society, shows somewhat that he believed that a world without ethical values would be a world that would be chaotic. If Krochmal is correct in this assumption, then we can better understand his discussion in the opening paragraph of the book when he discusses the question of חַיִּיבּוּת

Krochmal believes that the basic values of the Torah are צדק and חסד and חסד חסד חסד. He derives this from the verse in Hosea 2:21, but these are also dependent upon a fifth value, that being (חַיִּיבּוּת) faith. ⁽⁵³⁾ This fifth value was added during the period of time when the Land of Israel was under Greek occupation. The Hasidim had to find as many followers as possible if they were going to break the yoke of the enemy. Therefore, they added this fifth value which is חַיִּיבּוּת faith. The Hasidim argued that the tie with God was not only

the basic four values mentioned above but also this fifth value found in Hosea 2:22.

..וארשתיך וישראל

The Mishnah Sota wanted to find one principal on which the whole Torah could be based and they struck upon the verse in Habakuk 2:4 in which the prophet says, (54) וצדק האמון יחיה

Since Krochmal believes that the four values are fundamentals of society and all the laws of the Torah are based on them, the fifth value, added to them, shows that the values are changeable and that the הצדקה was correct in their views of changing the basic values to fit our natural values. The changes of the values in the Torah, according to Krochmal, are called הצדקה Krochmal believed that if our natural laws lack the two values הצדקה and הצדקה, they are groundless, while the הצדקה believed

that all values that do not have the element of

ה' ו'א or א' in them, cannot stand.

Shimon Hazadik who was among the last of the
ה' ו'א said that "the world rests on
three things,"

ה' ו'א (55)

Krochmal in explaining this verse says, "avoda are
all the laws which apply only to Jews."

G'milut Hasadim applies to the rules that the
non-Jews have to follow, while Torah is the
instruction to both Jews and Gentiles and how they
are to follow and respect the rules of each group. (56)

This too is keeping within the framework of
Krochmal's thinking of values. He uses the expression
of Shimon Hazadik for he finds within this thought
the ethical values he needs to express his own
philosophical attitude of the framework of the Torah.

To Krochmal, the laws of the Torah are not mere blind mandates, but contain within themselves ethical values. It is these ethical values that perpetuate the spirituability of man to mold a better world.

Krochmal's Analysis of Tzifilin

The impact of Greek culture and its domination of Judea ushered in a degeneration among the Jewish masses. Moses, when he saw God, saw him objectively (אֱלֹהִים) and he was shown the Knot of the Tifilin (קוּטְבֵּן). This "Knot" or "contact" (קוּטְבֵּן) shows us the way to keep in touch with God. Krochmal notes that, of course, the laws which we have to keep must fit into our natural values. The Jews, under the influence of the Greeks, asked themselves why "shouldn't we follow our natural logic?" Since the Jews believe that the values were not objective and they did not

characterize God but were rather a reflection of man's natural values, then God actually asked them to keep the "Knot", the contact, by keeping the laws which are actually based on man's natural values.

If God has given us values which are not his and has asked us to take them as our criterion and has also given us a natural logic, why shouldn't we make use of this natural logic and use it as our criterion? Why can't we examine the reason for the laws?

The Hellenized Jews dismissed as illogical the belief in the hereafter (*אחרי המות*) because they did not distinguish between the permanent dynamic action and the permanent local action, the (*אחרי המות*). The Hasidim who fought this notion changed the end of the blessing

ברוך אתה יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד

to

היוק ה' גל ה' ושלחל מן חלמ
 ודף חלמ חכמת נ"ז

To strengthen the belief in the contact with God
 they introduced the "Knot" (קשר) of Tifilin.

In the Tractate of Sabbath, the question is
 asked, "What does this knot chain?," and Rab answers,
 "this knot chains the importance of the love of God."
 We know that Tifilin were introduced during the Greek
 era as was proven by my friend, Osias Schor, in an
 article in the Hechalutz, Vol. 4. (57)

Krochmal's treatment of the question of Tifilin
 does not lay in the fact whether man should or should
 not put on Tifilin, but rather what do the Tifilin
 symbolize. Krochmal believes that the laws in the
 Torah are not divine. They are laws of society and
 not necessarily Godly. Using this premise he says,

"since these are not divine laws but natural laws, we follow them because they are good for our society." God has given us two basic concepts, which are logic and values. We govern ourselves by the values and explain the values through our logic. Since our Rabbis wanted to inculcate the people with the premise that these natural values are divine in origin, they originated the knot of Tifilin. Man can come closer to God by binding himself with this "Knot", and then immediately all those values are no longer natural but become divine and man may no longer question them. If on the other hand, there is no "Knot" to bind them, they are not divine and our natural logic may question their original premise and change them within a given situation. This philosophy is in keeping with the basic idea of Krochmal that all values of the Torah may be changed within the framework of the Torah in a given time and place.

Krochmal's Comparison of Elisha and Akiva

Elisha ben Avuya was one of the great men of Rome. His father taught him the Torah while he was very young but also included among his studies Greek and Latin. He was allowed to do this because he was from the aristocratic group.⁽⁵⁸⁾ The entire family of Raban Gamliel knew Greek.⁽⁵⁹⁾ Elisha's knowledge of Latin and his interest in Jewish law made him bring Roman books on Jurisprudence to the היה קנה ספרים in order to compare Roman law to Jewish law.⁽⁶⁰⁾

Elisha knew Rome and was opposed to fighting her.⁽⁶¹⁾ Rabbi Akiva, the foolish dreamer, wanted to support Bar-Kochba's rebellion and in answer to Elisha's opposition, excommunicated him.⁽⁶²⁾ Elisha always remained a good Jew. He was not a Gnostic as my friend Rabbi Mordecai Dubs thought. Elisha did not believe in the היה אומר those being

good and bad, but he did make a distinction between (63)

מפני שבין אדם לחסידו ומפני שבין אדם למקומו

He emphasized the importance of the first in opposition to Rabbi Akiva who wasted his time in dealing with the questions of

בין טומאה וטהרה, גזעים וטהרה
חמץ מצה וטילוג ידים.

Elisha said:

אדם שיש לו מדעים טובים, ולאדם גורם הרבה למה בטן
צומצם? לאדם שמונה אבנים מלמטה ואחר כך לבנים
אפילו האדם מים הרבה בליצן אין מחין אומן מחקוץ.

ואדם שאין בו מדעים טובים, ולאדם גורם הרבה
למה בטן צומצם? לאדם שמונה אבנים תחתיו אפילו
האדם מים קומצא מיד הופכין אותו.
(64) האבן דרב נתן כ"ב.

To Elisha, ethics played the more important role.

While Rabbi Akiva said:

KIDUSHIN 40

לימוד גבול ממדע

In the analysis that Krochmal gives us, we can

see clearly his overall views concerning Judaism. Elisha, the traitor to the faith, is praised for he spoke the truth or so does Krochmal believe. Krochmal projects himself into the past and feels that he is uttering the words of Elisha when he says, "I will not be afraid to tell the truth." Since ethics play such an important role in the philosophic system of Krochmal, he is forced to reject Akiva whom he calls a nominalist and a Kabbalist and supports Elisha who is the more practical of the two.

In 1872, Krochmal published his only complete German work Theologie-der-Zukunft. Truthfully speaking, this work does not belong to the category of אגדה ארצית. Since there are certain phases of the book that deal with an overall Jewish picture, and since we are discussing all of Krochmal's work, it would not be fair if we would not say a few words about it.

Theologie-der-Zukunft belongs to the section of books that deals with critical philosophy.

Theologie-der-Zukunft

The Theology of the Future was the first book Abraham Krochmal wrote in German. It was written in Lemberg, 1872 for the justification of the religious conscience. The motto of the book was taken from Hosea 2:21, 22.

"וארטיק לי ערדורס, וארטיק לי קל זק במשפט
בחסד וברחמים, וארטיק לי האמונה ויציג את ה'."

"To eternal progress in religion and science, in a country based on law."⁽⁶⁵⁾ The basic thought in Krochmal's mind when he wrote this book was to promote the truth. The book was dedicated to Mr. H. Reinherz and Mr. Leon Lifschitz in Odessa.⁽⁶⁶⁾

The book is divided into three sections.

1. חקר אמונה
2. חקר גבורה
3. חקר קצונו

The first portion of the book is divided into three subheadings and three conclusions.

- (67) 1. The principles of society as conceived by Hillel
ואהבה ארצך כמוך
- (68) 2. The Origins of Religion in Social life.
God being the unalterable guarantor of the social order
צבא הקדוש
- (69) 3. The true good is not found in the pursuit of happiness but rather in prevoyant acts. To be wise means to live with prevoyance.
איזה היא חכמה הרודה אצל הנזיר

Three conclusions are drawn from the first chapter. They are:

- (70) 1. The principal of sociality is based on the advise of reason. It would be ridiculous to base it on 'Religion or Morals'. This explains why our forefathers wanted a monarch from the

prophet Samuel

היה זהו מלך ישראל (71)

Krochmal says, that their real aim was not to find a judge in their King nor a man of war for they had both judges and men of war.

Israel wanted a worldly form of government (72)

מלך המלכות ודמיון ארץ ואי תחיות יבסס

A monarch lays the foundation for the community based on Justice instead of religion. Whereas the religious hierarchy destroys the country, the monarch improves it.

Absolom promised a separation of religion and state when he rebelled against David.

- (73) 2. The second chapter tells us that religion originates in social life, and strives to the unalterable leadership of God. Krochmal says that social law and human love are the two sources of religion. We know that love is

not in the province of the good. Love stands above law and is superior to it. It makes no condition for reciprocity. Love claims all of its reciprocal deeds afterwards. Unconditional love is therefore, only loaning from the good within itself, which is not yet really the truth. Religion, its derivative, is in itself not yet good. Service to God and willingness to sacrifice to him is the premise if one does the above mentioned. Religion, afterwards, offers him a reward.

- (74) 3. The third chapter deals with morality. Krochmal says morality in itself is already good. Morality is willful prevision based on one's own self without the least pleasure (which involves sorrow). This means to act similarly to those acts which emanate from the idea of God.

Antignos of Socho said:

א"ת (75) א"ת תהיו כדברים המשמטין את הרג א"ת מנש לקחא פריס
א"ת תהיו כדברים המשמטין את הרג א"ת מנש לקחא פריס.

This, says Krochmal, is morality in its true sense. Morality stood on a plain by itself. Then came ethics and pushed morality aside. Actually ethics only surpassed morals which were in conflict with passion. Ethics and morals are not yet a degree of culture in themselves. We must search still higher for a degree of culture above morals and ethics and in order to do this we must study the cultural history of Israel.

The most important chapter of the book is the thirteenth chapter of the first section. It is entitled "The Necessity for a Basis to Build a Reform in Jewry and the Finding of it." In this chapter, Krochmal deals with the all important question, the one which was so evident throughout his writings.

He opens with an immediate attack upon the Rabbis. He says, "When one speaks of a necessary reform, the people of the static mind cite the expression from the Talmud."

(76) הנהרה פט צומה עכסרה א אנשים כיון
לנהרה אחת מהן נהנהרה כלן

He continues in that same tone and says, "If a Synod of Theologians would convene to decide what part of the ritual had to be abolished because it did not measure up to the cultural niveau of our time, the moderate would oppose it saying, there is no possibility for change in the ritual," and they will hint

(77) הנהרה הם עולמאלס אמר א'ן נ'א'א'ן
הם בני נ'א'א'ן

Because of this, the searches of reform are driven away and are teased. But are matters of this importance allowed to remain standing as they are?

What happens when honest reformers are driven away? Each one reforms according to his own fashion. This then becomes a reform of comfort which does not stem from scholarship and this reform contradicts the truth in education.⁽⁷⁸⁾ He attacks the Breslau Seminary and says, "That in spite of some Seminary, a religious reform for synagogues could be made successful if one could find the true historic theological basis for it." We have seen other religious reformations. In Judaism, there were the Karaites and in Christianity, Protestantism. Reform is not new to religion. If these two reformations were able to find the necessary theological basis, then we today can surely find that theological basis for reform.⁽⁷⁹⁾

This parliamentary Synod should be empowered to restore the belief in human progress.⁽⁸⁰⁾ This is the main view of Krochmal in this chapter.

Chapter IV

A

DIGEST

of

ABRAHAM KROCHMAL'S

ARTICLES

As well as writing books, Abraham Krochmal also wrote a number of very interesting articles for the Hechalutz, of which he was one of the editors along with Schor from 1852 to 1859.

It was during those years that Krochmal wrote such articles as:

- | | | | |
|----|---------------------------|-----------|----------|
| 1. | תולדות שטאט ורמזא | HECHALUTZ | VOI I |
| 2. | תולדות רבי ומוציא הנשיא | HECHALUTZ | VOI II |
| 3. | דברי אהרן | HECHALUTZ | VOI IV |
| 4. | מנצח חטא | HECHALUTZ | VOI I |
| 5. | ה' נא אה | HECHALUTZ | VOI III |
| 6. | כחא דפיטא | HECHALUTZ | VOI III |
| 7. | ורוצה האומה והתעלות האומה | לפי רובין | שנת 1860 |

The last article that Krochmal wrote was not written for the Hechalutz but for the periodical

דבר צופים published by Michael Wolf especially for Krochmal in 1860. The article was entitled

(ורוצה האומה והתעלות האומה)

(2'11)12 11/11 11 11 11 11) This article was one of the most important and poignant articles that Krochmal wrote. Aside from the books written by Geiger and Ludwig Philipsohn which are in German, no other article or book of that period enters into a more specific and detailed account of the mission of Israel as does this article.

Abraham Krochmal tries to prove that when the land of a nation falls, the people also fall. This he says is not the case with Israel. For the spirit of Israel is in the belief of Israel. Therefore, when the body of Israel fell, the body being the land, the spirit was strengthened, the spirit being the belief, and rose up and stood as a bulwark for everlasting generations.

In order to prove this point, Krochmal enters into an evaluation of the History of Israel. He

does not take a specific period of time to prove his point, but rather discusses this problem from an overall picture.

Krochmal is sure that those returned captives in the days of Zerubabel wanted to establish a monarchy as they originally had had, the monarchy to consist of a Priesthood and a King in accordance with the role that Israel played during that time. It was during the days of Ezra that the nation became split over certain issues and the outcome of that was the beginning of the Pharasaic movement in Israel. This idea is not new, for Geiger in the Urschrift says the same thing. "The Pharasees were in the days of Ezra".^① It was during the Hasmonean dynasty that this burning idea for a pure land of Israel was renewed and took root, and from the Hasmonean dynasty, we see the off shoot

of the Pharisaic movement in Israel. Krochmal traces the Essenes as an off shoot of the Pharisees who practiced *חילוני* recluse and were greatly influenced by Persian cultic practices. The Essenes were even more greatly opposed to statehood than were the Saducees. Krochmal says that the Essenes carried their recluse practices to too great an extent.

After the destruction, Rabbi Akiva became the champion of Jewish rights. It was he who proclaimed Bar Kochba the Messiah, and Israel entered into a conflict with Rome. Even after the defeat of Bar Kochba and the disillusionment of Rabbi Akiva, the people did not despair of the hope of their land. It was during this time that Israel was confronted with the disillusionment that they could not live by the sword, that their mission in life was to live by their truth, and to be a priest for the other nations until all of the world would call upon His Name. Nevertheless, they still continued to exist. Krochmal felt that if the Lord would

cause all to bow down to Him and all to work for Him and all to call His Name, then what need would there be for a Land of Israel. But this desire to return to their land with an independent ruler of the House of David was a burning desire of the people. This of course, was during the period that Israel was as strangers in the eyes of the rest of the world, but in our times when the nations accept Israel into the covenant of their lands, Israel must take stock of the situation. Israel would now be able to fulfill the concept of spreading the categorical truth and speaking the word of God and sanctifying His Name in the entire world. In this article, we find certain traces of a missionary doctrine. I feel that Krochmal did believe that the Jewish people had a mission and that being *לפי מורה*, the spreading of the categorical truth to the other people. In no other

source of that period aside from Geiger and Philipsohn do we find this concept. To Krochmal the restoration of Zion is not an important factor and neither is the concept of Messiah. To him the sole role which Israel plays in the world, is the role of missionary to the other nations. Krochmal contradicts himself with regard to this subject. For in his Theologie-der-Zukunft, Krochmal says, "The Jews are not missionaries of the monotheistic concept of his days, but the Moslems are".⁵ We can see from this contradiction that Krochmal did not clearly understand the subject matter and was still wrestling in his mind. Theologie-der-Zukunft was written in 1870. ישיבת האמנה והשלום בארץ ישראל was written in 1860. A ten year period elapsed before Krochmal said that the Jews were not missionaries of monotheism. It is possible that in his later years his mind was already made up on the subject

of the mission of Israel.

The second most important article of Krochmal was his classic 'דברי אונ' published in the Hechalutz Vol. IV, 1859. It was later published in the אגודת ישראל under the title

⑥ דברי אונ' ואג' ה' א' נ' וט' אל' ונא' ונא'

The orthodox Rabbinate of Eastern Europe was under the opinion that the authors and editors as well as the friends of the Hechalutz had set their goal to destroy Judaism, and that they themselves were not truly Jewish in the accepted sense of the word. Because of this, Krochmal wrote this article to explain what the foundations of Judaism were. In this article, Krochmal tries to negate the thirteen Principles of Maimonides and says, "those thirteen Principles have already been broken down to three by Rabbi Joseph Albo, and even these three

principles do not embrace the true foundations of Judaism". Krochmal then goes on to evaluate the principles which constitute Judaism.

1. Unity of God. **אחדות ה'**

This unity is pictured in our rejection of idols and of the Trinity, but Krochmal says the Talmud states **כל הכופר במדבור נהי נקרא עובד ע"ז** all those who negate idol worship are called Hebrews.

2. The Love of Man. **אהבת אדם**

This love is depicted by the great commandment of the Bible **ואהבת לרעך כמוך**

And thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

Also Hillel's saying **ודאק סני לחבירי לא גזרני**

which has come to mean, Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.

3. Holiness

קדושה

This holiness is manifest in our separation from other nations by means of marriage and circumcision. The Jew should not feel that because of this separation he is on a higher level or that he is a "blue blood". He is only separated from other nations that he can help raise their spiritual standards and their fear of God, as it is written in the Scripture

וְאַתָּה תִּהְיֶה לִּי אֶמְלָכָה כְּתוּבָה וְאַתָּה קָדוֹשׁ ⑦

And you shall be to me a nation of priests and a holy people.

וְאַתָּה תִּהְיֶה לִּי אֶמְלָכָה כְּתוּבָה וְאַתָּה קָדוֹשׁ ⑧

Krochmal continues and says, "The Greek excelled in Philosophy and Beauty, the Romans in Power, Law and their conquests, and Israel excelled in the faith, knowledge of

God and fear of Him." Therefore, faith is the mission of Israel in its glorious fulfillment.

He concludes his article with these words:

ואתכן עברת עם לאור זו

Three more articles written by Krochmal in the Hechalutz that deal with a similar subject are,
 גורלות שמאל ורחמי נאמן, גורלות רבי יודן הנשיא,
 ג' נשיא.

All of these articles were only published in the Hechalutz and never found their way into other magazines or periodicals as did his other two articles
 ירידת האומה הגדולה האומה, וירדתי אנכי

which were later published in the אוצר האמריקני

These three articles are basic in that they raise Samuel to glorious heights and lower Rabbi Judah. The reason for raising Samuel is that to Krochmal, Samuel is the personification of a typical maskil,

one who is proficient in sciences as well as religious studies. He lowers Rabbi Judah because he gave to the people his codified Mishnah which Krochmal called "truncated laws". These thoughts are prevalent through the period of Haskalah in Galicia, and in Eastern Europe and influenced both Smolenskin and Isaac Hirsch. ⑨

In his article *חוקי טהרה וטומאה* Krochmal enters into a lengthy discussion about the laws of unclean meat. Regarding these laws Krochmal says, "The Rabbis of our time have leaned heavily on the *אמרי חכמים* in helping to ascertain the cleanliness or uncleanness of an animal". If it were not for the Talmudic injunction

⑩ *אם לא יאמר חכם*

many of the reasons for which our ancestors condemned animals as unclean, would not be applicable for the Rabbinate of our day.

In his previous article on *גליון רבי יהודה הנשיא*

Krochmal pours out his wrath on the Rabbinate and

says,

ה' הוא ישרא' ד' אנה האלו א'
 א' ד' ודמיה' - האלו א' א' הדיוק

He continues in the same vein saying, "you pour restrictions upon us that not even our ancestors thought out; every day you seek new ideas and new restrictions which eat up the beauty of Jacob, the beauty of the Almighty Lord." ⑩

The material which is lacking is the general arguments and discussions that were had between the Rabbinate and Krochmal, Lilienblum, Gordon and Smolenskin.

Krochmal was not satisfied with this alone. He published in the Hechalutz another article dealing with the same subject *כחא דה' י' נא* that was

republished in his *אוצר אאריס* . Krochmal
wants to prove that the Biblical verses :

והכל חיה שדה טרפה לא תאכלו

וכל נבלה וטריפה לא ואכלו

These verses are simple and need no redaction or clarification and most of all no exegesis. That which wild animals of the field have killed and the carcasses of animals killed in the field by other animals, may not be eaten. But the Rabbis placed a fence around the laws of and placed them under eight categories, those being:

5. קדושה

1. דיוס

6. נבילה

2. נטילת

7. עסוקה

3. חסירה

8. שבורה

4. נקיחה

(ד / חנה נר)

Later on these categories were changed to eighteen.

and still later on, the laws regarding the prohibitions overshadowed even the prohibitions of the *public*

Who can really know which sick animal can live and which will die if not the doctors. Therefore, why not let us ask the doctor's advice?⁽²⁾ Why should we be constantly causing our brothers to lose money. This last statement has certain ramifications in that many times after the animal was slaughtered, the Rabbis would declare it unclean and thereby cause wholesale disaster for a Jewish community.

This article made a great impression and there is little doubt that this article also had a great effect on Lilienblum and his work *נספח לפרשת ויקרא*

These then, are the articles of Abraham Krochmal. We can see that Krochmal was an extraordinary

individual. We know that he was well versed in Talmud and commentaries. He was a student of philosophy. He wrote many books and many articles. Why then was Abraham Krochmal forgotten? Why does he not have his place in the period of the

but he does!

התקופה המודרנית
Modern Hebrew Literature

The answer to our last two questions will be answered in the concluding chapter.

Chapter V

Why Krochmal was Forgotten

in the

הסטוריה של ספרות הצמחיה החדשה

Abraham Krochmal's philosophy was a product of nineteenth century currents. He searched through the philosophies of Spinoza, Kant and Hegel to find substantiation for his views concerning Judaism. He and his group of anti-religious propagandists promulgated the view that Judaism should abolish all restrictions weighing upon the people. ①

Basically, Krochmal was an eclectic philosopher. His views regarding Jewish life and Judaism were nothing more than a compilation of the existent philosophies of his era. His basic error lay in the fact that in order to prove or disprove an existent theory, he would project himself into the past in order to justify his viewpoint.

Krochmal stood for reform. His philosophy was namely the radical reform in Judaism promulgated by most of the left wing members of the Haskalah, such

as Schor, Gordon and Erter. Throughout his writings we can see how he actually projected himself into the past. In his book *חורבן בית המקדש* Krochmal outlines a history of Israel, and touches upon three main characters, Akiva, Elisha ben Avuya and Rabbi Judah.

Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Judah are exemplars of the orthodox Rabbinate of his day demanding strict conformity to the codified laws. It is for this reason that he holds them in such low esteem. On the other hand he praises Elisha for to him Elisha typified the maskil, one who was familiar with the literary philosophical pursuits of his day. ②

Krochmal says, that if Maaser was abolished during the days of the second Temple, then the *חכמים* must have felt it proper to reinterpret the lex talionis, and if they could change

and reinterpret the law, why can't we?

In his article *יחזקאל ורמיהו* ³ he makes a distinction of character between Judah and Samuel. He praises Samuel, for to him Samuel is a personification of a typical maskil who is proficient in sciences as well as religion. He pours his wrath out on Rabbi Judah for forcing upon the people his codified Mishnah, which he calls truncated laws. ³

In his article *לכבוד רמיהו* ⁴ Krochmal wages a struggle against the laws concerning unclean meat. He says, "The laws found in the Bible regarding unclean meat have been over-shadowed by more Rabbinical injunctions than initially intended by the Bible itself." ⁵

His feeling for justifying certain acts led him

to the past and in an unscholarly like fashion by deduction rather than induction, he arrives at his philosophic conclusion.

I have already alluded to the fact that Krochmal was influenced by his father. Growing up in the environment of Zolkiev could not help but leave a deep impression upon him. Krochmal extracted certain of his father's philosophical ideas and together with the philosophies of Spinoza, Kant and Hegel, he set out the pattern of his ideas.

Krochmal believed, as did his father, that all nations, except Israel, are subject to the laws of history. Israel is exempt from the laws of history because Israel is eternal. (c) This theory is somewhat similar to the theories in Hegel's Dialectic. Hegel's Dialectic includes Thesis, Antithesis and Synthesis. Nachman Krochmal's picture of history also

includes three stages: rise, development and decline. One might say that either wittingly or unwittingly, Nachman Krochmal absorbed some of Hegel's Dialectic and put it into practice in his philosophic view of history. Abraham Krochmal went one step further. Drawing still more from Hegel, he said, "Not only is Israel exempt from the laws of history but that Israel was projecting the spirit of God's law on earth in accordance with place and time".^⑦ This view would make Krochmal somewhat of a relative historicist. ??

Krochmal's views regarding the laws of the Torah are similar to those of Spinoza, to the extent that in following these views, Krochmal is also a realist.

Krochmal says that all the laws of the Torah would ultimately be understood. This is also the view of Spinoza.^⑧

Spinoza in his Ethics said, "God is substance and substance is God". He meant that God is equal to reality and in those forms of reality (logic and science) one can find God. In comparing Abraham to Moses in their recognition of God, Krochmal says, "Abraham recognized God in a subjective manner. Moses recognized God in an objective manner. The manner in which Moses recognized God is the same manner in which Spinoza recognized Him, that being in a logical and scientific manner".⁽⁹⁾ What Krochmal meant was that both Moses and Spinoza realized that the laws given at Sinai were not given for any specific time and that ultimately everything contained within the law would be understood. Hegel who followed in some respects Spinoza's philosophy said, "The real is rational and the rational is real and there is no dogma but only reason involved".⁽¹⁰⁾ Therefore Spinoza, by studying reality through logic attained

the highest understanding of God according to Krochmal.

Krochmal declares he is a student of Rabbi Imanuel Kant and Rabbi Baruch Spinoza.⁽¹⁾ I have tried to show whereby Krochmal was motivated by Spinoza. I will now show what philosophy he drew from Kant.

Kant in his Critique of Pure Reason says, "It is reason which prescribes its laws to the sensible universe. It is reason which makes the cosmos."⁽²⁾ Krochmal in discussing the laws of Israel says, "the sum total of good deeds are truth and truth stems from spirituality, because of these basic truth have we been chosen".⁽³⁾ This phrase shows clearly what Krochmal was. He was a rationalist, following the line of rationalism of Hegel and Kant. From his father he received the motivation for his

historicism. From Spinoza, Hegel and Kant he was motivated to his rationalism.

Abraham Krochmal was adrift in two currents: in the current of historicity projecting his views into the past to find justification for his cry for reform, and secondly in the current of pure rationalism as espoused by Spinoza, Kant and Hegel, to prove that through logic and science his appeal for reform was justifiable.

Living and developing in the era of Geiger, Frankel, Zunz and his father, and being overshadowed by their profound intellect and thorough scholarship, we can readily see how Krochmal, who had nothing to offer but a coalition of the already existent material, was easily forgotten.

If Krochmal had nothing original to contribute to this generation, why then were Lilienblum and

Smolenskin so influenced by him? We know of individuals who are magnificent teachers but are poor writers. In contrast to them, there are those who have a magnificent style in prose and are poor teachers. I feel that Krochmal had something to contribute. If his ideas were void of any original thought, he could not have left such a lasting impression upon Lilienblum and Smolenskin, and Gordon would not have considered him a candidate for the editorship of the Hechalutz.

Krochmal belonged to that group of good teachers and poor writers. His Hebrew was heavy and lacked the finesse in style of Lilienblum, Smolenskin, Gordon and Schor. His German was also poor for on two occasions he gives thanks to two people for correcting his German. His was indeed a sad lot.

Flourishing in his era and not being an equal of his contemporaries, he was doomed to obscurity.

I can only say that his eclecticism led to his
 being almost totally obscured from the pages of
 the

not so

~~הוא נשכח מן העמודים~~

Modern Hebrew Literature

Klausner devotes a full chapter
 to ^{הוא} ~~הוא~~ /etc, as you well know.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1. The German, Russian and Jewish Encyclopedias date the life of Abraham Krochmal as follows:
Born in 1823 - Died 1895. According to Klausner
A. Krochmal was born in 1818 and died in 1888.

a) הסטוריה הספרות הדגריג החזלס Klausner

Vol. 2 Pg. 163 Note 25.

2. From the Letters of רבי מנחם מיינליס to רבי"ק
we note that Sarah Krochmal, Abraham's mother,
died in 1826. Abraham was 10 years old, therefore
he could not have been born in 1823 as the
Encyclopedias date him.

a) כתבי רבי"ק Rabidowitz

Pgs. 420-421

3. האמט"ל עמלמיך א האטאריטטיס הרבנים האמט"ל בפולניה

Theologie der Zukunft

A. Krochmal Pg. 76

מלחמה הספרות הדגריג החזלס

P. Lachover Vol.2 Pg.309

הסטוריה הספרות הדגריג החזלס

Klausner Vol. 2 Pg. 90
Note 11

המאמר אלוין 27 דף 303

a) Theologie der Zukunft A. Krochmal Pg. 76

b) ספר הנזכר Vol 2 Pgs. 161-162

c) מלאכות השבת והעבודות הקדושות Lachover Vol 2 Pg. 309

4. In a letter from רבי'ק to his son Abraham dated the 21st of Tebet 1837 from Tarnapol (Pg. 427

(. כתב' רבי'ק

a) רבי'ק כתב' Ravidowitz Pgs. 427,444.

5. From the letters of the years 1837 to 1840.

a) רבי'ק כתב' Ravidowitz

6. רבי'ק כתב' Ravidowitz Pgs. 428,429, 403

7. רבי'ק כתב' Ravidowitz Pg. 430

8. ואלו הן מקומות הנזכרים
פירושם והענין שלהם אצל רבי'ק A. Krochmal Pgs. 173,174

a) רבי'ק כתב' Ravidowitz Pgs. 441-444

9. Theologie der Zukunft A. Krochmal Pg. 11

a) יו"א'ם הבנין A. Krochmal Pg. 58

10. From what A. Kahana told Klausner

Klausner Pg. 92 הספורים הספרות בדמיון החזק

11. This is what זבי' ריפל זרשסקי told P. Lachover.

knew A. Krochmal in Odessa. זרשסקי

a) "אין המצב המדויק לא נשאו בידי אבין קדושתו
אך אחרי ג' במצב פנימי אחר פ' לחובת אי" קאופמן

12. Rabidowitz Intro. Pg.220 כתבי רבי'ק

a) יו"א'ם הבנין A. Krochmal Pgs. 77,93.

היה חוקר המצב איבין פונץ אולי אחר וא"י זגלר
נשכין' הן כח דברי הסופר, יאלא שאן פורו באו' לרב.

b) Hechalutz Vol 2 Pgs. 87, 93

13. Tel Aviv 1939 Pg. 16 מחבר כתב' אחר

14. מכתב אליעזר לזרצון/ Klausner Pg. 94

15. מכתב אליעזר לזרצון/ Klausner Pg. 94

16. ברך בן משה סמולנסקי Brainin

17. A. Krochmal 1874
הפסד ופסחאק Pgs. 6, 9

a) A. Krochmal states that he went from Lwow
to Odessa to Lwow and then back to Odessa.

18. A letter from Lilienblum to Gordon Sept. 12, 1872

19. קטאג נצחיים Lilienblum

כל נחמי מליל Lilienblum Vol 2

Pgs. 301,302,336,338
339,340,402,403.

20. קטאג נצחיים Lilienblum Pgs. 301,302

21. קטאג נצחיים Lilienblum Pg. 336

22. חטאוי גארוי Lillienblum Pgs. 339,340
402,403

זיין זשורנאל Pg. 49

23. Vol 2, Pg. 437

ווען ער האט אים קענטליך איינזען
אין אים איז ער אים אים
הערצליכע (הערצליכע) מיט צו
וואס ער איז ער אים אים
וואס ער איז ער אים אים

24. If he says he was old in 1870, he surely was not born in 1823 but in 1818.

25. טעגליכע פרעזענטאציע ביזנאס S. Bernfeld Pgs. 237, 238

a) I. L. Landau Pgs. 8, 9

26. She was born in 1853 in Brodie.

27. Popular-wissenschaftliche Monatsblätter 1888

A. Brul Vol. 8, Pg. 238

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

1. Theologie der Zukunft A. Krochmal Pg. 37
2. This is what Schor says in his article in the Hechalutz Vol. 13, Pg. 23. Abraham calls him my dear friend.
- 2a. Klausner Vol. 2, Pg. 102
3. A. Krochmal Pg. 70
4. A. Krochmal Pg. 7
- 4a. Allgemeine Zeitung der Judentums
1867 Pg. 675
Hechalutz Vol. 6, Pgs. 47-55
5. A. Krochmal Pgs. 9,10
6. A. Krochmal Pg. 247
7. J. Klausner Vol. 4A
8. A. Krochmal, Pg. 62

9. כ'רש"ם והדפוס אגמון בע"ל A. Krochmal Pgs. 5-73
Pgs. 98-100
Pgs. 184,185,239,246,278
10. כ'רש"ם והדפוס אגמון בע"ל A. Krochmal Pgs.124,125
11. כ'רש"ם והדפוס אגמון בע"ל A. Krochmal Pgs. 205,246
259,263,264,283
12. כ'רש"ם והדפוס אגמון בע"ל A. Krochmal Pg. 215
13. כ'רש"ם והדפוס אגמון בע"ל A. Krochmal Pg. 281
14. כ'רש"ם והדפוס אגמון בע"ל A. Krochmal Pg. 263
15. כ'רש"ם והדפוס אגמון בע"ל A. Krochmal Pg. 218
16. כ'רש"ם והדפוס אגמון בע"ל A. Krochmal Pg. 140
17. כ'רש"ם והדפוס אגמון בע"ל A. Krochmal Pg. 237
18. כ'רש"ם והדפוס אגמון בע"ל A. Krochmal Pg. 286

19. From this article we can see that Abraham left Odessa and went to Lwow in 1869. This means that Abraham left Odessa more than once, and that Abraham was in Odessa before 1869.

הנהגת אברהם א. Krochmal Pgs. 6-9

20. Hechalutz Schor Vol. 10 Pgs. 70-103

21. Theologie der Zukunft A. Krochmal Pg. 81

22. פירוש אברהם א. Krochmal Pgs. 5-7

23. פירוש אברהם א. Krochmal Pgs. 5,7, 10,27,77

הנהגת אברהם Schor Pgs. 3-89

הנהגת אברהם א. Krochmal Pgs. 76-77

24. Hechalutz Vol 1 Pgs. 43-44

25. Hechalutz Vol 1 Pg. 46

26. Hechalutz Vol 1, Pg. 46

27. Hechalutz Vol 2 Pg. 36

Critique of Pure Reason - Kant - M. Muller
N.Y. 1922 Pg. 389

28. הסטוריה משפחה הדגריה חסדג J. Klausner, Vol. 4A
Pg. 108
- 28a. אב = האב / האב אברהם Krochmal's name
אברהם / אב
29. גורדו פיתחמי והקסמי Hechalutz Vol. 6
Pgs. 47-55
30. גורדו פיתחמי והקסמי Hechalutz Vol 9
Pgs. 1-47
31. Hechalutz Vol. 6 Pg. 53 *ref? in 112*
32. Hechalutz Vol. 3 Pgs. 17, 18
ref wrong
33. דין התפילי A. Krochmal Pg. 62
34. דין התפילי A. Krochmal Pg. 63
35. דין התפילי A. Krochmal Pg. 64
36. דין התפילי A. Krochmal Pg. 66
37. דין התפילי A. Krochmal Pg. 68

38. דין התפילה A. Krochmal Pg. 70
39. דין התפילה A. Krochmal Pg. 70
40. דין התפילה A. Krochmal Pgs. 71, 72
41. דין התפילה A. Krochmal Pg. 74
42. דין התפילה A. Krochmal Pgs. 74-79
43. דין התפילה A. Krochmal Pg. 79
44. דין התפילה A. Krochmal Pg. 79
45. דין התפילה A. Krochmal Pg. 82
46. דין התפילה A. Krochmal Pg. 83
47. דין התפילה A. Krochmal Pg. 84, 85
48. דין התפילה A. Krochmal Pg. 134-136
49. דין התפילה A. Krochmal Pg. 141
50. דין התפילה A. Krochmal Pgs. 142, 146

51. דיון הגפיל A. Krochmal Pgs. 148-149
52. דיון הגפיל A. Krochmal pg. 16
53. דיון הגפיל A. Krochmal Pg. 38
54. דיון הגפיל A. Krochmal Pg. 38
55. דיון הגפיל A. Krochmal Pg. 16
56. דיון הגפיל A. Krochmal Pg. 16-19
57. דיון הגפיל A. Krochmal Pg. 19-36
58. דיון הגפיל A. Krochmal Pg. 168, 170
59. דיון הגפיל A. Krochmal Pg. 168
60. דיון הגפיל A. Krochmal Pg. 170
61. דיון הגפיל A. Krochmal Pg. 170
62. דיון הגפיל A. Krochmal Pg. 171
63. דיון הגפיל A. Krochmal Pg. 168

64.	ה' פדסו / 117	A. Krochmal Pg. 174
65.	Theologie der Zukunft	A. Krochmal Title Page
66.	Theologie der Zukunft	A. Krochmal Introduction
67.	Theologie der Zukunft	A. Krochmal Pg. 4
68.	Theologie der Zukunft	A. Krochmal Pg. 5, 7
69.	Theologie der Zukunft	A. Krochmal Pg. 9, 13
70.	Theologie der Zukunft	A. Krochmal Pg. 15, 16
71.	Theologie der Zukunft	A. Krochmal Pg. 15
72.	Theologie der Zukunft	A. Krochmal Pg. 16
73.	Theologie der Zukunft	A. Krochmal Pg. 16, 17
74.	Theologie der Zukunft	A. Krochmal Pg. 17, 18
75.	Theologie der Zukunft	A. Krochmal Pg. 17

76. Theologie der Zukunft A. Krochmal Pg. 75
77. Theologie der Zukunft A. Krochmal Pg. 75
78. Theologie der Zukunft A. Krochmal Pg. 76
79. Theologie der Zukunft A. Krochmal P. 76-77
80. Theologie der Zukunft A. Krochmal Pg. 87
81. Theologie der Zukunft A. Krochmal Pg. 87
82. Theologie der Zukunft A. Krochmal Pg. 87

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4

1. *ההגות האמיתית* A. Krochmal Pgs. 18,19
2. *ההגות האמיתית* A. Krochmal Pgs. 34,35
3. *ההגות האמיתית* A. Krochmal Pg. 55
 - a) *אגדות מאחורי* A. Krochmal Pgs. 57-58
- הספדו של הרב חיים הכהן* Klausner Pg. 113
4. *אגדות מאחורי* A. Krochmal Pg. 58
5. Theologie der Zukunft A. Krochmal Pg. 83
6. *אגדות מאחורי* A. Krochmal Pgs. 1-12
7. Hechalutz Vol. 4 Pg. 27
 - a) *אגדות מאחורי* Pg. 11
8. Hechalutz Vol. 4 Pgs. 27, 28
 - a) *אגדות מאחורי* Pgs. 11, 12

10. Hechalutz

Vol. 1 Pgs. 73, 74

11. Hechalutz

Vol. 2 Pgs. 89, 90

12. Hechalutz

Vol. 3 Pgs. 31, 32

a)

. פ"ח/מ 1/34/6 Pgs. 72, 73

NOTES TO CHAPTER 5

1. Renaissance of Hebrew Literature - ^{Slouschz} ~~Slouez~~ Pg. 207-208
2. Hechalutz Vol. 6 Pg. 53
3. ^{דור ודור} Weiss Vol. 2 Pgs. 190-193
4. Hechalutz Vol. 2 Pgs 89-90
5. Hechalutz Vol. 2 Pgs 89-90
6. ^{האמנה} Pgs. 34, 35
History of Hebrew Literature - Waxman Pg. 463
ד"ר Rawidowitz Pg. 50
7. Hechalutz Vol. 2 Pgs 40-41
- 7a. Hegel's Selections Pg. 234
8. Hechalutz Vol. 1 Pg. 46
Hechalutz Vol. 2 Pg. 36
9. ^{האמנה} A. Krochmal Pgs 5-7

10. Hegel's Selections

I. Loewenberg
Pgs. 288-293, 310

11.

דברי חכמים / א. Krochmal Pg. 70

12. Critique of Pure Reason

Kant - M. Muller
N.Y. 1922 Pg. 389

13. Hechalutz

Vol. 2 Pg. 36