American Jewish Periodical Center CLIFTON AVENUE - CINCINNATI, OHIO 45220

JACOB R. MARCUS, *Director*

HERBERT C. ZAFREN,
Executive Director

The originals are from the holdings of

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE LIBRARY

Further copies of this film may be made only after securing written permission from the American Jewish Periodical Center as well as from the owner(s) of the originals and/or the copyright owner.

Statement by Referee of Master's Thesis

The M.H.L. dissertation entitled:

written by Bernard Wallack
(name of student)

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

cannot be considered for publication (✓)

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

may not be loaned by the Library (✓)

Jacob R. Marcus
(signature of referee)

Jacob R. Marcus
(referee)

May 1, 1951
(date)

Microfilmed 8/27/69

Dr. David Einhorn's

S I N A I

1856 - 1862.

An Evaluation and Partial

Translation of His Writings.

Submitted to the Faculty
of the Hebrew Union College
in Partial Requirement for
the Degree of Master of
Hebrew Letters and Rabbi
by
Benno M. Wallach,
Spring 1950.

SUMMARY.

SUMMARY.

From 1855 to 1862 Dr. David Einhorn, Rabbi of the Har Sinai Congregation in Baltimore, and later Rabbi of Kneseth Israel Congregation in Philadelphia, published a Jewish scientific magazine called the Sinai. It is with the partial translation and analysis of Dr. Einhorn's work in this magazine that this thesis concerns itself.

Dr. Einhorn's struggle began the moment that he set foot on American shores. He immediately entered the fray on behalf of Reform Judaism by speaking up vigorously against the so-called Cleveland Conference, at which meeting some of the early American Reform Rabbis were willing to sacrifice their principles for the sake of unity for all Israel. He continued this struggle from the pulpit and with the pen in the Sinai.

Dr. Einhorn's outspokenness on behalf of the oppressed cost him a lifetime job in Baltimore. Since his freedom of the pulpit was threatened he resigned and accepted another position.

In the course of the years he made many enemies and friends, both too numerous to be mentioned here. Let it suffice to say that both enemies and friends were made on behalf of the cause which Einhorn espoused.

Dr. Einhorn's scholarly contributions are as often as not classics. While he was a member of his

generation, and could therefore work only with the tools available to his contemporaries, there were certain subjects which to Reform are timeless. Thus, for example, his analysis of the laws of Kashruth and his exposition of the circumcision issue in Reform are of as much value today as on the day that he wrote them.

What Isaac Mayer Wise did in organizing American Reform Judaism, Einhorn did for Jewish theology, defining its principal paths of thought. The work of the one could not have stood without the work of the other. Together they erected the living monument which we of today know as American Reform Judaism.

DEDICATION

To my beloved parents,

MARK and LENA WALLACH

whose devotion and encouragement
enabled me to pursue my studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

VOLUME I.

Table of Contents ..... i.

Preface ..... iv.

Part I. Introduction.

Section A. Introduction and biography ..... 1.
Notes ..... 8.

Section B. The Cleveland Conference ..... 9.
Notes ..... 19.

Part II. The Theologian.

Section A. Jewish Theology.
Chapter 1. The Old and the New Judaism: Attitudes to the Talmud ..... 20.
Appendix A. ..... 27.
Appendix B. ..... 51.
Notes ..... 59.
Chapter 2. Einhorn's Concept of Revelation ..... 63.
Chapter 3. The Circumcision Issue .. 66.
Appendix C. ..... 75.
Notes ..... 112.
Chapter 4. The Dietary Laws ..... 114.
Appendix D. ..... 119.
Appendix E. ..... 157.
Notes ..... 161.
Chapter 5. Freedom of Will ..... 165.
Appendix F. ..... 168.
Notes ..... 184.

Section B. A New Liturgy ..... 185.
Notes ..... 202.

Section C. Comparative Theology ..... 204.
Appendix G. ..... 205.
Notes ..... 240.

Section D. Practical Theology.
Chapter 1. Introduction ..... 243.
Chapter 2. The Procedure to be Followed with the Deceased ..... 244.

TABLE OF CONTENTS. (cont.)

Section D. Practical Theology. (cont.)
Chapter 3. Observance of the Sabbath . 246.
Chapter 4. Miscellany ..... 247.
Appendix H. ..... 248.
Notes ..... 250.

VOLUME II.

Part III. The Preacher.

Section A. Introduction ..... 251.

Section B. Installation Sermons.
Chapter 1. Baltimore ..... 257.
Chapter 2. Philadelphia ..... 265.

Section C. Holy Day Sermons.
Chapter 1. Rosh Hashonah ..... 276.
Chapter 2. Yom Kippur ..... 283.

Section D. Holiday Sermons.
Chapter 1. Shemini Azereth ..... 321.
Chapter 2. Simchath Torah ..... 326.
Chapter 3. Chanukkah ..... 331.
Chapter 4. Pesach ..... 337.
Chapter 5. Sefirath HaOmer ..... 349.
Chapter 6. Shevuoth ..... 361.
Chapter 7. Tishoh BeAv ..... 368.
Chapter 8. Sabbath Zachor ..... 373.

Section E. Special Occasions.
Chapter 1. January 4, 1861 ..... 377.
Chapter 2. July 4 Sermons ..... 383.

Section F. Funeral Sermon ..... 400.

Section G. As a Guest-Preacher ..... 402.

Section H. Sabbath Sermons ..... 412.

For a list of texts (all sermons)
cf. Addendum, after page ..... 548.

TABLE OF CONTENTS. (cont.)

VOLUME III.

Part IV. The World Arena.

Section A. The Slavery Question ..... 549.

Section B. Swiss Intolerance ..... 553.

Section C. The Board of Delegates of American Israelites ..... 556.

Section D. The Chaplaincy Question ..... 560.

Section E. The Mortara Affaire ..... 564.

Section F. Anti-Semitism ..... 571.

Section G. The Struggle for Reform ..... 575.

Section H. Friends and Enemies ..... 579.
Appendix I. ..... 584.
Appendix J. ..... 587.
Appendix K. ..... 590.
Appendix L. ..... 596.
Appendix M. ..... 600.
Appendix N. ..... 603.
Appendix O. ..... 605.
Appendix P. ..... 608.
Appendix Q. ..... 611.
Appendix R. ..... 614.
Notes ..... 616.

Part V. The Scholar ..... 619.
Appendix S. ..... 620.
Appendix T. ..... 632.

Part VI. The Educator ..... 638.
Appendix U. ..... 639.

Part VII. Panorama ..... 644.
Appendix V. ..... 645.
Appendix W. ..... 648.
Appendix X. ..... 651.

Part VIII. Correspondence ..... 652.

Conclusion ..... 654.

PREFACE.

PREFACE.

Several people have aided me greatly in the preparation of this thesis. I wish to acknowledge primarily the invaluable aid of my teacher and referee, Dr. Jacob Rader Marcus, Adolph Ochs Professor of Jewish History at the Hebrew Union College. It was his suggestion that led me to pursue this study.

Additional hints were kindly supplied by Dr. Samuel S. Cohon, Professor of Jewish Theology at the Hebrew Union College. I am also grateful for the help received from my dear wife Madeline for her aid in typing the first draft of this paper, and her constant encouragement. Last but not least I wish to acknowledge the help of Mrs. Etheljane Callner, who typed the final draft of this dissertation.

To all these people, my heartfelt thanks.

April, 1950. Benno M. Wallach.

V O L U M E I.

P A R T I.

Introduction.

PART I.

SECTION A.

Introduction and Biography.

Introduction and Biography.

Several years ago, while going through an art gallery, I came upon two works of one of the old Dutch masters. The one was a beautifully finished portrait, exquisitely executed, rich in detail and color. The other, hanging next to it, was a mere sketch which the artist had hoped to bring to life as an oil painting, but had never finished. Rough lines showed what was to become a work of art, bare outlines indicated where fine details were to be filled in later on. After studying the sketch for a long time I tried to picture in my mind what the finished product would have looked like, but the task was impossible.

I cannot help feeling like that again as I am trying to get a good look at Dr. David Einhorn. After having read many of his writings, sermonica, scientific writings, analyses and cricitisms among others, I can clearly see the framework of his mind; his ideas are sharply focused and brilliantly lucid -- but the man Einhorn is hidden. True, some photographs of him are extant. We see a gaunt, strong man with very high and wide cheekbones, sloping sharply to a determined, pointed chin. His eyes were of a most unusual brightness, which even shows on photographs. These are topped by thick, bushy eyebrows beneath an uncommonly high forehead.

While these pictures give us an idea of the man's fire, they do not nearly portray the things we find in his

writings, nor do they tell us anything about the type of an individual he was in his home, among his friends, or when at leisure otherwise. We know very little about his youth; only a few facts about him have been passed on to our generation.[1].

David Einhorn was born in Dispeck, Bavaria, near Fuerth, on November 10, 1809. His father died while he was still very young, and his mother proceeded to provide her children with a good education. Young David proved to be a very precocious youth; at the age of ten he had learned all he could gather from his village teacher, and was enrolled at the Yeshivah in Fuerth under the leadership of Rabbi Wolf Hamburger, a zealous adherent to Orthodoxy. At the age of seventeen he was ordained there, receiving much praise and admiration for his erudite scholarship. However, the young rabbi was not satisfied with the knowledge he had gleaned at the Yeshivah. As a student he had stealthily studied the classics and mathematics, and he now set out to broaden his knowledge in those fields. He studied at the universities of Erlangen, Wuerzburg and Munich, eventually receiving his doctorate.[2].

The thirst for a liberal education cost him the esteem of his teachers. He found himself branded an אפיקורוס and a פושע ישראל. Though several rabbinical positions were open to the young candidate, Hamburger and his associates did everything in their power to prevent him

from attaining to any one of them. These men were so powerful that when he finally received a call from the congregation of Wellhausen near Uffenheim, the Bavarian government would not confirm the appointment. He thus spent a decade in bitter disappointment, until he finally became the rabbi of Hoppstaedten and Landesrabbiner of Birkenfeld in the Grand-Duchy of Oldenburg. It was there that he launched upon his brilliant career as a Reform Jewish leader, until he eventually became one of the גדולי הדור in America.

In 1844 he was married to Julie Henrietta Ochs, a member of a prominent Kreuznach family. She was a great help and comfort to him throughout his life, a never-failing source of inspiration. She outlived her husband by nearly thirty years.

It was during this time that several important controversies raged in German Jewish circles. These were the Hamburg Prayerbook controversy, the Geiger-Tiktin controversy, and the uproar caused by the Frankfurt Reform Verein. Undauntedly the young rabbi let his voice ring forth among his older colleagues, gaining their respect and admiration for his firmness, his clear insight into the issues under discussion, and his tremendous scholarly acumen and store of knowledge. After serving as the key figure on several committees at Rabbinical Conferences, (some of Einhorn's work in that capacity will be discussed in the course of this thesis) his reputation spread far and wide, so that in 1847 he was called to succeed Samuel

Holdheim as the chief rabbi of Mecklenburg-Schwerin. Again Einhorn was abused very harshly by his former teacher, Rabbi Wolf Hamburger, but this time the disciple did not spare the master, and answered in vigorous language, clearing his name.

The scope of the work in his new position was far greater than that permitted him in his first position. It was not very long before he had a chance to prove himself against one of Germany's foremost scholars, Professor Franz Delitzsch. The issue at hand (to be discussed later in this thesis) was a burning question for all Jewry, and had Professor Delitzsch won his case, Reform in Germany would have received a very serious setback. As it turned out, however, Einhorn emerged victorious beyond a doubt, and the movement gained added impetus through his brilliant thinking.

During his ministry in Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Dr. Einhorn realized the fallacy of preaching one way of life and practicing another. He was too honest to preach that the Jewish people had been dispersed throughout the world to fulfill the messianic ideal, and afterwards to pray in the liturgy for a speedy return to Zion.[3] He also realized that the vernacular must be employed in prayer, since the majority of the masses did not understand Hebrew, and their worship was merely a mechanical repetition of unintelligible syllables. It was at that time that he began to consider the redaction of a reformed

Jewish liturgy to be used by Reform congregations, a wish which he realized almost a decade later when he published his עלת תמיד in America.

Despite his eloquence and force his position was at best precarious, on many occasions nigh unto untenable. The orthodox element was very powerful, and was strongly supported by the government. Realizing that he was fighting a lost cause without any chance of success, he accepted a call from the Reform Congregation in Pesth in October 1851.

Dr. Kohler[4.] terms Einhorn's services in Pesth "..... like the flashing up and facing away of a meteor on the sky." However, political unrest in Hungary was very strong, and since the Reform elements there were identified with the revolutionary party, the movement almost died before its inception.[5.] The petition for a charter for the new congregation was refused by the Austrian Minister for Public Worship, and so the congregation had to close its doors two months after they had been opened, and again Einhorn had lost a position. It is very characteristic of the man that during all this time it had never occurred to him to sacrifice any of his principles, or even to compromise a little. How easy it would have been for him to meet his opponents half way, and to create for himself a secure position somewhere, so that he and his could live the rest of their days in tranquillity! Quite to the contrary, instead of giving

in to this crushing defeat and leaving Pesth, he remained with some of his ardent admirers, and began to put his ideas on paper as a systematized theology. This work appeared later under the title Das Prinzip des Mosaismus und dessen Verhaeltniss zum Heidenthum und Rabbinischen Judenthum, but it was never finished. The first volume was published in Leipzig in 1854; a few chapters of the second volume on Free Will and Divine Providence were later published in Sinai (to be discussed later in this thesis); and some additional materials were published in the Jewish Times of 1872.

In 1855 Dr. Einhorn received a call to Baltimore. His work in the field of theology, though he undoubtedly cherished it, had not been enough for this man of flaming zeal: his place was not behind the desk (though he was well qualified for this), but in the pulpit. The best vehicle of expression for him was not the pen, but the tongue, for only by bringing his ideals and ideas to the masses could he hope to see his efforts and sacrifices crowned with success. He came to this country not as an immature young man fresh from the classroom, but as a prophet of Reform Judaism. Like the prophets of old he had suffered and wandered from place to place and from land to land, gaining experience, and fanning the burning flames within him to a mighty roar. At last he came to a place where no government restricted his utterings, a place that needed him and wanted him. At the

height of his powers, brimming over with enthusiasm, he entered on a new life. One of the very first things he did upon assuming his new position was to found the Sinai, a monthly magazine, in which he could express the thoughts which could not be voiced in the pulpit because they were too deep for the masses, and which also served to reach those who lived too far away to come to hear him. His motto was "I seek my brethren," for he wanted to reach all Jews in this country. By means of this periodical he taught the teachers in Israel as well as the masses.

The Sinai was published for a period of seven years, until it died for a lack of funds. It is the purpose of this dissertation to analyze the contents of this magazine, and to evaluate the influence it had on American Reform Judaism in its infant stage.

N O T E S

to

PART I, SECTION A.

Notes.

1) Most of the biographical details presented in this thesis were taken from Dr. Kaufmann Kohler's biographical essay: David Einhorn, The Uncompromising Champion of Reform Judaism, written for the one hundredth anniversary of his birth.

2) None of the available sources state where he received this degree, at what university, or the subject of his doctoral dissertation.

3) Cf. Singer Prayerbook, Bloch Publishing Co., 1939, p. 191. הביאנו לשלום מארבע כנפות הארץ ותולידנו קוממיות לארצנו. There are many similar passages in the orthodox liturgy.

4) Kohler, op. cit., p. 27.

5) For a more detailed discussion of the reform movement in Hungary cf. David Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism, Macmillan Co., 1907, Chapter X.

P A R T I.

SECTION B.

The Cleveland Conference.

The Cleveland Conference.

Dr. Einhorn was in the new world but a very short time when he was forced to put on his armor and enter the fray once more. The occasion was the Rabbinical Conference in Cleveland of 1855.

In the New York Herald of January 21, 1855 an invitation was issued "In the Name of Jehovah, the one God of Israel, and Israel's holy religion," inviting "the ministry, rabbis and delegates of Israelitish congregations" to assemble in Cleveland on October 17, 1855, to deliberate the following points:

1. On the union of the American Israelites.
2. On a plan to establish a regular and permanent Synod or Sanhedrin of American Rabbis.
3. On a plan for the religious and scholastic education of the Hebrew youths.
4. On any proposition which may be brought before the conference.

This invitation was signed "By order of the Provisory Sanhedrin of American Rabbis, Rev. Drs. Cohn of Albany, Guenzburg of Baltimore, Illowy of St. Louis, Kalisch of Cleveland, Merzbacher of New York, and Wise of Cincinnati.

The Israelite of Nov. 9, 1855 published the so-

called "Articles of Union," an excerpt of which is quoted here:

> "The conference also feels obliged to give utterance to the following points in which they unanimously agree to be the leading principles, of the future synods:
>
> 1. The Bible as delivered to us by our fathers, and as now in our possession is of immediate divine origin and the standards of our religion.
>
> 2. The Talmud contains the traditional legal and logical exposition of the Biblical Laws which must be expounded and practiced according to the comments of the Talmud.
>
> 3. The resolutions of a Synod in accordance with the above principle are legally valid.
>
> 4. Statutes and ordinances contrary to the laws of the land are invalid."

Before looking at Einhorn's denunciation of this conference, let us first consider the motivation for this assembly. Dr. Kohler in his work on Einhorn[1] states that men like Poznanski, Merzbacher, Lilienthal and Wise had labored earnestly to prepare American Jewry for Reform. The work was great, and progress slow. Suddenly Einhorn appeared on the scene, and the question arose: "Were the congregations ..... prepared and ripe for Einhorn's radicalism? Such, I (Kohler) think, were the considerations that induced Drs. Wise, Merzbacher and Lilienthal to antagonize the newcomer and to form a coalition at Cleveland in 1855 with the conservatives by declaring the Talmud to be the authoritative interpreter of the

Bible and therefore binding upon the Jew ....."

The author of this dissertation is forced to disagree with this opinion for several reasons. First of all it is true that Einhorn was a "radical" in many respects, however he was not as radical as Kohler seems to indicate. We must not forget Einhorn's antipathy to the Frankfurt Reform Verein, or his mitigating efforts upon assuming his office in Pesth. While he always preached against outdated norms in Judaism, he nevertheless always preached that the spirit of the Mosaic Law must be obeyed. A "radical" would have advocated a complete break with the past, but Einhorn's Judaism retains and cherishes a Jewish tradition wherever he did not deem it actually detrimental to a modern, liveable Judaism. His sermons were full of examples from Jewish history; he drew on the Midrash innumerable times to substantiate his arguments.

Secondly it is highly unlikely that the rabbis already engaged in the work of Reform would commence by antagonizing a newcomer. The scope of the work was tremendous, the workers few in numbers, and any additional help that might be available, especially of such high a calibre as Einhorn, would be welcomed with open arms, and not be rebuffed crudely. Besides that these men were undoubtedly acquainted with Einhorn's record, and must have realized that they would create a schism in American Reform Jewish circles that would be nothing but harmful. That

certainly was not their intention; quite to the contrary, they were willing to concede some of their principles to build a strong unified American Jewry, on grounds acceptable to all.

Thirdly Einhorn preached his inaugural sermon to Har Sinai at Baltimore on September 27, 1855, and the invitation to a Rabbinical conference was issued on January 21, 1855 in the New York Herald. The conference was called for October 17, 1855. It is almost absurd to think that a conference would be announced as early as January to formulate "safeguards" against possible "radicalism" by a man who was not scheduled to arrive in this country until many months had elapsed.

The fact that Einhorn's name did not appear with the other signatures appended to the invitation to the conference does not indicate that he was not asked to participate. We have no evidence available to this effect either way. That the conference was called so shortly after Einhorn's arrival seems to be a pure coincident, but that it was called because of his arrival is, as we have just pointed out, an impossibility.

Let us now look at Einhorn's reaction to the conference. He wrote: "No prophetic gift was required to foresee failure of this undertaking. The announced intent to bring about a unification of the various religious parties of American Israel could leave no doubt that .... the deliberations would lead to no result.[2] Who, so he

argued, would come to answer the call of a "provisional Sanhedrin" -- the Orthodox in union with the radical Reformers, knowing that the latter were to be the leaders of the assembly? And who, at the outset, could have expected that Dr. Wise would so faithlessly desert his Reform, "beloved as a bride," to enter into an unhappy union with believers in the Talmud, who seemingly "sit more on his neck than in his heart?"[3]. Of what possible interest could this conference be to Orthodox Jews, knowing that those who had convened the assembly wished to work out an American Minhag and a new Shulchan Aruch? A single word from Joseph Karo or Moses Israels (sic. Isserles is probably correct) was more important to them than all these doings, which in their eyes could constitute nothing but a whole series of unforgivable transgressions.

Reform rabbis could have but few objections to attending the conference. As yet there was no conflict of principles for them; all they could obtain or wish for were only matters of good taste. Jewish life was still so beset by talmudic ideas, that the one without the other appeared paradoxical. Mendelssohn's Jerusalem had already offered some suggestions for reforming Judaism, even though he himself had not yet fully grasped what he was proposing. Solomon Maimuni (sic.) had understood the task more fully;[4]. however the pace of progress in history is a slow process, and ideas must remain ideals for a long time before they gain concrete form. Dr. Einhorn believed that Reform Judaism

had reached that stage where it must step forward to proclaim its principles. What had been an ideal heretofore had now captured the hearts of people, and consequently the principles of Reform should no longer be recognized in spite of religion, but rather in the name and in the interest of religion.

Jewry was faced with two opposing principles, which could not be compromised: the one rested on an outlived Talmudism, the other on the everliving spirit of the Bible; the one contained rabbinic particularism, the other holds out a prophetic universalism. How could these be reconciled? All that the Cleveland conference taught its participants was to give up the idea of harmony between these antithetical idealogies.

The union achieved in Cleveland was one of personalities, and not principles. The participants were faced with the spectacle of I. M. Wise and I. Leeser uniting to protect talmudic authority. Well might Rev. Leeser have been speechless: before his very eyes Saul had become Paul! As for Dr. Wise, he saw Reform Judaism sink down dead at his feet -- because its soul, Dr. Wise, had left it. "Union! Union! no longer are there two camps in Israel!" Thus sounded the cry of rejoicing. The achievers of this union expected the applause of the multitudes as a foregone conclusion, but what a bitter disappointment lay in store for them!

According to the first notice[5]. the Cleveland

Platform had started: ".....that the Talmud is to be recognized as the legal and binding exegesis of the Bible by all Israelites:" According to a later announcement of the same paper[6.] this platform also included that "the traditional and logical exposition of Biblical Law contained in the Talmud is to be recognized as binding." In essence the spirit of these two declarations is identical. The Har Sinai Verein raised a strong protest against the first declaration, as did the board of trustees of Congregation Emanu-El of New York shortly thereafter.

But not only Reform Judaism, Orthodoxy as well raised its voice in protest: Why should Orthodoxy accept the Danaan gifts of the conference? And even more: This platform did not safeguard Orthodoxy's interest sufficiently, for it sanctioned only the Biblical Law according to talmudic concept, but it said nothing as yet regarding purely talmudic legislation, i.e. principles MiDeRabonon; e.g. it did not mention the law not to ride on the Sabbath or holidays. At this point, in a footnote, Dr. Einhorn becomes somewhat personal: He points out to Rev. Leeser that he is by no means sarcastic in his statements, and refers him to tractate J. Betsa 36C.[7.]

Dr. Einhorn contended that from the Orthodox viewpoint there is a great deal of impudence in the very tenor of the Platform: In effect it amounts to a confirmation of "the by God Himself on Sinai determined platform," [8.]

to crown it with human approval!

The replies from the Israelite, occasioned by the protests from Baltimore and New York, Dr. Einhorn termed as "ridiculous and full of confusion." As a matter of fact, he adds, so is everything which has been published to date on this subject by the Israelite.

A scientific challenge was offered to the men in Cleveland; the assertion was made that an unconditional recognition of the talmudic exegesis is in sharp contrast to sound Bible research; that such recognition would force Judaism forever into a special pattern of nationalism, and would eternalize the morbidity of the then existing religious circumstances. Instead of contradicting any one of these objections, the editors of the Israelite chose to answer with fanatical accusations of heresy, to call the Reformers atheists, and to number them with the Christian Unitarians, the editor of the Israelite even going so far as to give the pontific advice that the Reformers should join the latter formally.

"No Sabbath, no Yom Kippur, no Miloh," so came the lament from Cincinnati-Zion. Again Dr. Einhorn inserts a personal note:[9] Dr. Wise had upon occasion accused him of wishing to shift the Sabbath to Sunday. Wise never brought proof for this accusation and it is Dr. Einhorn's wish that he will do so at some future opportunity. "Between the 'holyday' of Cleveland and the Biblical Sabbath there still is a great difference," so writes Dr. Einhorn,"

even though both appear as an אות ברית, it would not be an impossibility to negate the former, and to be on good footing with the latter simultaneously."

At this point in the essay Dr. Einhorn becomes merciless towards his opponent, Dr. Wise. He attempts to prove that he is right and his opponent wrong by using bitter sarcasm and by employing the sharpest ridicule available to him. Though one cannot feel but that his views are correct, nevertheless the methods employed do seem a trifle too drastic. He writes:[10.] "Dr. Wise's determination is made of iron, and for this we must praise him. Both the Bible and the Talmud are for him on the same level, the only small difference is that whereas he previously dragged both of them through the mud, he now ascribes a divine character to both of them." He then proceeds to quote various passages from Dr. Wise's history text book,[11.] and to ridicule them as sharply as possible. A few examples may suffice at this point: "The voice of God, which ordered Jacob to return to the land of his fathers, was probably the messenger which his mother had promised to send him."[12.] "The man with whom Jacob wrestled a whole night was probably a highway man."[13.] "The first eleven chapters of the Bible Moses composed from a comparison of Egyptian, Hebraic and Arabic myths; he furthermore compared Hebraic and Arabic sagas and wrote the rest of Genesis -- naturally with the help of God."[14.] To this latter Einhorn adds an ironic footnote: "This last phrase,

'with the help of God,' is a concession which the sharp critic makes for the believing theologian -- we must admit that the latter is not immodest in his claims. The compiler Moses was simply not as original as the historian Wise!"

By this time Einhorn's criticism had degenerated into a diatribe. The reader of the article senses that the criticizing scholar has dipped his pen in venom to conclude his writings. Einhorn concludes: The man who wrote these statements is the one who without hesitation is accepting the role of the fanatic for talmudic authority, who preaches thundering sermons about the spilled blood of our forebears. He is upset because of the Reformers' insurrection against talmudic Bible exegesis, which has been in force for over two thousand years. It is the claim of his faction that the Bible without the Talmud is an impossibility, and everyone who does not almost swear by the Talmud should be excommunicated from Israel. "We fear," so he states,[15] "that the Israelite and the Deborah will have to wander about for many years in America until they will be successful in gathering the many strayed herds, and to find Zion-Cincinnati recognized as the seat of the שכינה. Their Union is like that of the Tower of Babel. No! Babel can never become Zion!"

N O T E S

to

PART I, SECTION B.

Notes.

1) Kohler, op. cit., p. 33.

2) Sinai, Vol. I, p.4.

3) Ibid., p. 4.

4) Moritz, K.P. - Lebensgeschichte ..., Berlin, 1792-3.

5) The American Israelite, 1855, #6.

6) Ibid., #17 and 18.

7) Following an accusation to that effect, printed in The Occident, January 1856, p. 512.

8) Sinai, Vol. I, p.7

9) Ibid., p. 8, footnote.

10) Ibid., p. 8.

11) I. M. Wise, A History of the Israelite Nation, from Abraham to the Present Time; Albany, 1854.

12) Ibid., p. 21.

13) Ibid., p. 23.

14) Ibid., p. 60.

15) Sinai, Vol I, p. 10.

PART II.

The Theologian.

PART II.

SECTION A -- JEWISH THEOLOGY.

Chapter 1.

The Old and the New Judaism: Attitudes to the Talmud.

The Old and the New Judaism; Attitudes to the Talmud.

The fiasco of the Cleveland conference caused not only discord between Einhorn and Wise, it also resulted in some constructive work. Whereas Einhorn had only thrown out some loose remarks against a union of Orthodoxy and Reform in his attack on the Conference, he proceeded in subsequent issues of the Sinai to show systematically why Orthodoxy and Reform could never meet on common grounds. (The articles in question are to be found in condensed form as appendices to this chapter). This he accomplished especially in two articles: The Position of the New Judaism in the Talmud,[1.] and The Principal Differences Between the Old and the New Judaism.[2.] Some additional opinions are given in an answer to a letter by "B. F."[3.] While these articles may be considered a direct outcome of the Cleveland Conference, the chain of enlightenment from Einhorn's pen continued throughout his lifetime. In this process he did not always write new articles, but he republished some of his earlier works, as for example his attitude towards circumcision, the dietary laws, etc. Let us consider his analyses seriatim.

The chief objection Einhorn had to Orthodoxy was that it was a completely stereotyped, stagnant system, which would not permit of any change. Everything in Orthodoxy was an absolute, everything was of equal value.[4.] The old system failed to recognize that the validity of a law lay not in its origin, but rather in its applicability

to certain situations; to phrase it colloquially: the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Were we to categorize Judaism we would not look for the origin of laws, but rather we would divide the extant corpus of law into categories of essence and form. The Rabbis themselves recognized this already, but due to their cultural environment and their tradition they expressed this only in homiletical form (Haggadah), not in actual Law (Halachah).

The new system is not bound by such encumbrances, it approaches Judaism analytically. It distinguishes sharply between the body and the soul, between essence and form. There is one set of laws which is part of man because man is human, and there is a second set of laws which serves only as a means to the first, and is therefore only relative.

According to Reform the true essence of the Covenant between God and man is the relation of the Creator and the created. The Law is not external to man, it was not presented to us as a fait accompli. It developed as other cultural patterns did from the time that man first came into existence. The type of plant that will grow from the earth depends on what kind of a seed was planted. The original seed in man was reason, a part of the Divine Being. Consequently there was nothing mysterious about the Law that evolved, for it was developed by man. This Law reached a climax at Sinai, for there its principles

were fully clarified, and it became incumbent upon Israel to spread it among all nations of the world. But this clarification at Sinai did not imply stagnation, which is obvious from the further developments which this Law underwent. The Law at Sinai still contained many imperfections, but these were eventually corrected, e.g. slavery, bigamy, etc. The cardinal principle of Reform therefore is that reason is the basis of all law, and laws which are not based on reason are automatically valueless and therefore invalid.

As soon as this is admitted, it is only one step further to state that the principles of Judaism are the principles of humanity. The separatism of the Jew was nothing but a means to protect these ideals in a world hostile to them; it served as a lever to an eventual unlimited universalism. It has been brilliantly pointed out[5]. that the justification for the existence of the Jewish people today (since we have taught our principles to the world at large) lies in our status of an example of how this system must be lived; we are a living monument to the principles which we have taught.

Another point of difference concerns itself with the length of time that a law remains valid. For Orthodoxy there is no question about this: Once a law has been accepted it cannot be retracted. Only God can do this when He will send the Messiah to set the world right. Circumstances may cause a law to be suspended

temporarily, as for example the laws of sacrifice, but that does not invalidate them or abrogate them. Also there are certain occurrences which ostensibly are violations of laws, but these are only appearances of violation, for these seeming exceptions were already provided for in the scheme of creation.[6] On occasion, when it was perfectly obvious that certain laws had outlived their usefulness, or when they had actually become detrimental to the people, the Rabbis would circumvent these by legislating additional regulations. The outstanding example of such a case is Samuel's famous principle of דינא דמלכותא דינא.[7]

Einhorn wisely points out the one loophole to these principles contained in the Talmud. R. Shimeon b. Jochai said: "It is up to us to find grounds for divine commands."[8] This teacher then apparently recognized that laws require the motivating power of reason. Nevertheless this makes no difference as far as Orthodoxy is concerned. To use the terminology of Maimonides, whether the laws are מצוות שכליות (laws characterized by having reason as their basis) or whether they are מצוות שמעיות (externally acquired laws), the category to which a law belonged did not influence the degree to which it was to be obeyed.

The attitude of the new Judaism is more rational. It recognizes divine legislation as an expression of the reason of man (which, as mentioned above, is the divine seed of man). There is nothing supernatural in it. Our

prophets and lawgivers were not mysterious beings, they simply distinguished themselves from ordinary men in that their insight into the Divine was extraordinarily developed, and was far ahead of the insight to which their contemporaries had attained.[9]

Reform Judaism is not something new; contrary to the belief of many of our Orthodox brethren it rests solidly on the Judaism of the past. We find very frequently that when the pronouncements of our sages have been stripped of their coverings and have been properly focused, they turn out to be the basic truths of the new belief. We differ, however, in our interpretation of religious history. Whereas they pyramided events one upon another as they occurred, loosely without arrangement, and were willing to accept this shaky structure as it stands, we want to bring order into this untidy heap, to discard that which is no longer of any use. Orthodoxy sees history as a divine jurisdiction imposed upon mankind; Reform sees history as the result of the norms which caused it. This principle holds true in religious as well as in secular matters. For Reform the Deity is God who manifests Himself in history, and the institutions of man are merely reflections of the degree of understanding they have of Him. He is אל, שדי in nature; He is יהוה, אהיה in history, the future form of the verb הוה indicating progress and development.[10]

Last but not least are the views held by the

old and the new system in regard to the nation of the world. Though Einhorn does not mention this phrase, it is the concept of אשר בחר בנו מכל העמים. Orthodoxy holds itself rigidly aloof, no one, not even the proselyte, can ever attain the same status as he who is a hereditary member of the Jewish people. Reform holds an almost antithetical view to this. We are distinguished only in that we have given the Law to the world; our calling demands that we attempt to equalize all others to our status. Briefly stated, Orthodoxy champions separatism, Reform stands for universalism. In all fairness Einhorn points out that the Talmud does contain a few statements which support universalism, e.g. לא הגלה הקב"ה את ישראל לבין האמות אלא כדי שיתוספו עלהם גרים [11]. -- but such views are very rare, generally the opinion remains ומפני חטאינו גלינו מארצנו.

The Reform attitude towards the Talmud can be summed up very briefly. The Talmud represents one of the most significant developments in Judaism. It enriched Judaism, and even to a degree broke the rigidity of the Biblical Law according to the developments of the times. We cannot ignore, however, that it often was blind to the spirit of the Bible, especially its universal aims. It rejected progressive development, and constantly stresses the return of the people to its former habitat. In spite of these lacks, however, it remains a great storehouse of religious thoughts.

"In rising above talmudic Judaism," Einhorn writes, "we merely follow its own principles. The essence of tradition is the ability to develop the Written Law, as attested by the Talmud. For that reason we break with the principles of the Talmud, but not with its motivation. It is rather our task to bury ourselves deeper in this."[12].

As for a comparison between the Talmud and the Bible, the former stands far below the latter in spirit. True, the Talmud created many wholesome institutions, and often broke the rigidity of the Biblical Law, but it always was only a blind tool in the hand of history. Life had to wrest concessions from it. The spirit of Mosaism advanced the Talmud despite the latter, for the Talmud completely misunderstood the nature of Biblical particularism, and therefore sought to eternalize that spirit. According to Mosaism Israel is to serve as an example for all of humanity within its legal limitations; according to Talmudism such setting of an example by climbing to a higher rung on the ladder of progress constitutes a degeneration of Jewish dignity.

The conclusion he then draws is that we can utilize those portions of our greatest literary compendium which are still applicable, but must reject that which is outdated. Before we look at some of the specific institutions in Judaism to which this principle must be applied, let us look at Einhorn's concept of revelation.

APPENDIX A.

The Principal Differences Between the Old and the New Judaism.

Sinai, Volume	I	: 161 - 163.
	I	: 193 - 197.
	I	: 291 - 294.
	I	: 333 - 335.
	I	: 365 - 371.
	II	: 398 - 404.
	II	: 538 - 544.
	II	: 572 - 576.
	VII	: 320 - 328.

The Principal Difference Between the Old and the New Judaism.

Vol. I: 161-163.

The old Judaism rejects the difference between essence and form in religion. Everything in the old Judaism is absolute, of equal value. The fulfillment of a divine command is not a means, but an end in itself; everything is equally holy, and therefore a classification according to inner values of the commandments is invalid. Thus the expression "ceremonial law" is not justified; there is only one indivisible Divine Law, which must be fulfilled because it is from Sinai. But we must distinguish between those laws engraved in us by God, and those which are external. The engraved laws are for everyone, they are not limited to times or to individuals. The external laws are connected with individuals, e.g. Israel, the priestly tribe; they are in relation to the times, e.g. the time of the Temple; in relation to places, e.g. Palestine. However, both really are of divine origin. The value of the divine commands lies in their origin, not in their success; in their relation to human nature, and therefore it does not matter how we acquire them, what influence they have on us, whether their measure of application is applied to small or to large circles. They are divine destinies, which, like fate, must be borne, no matter how or where they are applied. The Rabbis take ceremonial obligations as specifically Jewish religiosity, the practice of which

by a gentile is a sacrilege.[13] Only the Noachian Laws, which actually come from reason, are the property of all mankind.[14] The higher religious values of Israel lie in obligations not understandable in themselves, which are due to revelation, i.e. what we call ceremonial law. Especially the polemics against Christianity contributed to this doctrine: for Christianity adopted the ethical law on the one hand, on the other the Sabbath (even if the day was changed, and the institution was placed on a new basis), as well as other ceremonial laws.[15] Of course Judaism could not tear itself away from its fount of life; many rabbinic sayings betray this directly or in their deductions by making a distinction between the essence and the form of Judaism, setting the first on a higher level. Thus the Rabbis declared: what does God care about the method of slaughtering, whether we eat of what is clean or unclean: לא נתנו המצות אלא לצרף בהן את הבריות.[16]

Vol. I: 193-197.

Maimonides[17] states: A Jew should not say he has no desire to eat the forbidden, but: I have the desire, but I am restrained by God's commands. Maimonides stresses only the מצוות שמעיות (ceremonial law). The deduction is that in ethical respects, e.g. theft, murder etc., the nonpresence of the desire is to be preferred to the suppression of the desire; in a ceremonial respect, e.g. in regard to the laws of food,

the suppression of desire is preferable to the non-presence of desire. A weak reflex of the difference between ethical and ceremonial law is to be found in the Talmud; the principles is that a Kehillah is not obligated to stop a minor (in a religious sense) from breaking a religious command; this applies only to ceremonial duties (chazer, light on the Sabbath, etc.), but it does not apply to ethical commands; theft, etc.[18].

Otherwise the law is not touched by these reflections. The Rabbis only admit the existence of commands שאלמלא לא נכתבו דין הוא שיכתבו which would have become valid also without divine revelation.[19]. But the Rabbis are far from giving such commands higher value than to the others, which have no foundation in man and are disputed by reason. Rather they seek to bring the moral law down from its heights.

The New Judaism distinguishes sharply among religious laws between essence and form, soul and body; those laws which are axiomatic to the human spirit and are therefore of an absolute and general value, and those which only serve as means towards the first; and are therefore only relative. For the new Judaism, according to irrefutable Biblical testimony, has the true recognition of God, and the relation of Creator and created is the true essence of the Covenant between God and man. Orthodoxy, however, is only a sign of this covenant. Reform does not take the divine revelation as an external fact,

delivered completed and sealed millenia ago, but as a development step by step of the Divine in man. It started with the first members of our people, it reached its climax at Sinai because there its principles were fully clarified, and a whole nation undertook the mission of spreading it. At Sinai only the principle was clarified, for the world redeeming ideas of Mosaism were not fully ripe yet, as demonstrated by the laws of slavery, bigamy, the bad position of women in Judaism, et al. From this viewpoint the obligations to Jewish belief and life are not a strange fact to us, they lie in the higher nature of man, which gets its dictates from the divine Source. These obligations are not like talmudic גזירות המלך -- for with them reason cannot be used. In Reform, human reason is the basis for the divine Laws, so there is no question of a right to look for the grounds of the laws, there is no distinction between the essence and the form.

Already Ibn Ezra has these ideas.

המצוות שהם העיקרים שאינם חלוים במקום או בזמן או בדבר אחר הם הנטיעות בלב הם המקודים שהם כמו המקדון שהוא נתון ביד אשר הפקד אותו ע"כ אמר פקודי ד' ישרים משמחי לב ואלה היו ידיעות בשיקול הדעת קודם שנתנה התורה ביד משה ועל אלה אמר וישמר משמרתי מצותי חקותי ותורתי:[21]

Vol. I: 291-294.

Judaism often brings forth ideas, which in reality belong to a level of religious development which

has already been passed; basically, however, these are truths that come to light completely only on a higher level. The spirit of a religious truth, not fully ripened yet, embraces this truth with a symbolic action, yet it has need to give these truths more concrete form, and thus to create symbolic demonstrations, whose task it will be to further and complete the growth of the kernal, til this is ripe and independent. To this category belongs the following principle: Membership in the Jewish community is stipulated for the descendants of the Jewish people only through their ancestry: whoever is born of a Jewish mother is a Jew. As such an individual belongs to Judaism, he cannot part from it, not even by baptism. The principle is אע"פ שחטא ישראל הוא. Both Christianity and Reform Judaism have fought this principle. The objection is that a religion that stipulates thus is a religion of the flesh, not a religion of the spirit. There is nothing worse than to be unable to leave a confession one does not profess. Yet there is wisdom to the principle: The Israelite calling, the mission of the Jewish TRIBE rests on a natural basis, and thus is innate. This must be distinguished from the Jewish profession (of principles) and from the moral connection with the community of Israel -- which can of course only be transmitted by free choice. We admit that the idea in question in its strict interpretation permits an overlapping of national and religious elements. But scrutinized more closely it is only the shell of this

great truth: Judaism is "Menschentum," its truths and obligations are after its essence implanted divinely in man, and thus are really innate to man. Biblical particularism is nothing but a lever to unlimited universalism; the Jewish people is to Mosaism only an example of complete and redeemed mankind!

Vol. I: 333-335.

The second point of difference concerns itself with the duration of ceremonial obligatoriness. The Rabbis said: The eternity of the Mosaic ceremonial law is self-understood. Since all laws a priori appear to be of absolute value, the difference between essence and form is inadmissable for them, so that there can be no mention even of a termination of an obligation to the Law. From this standpoint the laws regulating man's activities are an unfathomable secret, as for example the laws of nature, creation and fate. The world and the Torah are parallel products of the divine Will, which permits no interference on the part of man. Material bases for laws may disappear, e.g. the destruction of the Temple made sacrifices impossible, but the Law, though it is not possible to practice it, is nevertheless still in effect. Should its material basis be reinstituted, then the Law would become effective again. Only momentarily may a law be revoked, e.g. in the case of Elijah who made a sacrifice on a במה. This is not a violation of a law, even as a miracle is not a violation.[22] We are told that the Rabbis

have the power to suspend a law,[23] but only to prevent the violation of a more important Biblical Law. The Talmudists go so far in proclaiming the obligation to the Law, that they have Abraham, Isaac and others fulfilling Mosaic precepts!![24].

Vol. I: 365-371.

Occasionally the Rabbis sense the uselessness of certain Mosaic laws which have been outgrown by the people. Direct abolition of such laws is impossible for them, they will only circumvent them. For example the Chalitsah ceremony was instituted for a punishment in case the levirate marriage was not performed. Formerly it was mandatory, but now it is discouraged. The reason given for this is that the people today are less pious, and the ceremony of the levirate marriage would appear as incest![25]. The question is whether levirate marriages are still necessary -- for since there are no parcels of land in Palestine to be inherited now, this ceremony has lost its character of a מצוה, and therefore the חליצה also has become unnecessary!

One of the main causes that hindered the abolition of the ceremonial law was the advance of Christianity, which wanted to free the Jews from ALL ceremonial law. In civil matters the principle of Samuel דינא צמלכותא דינא is truly reforming.

Orthodoxy pictures the messianic age as one in which all Mosaic laws will regain full practicality, in

that the material bases will be fully reinstituted.[26] R. Jochanan declared:[27] "In messianic times ..... the Prophets and the Hagiographa will be invalidated, only the תמש will be valid." Here we find the contrast between rigid legalism and national limitations (for the תמש) portrayed. The universal view which characterizes other Biblical books, especially the Prophets, is also sharply visible in Christianity. Since the restitution of the Mosaic theocracy, Jewish nationalism has been the focal point of Messianism, and the prophets' universalism is regarded as anti-messianic.[28] That idea is contradicted by Rav Joseph מצוות בטלות לעתיד לבא.[29] This opinion, however, belongs in the Haggadic realm, and is only loosely connected with the accompanying Halachic portion, in that in the discussion about Shatnis for a shroud R. Jochanan, who insists on the validity of the ceremonial law in messianic times, approves Shatnis there, because death "liberates from the Law." The Haggadah has the view that ceremonials only aim to dignify man, and are thus an educational means, as such being subject to change. Einhorn thinks R. Joseph's opinions were influenced by his fate, for he was blind, and thus not subject to the ceremonial law.[30] However, in the Halachic field the eternity of the ceremonial law is unquestioned.

Yet talmudic Judaism has a principle which smacks of a belief in the mutability of the Mosaic cere-

monial law. R. Shimean b. Jochai said: דרשינן טעמא דקרא. "It is up to us to find grounds for divine commands."[31] This saying shakes the foundation of the entire system. If reason has the right to question the Law, then (a) this a priori constitutes a denial of the principle that laws, because of their divine origin, have an absolute value, (b) those divine laws which have external reasons have only a relative value. Thus reason has the right to attribute to gained cognizance practical results. In other words a law with a motive is in force only as long as the motive is active, and in the reverse, any Biblical law may be expanded to cover any object (incident) which has the same motive. Traditional religion depends on the principle that we owe God's commands blind obedience, and have no right to question their basis or purpose. God's commands thus are as unquestionable as nature or as fate.

Man's reason therefore has nothing to do with the divine commands, and even if the reason is obvious, it may not be deduced. Thus the Noachides obey the Law only to its full extent if they obey it not because of its sense, but because God gave it.[32] The laws are classified as מצוות שכליות, those recognizable by reason, and the מצוות שמעיות, externally acquired laws. These designations bring out a fact, but this does not mean that they differ in the degree in which they must be obeyed: the reason for obedience is ALWAYS the fact

that the Law has a divine origin. This opinion then was attacked by R. Shimeon b. Jochai, for he asked for rational explanations of the Biblical Law, thus seeking to make all מצוות into שכליות . This new type of religious thought would recognize all מצוות only as rational, differentiating between them only as to essence and form, i.e. those that are axiomatic, having the reason within themselves, and those in which rational explanations are to be found only externally, whose (the latter) force depends on the duration of these external grounds.

Vol. II: 398-404.

R. Shimeon b. Jochai gave the impetus to this new interpretation of religion. But he was far removed from getting the full consequences of this principle, to believe in a rational basis for all מצוות! Reason for him was only the interpreter, not the organ of divine revelation. For him the law external to man was a divine power, and higher than man, its interpreter. For that reason the explanation of laws may often be unattainable to us. He who knows the history of cultural development will realize that such development takes time. Reason teaches us that there is a God, but whether His commands are tied to a certain time or place cannot be decided by reason. Thus on the one hand human powers are exclusively the organ of divine revelation, and on the other this power is not capable of finding grounds for these externally pronounced laws!

There is no doubt that Judaism recognizes reason as the organ of divine revelation of religious truths and at least a few laws. In the case of Cain, for example, there was no law as yet against the spilling of blood, yet he is accounted a criminal! It is taken for granted that he knew this, as we know from the words "sin lies couching at the door!"[33].

The new Judaism simply is more consistent when it recognizes in the divine legislation only the reason of man, and not something external to man. This power of reason was not super-naturally, but extraordinarily developed in the prophets, enabling them to be far ahead of their contemporaries. Very often human reason cannot be the organ of divine revelation, because results are not consistent and most individuals have various opinions, various objections. Supposing that the external type of legislation theory was correct: Then why have not all men recognized the same laws, why are there many interpretations of laws? There are many denominations in each religion -- is not in the long run human reason always the last word, be the legislation internal or external? A possible objection might be that there should be only one interpretation for those who were present at Sinai or for the prophets. But since we have learned of the incorporeality of God, the impossibility of physically hearing or seeing Him, this doctrine received its death blow. The claim of our dogmatists is that not God, but the

כבוד הנברא descended on Sinai, and the voice heard there was a creation by God for this occasion (קול נברא). There are various opinions of how the Ten Commandments were heard: And see how many traditions we have! Some say the Ten Commandments were spoken by one voice, others say the people only heard the first two words comprehensively, and heard the rest without understanding it, so that Moses had to interpret the remainder.[34] The Midrash Tanchuma states that each man understood according to his capacity. There is, as we can readily see, a great deal of confusion in the matter. Basically the idea of God and a voice is a dualism, and foreign to Jewish monotheism. There will always be "Korach's" towards the truth, but basically our religion is founded on human reason, and God's reflection in man. In reason we see the דמות אלהים, yet we do not worship reason.[35]

Vol. II: 538-544.

Before we may deduce the duration of the ceremonial law, we stress again: Judaism in essence is older than the Israelitic tribe; it is pure "Menschentum," and as the result of God's spirit being innate to man, it is as old as mankind. The origin and cultural evolution of man's reason is also the origin and development of Judaism -- it roots in Adam and finds its peak of fulfillment in the messianic age. Not a religion, but a people of a religion was newly created at Sinai.

This people was to imprint the religion on itself first and then was to spread it to all men. This is illustrated by the Ten Commandments: These were basic to the Noachides already, but at Sinai they were pronounced on a higher level of religious evolution, in a deeper setting. All the commandments given there were known earlier already, even the command of the Sabbath. The fact that the Sabbath was to be celebrated on the seventh day is symbolical not of world creation, but of the completion and completeness of God's handiwork. The world was completed in six stages, to reach its peak through its crown, i.e. man. God rested on the seventh day, i.e. He ceased to create new things. The Sabbath is not only a testimony of the highest creative worth of man, but a protest against the absolute preference of Israel above other nations: It is a watchman against the calcification of the national element. It points out that the Covenant between God and Abraham's descendants is nothing more than an indication of priesthood for Israel, an example of the Covenant between God and all men.[36].

In further analysis, however, the idea of world "completeness" excludes constraint of the Torah from creation as well as from continuance of the Jewish people, pointing to the fact that the Covenant between God and Israel is merely to reconstruct the original divine revelation to mankind, and is to lead it to the highest peak, for the creation of a new Torah would have the pre-

supposition that before Israel the world, because it had no Israelitic Law, lacked the possibility to fulfill its destiny, or had only a measure of creative nobility which was not sufficient for the fulfillment of the divine Law. Both possibilities would make the original situation of the cosmic order look very defective, because in the first case man had sufficient means for the fulfillment of the task, and in the event of a second creation the world would have reached its fulfillment only with Israel.

It is therefore clear why Scripture has a festival to celebrate Israel's becoming a divine nation, מוֹעֵד, but not one for the giving of the Law at Sinai, even though the latter seemingly is far more important. The origin of the divine Law is prehistoric, and needs no festival for its commemoration, which would be historical -- it can be celebrated only as a religious truth, the recognition of which is identical with the divine image in man, and this festival is fully expressed as the Sabbath.

From the rabbinic viewpoint the revelation at Sinai was a supernatural event, external in nature; it is the celebration of the creation of a new Torah. Therefore the ceremonial aspects are to be regarded as characteristic of this event. Outside of the distinguishing solemnities of the revelation of the Ten Commandments, it might be asked: Why the repetition of the Noachian Laws?

This is answered in Sanhedrin 59a, though in connection with a law which is not one of the Ten Commandments: "Every law .... taught to the Noachides, and repeated on Sinai, is in force for the Noachides (gentiles) after Sinai as well as for the Jews; any command to the Noachides not repeated at Sinai ceases to have validity for the Noachides after Sinai, for the obligation thereof now rests with Israel."[37]. According to this the repetition of the Noachian laws on Sinai has the purpose to document the Noachian laws -- for the Noachides! Obviously this is wrong.[38]. In direct opposition to this, Maimonides states:[39]. Our present obedience to all negative and positive commands rests on the divine mandates to Moses, not on communications to earlier prophets. Thus the law of not eating part of a living animal[40]. is observed not because it was already in force for the Noachides, but because it was RENEWED at Sinai. The same is true of circumcision -- not because Abraham practiced it, but because a Mosaic Law commands it." According to this the Sinai revelation is completely independent of all earlier revelations, thus creating a completely new system for Israel. Old obligations are no longer mandatory, and new obligations become apparent immediately.

The consequences of the talmudic system are obvious. It is a giant with clay feet, whose weaknesses cannot be hidden. Reform, however, rests on divine revelation, which includes all time and all generations.

On Sinai a focal point was created in a people of the Covenant, to bring light to the nations.

Vol. II: 572-576.

The Rabbis often had principles which merely needed stripping of external coverings to become pillars for Reform. For example: The Torah was contemporary to the creation of the world, it was even before the world, and was merely revealed to Abraham and at Sinai. The reference of the Mosaic Law back to Abraham is based on the correct feeling, that a divine law, according to its very nature, is eternal, and extends backwards in history as well as forward, and does not enter the circle of mankind suddenly as <u>deus ex machina</u>. Only the Rabbis see humanity enclosed in Israel, and see the divine Law mostly in ceremonial law. Thus take away the "covering," and we have the realization that the Torah was not the property of the first of our people, but the property of the first beings of humanity, who, however, did not reach full bloom until much later.

Our religious history has a twofold task; (a) to bring to ripeness the <u>essence</u> of Judaism, i.e. its truths and its innate obligations built on reason, (b) to re-shape its form into likewise rational laws, which, however, are motivated only externally -- a task already attempted in the Bible. The Bible leaves us in the dark about the God concept of the first man. This, however, must have been quite limited.[41] God was called upon first,

according to the correct interpretation of the Septuagint, by Enosh.[42] A deeper recognition of this concept is found in the revelations to Noah, and eventually a concept of a Ruler of heaven and earth was attained in the time of Abraham.[43] These ideas are still far behind the Yahve concept of Exodus 6:3, where God is designated as unique, and He is described with all the attributes of completeness. In the Mosaic revelation the God idea reaches its peak, but only in the spirit of Moses, its bearer. It required millenia for people to grasp this idea; a whisper of it penetrated to them in the prophetic age, and even greater recognition after the exile. Biblical history exhibits the same process of development in regard to the Law. The ethical law became more and more strict, as the principle of ethics appeared among the Noachides (included here are the patriarchs) as צדקה. Until this time only the deed, not yet the spirit, was included; only with the Sinai revelation, when God's holiness was recognized, ethics reached the state of sanctification, excluding simultaneously the unclean desire.

On the other hand we see already in Biblical times abrogations, permanent or temporary, of certain laws. Thus Albo[44] attacks Maimonides who had proclaimed in one of his Thirteen Articles the immutability of the Torah, in that mutability neither affects the truth in itself, nor the will of the divine Lawgiver. The term mutability

is only suited for man, for whose changeable nature after all laws are made -- like a physician may forbid or permit food for a patient according to the latter's condition.[45] Reform Judaism wholeheartedly supports Maimonides' article -- but only in as far as it concerns itself with Jewish religious truths and Jewish ethics, whose changing appearance in history are based on the changing comprehensions of man. Thus where the patriarchs had slavery and polygamy, this was only due to the fact that they knew no better! The ethical law basically is always the same -- but the FORMS of religion change with the people, beginning already in Biblical times.

Vol. VII: 320-328.

Note: Since this concluding article of the series was not published until several years later, Dr. Einhorn began this last chapter with a brief summary, which is omitted here.

****

A further difference in regard to the character of the oral Law and its position in regard to the written Law must be brought out. Since according to the Rabbis the Torah appeared in its complete form at Sinai, they are forced to claim that the non-written Law was handed down orally. Neither the written nor the oral Law may receive additions or be diminished. Because of their divine nature they cannot develop historically; only the history of Israel could shape them, like the sun shapes the moon's visible

parts. The Rabbis know of no divine revelation in history for the free will of man. For them history is a divine jurisdiction, not a divine legislation. According to them no religious laws of conduct can be deducted from the laws of fate, even as not from the laws of nature. The Rabbis in general lacked a concept of a planned chain of events in history, in which the foresight of man strives for a higher, nobler life. For them historical events are a disconnected, eternally repeated "Wechselspiel," where even chance plays a leading role. There is a question in the Midrash:[46] How does God rule in the world since the creation of man? The answer is that God leads some men up and some down on the ladder of life. This is characteristic of the Rabbis' historical view. The new Judaism takes history as a manifestation of the divine will, and sees in it also an organ, as a commentary of religious legislative norms. The way of mankind, and especially Israel in and with mankind, is its true תורה שבעל פה, which comments on the written Law, limits or expands it, cancels or adds. It recognizes in Moses' teachings and in history an <u>educational institution</u> of the ethical, holy God. These cannot contradict each other simultaneously, but they can do so at different periods of time, without impairing the divine will. Yet this view is taken from the very depth of the Mosaic teaching, which takes the divine Manifestation in history as the starting point of its highest revelation, the giving of the Ten Com-

mandments. In nature God manifests Himself in His omnipotence, in law in His holiness. The real kernel of the Law is God in history --אהיה, יהוה. The future form of the verb הוה is the chief designation of our God -- not only is He the שדי אלהים in the circle of nature, but also in the ever forward-going walks of history, revealed always in an ever increasing magnificence. This is the best explanation for Exodus 6:3.[47] When God's voice is heard so loudly in history, it must influence the religious behaviour of man, as stated in Deuteronomy 17:16 -- for which only history can be the source: "The Lord said unto you: and you shall henceforth no more return that way." In vain the Rabbis searched for this command elsewhere, all they could quote was what Moses said when the people were pursued by the Egyptians: "See .... the help of the Lord .... you shall not see it again until eternity."[48] Indeed God had commanded non-return to Egypt by the fact of redemption and by showing the way to Palestine. In this historical event, basic to the Covenant, He proclaimed His will that Israel in the future, in the interest of its calling, was not to settle again in Egypt. This of course was of no consequence later in history -- at the time of the Second Temple there already was a big colony in Egypt, which Rabbinism cannot explain.[49] Be it sufficient to mention this to prove history's influence on all our religious life. The question whether Israel is destined to return to Palestine for the purpose of founding an independent state, connected intimately with

the meaning of the ceremonial law and the general powers of development of Judaism, depends entirely on whether historical circumstances have or have not an influence on our religious life.

A further difference is the relationship of Israel to other people. Rabbinism regards Israel as a nobility; even in messianic times. Israel has absolute holiness, not even attainable to the proselyte, who is regarded as newly born![50] Because of this intermarriage is impossible;[51] even wedlock between Noachides is binding only for themselves, not for Jews;[52] the Bible[53] declares inter-marriage with members of the seven nations as non-binding only because it leads to idolatry for the offspring.

We can see the deadness of this system (Orthodoxy), in that many of its practices are monstrous even to its members. In various respects the new Judaism knows no difference between Jew and gentile, it denies the nobility of any people, because such a doctrine is at variance with the Mosaic teaching of the divine image of man. It knows only a higher moral holiness, which Israel, as the tool of divine revelation, is to earn, and indeed has earned in the many periods of its painful, everchanging career. Not higher holiness is the reason for Israel's divine selection, but the selection is the reason for our higher holiness. Our priestly calling demands the leading of all rational beings to the same level of holiness.

This calling may demand that certain signs be manifested to Israel alone, but its eternal truths are for all people -- were it otherwise, it would be the same as saying that the light of a planet is for its discoverer only!! Before Sinai of course our moral law was full of loopholes -- but not as much as the Rabbis claim. This does not mean that non-Israelites are excluded from our moral Law. The recognition of the moral Law came in steps: It went from Adam to Noah, from Noah to Abraham, and on to Moses: The fact that the moral Law was not spread more widely was always due to a lack of recognition, not due to a lack of its existence: Originally we knew of only seven planets -- others existed, only we did not know of them. In short: The old Judaism teaches Torah for Israel only, the new Judaism teaches Torah for Israel and for all mankind.

Here also there is a basis for a division of opinion in regard to the dispersion of Israel. The Talmudists claim that Palestine is a means for the separation of the intrinsically holy Israel from other nations. In denying all historical developments, they vindicate each iota of the Torah in such a manner, that the מצוות are never abolished, but that the conditions for fulfilling of מצוות may be absent. Israel is in double straits: (a) it is degraded by local consort with the nations, as by (b) its inability to fulfill the מצוות which are usable only in Palestine. Such degradation is

ours only because of the sins we committed, and the dispersion is an exile. But according to God's promise Israel will return -- to live in separateness again, to fulfill all the מצוות, including those which are practicable in Palestine only. In the present state of development they see only a protective wall against heathenism for the not yet deeprooted enough divine Law, and this status will be changed when the Law is deeply enough imbedded in the people. Our aim now is to go through the world, teaching what we believe. The beginnings of this task were to be found in the settlement of Jews in foreign lands, in the Septuagint and in Christianity. Thus Israel's dispersion is not a curse, but an ennoblement of our tribe, motivated not by the sins of the past, but by an elevating mission, to be the bearers of God's word, "to be a dew amongst the nations." The suffering exile is to become a wandering Messiah. The "Volkstumlichkeit" is gone, "nationality," i.e. in origin of the individual, the race, must remain, which, with its spiritual qualities, must be the root of each "Volksmission." This "race" is not to disappear until after the fulfillment of its mission. Even the Talmud says לא הגלה הקב"ה את ישראל לבין האומות אלא כדי שיתוספו עלהם גרים.[54] But such quotes are rare in our literature, the opinion remains generally ומפני חטאינו גלינו מארצנו.

With such a difference of opinion on origin and

development we can see why the new and rabbinic Judaism are widely separated in regard to the goal of Judaism. The Rabbis look for a return of Israel to Palestine, for separation with the old Temple, for sacrifices and a priesthood. These must be resurrected, even as dead bodies are to be reincarnated.[55] All other nations, according to this concept, are to be Noachides. No mention is made of smelting Israel and the nations .... we, however, see in Messianism the development of the divine Law, already reposed in Adam, with neither slavery nor kingship, with no more differences between Jerusalem and Rome, a time when all men shall have one God.

APPENDIX B.

The Position of the New Judaism to the Talmud.

Sinai, Volume I : 1 - 4.
I : 33 - 39.
I : 65 - 67.

The Position of the New Judaism to the Talmud.

Vol. I: 1-4.

A battle is now raging in American Judaism which has long been fought in Germany; its outcome can only be in favor of religious progress. About fourteen years ago Abraham Geiger, Rabbi of Breslau, first came out in his theological-scientific magazine with the statement that talmudic Bible-exegesis was obscure. He was not so much interested in the facts per se, known to any expert, but rather in the type and motives of this cloudiness. The believers in the Talmud, that is the true ones, fought him, and a battle developed from which the freedom of Biblical research came out victorious. The full discussion brought to light the true meaning of talmudic Judaism. No one denies that the Talmud represents one of the most significant developments in Judaism, that it enriched Judaism, even in troubled times. It must even be given credit for having broken the rigidity of Biblical literalness, and having reformed Mosaic Law according to the internal and external demands of time, even though doing this unwittingly. This should not blind us to its obscure side, however, for its morals are narrow-minded, the high universal sense of the Bible is strange to it, its very literalness (everything is forced into the letter) forbids thinking about the basic aims of the religious commandments. It even goes so far as to have a controversy whether the exercise of the religion

loses its value by complete thoughtlessness; it rejects the idea of a steplike religious progress; it sees the ideal of Judaism only in the past, in the return of Israel to independent nationhood and national separation, with all its ancient religious laws; and finally it makes a colossus of formality (ceremonialism) which is stifling. We are willing to prove that according to talmudic precept a Jew who does not feel the pangs of גלות, must perish. In spite of all this we cannot ignore the spiritual reality of the Talmud that carries rich treasures of religious building materials, and which can be traced back to Maccabean times. The question thus became more and more important from what angle to regard the Talmud, to see how it fits into the giant structure that is Judaism, without hindering the religion's progress. The finding of this serious theological search was that we cannot undergo a reform while recognizing talmudic traditions and interpretations. Nevertheless the fact remains that the process of development in the Talmud is a positive, even if unconscious, metamorphosis of Biblical Law according to the pressing requirements of religion and life. This historical fact has as its basis the idea of an <u>oral law</u>, in the sense that besides the eternal and unchangeable in the religious Law there is a fluid element -- the mere form of religion -- which is set in motion by this ever-living spirit, which has the right and the duty to free itself of petrification. Talmudic Judaism owes its existence and importance to this idea,

even though it itself rejects it. In rising above talmudic Judaism, we merely follow its own principles. The essence of tradition is the ability to develop the written Law, as attested by the Talmud. For that reason we break with the principles of the Talmud, but not with its motivation. It is rather our task to bury ourselves deeper in this. Thus it is not an inconsistency, if we retain as inviolable sanctities such institutions as are in line with such a policy, e.g. religious forms for weddings, or a connection of the Sinaitic revelation with the Shevuoth festival, which in the Bible has a completely different character. But talmudic products that contradict the Biblical spirit or the oral Law in the above mentioned sense, we must deny.

It is easy to see how little our protest against the Cleveland platform was appreciated, which protest was accused of being a depreciation of the Talmud and an ignoring of a developmental period of several millenia. There is "flatness" and a confusion of ideas in the statement that calls the Talmud in the same breath a "development" and a "revision" of the Mosaic Law, and yet recognizes its dicta as legal and obligatory. For the Talmud there is no revision or progress, each iota of the Mosaic Law, as far as the material grounds are not lacking, is of eternal duration. That which is read into the Biblical letter, or is based on the תורה שבעל פה, is given with the תורה שבכתב. The Talmud was developed by the power of life,

by the spirit of history, and it was pushed to a torture of the Biblical letter, but not to its spiritualization. It denies its own motivating powers, the existence of a religious history. It would be foolish for us to go to such a work for our religious needs. אין הקופץ משביע את הארי --"with a handful one cannot sate a lion." In this manner you (the Cleveland Platform writers) might look at a priest while he is engaged in דוכן, you might permit women to be heard in the Temple, but it is unfortunate that despite such reforms we would have to close our Temples eventually.

****

Vol. I: 33-39.

The talmudic exegesis of Biblical Law is often in sharp contrast with the actual wording and the spirit of the Law, so that one must transfer himself completely into the talmudic train of thought to understand the argument. It appears as if the Rabbis were not serious about their interpretations; as if their decrees were merely surrounded with a Biblical nimbus for the sake of the masses. For example: Deuteronomy 19:16-19 states that if a false witness arises to accuse a man both men must come before the priests and the judges. An investigation must take place, and if the testimony brought by the accuser is false, then we must do to him as he wished to do to his brother. The Bible speaks of two men who have an argument -- the Talmudists carry this back to the witnesses

involved, and derive from this that women cannot bear witness.[56] Even the Rabbis seem to have doubts regarding this interpretation, but they silence these doubts as follows: Two verses before the verse in question here it is stated: "a matter must be established by two or three witnesses." Since "two" appears in this verse, and appears again in the verse regarding the two "quarreling parties," the "two" in the second instance must also refer to the witnesses!! This tomfoolery is called a גזרה שוה, and is one of the chief means of talmudic "logic."

Einhorn then continues to give several similar examples. He states that thus castles in the air are built. The Rabbis, like sleepwalkers on high towers, walk on groundless thoughts. They accomplish this with a naivete that cannot hide the weaknesses of their system. In this regard there is an interesting comment from the Mishnah:[57] "..... the rules of Sabbath, festal offerings and sacrilege are as mountains hanging by a hair, for the teachings of Scriptures on these are scanty and the rules many; the rules about cases (property) and (Temple) Services, the rules about what is clean and unclean and forbidden degrees, they have that which supports them, and it is they that are the essentials of the Law." They never thought that the hair might not be able to hold the mountains! There are the revelations of seers -- often almost prophetic -- in the Haggadah; these widen the

incarcerated view for a moment, but disappear again without a trade. Laws, spun out eternally, have a testimony to their divine origin in the descent of tradition, in their universal recognition.[58] The less basis and time for development a religious decree had, the bigger was the aura that surrounded it, and the less effort was taken to push it back into the "Urzeit" of Judaism. If there was a Biblical proof for a law there was no problem, if not, the law was ascribed to the "Oral Law." R. Jochanan said:[59] "..... a religious matter ..... if no origin is known ..... we attribute it to Moses, handed to him orally on Sinai in the Halachoth, which are all found in the Mishnah" (even if that is so only rarely!) In this way there was no embarrassment about means to motivate a religious practice; at will the Rabbis could extend or abolish a Biblical Law. There was no concern that the thirty-nine categories of work were suspended like a mountain from a hair; or that the levirate marriage laws might eventually lose their power. Legal changes originated in a time when the independent powers of creativity in the field of religion were not dead yet, when the teachers still conceived of the Biblical "letter" as the external law, as the mirror of the higher thought, even if not taken as strictly literal. But as the prophetic echoes died down, the Biblical letter became more rigidly observed. The principle took hold that no higher thought may be looked for in the divine

Law. The original could no longer be questioned, it became almost mysterious.

From the very beginning there was opposition by the Sadduccees to the widening in scope of the תורה שבעל פה. We don't know nearly everything about their Bible exegesis, and may not conclude that they clung to the letter of the Law rigidly. Many examples from their writings even show the opposite. We are certain, however, that the Sadduccees opposed rabbinic re-interpretation and the widening of the Mosaic Law in general.[60.]

****

Vol. I: 65-67.

This far we have proved the untenability of talmudic exegesis and tradition, and also the divine motivation, which drove the Talmud without will or knowledge to progress. It is now our task to portray the difference between the old (talmudic) and the new Judaism. If we see in the old Judaism only a chaos of laws and meanings, which like epicurean atoms only heap up by chance and thus, without a soul, created a new world, then we may be satisfied to let one part of our tradition go, hold on to another, and to fill the gap with whatever we wish. If we see in the old tradition only a conglamoration of laws and customs, then in the new religion we might see only a frivolity, a whim, a mania for a new fashion -- in short see in it only a spirit of negation. In truth there is in it an organic building power, a historic formation ..... The new religion .... is the product of ideas which consciously or

unconsciously have dominion over Jewish thinking and feeling. The younger system has its preparation in the older. The Haggadah provided plenty of sources, it has storehouses of Reform thoughts. These were without influence on our life only because they were not yet ripe, because they were merely the "foam of the ocean of wisdom." Even the talmudic Halachah has many sources for Reform Judaism. From this point we shall attempt to compare the old and the new Judaism in the near future.

NOTES

to

PART II, SECTION A, CHAPTER 1.

Notes.

1) Sinai, Vol. I, pp. 1-4; 33-39; 65-67.

2) Ibid., pp. 161-163; 193-197; 291-294; 333-335; 365-371; Vol. VII, pp. 320-328.

3) Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 404-412. The sound knowledge of Judaism displayed by the questioner leads to the speculation that the letter was written by Bernard Felsenthal, who later became a dear friend to Dr. Einhorn. This speculation is strenghthened by the fact that the writer terms himself "from the West." However no further substantiation for this theory is available.

4) This statement needs interpretation. Of course Einhorn realized that the Talmud speaks of laws which are מדאורייתא and מדרבנן, the former being more weighty than the latter. Later on we find that a law of the Tannaim takes precedence over a law by the Amoraim. In practice, however, Orthodoxy seeks no differences, for whatever the origin of a law might be, its observance was not to be questioned.

5) By Professor Samuel Atlas in a classroom lecture.

6) Maimonides discusses the question of miracles in his Moreh Nebuchim, 11:29. He quotes the Midrash Bereshith Rabbah and Koheleth as his source. Cf. also Pirke Aboth, V, ad passim, and parallel passages in Aboth de Rabbi Nathan.

7) Cf. Baba Kamma 113a, Baba Bathra 54b, et. al.

8) Kiddushin 68b, et. al.

9) On the qualification of prophets cf. Maimonides, op. cit., section II, the latter half ad passim, and especially sections 32, 35, 36, 40, 45.

10) It is difficult to ascertain whether Einhorn intended this explanation as a truly theological concept, or whether he was toying here with a homiletical device. Upon occasion he mentions the E and the J codes, so that he was not unfamiliar with a scientific analysis of the Bible. On the other hand Biblical science was still in its infancy, so that he perhaps did not know the correct explanation of the tetragrammaton, and therefore meant what he was stating here in the literal sense of his expression. The latter explanation seems more likely to us, especially in view of the cold rationality of the article.

11) Pesachim 87b.

12) Sinai, Vol. I, p. 3.

13) Sanhedrin 58b.

14) Cf. Abarbanel to Deuteronomy 2:3; Maimonides to Kings 8:11; 9:1. The עריות laws also belong here (Cf. Yoma 67b), but only in relation to generic mixtures, prohibited for the Noachides; in שמונה פרקים 6 Maimonides puts incest in the category of מצות שמעיות.

15. Resh Lakish in Sanhedrin 58b says a gentile who celebrates the Sabbath is worthy of death. Rabbina says even if he celebrates בשבת בשבו (Monday) -- all Sabbath celebration is forbidden for him. Cp. Rashi Ibid. and Kesef. Mish. to Maimonides Kings 10:9.

16) Cf. Beresh. Rab. 44, and Tanchuma h to שמיני. Thus here the ceremonial law is not an end, but a means towards perfection, so that by this case the entire old system is undermined.

17) שמונה פרקים, Ch. 6.

18) Cf. Yebamoth 114a.

19) Cf. Yoma 67b.

20) Cf. יסוד מורא, division #5.

21) This explains the obscure passage in Ibn Ezra's Torah commentary to Leviticus 19:19. Abraham, because of his piety, did not have to observe the ceremonial law, which was only a reminder of his essential duties.

22) Cf. Moreh II:29.

23) Cf. Yebamoth 90b.

24) Cf. Yoma 38b.

25) Cf. Yebamoth 39b.

26) Cf. Maim. Kings 11:3-4 and Erubin 43b.

27) Cf. Talmud Yerushalmi, Megillah 4.

28) Strangely enough Maimonides quotes this, Hilch. Megillah 2:17.

29) Cf. Niddah 61b.

30) Cf. Baba Kama 87a.

31) Cf. Kiddushin 68b et. al.

32) Cf. Maimonides to Kings 8:11.

33) Cf. Genesis 4:7.

34) Cf. Moreh II:37, Nachmanides and Abarbanel to Exodus 20:1.

35) Cf. Numbers 12:6-9.

36) Cf. Isaiah 56:2.

37) Cp. Rashi to loc. cit.

38) Cp. Mishnah Lamelech to Maim. Melachim 10:7.

39) Cf. Commentary to Chullin 100b.

40) עבר מן המיי.

41) Cp. Genesis 3:5, 10; 4:9.

42) Cf. also Ibn. Ezra to Genesis 4:26.

43) Cf. Genesis 14:22; 17:1; 18:25; 24:3.

44) Cf. Ikkarim III:14.

45) Ibid. 13.

46) Cf. Midrash Rabbah to Genesis, p.68.

47) Cp. Deuteronomy 4:32-40.

48) Cp. Nachmanides and Ibn Ezra to loc. cit.

49) Cp. Bechai to loc. cit.

50) Cp. Yebamoth 76a.

51) Cf. Kiddushin 156b.

52) Cp. Sanhedrin 52b and Maim. Issure Biah 14:19.

53) Cf. Deuteronomy 7.

54) Cf. Pesachim 87b.

55) Cp. Abr. Ibn David to Maimonides Beth Hab'chirah VI:14.

56) Cf. Shevuoth 30a.

57) Cf. Chagigah 9A.

58) Yerushalmi, at the end of Erubin states: "From one pair of pliers many are made, from one law of rest many laws are made. מצבתא אחת למדו כמה צבתות וכה משביתה אחת כמה שביתות. The existence of the pliers shows the divine origin of the first pair of pliers, and thus the existence of the law of rest (שבות), (which

actually contains laws really not connected with work, but the work is nevertheless forbidden) must also, by analogy, be of divine origin.

59) Cf. Yerushalmi Chagigah I:8.

60) Cf. Horayoth 4a and 6.

P A R T II.

SECTION A -- JEWISH THEOLOGY.

Chapter 2.

Einhorn's Concept of Revelation.

Einhorn's Concept of Revelation.

To understand Einhorn's theology and the motivation for his thinking on problems of Reform Judaism completely, we must know what he meant by "revelation." For Orthodoxy, from whose narrow viewpoint Einhorn wanted to break away, revelation posed no problem. תורה מסיני was accepted without any further inquiry, and to this day כמו שכתוב בתורה is the final word.

For Einhorn revelation was a spiritual phenomenon without physical attachment. God revealed certain information to a highly gifted person, whose intellect was more developed and, to use modern terminology, was more attuned to the Divine than the intellect of the average person. This analysis we must deduce from the general tenor of his writings, for nowhere in the Sinai is the idea fully explained. There are a few brief references to revelation in the sermons, but the only specific answer to this question is to be found in reply to a letter.

We have already had occasion to refer briefly to the letter by "B.F."* The questioner poses several issues before Einhorn, to which the latter replies by referring him to his article on the difference between the old and the new Judaism. However to the end of the letter Einhorn appends a brief article in which he gives his

---

*Page 59, note 3, and also note 2, to ...

exposition of revelation.

In order to approach the problem correctly, so Einhorn states, we must first distinguish between a belief in revealed religion and a belief in an external revelation. Because these two have commonly been identified as one, people have either held rigidly to all traditions, or else have gone to the other extreme and have accepted only cold rationalism. The masses have not yet become used to accepting rationality in accordance with Mosaism, as the שכל אלהי; they have not yet learned to overcome the trend of thought which regards only the physical and the visible as the means of divine revelation. In general rationality is still regarded as a negative, heretical element, in many instances hostile to religion. The fault for this lies not in rationilty but rather in irrational religiosity or irreligiosity, both of which are results of laziness in thinking and mental unripeness.

Judaism inherited this view from Christianity, which accepts it despite the concept's irrational dogma and tenets of raw externals. This view is not even overcome if rational revelation is not regarded as anti-divine, but as something profane, existing outside of God. Exclusive recognition of rational revelation in the religious field therefore appears as a self-contradiction, completely dissolving the concepts of the prophets, which

would make anyone equal to an Abraham, Moses or Isaiah.

This view can be overcome completely only by full comprehension of the Mosaic idea: Man's mind is the son of God, and therefore is the only intermediary between God and man, the only bearer of the divine testimony. Christianity teaches: The Word became flesh. Judaism teaches: The Word became the spirit. This revelation of the spirit seems to us to be of the same divinity and sanctity as the belief in an external comprehension of God's word. We believe that Moses, the greatest of the prophets, saw in his mind that which others require millenia to see. Yet we regard him with the same respect as do those who believe that he saw God face to face.

For these reasons it is incorrect to say that the Mosaic view is inferior to that of the prophets. The spirit of the Mosaic Law is far beyond all national boundaries, but for educational purposes it had need of the vessel of Jewish nationalism to contain its world-embracing ideas. The Mosaic age was inferior to the prophetic age, but not Moses to the prophets. Quite to the contrary, it is always the Mosaic ideal which stands forth in the prophetic outpourings, much more than in the Mosaic instititions. The highest universalism lies in the words: God created MAN in His image, and even Christian theologians have recognized that Mosaic particularism only desired to raise a messianic humanity.

PART II.

SECTION A -- JEWISH THEOLOGY.

Chapter 3.

The Circumcision Issue.

The Circumcision Issue

Einhorn had not yet concluded his writings on the relationship of the old and the new Judaism, when an occasion arose that provided him with the opportunity to take a specific case and defend its merits from the viewpoint of Reform Judaism. In the regular rubric of "News dispatches"[1.] the Sinai reported the case of Dr. Veit Levit, a physician of Horic, Bohemia, who wanted to raise his child as a Jew, but did not wish to have the circumcision ceremony performed. Einhorn had handled a similar case when he had just assumed the position of "Landesrabbiner" in Schwerin. The responsum he gives in the case of Dr. Levit is exactly the same as that which he gave at that time. His decision in the earlier case had been challenged by Professor Franz Delitzsch, the foremost worker in the Lutheran Church for the conversion of Jews, who at that time taught at the University of Rostock. A polemic developed from this, which was printed in the Rostocker Zeitung. The appendix to this chapter contains Einhorn's analysis of the Veit Levit situation, the responsum on the case in Mecklenburg, and the polemic between Delitzsch and Einhorn.

Let us first examine the situation of Horic, Bohemia. Dr. Levit, the physician of the Jewish community there, became the father of a child on January 13, 1850. He refused to have this boy circumcised. The community

decided to regard the physician as excluded from the Jewish faith, but the following Saturday he came to the synagogue and requested that he be called up for the reading of the Law. This he was refused. Thereupon he ascended the pulpit, and before the open Scroll he declared loudly and solemnly "in the name of the Lord Zebaoth," that he would "raise his uncircumcised son in the religion of his fathers, in the religion of Judaism." The community was appeased, and the matter was ostensibly dropped. District Rabbi Grunfeld made an official complaint, but no decision was handed down by the courts. Young Levit was raised as a Jew.

A few years passed, during which Dr. Ehrentheil assumed the position of rabbi in Horic. On June 15, 1856, that is more than six years later, Dr. Ehrentheil brought suit against Levit in the district courts. "As a representative of his holy religion" Ehrentheil deemed it a matter of duty to bring this case before the courts, which case had taken place "shortly after the confusion of the year 1848." Since circumcision was a "sacrament" of the Jewish religion, and nonperformance thereof "a priori constituted a factual exit from Judaism," this child belonged to no religion whatever, and the rabbi respectfully requested the courts to bring Dr. Levit back to the "path of legality, and to restore the opinion of the masses to a definite norm."

After Dr. Levit had been heard, the court dismissed the case, whereupon Ehrentheil appealed to a higher

court. Before dealing with this appeal, let us first consider Dr. Levit's defense. He brands Ehrentheil's statement that his son was born "shortly after the confusion of '48" as a lie. He then proceeds to point out that circumcision is older than Mosaism, and therefore is neither a characterization of Judaism nor a sacrament. He cites that the Egyptians circumcised their children long before the Jews did. Moses did not circumcise his son, that was done by his wife after Moses had returned to Egypt. The Israelites were not circumcised in the desert for a period of forty years. All women are members of the Jewish people without this "sacrament." A father who has lost children by circumcision is not obliged to circumcise later sons, and yet these also are members of the Jewish people. As for a "factual exit from Judaism" because a ceremonial law has been broken, a Jew who eats of forbidden foods is not excluded from Judaism for that reason! Dr. Levit then clinches his defense by stating that only recently a child bled to death after a circumcision. His refusal to have the ceremony performed was not motivated by a wanton desire to break the Law, nor out of a passion for Reform; he refused the ceremony because as a physician he felt that the operation was dangerous to the life of the child. He concludes that he has already lost one child by circumcision, and since religious law may not be in conflict with the law of the land[2]. the decision regarding circumcision should, in his opinion,

be left as a choice of the parents.

The higher court subsequently dismissed the case and enjoined Ehrentheil to impregnate the boy with religious convictions, so that he might follow the guidance of his conscience upon becoming of age.

Let us now take a look at Einhorn's responsum of 1847, when he handled a similar case. A father refused to have his child circumcised, but wished to rear the child as a Jew. This incident happened in Teterow, a small town in Mecklenburg-Schwerin. The local religious school teacher requested guidance from Einhorn. The latter replied that circumcision was obligatory, but did not constitute an initiatory rite. The child was Jewish and entitled to all the privileges of a Jew. He cited the case of an idol-worshipper, who apparently had left Judaism, but was still considered as a Jew. How much the more so then an innocent babe that cannot undertake anything of its own volition! Non-performance of the law of circumcision must be regarded as any other violation of a positive commandment.[3.] The father of course is a transgressor and is punishable by כרת. The teacher was instructed to name the child publicly, and the responsum was closed with the very significant words:

> "May God bless the child and crown him with the virtues befitting an Israelite of a circumcised heart; may all those troubled and dismayed by events that seem to imperil our divine religion, the Covenant concluded by God with Israel and with humanity and sealed by the precious blood of our forefathers, be re-

> assured by the thought that that which is divine is by its very nature indestructible. Judaism rests upon the immovable pillars of justice, truth and peace, pillars which are not shaken, though the earth wax old like a garment and the heavens vanish like smoke."[5].

Let us now return to the case of Dr. Levit and all the factors involved in it. Einhorn attacks Ehrentheil bitterly. "The Jewish religion can be represented only by itself," he writes, "not by any single individual..... not even by a Moses.....and an unheard of Rabbinerchen dares to present himself as the incarnation of Judaism!"[6]. Again he dips his pen in venom and writes: ".... At best he could be a representative of his congregation, and this only if the majority of the congregation agreed with his questionable view, i.e. consists of idiots."[7]. He then implies that Ehrentheil is not an honorable man in that he misrepresented the date of the child's birth in order to improve his case before the court. And furthermore what need is there to involve the government of a Christian state in a purely internal Jewish affaire? What if Dr. Levit had gone from the defensive to the offensive, as he well might have done, and as a physician had stated that circumcision was a very dangerous operation, detrimental to the interests of the state, and had demanded that it be abolished completely?

At this point Rabbi Fassel of Grosskanischa, Hungary, entered the argument. He approves of the govern-

ment's refusal to enter a case in which it really has no business, but since Austrian law prescribes that everyone must belong to a religious denomination, he feels that the problem of the child's religion (or any similar case) is a matter for all of Austrian Jewry. Fassel believes that the child, when grown, must be treated as a heretical Jew is treated, i.e. he cannot be called to the Torah, cannot marry a Jewish woman and cannot be buried with Jewish rites. The child is a Jew but cannot claim all privileges connected with that status.

Einhorn condemns this attitude. The government, if it must make a decision, has only two alternatives: Either the child is circumcised, or the father is baptized, for he is the transgressor, not the child. Then Einhorn raises himself above this quarrel; he states that this whole business is a confusion of principles. Thousands break various religious laws regularly, laws equally important to the circumcision legislation, and yet no one punishes those transgressors. The government cannot force anyone to be either a pious Christian or a pious Jew. So why involve the government?

To return to the issue in Teterow, after Einhorn had issued his responsum, this was attacked by Professor Franz Delitzsch. The latter points out that formerly, when the Sanhedrin was still in existence, it took charge of cases where the parents refused to fulfill the Law in regard to their child. In our day we could

expect the Jewish directorate to do the same in cases where religious obligations are not fulfilled; at least we would not expect it to encourage non-performance of legal dicta!

Einhorn's reply was insulting, even though Dr. Delitzsch, according to the viewpoint of an objective reader, had been gentlemanly, and had merely adopted another stand. "Anyone with a superficial knowledge of Judaism hardly needs any counterstatement to Professor Delitzsch's article," Einhorn wrote,[8] and "....he has the Talmud neither in his hand nor in his head ....."[9] He points out that he does not regard the talmudic view as strange, but simply as surpassed. He answers all of Delitzsch's objections point for point, however the main argument has by now been sidetracked. Both participants go off on tangents, and the debate by this time has become a clash of personalities.

Delitzsch in his reply is still a gentleman. He chooses to ignore all personal attacks, and concentrates on the academic aspects of the question. At the end of his argument, however, he states that though he is a Christian, he has given all his opinions from the Jewish standpoint. Einhorn had insulted him in matters which were holy to him as a Christian. "Was this necessary, when I answered simply on Jewish grounds?" he asks.

Einhorn's next article was entitled: Professor Delitzsch as the Patron Saint of Circumcision. He accuses

him of having left the main argument. The polemic thus teeters back and forth, Einhorn replying to every proof by Delitzsch, meeting it, and destroying its power. There is no question that Einhorn bested Delitzsch, and so the latter, weary of the whole matter, ends it all by bringing a series of opinions by recognized rabbis and well-known authorities. Einhorn replies to this by rising to the highest level of which he was capable, but then sinking as low as he could get. He shows his true, undismayed courage when he proclaims: "Even if thousands of our present day rabbis or professors disagreed . . . I would still continue to say the same thing . . . ."[10]. Then he finishes the argument in a most despicable fashion, by appealing to the subjective feelings of his readers, and denouncing his opponent as a missionary whose sole purpose is to convert Jews.[11]. Whether that is true or not (and since the statement was documented it probably was true), Delitzsch in this instance at least had acted on good faith, and therefore the insults levied here were entirely uncalled for.

This article, besides the scholarly erudition displayed in it, also brings out a feature of Einhorn's character which is most disagreeable, namely his habit to become very insulting against his opponent. It has been pointed out that that was a characteristic of the style of writing in the nineteenth century, but that cannot serve as a valid excuse. True, we are taught "....know what answer to give to an <u>apicoros</u>,"[12] but we are also taught the quality

of humility in innumerable passages. Well might Dr. Einhorn have taken to heart the old exhortation: "Even if thou art perfect in all virtues, thou art imperfect if thou has no humility within thee."[13]. This was the case several times in this particular series of essays. Dr. Delitzsch protested mildly several times, but Dr. Einhorn continued to heap abuse upon him.

We must speculate that this was the reason for many of the enmities which Einhorn had during his life-time. We cannot but applaud him when he denounces false teachings, or crushes untruth wherever it appeared. But by the same token we cannot condone the harshness of his tone in many instances when it was completely uncalled for.

APPENDIX C.

The Question of Circumcision.

Sinai, Volume	II	: 699 - 708.
	II	: 731 - 740.
	II	: 763 - 772.
	III	: 796 - 805.
	III	: 827 - 835.
	III	: 859 - 867.
	III	: 929 - 929.
	III	: 955 - 965.

The Question of Circumcision.

Vol. II: 699-708.

A physician-father in Horic, Bohemia, refused to have his son circumcised. The local rabbi wished to force him to do so; he went to court, and the case finally ended up in the highest court -- the "Cultusministerium." The state refused to use force. The fact that the local courts decided against Rabbi Ehrentheil, the accuser, can only be explained by the fact that there was an objective report for the courts by Chief Rabbi Rappapurt* of Prague. In the highest government circles any opposition against tradition was accounted as a rebellion, as a manifestation of the spirit of '48, -- and Ehrentheil indeed cleverly sought to put the child's birth into that year. The Christian clergy, which is still very influential, would gladly take this opportunity to gain a person by baptism -- or else will insist on a circumcision. Furthermore, the case is peculiar since Dr. Levit, the father, pronounced an oath in the synagogue before the Scroll to raise the child as a Jew, despite the fact that the child was not circumcised. Thus there is proof in this case that the father was not indifferent to his Judaism, and that he had no intention of changing his religion. It is the phenomenon of a sincere Jew who still wishes to pass up this important ceremonial act.

*Sic. The Jewish Encyclopedia gives the name as Rapoport.

According to Talmudism we are faced with the following question: A child, born of Jewish parents, respectively a Jewish mother, 1. Is it Jewish by birth, or 2. Does it become a Jew by the act of circumcision? In the first case the child cannot be denied membership in the Jewish community. The father may be condemned for his actions, but the child remains Jewish. If the child, when grown, still refuses circumcision, he is still a Jew, according to the principle אע"פ שחטא ישראל הוא. In the second case the child NEVER was a Jew without circumcision, even if sickness or another hindrance prevented his circumcision. The moral question of non-performance here is of no consequence, for the exclusion from the community under these circumstances is not a punishment. There is no excommunication, but it would be a rather natural consequence of the non-performance of the initiatory rite. Ten years before this case Dr. Einhorn was involved in a similar case while he was still the Mecklenburg "Landesrabbiner;" a literary feud developed from this. In the present instance Rabbi Ehrentheil's actions stand beneath criticism from a moral and theological-scientific view. Before the authorities he represented himself as a "representative of the Jewish religion." This is ridiculous and arrogant, and involves a great measure of ignorance. At best he could be a representative of his congregation, and this only if the majority of the congregation agreed with his questionable view, i.e. if it consists of idiots.[11] The Jewish religion can be rep-

resented only by itself, not by any single individual, not even by a Moses, and an unheard of "Rabbinerchen" dares to present himself as the incarnation of Judaism! Ehrentheil's statement that the non-performance of the circumcision took place shortly after the confusion of '48, while the child really was born in '50, shows Jesuit-like knavery, which seeks to cover the weakness of this argument by shameful means. The holier the cause to which Ehrentheil felt himself called, even if the child was born in '48, the more he should have declined such a weapon. The same weapon was used against the Reform Jewish community of Pesth -- it was called a rebellious gang of '48..... and the people involved barely escaped being hung. Shame on Jews who in the so-called interests of religion use such weapons! One must be blind not to recognize the danger for today's Jewry to enforce Jewish religious obligations by means of the constabulary of a Christian state! Supposing the state had interfered: then a child, completely Jewish, innocent, would have been pushed out of Judaism! Or had the father consented to remind Jewish under such a decree, he and those on his side would have been immensely embittered. Eventually the sword might have turned, and the state might (in the extreme) forbid circumcision completely as a dangerous operation and as such harmful to the state. What if our opponents would use the same weapons as those in power now? What if this physician had brought many proofs that circumcision was dangerous (which would not be too difficult

to do), and then all circumcisions had been stopped? Dr. Levit's defense sounds as if he might change at any moment from the defensive to the offensive!! The clergy in Europe might easily under the cover of "humanitarianism" give you new Hadrianic decrees, and deal the hated Judaism a fatal wound!!

Ehrenteil's petition is comical, and a testimonial of rare ignorance. Circumcision is a sacramental law in Judaism, he states, and non-performance thereof must a priori be regarded as a withdrawal from Judaism. By sacramental he apparently means that which baptism means for Christianity, an act of joining the faith. Thus if the parents don't permit circumcision, the child is not considered a member of the Jewish community. How then can one leave Judaism without having entered? Ehrenteil says: It constitutes a factual withdrawal. Sick children of course are exempted from circumcision (even by Ehrentheil), and that, of course, constitutes a breach in the sacramental bulwark. An uncircumcised child still is a member of the Jewish community, but the child is thrown out -- or rather it throws itself out, for non-circumcision constitutes a "factual exit from the faith!" How can a child "leave Judaism?" The father must see to it that there is a circumcision -- and the child leaves? The father remains a Jew, he did not leave the community -- and the child did? What Mr. Ehrentheil ascribes to Judaism is pure insanity!

Rabbi Fassel of Grosskanischa (Hungary) published a notice in the Wiener Mittheilungen of August 31, 1857, acknowledging the government's decision that an uncircumcised child is regarded as a Jew by the government. It is well that the authorities do not wish to enforce a religious command, he states, for that would mean interference on the part of the government with the internal affairs of a certain confession. But to decide that an individual does or does not belong to a certain confession also constitutes an act of interference. Thus this is a matter for all Jews of Austria, not for Ehrentheil alone. Fassel now wants to submit a memorandum to the Cultusministerium to the effect that there were no grounds in this case for refusal of circumcision. This act manifestly constitutes a withdrawal from Judaism, as God said: "My covenant has been destroyed." A Jew who has left his confession must be regarded in this light even though the authorities regard him as a Jew -- but he may not marry a Jewish woman because he is a heretic. Rabbi Fassel then asks for opinions from other rabbis: Is this individual, who on his father's behest was not circumcised, without a legal basis existing, to be regarded and treated formally as as a Jew? Fassel believes this individual cannot be called to the Torah, that he cannot marry a Jewish woman, and that he cannot be buried according to Jewish rites. In brief, he is to be treated as a heretical Jew.

Thus Fassel says nothing of a sacrament; he claims

that the child is a Jew, but unformally so.

Vol. II: 731-740.

Fassel thinks it correct that the authorities will not enforce religious rules. We expect then that he would condemn Ehrentheil's petition, but he doesn't. He says: Only a denomination can state if a man is a member or not. If the denomination demands the exclusion of an individual, the state cannot recognize him as belonging to that denomination without entering into the affairs of said confession. The Austrian law is that everyone must belong to a recognized or tolerated group. Thus the government is willing to recognize the child as Jewish, i.e. it will not force a baptism. Fassel compliments the government on this, but he thinks toleration ought not to go too far and in each case that a religious obligation is broken there should be an investigation into Jewish Law before the government permits the enforcement of this duty or baptism. Thus "freedom of belief" comes down to either to live according to Judaism as it is or to be released from it by accepting Christianity. If Fassel is sincere in condemning religious enforcement then he must condemn the law that forces an individual to join a denomination. But besides this opinion Fassel does not dare say that the child is not Jewish. He says this case is a "manifestation of cutting oneself off from Judaism." Therefore in his opinion the child is Jewish by birth, but by not being circumcised it cuts itself off

from Judaism. Fassel's assertions hold true only for the father, not for the child, for all "manifestations of cutting loose" come from the former. The government could thus only offer two alternatives a. circumcision, b. the father must be baptized. There is a terrible confusion in the understanding of principles here, which can be exceeded only if force were used to bring about religious observance. Is the Sabbath a lesser sign of the Covenant than circumcision? There are thousands of Sabbath desecrators -- Fassel's congregation surely also has a contingent of such! Then these really ought to be forced to baptism also! If the government would accept Ehrentheil's suggestions, then all Austrian Jews must really fear to pour water on a plant on the Sabbath! The Jewish and Christian shepherds would fall on the flocks like wolves at the very first opportunity, each looking for a prey!

Fassel stated: Such an individual .... is to be regarded only as a heretical Jew .... he cannot marry within the Jewish faith, etc. -- this is the crown of it all. Then Fassel asks for rabbinical opinions. What does it lead to? His was a hollow phrase: he is formally a Jew, he is unformally a Jew. Israel never lets a member go; even if he is baptized, he is recognized as a delinquent member of Jewry. Under this latter ruling of Judaism the whole question of circumcision is taken from the hands of the authorities, for the law can NEVER prescribe an individual

to be a pious Christian or a pious Jew. So what business of the authorities is the whole matter? "He can't marry a Jewish woman" -- i.e. such a union is legal,[14.] but entrance into such an alliance is not permitted. In the STRICT sense even this is untrue,[15.] and also that a marriage with a Sabbath desecrator is forbidden.[16.] Besides that -- should the Austrian government decide if a six year old uncircumcised boy can or cannot marry -- or whether a rabbi can perform the wedding ceremony or not? If Fassel has daughters he had better watch out not to be caught in his own net! To follow through on Fassel's argument: The fault could be only with the father, never with the child. Yet Fassel puts the blame on the child, and marks him as an outcast -- "in life and in death." From the sinning father the guilt was transferred to the innocent child, but not until the child was a grown man. The father can be called to the Torah -- but not so the son when he grows up! The sinner goes free, and the innocent is guilty! Fassel is sowing a dragon seed by involving the government, and he himself may well be afraid of the consequences.

Dr. Einhorn, when he was Landesrabbiner in Schwerin, had a similar case in 1847, and gave a responsum of exactly the same nature as in the above case. A local teacher wrote him that a father did not wish to have a newly born child circumcised. The teacher asked for instructions regarding the procedure to be followed. The responsum stated that circumcision was obligatory, but did

not constitute an initiatory rite, and that the child was a Jew with all the accompanying privileges. A Jewish idol worshipper surely has transgressed more than a person who is not circumcised, and yet he is still considered a Jew. This holds true especially in the case of an uncircumcised child, which never made known an intention to cut itself off from Judaism. The father is the transgressor, and is as guilty as he who eats bread on Passover, and, under ancient dicta, is punishable by Karath. Such an individual, however, is less guilty than a desecrator of the Sabbath. The Rabbis had the dictum אין חבין לאדם שלא בפניו -- consequently it is even more difficult to convict an innocent babe. The teacher was instructed to name the child, and Dr. Einhorn wished that it might grow up to be an Israelite of a circumcised heart. This decision of course brought a storm of protests, but not a single refutation. Hamburg and Berlin welcomed the decision. Dr. Saalschutz, the orthodox rabbi in Konigsberg, actually publicly blessed an uncircumcised child in a synagogue after the above responsum.

Vol. II: 763-772.

Einhorn's responsum opened a polemic. The Christian theologian Professor Delitzsch published an opposing opinion in the "Rostocker Zeitung[17]. entitled: "The Israelitische Oberrath on Circumcision." "The saying was good in their eyes,"[18]. was the motto of the protest.

A news dispatch on Dr. Einhorn's decision had appeared in the Rostocker Zeitung #195, and Professor Delitzsch's answer appeared in the same paper, #198.

This is the essence of the protest: Dr. Einhorn stated: Talmudism recognizes the principle that circumcision is not the basis for entrance into Judaism. No one challenged this, because such a case is unheard of. All proselytes must be circumcised, because this act constitutes "being born into Israel," and also teaches that the uncircumcised of Jewish parentage are not entitled to practice the religious obligations and rights of a Jew. As long as a Jewish individual is uncircumcised, he is forfeited to God's punishment.

Dr. Einhorn stated further that he who does not circumcise his son comits the same sin as he who commits another sin, the punishment for which is Karath (כרת), e.g. one who eats bread on Pesach. This is only true in Talmudism if the individual who is responsible for the circumcision does not do so in regard to himself. If a father refuses to fulfill the command, he merely counts as one who transgresses a מצות עשה, but he who refuses to do the act on himself is punishable by Karath.

Dr. Einhorn asked: A Jew who eats bread on Pesach, who is a public Sabbath-desecrator, or a woman

who marries such a man -- where has such an individual ever had his marriage declared void, or was excluded from the Minyan, was not called to the Torah, or was refused Jewish burial? The answer is that if an individual was permitted to do these things, this was due only to a decay of the community's discipline. A Sabbath desecrator, according to the Law, is punishable by death, but one who eats bread on Pesach is punishable by Karath. Excommunication (נדוי) was applied where there was no communal lack of discipline, it was even enforced for lighter transgression for disregard of the traditional, let alone the written Law. One who died without being בעל תשובה had a stone put in his coffin. (בית דין סוכלין את ארונו), and his funeral took place without benefit of a ceremony of לויה המהוסרים. With a מוחרם (excommunicé) like Uriel Acosta or Spinoza, no one was permitted to eat, drink, etc. The easing of these regulations has its eye on the great-hearted Reform practice -- which was never authoritative and still cannot boast of universal recognition. Dr. Einhorn does not wish to expel from Judaism those who have transgressed a law by passion or indiscretion, or anyone who transgresses a law because he is convinced that such a law is not valid at our present level of development. The latter Dr. Einhorn regards as the most noble motive, whereas traditional Judaism regards it as the worst motive. A transgression is understandable in a case of passion or indiscretion,

but not if the motive for the transgression of a command is the denial or its divine origin. Here, in this case, מומר לעבירה cannot be applied, for according to the Talmud and teachers like Joseph Albo (Ikkarim) such a transgressor must be regarded as a denier of revelation, be the transgression light or heavy. Judaism reduced its fundamental articles to a minimum of three, but always insisted on the revelation dogma in regard to the Torah, which policy is to its credit.

Dr. Einhorn speaks of the talmudic and rabbinic view as strange. Of those familiar with talmudic and rabbinic Judaism, who will blame him for that in our time? But once the "fence of tradition" is removed, the starting point must be the Torah! Dr. Einhorn has no proof from the Torah -- to the contrary: It is written: "He who does not circumcise himself .....that soul shall be cut off ....he has broken My Covenant."[19] Dr. Einhorn states: Anyone of Jewish parentage has the right to religious duties and the privileges of an Israelite. The Torah states: No one who is uncircumcised shall eat of the Passover meal.[20] The participation in Judaism's basic festival thus depends on circumcision. And what is meant by Karath? The Jewish exegetes say it means early childless death -- i.e. weeding out of the whole family. How can Dr. Einhorn say that in the case of non-circumcision there is no instance of "tearing oneself away" from the con-

gregation, since in the case of non-circumcision there is a divine punishment?

When the Synhedrion was still in existence it took charge in cases of circumcision if the parents refused to do their duty, so that there would be no uncircumcised males in Israel. In our day in religious matters there is no other power than the conscience of the rebellious individual. Many would expect from the Israelitische Oberrath that it would attempt to convince the father of the obligation of circumcision. Instead Dr. Einhorn helped the father.

This is not an attack on the decision, it is merely an opinion rendered by the undersigned (Professor Delitzsch).

A reply was written by Dr. Einhorn, entitled: Professor Delitzsch vs. the Israelitische Oberrath.[21] Its essence follows: Anyone with a superficial knowledge of Judaism hardly needs any counterstatement to Professor Delitzsch's article, even though it was written with so much confidence.

Professor Delitzsch states: Entrance into the Jewish community is not independent of circumcision, because no such case has ever been heard of in rabbinic Judaism. The Shulchan Aruch,[22] states: A Jew, who does not circumcise himself is regarded as a מומר merely in regard to that one law .... but according to a previous paragraph[23] he may act as a Shochet, which is forbidden to a gentile even if all rituals are observed strictly.

If Professor Delitzsch did not read this passage, that is not my (Dr. Einhorn's) fault -- but Professor Delitzsch should not have spoken with such certainty. From this one statement alone we can see the quality of the proofs Professor Delitzsch is going to bring. He says: Rabbinic Judaism teaches that a proselyte must undergo circumcision (to be "born") and also that the uncircumcised individual of Jewish parentage may not fulfill the obligations and privileges of a Jew, for he is forfeited to divine punishment from day to day. There are two arguments here: The first is based on a bad blunder in logic, and the second on a lack of factual knowledge. The question is: Is a child of Jewish parents a member of the Jewish community by birth or by circumcision? Professor Delitzsch denies the right of the conveyance of the Jewish heritage because a proselyte, who has no Jewish parentage, enters the faith by means of circumcision, and does not enter by birthright! According to this a Jew, to become a Jew, would have to undergo baptism, which, according to the Halachah, is just as important for him as circumcision is for the proselyte. Furthermore in the Talmud[24]. an important rabbinic authority states that a proselyte becomes a Jew already by baptism, and not by circumcision.

The second argument by Professor Delitzsch is that according to Talmudism the uncircumcised of Jewish parentage may not have religious obligations and privileges

... and that he is forfeited to divine punishment. Proof? There is none! To the contrary ..... as proved above such a Jew may perform functions of a ritual character, and furthermore, an uncircumcised priest is forbidden to partake of the heave offering ONLY by application of a special hermeneutic rule (the partaking of the heave offering is punishable by death for every Jew or non-priestly origin). If a non-circumcised priest then does partake of a heave offering, the transgression is the same as if an uncircumcised individual partakes of the Passover lamb.[25] Furthermore, the prohibition in regard to the Passover sacrifice has as little to do with the idea of non-recognition of an uncircumcised individual of Jewish parentage as with an Israelite, so that even a circumcised individual is concerned therewith only as long as he keeps his children or slaves from circumcision -- even though he is to be recognized as a Jew under such circumstances even by Professor Delitzsch.[26] Besides that it is ridiculous to think an uncircumcised Jew must be a desecrator, because rabbinic Judaism grants the uncircumcised of Jewish parentage religious possibilities which it denies the Sabbath desecrator.

Professor Delitzsch makes the ingenious observation that the Karath-punishment is only for the uncircumcised of age, but not for the father of the uncircumcised child. If this will prevent a possible misunderstanding for uninformed laymen, I wish to thank him, but he should have saved his criticising tone!!

I (Dr. Einhorn) stated that a Jew who eats bread on Pesach, or desecrates the Sabbath, is never regarded as one who has departed from Israel, his marriage is not declared invalid, etc. Professor Delitzsch states that it is only due to a degeneration of communal discipline (i.e. the disuse of the holy autodafe), if such an individual is called to the Torah or is counted in the Minyan, for in the law-exacting Judaism a desecration of the Sabbath carries the punishment of death, the eating of bread on Passover carries the punishment of כרת, and נדוי comes even for lighter transgressions. As to Professor Delitzsch's sympathies for punishments for religious transgressions, there is no argument, only we do not wish to make people "seelig" by flogging. If we discarded Nidduim and Charamoth this would be a step forward. If Professor Delitzsch thinks that a transgressor of the Sabbath or Pesach laws may not be counted for Minyan from the rabbinic view, (because he is under the death penalty for a forseeable excommunication penalty), he only gives proof of his lack of knowledge in rabbinics -- for until a man is actually excommunicated he may be a member of a Minyan.[27]. The excommunicated man is indeed not countable to a Minyan -- but not because of his sin, but because of the ban! That such a ban, often given for little things, really throws a Jew out of the religious fellowship, and that Professor Delitzsch regards the excommunication as literal, is ridiculous. Professor

Delitzsch is again in error if he states in the name of rabbinic Judaism that only with the Muchram (in contrast to a Menuddah) one cannot eat or drink. The same does hold true for the Menuddah.[28] This really is an insignificant error in his analysis, but as long as Professor Delitzsch speaks with such certainty, this should be mentioned.

Vol. III: 796-805.

I (Dr. Einhorn) stated that if a ceremonial law was not observed out of conviction, the motive is far more noble than a case in which the transgression took place because of passion or indiscretion. Professor Delitzsch thinks that traditional Judaism regards this motive as the worst. The individual must be considered as having departed from Judaism, he states, if the motive for transgression is the denial of the involved law's divine origin. מומר לערלות cannot be applied here, for the individual is to be regarded as a denier of revelation according to the Talmud and such an enlightened teacher as Joseph Albo. So far Professor Delitzsch. In regard to the individual: As for his "being cut off" -- well, that is an idee fixe of the Professor, but it is not understandable how he can identify the conviction of the non-obligatoriness of a ceremonial law (at the present level of religious development) with a denial of revelation. One can easily believe in the divine origin of a ceremonial law, and simultaneously believe that it was an educational measure employed for a limited people, time, and place. If

that is denied, then the development recognized by the prophets and the historical development of Judaism must also be denied, since the greatest part of the Mosaic legislation has lost all meaning even for strictest law-abiding Jew. Professor Delitzsch, in closer scrutiny of historical Judaism,would have seen a constant development there without the consciousness of such a development, which was present simultaneously with a strong belief in the divine revelation of the Torah. Judaism does not wish to ignore rabbinics, to remove tradition, or to return to the strict letter of the Biblical Law. It rather wishes to return to the divine spirit that caused the creation of history, fully conscious of its high calling to go forward to the goal already set by the prophets. It is our goal to give Judaism's truths and ethical laws such power over the spirit that symbols will no longer be necessary -- to root out all ideas of a religious monopoly, by which strict legalism seeks to compensate its adherents for the force put upon them. The Talmud itself even predicts the downfall of ceremonialism. This talmudic concept, indispensable to the Reform movement, is already reaching general recognition. Our decision thus speaks about the talmudic view not as <u>strange</u> but as <u>surpassed</u>. Both belong to the same organism, even though the head stands higher than the foot. Also the correspondent of this paper, in issue #189, does not understand my view -- he has the Talmud neither in his

hand nor in his head .....(!!)

Professor Delitzsch stated that the Bible says the uncircumcised is to be cut off; this does not mean excommunication, he says, but an early, childless death. He asks: How is it possible not to have a self-removal from the congregation for an uncircumcised individual, since according to the Torah non-circumcision has the more serious consequence of a divine judgment? What a confusion of principles! Because God will punish an Israelite forgetful of his obligations by early childless death, this individual is in addition to be punished during his lifetime by excommunication? The Rabbis taught: When capital punishment is to be exacted, no other punishment may be given in addition, not even a monetary fine. From the law that an uncircumcised individual may not eat of the Passover he deduces that an uncircumcised person may not practice any other religious privileges or obligations. The passage, however, proves the opposite! Pesach, so he himself states, is the most important holiday. If an uncircumcised person may not observe other rituals which are less important, would not there have to be other laws to state this explicitly? And furthermore, were we to follow his reasoning, even ritually unclean people would have to be denied religious privileges and duties -- because they are denied the Passover.

Moses was careless about the circumcision of his son. Also all Israelites were uncircumcised for a period

of forty years. Surely we cannot believe that even in the Biblical age the uncircumcised ones (of age), despite their transgression, were reckoned as excluded from the community.

In addition, if a father does not circumcise his child the spiritual leaders of the community are obliged to fulfill the command. This law holds true even today, not only in the time of the Synhedrion. Nevertheless we feel we acted correctly. Professor Delitzsch is trying to protect the Jewish community, he wants to see all its males circumcised so that all can partake of the sacrificial lamb. To do away with ceremonials, Professor Delitzsch thinks all Jews would have to become Christians.

Reply by Professor Delitzsch: The Defense of the Landesrabbinat in Schwerin.[29]

I do not care to enter into the tone used by Dr. Einhorn. He also involved extraneous matters in the discussion -- perhaps to hide the real issues.

Dr. Einhorn asks: Where can a Jew be found who ate bread on Pesach, desecrated the Sabbath, and was excluded from the Minyan, etc. Schwerin is not the only Landesrabbinat! Now Dr. Einhorn admits that Judaism knows two degrees of excommunication -- not only eating and drinking with excommunicants is forbidden, but the excommunicant is also excluded from the Minyan. In asking where a Jew has ever been excluded for the various trans-

gressions named, Dr. Einhorn seems to have forgotten history.

Dr. Einhorn stated that a Jew is entitled to all the privileges of his faith, without restriction, by heritage alone. The Bible,[30.] however, clearly excludes the uncircumcised Israelite from this ceremony. Dr. Einhorn sought to hide this fact by stating that the uncircumcised individual is denied this privilege only as an unclean person is denied the right to partake of the Paschal lamb, but that this does not make him a member of the Israelitic community. Because circumcision in a negative sense is a shedding of natural uncleanliness, and in a positive sense is a sign of God's Covenant with Israel, it constitutes the means of acceptance into the Jewish community. Without circumcision both the stranger and the native Israelite were excluded from the Jewish community, so that the privilege of participation in a festival depended on circumcision. Dr. Einhorn minimizes this by reducing non-circumcision to only a sign of uncleanliness and ignoring it as a symbol of the Covenant.

The importance of circumcision and the Passover law is accentuated by the fact that both are positive commands, non-fulfillment of which is punishable by כרת. This is an excommunication by God's interference. From this the conclusion was drawn that he who transgresses the law of circumcision automatically cuts himself off from his people. Dr. Einhorn calls this a confusion of

concepts. I never said that non-fulfillment of this law involved excommunication as Dr. Einhorn quotes me. Dr. Einhorn imagines this, passion blinds him. Also I never spoke of my own opinion, only of Scripture's and tradition. According to these one who breaks God's Covenant is to be regarded as one who tears himself away from the congregation because he automatically incurs the peremptory decree of God. Thus I protest Dr. Einhorn's distortion of my words.

Dr. Einhorn's distortion leads one to think that excommunication is much harsher than כרת. I never thought of excommunication as extermination. Let Dr. Einhorn think of the eighth commandment which even at the present level of religious development is still in force.[31.]

Dr. Einhorn stated that Judaism does not excommunicate for a transgression committed in passion, indescretion, or out of conviction. I say that Judaism regards anyone who denies a single law its divine origin is to be regarded as a non-Jew, except for a transgression committed in a state of indiscretion or passion. But according to Judaism any denial of the divine origin and permanent binding force of a law, e.g. the law of circumcision, makes one a non-Jew.[32.]

A rabbinic Votum [33.] says: "Any religious act done by such a person is invalid, even if it is known that it was done according to all the prescriptions of the ritual!"

Vol. III: 827-835.

I know that the Talmud speaks of the eventual

disuse of ceremonial law -- i.e. the עתיד לבא or ימות המשיח. It is too bad for Dr. Einhorn that not one passage mentions circumcision.

Dr. Einhorn points to Yoreh Deah II: 7, cp. 6 and 1. That passage states "an uncircumcised Jew of age is to be regarded as a mumar merely for this one law, but may act as ritual slaughterer." In reading this, how could Dr. Einhorn state that a Sabbath desecrator has privileges in a congregation! For it says right near there that a public Sabbath desecrator is to be regarded as a Kuthi -- does not that mean that a Sabbath desecrator does not have the right of Shechitah?

Dr. Einhorn's conclusions from these paragraphs are wrong. In these passages an uncircumcised Jew who may act as a Shochet is one, who, e.g., does not undergo circumcision, because he is afraid of the pain, not one who denies the law of circumcision out of conviction.[34] Even for ritual slaughtering rabbinic Judaism demands more than mere Jewish origin -- it requires confession of the Mosaic Law as having been divinely revealed, and where that is lacking it denies an uncircumcised individual the right of ritual slaughter. The meat of an animal slaughtered by such is permitted for food, but the man himself is not part of the Israelitic community. Tractate Chullin demands a knowledge of all the rules of Shechitah, but it treats the whole matter as being on the very fringe of Judaism.

The question: 'Is a child born of Jewish parents

a Jew, or does circumcision make him a Jew?' is answered by the parallel situation of the proselyte. Dr. Einhorn does not accept this parallel -- let him look at Hilchoth Issure Biah 13:14. There the answer is found to Dr. Einhorn's insignificant objection that according to one of the earliest rabbinical authorities a proselyte is converted by baptism. The authority referred to is R. Joshua, whose private opinion is based on very silly grounds. The law is that a proselyte must be both baptized and circumcised.

Dr. Einhorn utilizes quotations such as these without any power of proof to support his arguments, when he really faces a confusion of two concepts: 1. That of national fellowship and religious fellowship, and 2. That of confessional fellowship and confession. A child is by descent a member of the Jewish people, and by the act of the parents it is introduced to the Jewish confession. In fulfilling this divinely revealed law, and in confessing this God, this people, held together by bonds of blood, becomes a religious community. It thereby becomes clear that one who does not abide by the laws of that group, i.e. ignores the sign of the Covenant, or denies divine revelation and the Sabbath, does not cease to belong to the Jewish people and his religious obligations are not lifted, but he does cut himself off from the Jewish religion and from its confessional fellowship. Dr. Einhorn closes his eyes to this: He gives any Jew, by

reason of descent alone, all the privileges of Judaism without restriction. As if there is any positive religion to which a man is born! Or as if any religious fellowship can hold a man so tightly that he cannot possibly escape it! Man's relation to the community and vice versa would then not be a free one, but a blind necessity!

This is the only possible view (from the Landesrabbinats stand) that one can gain of a Jew who violates all his obligations, and yet enjoys all the privileges of the community. In this fashion all laws will eventually become non-binding if they are considered burdensome.

"Is that bad?" Dr. Einhorn will ask. This I will not answer, for Dr. Einhorn has answered the arguments which I gave from a Jewish viewpoint by insulting me with bitter sarcasm about matters holy to me as a Christian. Was this necessary, when I answered simply on Jewish grounds?

From this Jewish viewpoint I answered: Not descent but circumcision makes a Jew a fullfledged member of his community -- he who overthrows this gives up the privileges and the obligations of Judaism, and the self-withdrawal from the Mosaic Law, praised by the Landesrabbinat, constitutes a withdrawal from Judaism to a deism which cannot distinguish between the divine spirit and the human spirit, between revelation and contemporary opinion, between development and heresy.

Answer by Dr. Einhorn: Professor Delitzsch as the Patron Saint of Circumcision. I do not care if Professor Delitzsch wishes to defend his view, but I resent it that Professor Delitzsch suspects my views towards both the Jewish and the Christian public. This procedure cannot be sanctioned even by the best intent, not even if it is a fight with "ruthless" men in Israel "who liked this opinion well."*

Professor Delitzsch accuses me of bringing in extraneous materials and departing from the subject under discussion. It is significant that his own defense, instead of following the subject, has now assumed entirely different dimensions torn from the main body of our discussion, so that by this disfigurement he will at least make a good impression at first.

The remainder of this article is devoted to a summary of Professor Delitzsch's views, and a counter-proof for each statement. The article here assumes aspects of a personal feud, with a terminology unbecoming to great scholars.

Vol. III: 859-67.

The confusion of concepts by Professor Delitzsch comes from the question: 'In what manner does a Jew enter the community?' (by birth or by circumcusion), which he confuses with the question: 'How does a Jew leave the community?' We deal here only with the first question. Supposing a Jew could by denial of the divine origin of a

*A reference to Professor Delitzsch's text from I Maccabees 1:13, which he used at the beginning of the controversy.

Mosaic Law, with or without transgression, really be regarded as having left the congregation, thus losing all his privileges. This would not change my (Einhorn's) thesis that his entrance is effected by birth. Were we to regard only those means to enter the confession which exclude the possibility of an eventual withdrawal -- then a Jew could not enter the confession by either birth or by circumcision. By birth one becomes an Israelite, and no matter how much an Israelite sins or transgresses, there is no withdrawal. As regards the passage in Yoreh Deah 2:5 -- where the Sabbath desecrator, in point of ritual slaughter, is likened unto a Kuthi -- one must read the commentary Sifte Cohen with this passage in order to understand it. There it is explained that the Sabbath violator has not really become a non-Jew, he is only Dino Kekuthi. In regard to the Sabbath violator: I have mentioned several rights and privileges which are his -- which proves that he is not excommunicated. I never thought to ascribe to the Sabbath violator mumar lehachis or to give a heretic all privileges -- even though such heretics are duty-bound to all the laws of Judaism -- e.g. a baptized Jew who eats bread on Pesach is forfeited to Karath like any other Jew. I refer to Yoreh Deah 266:12 where it is specifically mentioned that a child of baptized Jews and a baptized Jewess must be circumcized -- some say even on the Sabbath. He who knows Judaism from other sources than the Orient, 1843, can never state in the name of Judaism that an exclusion from the Jewish confession is possible.

The example of the baptized Jew was purposely chosen because in Jewish tradition this is the ultimate treason to Judaism. The Rabbis, however, declare a marriage to such a traitor as legal.[38] If this is so, with what right does Professor Delitzsch wish to remove Jews from Judaism, or how can he under these circumstances exclude a transgressor in regard to circumcision from Jewish obligations and privileges? If circumcision is initiatory to entrance into the congregation, then there cannot be any difficulty in a case of neglect of circumcision on the basis of conviction. But if an uncircumcised individual is admitted to the congregation, with all or only part privileges, then the new factor of conviction can lift the adherence to the congregation as little as a conversion to another faith can.

In regard to the Karath punishment, this constitutes an automatic removal from the congregation by the interference of God. Professor Delitzsch just cannot get away from his favorite idea. According to his interpretation each of the thirty-six commands which carry the Karath punishment, e.g. the eating of bread on Pesach, the eating of blood, etc., would mean exclusion from the community. This, states Professor Delitzsch, is tradition. But since tradition does not think of a baptized Jew as excluded, tradition must in each reference to a baptized Jew think of one who annually -- bakes matsoth for Pesach!!

Before this I have pointed out that there is a

difference between believing in the divine revelation of the Law, and believing in our eternal obligation to it. In that I pointed at our two thousand year old history, and also to the idea (already found in the Talmud), that the ceremonial Law will eventually disappear. Professor Delitzsch termed this one of the most amusing ("zu den Kostlichsten") passages in the Talmud.

At this point Dr. Einhorn attempts to explain the process of thought of his opponent, and again becomes somewhat belligerent.

In regard to Shechitah by an uncircumcised person (of age), Professor Delitzsch stated that such was permissable for food. But rabbinic Judaism denies the non-Jew and even the public Sabbath desecrator the right to practice ritual slaughtering, even if he observes the ritual strictly. Meat slaughtered by such a person is regarded as a carcass, and may thus not be eaten.

Professor Delitzsch concluded that a proselyte can become a Jew only by circumcision, and consequently the same must hold true for a Jewish child. He disregards that in the case of a child the initiation lies in birth, but that with a gentile there must be another process.

Vol. III: 923-929.

Professor Delitzsch thinks that I (Einhorn) am confused in regard to the concept of national fellowship ("Volksgenossenschaft") and religious fellowship ("Religionsgenossenschaft"). He states: A child is a member of the Jewish people, who depend on the fulfillment

of the revealed Law, by birth; of the religious fellowship by circumcision. Professor Delitzsch is wrong -- for how can he say that a child, as a member of the Jewish people, is dependent on the fulfillment of a revealed law? The dependence on Jewish obligations, which is nothing but religious, can hardly come from membership in the Jewish people per se, and it a priori supposes membership in the Jewish religious fellowship. How does a child of Jewish parents become a member of the religious community, or a national member a religious member? Professor Delitzsch says: By circumcision, the parental act, and by free decision upon reaching age the child becomes a member of the Jewish fellowship. A new factor! Not birth or circumcision -- but by free choice the circumcised adult becomes a Jew!! Circumcision of course brings about this free decision. But, once the child is of age -- if he does not care to be a Jew -- can he negate his obligations? Does he apply himself less to the fulfillment of the ceremonial Law -- e.g. when he is uncircumcised to circumcise himself? It is, after all, impossible to have religious obligations to a community before one's entrance into it. How then can we solve the puzzle that a Jewish national, without being in the religious Jewish fellowship, is embraced by the Jewish religious obligation so tightly that he cannot get away? Or does Professor Delitzsch take "national" literally in the sense of "state" and wishes (according to a heretical theory) to

separate the religious and the political in Judaism -- to transmit religious obligation as a contradiction in terms to politics? If so, he could not have spoken of the impossibility of lifting religious obligations by separation from the religious community, nor, instead of pitting "the religious" and "the political" against each other, could he have pitted Jewish rights and qualifications against Jewish obligations!

If Jewish duties are religious as Professor Delitzsch states, then they can be connected ONLY with the religious community, never with the "national" community. They can never belong to anyone who never belonged to the religious community, who can withdraw from the same, or who has withdrawn from it. A Jewish "tribal member" has all the Jewish religious obligations, and more or less privileges, even if he is uncircumcised -- and if he is opposed to Judaism from before ("von vorn herein") -- then according to Professor Delitzsch he had never been accepted into the Jewish community. If an individual of baptized Jewish parents, or the offspring of a baptized Jewess, is married to a Jew, the marriage is valid.39. Thus it is clear that traditional Judaism never accepted Professor Delitzsch's theory of acceptance or exclusion -- neither circumcision nor free decision make a Jew a Jew -- that the status of being uncircumcised and a free decision against the Jewish faith cannot take an individual out of Judaism, for membership in the Jewish religious fellowship

is determined solely by membership in the Jewish race -- i.e. descent -- and sins or transgressions do not excommunicate a man. He who does not wish to belong to Judaism is still obliged to obey its laws, and the only things that the use of his free will brings him is the loss of Jewish privileges -- according to Professor Delitzsch. Under such circumstances the Jewish community enslaves its members, but not in the case of sin where it still gives its blessings. And let us look at the consequences of free decision according to Professor Delitzsch! A Jew who does not hold a Mosaic law as eternally binding, be it circumcision or tsitsith, is forced "of his own free will" to throw himself out of the confession, to give up its privileges -- even though he protests against doing so!! Both Judaism and Jews want neither the honey nor the sting of this. Professor Delitzsch fights against the idea of Judaism by descent, forgetting that even with his "free decision" the Jew because of his descent is dependent on the revealed Law, and willingly or unwillingly is subject to its religious obligations. It is as absurd to understand religious obligations without previous religious adherence to the community, as it is to tear apart religious obligations from religious privileges -- to make the one dependent on mere descent, and the other on entrance into the confession. Furthermore, Professor Delitzsch in denying descent as a medium for entrance, has overlooked the characteristic of Judaism according to which its ceremonial law is restricted solely to the Jewish

race. What is the use of the phrase "of descent," since that alone, insert whatever you wish, is the last basis of specifically Jewish Law?

A protest follows here against Professor Delitzsch's assertion that Dr. Einhorn insulted Judaism or made fun of Christianity -- and this is followed by an insult to Professor Delitzsch about his "supposed rabbinic knowledge." Again Dr. Einhorn asserts that descent alone determines Judaism. "We want our ceremonials obeyed only by our people, we are loath to admit proselytes -- no one can leave us of his own free will. You, Professor Delitzsch, call that tyranny -- Judaism says אע"פ שחטא ישראל הוא -- lovingly Judaism holds on to the erring son."

Thus I (Einhorn) declare: It is treason to Judaism to declare circumcision as necessary to entrance into Judaism. He who discards a Mosaic Law out of the conviction that it does not any longer express a religious thought, and that it therefore has been abrogated by God -- if such an individual still cleaves to the purely religious laws of Judaism -- not only is he not fallen away from Judaism, but he is an industrious worker for the messianic kingdom.

Vol. III: 955-965.

Professor Delitzsch's last reply: A Last Necessitated Word Against the Assertions of the Landesrabbinat.[40]

I (Delitzsch) do not care to make any more statements after this, since I cannot hope to convince the Landesrabbinat of my opinion. But Dr. Einhorn's last statement was so full of personal invectives that I owe it to the readers of this paper to give one more explanation.

The rabbinical rescript decided in this case that the child is to be a Jew, and that the father in refusing to have a circumcision has not in any way removed himself from Judaism. I only attached this decision on grounds which are now called pure reason, on grounds that are universally accepted and are uncontested in talmudic Judaism.

The Verein von Reformfreunden in 1843[41.] set up the principle that "birth makes Jewish ..... a child of Jewish parentage belongs to the Jewish community even if he obeys no ceremonials, as long as he does not deny the teaching about one God and revelation." It denied the Talmud all authority. This declaration was of course fought by other Jews. We do not deny that such a child has certain characterics and obligations of a national character, also that it has certain rights. Among the opponents of Reform was one authority who stated that membership in the Jewish congregation depended on observance of the laws, and he who transgresses the law of circumcision was to be regarded as a non-Jew (in the ecclesiastical sense), or as one departed from Judaism.

Dr. Einhorn says the contrary. Let us then look at some rabbinic responsa on this issue. In 1843 there took place what Moses Mendelssohn had deemed in his Jerusalem (1783) as a theoretical, not to be feared, possibility. Rabbi Trier's father (Frankfurt) had joined the Reform Verein. Rabbi Trier wrote letters to his colleagues (after other means of persuasion had failed) asking their opinions. Twenty-eight of these responsa were published[41]. and the epilogue contained a letter by Dr. Zunz. Ten responsa were not published. Among those published were opinions by Zunz; S. J. Rapaport, Prague; S. D. Luzzatto, Professor, Collegio Rabbinico, Padua. Their opinion is opposed to that of Dr. Einhorn.

1. Dr. Einhorn said: It is treason to Judaism to make circumcision a condition of entrance into the Jewish religious community. Opposing statements are then quoted by Dr. Adler of Hannover, Rabbis Furst and Traub of Heidelberg and Mannheim. These then are "traitors."

2. Dr. Einhorn stated: Only ignorance of Judaism or the desire to dissolve Judaism will place an individual in the position of a non-Jew if he rejects circumcision out of conviction.

Rabbi Horwitz (Vienna) states: "Anyone, who out of principle denies circumcision as the sign of Judaism, must be declared a non-Jew by the religious authorities." Is he an ignoramus?

Rabbi Mecklenburg (Konigsberg) states: "He who

out of principle transgresses the law of circumcision cannot be counted as a member of the community of Israel." Is Rabbi Mecklenburg a secret proselytiser?

I (Delitzsch) would have no objection if Dr. Einhorn would have made these statements in his own name, or in the name of Reformers, or even in the name of the Braunschweig Rabbiner Versammlung (twenty odd rabbis) which was opposed in protest by one hundred and sixteen rabbis of Germany, France, Switzerland and Hungary. But Dr. Einhorn says "these are principles of Judaism!" In the name of history I am forced to protest.

This "non-obligingness of the Mosaic Law at the present level of development" is new --- it is not historic. Only a new divine revelation can lift the Mosaic obligation -- so Judaism teaches, and Christianity which deems itself the second revelation, agrees with that.

Professor Luzzato states:[43] "He who overthrows the sign of the Covenant is like one who overthrows the entire Mosaic Law -- especially if this is done out of principle."

A similar (but stronger) statement was made by "Bezirks" - Rabbi Lowenstein of Baden.[44]

Dr. Zunz, despite Dr. Einhorn, stated there is such a thing as cutting oneself loose from Judaism. Now let these testimonies speak for themselves.

Reply by Dr. Einhorn:[45]

Professor Delitzsch has finally given up. He does not answer my arguments, but rather quotes some rabbinic responsa of 1844 on the subject. Even if thousands of our present day rabbis or professors disagreed -- I would still continue to say the same thing: Rabbinic Judaism recognizes even the children of baptized Jewish parents as Jews. That is a fact. Whoever says the opposite commits treason to Judaism. No one else has protested my decision!

As regards Professor Delitzsch: Pfarrer Steger in Nurnberg, Hof 1847, wrote in an article entitled Die evangelische Juden-Mission in Ihrer Wichtigkeit und Ihrem Gesegneten Fortgange, pp. 11, the following: The evangelistic Lutheran missionary society ..... has been interested in ..... saving the children of Israel. Dr. Delitzsch of Leipzig ..... has been active in both a literary and an oral-capacity among the Israelites ....." These are facts ..... actual testimonies!

NOTES

to

PART II, SECTION A, CHAPTER 3.

Notes.

1) Sinai, vol. II, pp. 695-698.

2) דינא דמלכותא דינא.

3) Cf. Yoreh Deah 2:7.

4) כרת, a cutting off, is a divine punishment, and cannot be inflicted by the community in the form of excommunication.

5) Translation from Kohler, Op. cit., p. 23.

6) Sinai, vol. II p. 703.

7) Ibid., loc. cit.

8) Ibid., p. 767.

9. Sinai, vol.III, p. 798.

10) Ibid., p. 963.

11) Ibid., pp. 964-965.

12) Aboth II:19.

13) Kallah Rabbati, 3.

14) Cp. Eben HaEzer Hilch. Kiddushin 44:9.

15) Cf. Eben HaEzer 7:11, 115:4; 154:1.

16) Cf. Tur Eben HaEzer 44.

17) December 6, 1847.

18) I Maccabees 1:13.

19) Genesis 17:14.

20) Exodus 12:48.

21) Rostocker Zeitung, #204.

22) Yoreh Deah 2:6.

23) Loc. cit. #1.

24) Yebamoth 46a.

25) Ibid., 70a.

26) Cf. Maimonides, Korban Pesach 5:5.

27) Cf. Orach Chayim 55:11; Yoreh Deah 334.

28) Cf. Yoreh Deah 334:2.

29) Rostocker Zeitung #208.

30) Exodus 12:48.

31) Delitzsch probably meant the ninth commandment "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

32) Cp. Maimonides, Hilchoth Teshubah III:8, and to this Joseph Karo.

33) Literaturblatt des Orient, 1843, #6.

34) Cp. Maimonides, Hilchoth Shechitah IV: 14 f., and to this Joseph Karo.

35) Hilchoth Issure Biah 13:6.

36) Schwerin, January 4, 1848 (The sourse is not mentioned, but presumably it is the same newspaper mentioned above).

37) Vide Sifte Cohen and Ture Sahab.

38) Cf. Yoreh Deah 269:12.

39) Cf. Shulchan Aruch, Eben HaEzer 44:9.

40) Rostock, January 15, 1848 (no publication is mentioned, but presumably it is the same newspaper quoted above)

41) In the Frankfurter Journal, July 7.

42) Frankfurt 1844.

43) Frankfurt manuscript, p. 75.

44) Ibid., pp. 187 ff.

45) Schwerin, January 25, 1848.

P A R T II.

SECTION A -- JEWISH THEOLOGY.

Chapter 4.

The Dietary Laws.

The Dietary Laws

Continuing with his policy of enlightening the Jewish public, Einhorn published the report he had written more than a decade earlier for the fourth[1] German Rabbinical Conference. This report had been published at the time it was written,[2] but for the above stated reason it was republished in Sinai.[3]

"We are dealing here with a question of the utmost importance," he writes in the introduction to the actual article in Sinai,[4] "a question which plays an important part in practical life. We are dealing with the Jewish dietary prohibitions, which have truly lost nothing in significance, despite the fact they have ceased to be a burning issue. Through cold indifference a factual decision has already been reached -- in favor of the stomach, but not in a religiously progressive, convincing sense."

Academically Einhorn approaches the problem by analyzing the Biblical laws of impurity and their talmudic counterparts, as well as the writings of the medieval philosophers. The first conclusion at which he arrives is that the dietary laws are not an independent unit in Judaism. They are closely connected with the laws of impurity, what is forbidden, and ritually permitted substances.

In order to consider the suspension or the retention of the dietary laws a definite standard of evaluation must be established. From the viewpoint of critical analysis Einhorn immediately rejects the oft-

quoted arguments that the laws in question were sanitary regulations.[5] He writes: "We might as well admit openly: The dietary laws, in regard to the unclean, are for us antiquated, and thus, being empty symbols, have lost all significance, and therefore all obligations on our part have ceased ..... The prohibitions against uncleanliness would already have to be discarded since this symbol no longer has any life in it, as we do not know by what quality the named animals achieve bodily pollution."[6]

The removal of a dead symbol is of equal value to Einhorn to the retention of a live symbol. The fact that the dietary laws are a series of dead symbols seems to him to be of sufficient importance to justify their deletion from religious practice. On the other hand he realizes full well the danger of suddenly declaring a Biblical law invalid, because the masses would not grasp the full significance of such a move. He writes: "We must recognize that the people still live largely in the sphere of legality," even though, "we need have no illusions -- they know how to distinguish as little between the dead and live limbs of the body of Judaism, and perhaps even less, than between its body and soul."[7] But he realizes that a sudden abandonment of these laws would not mean to the masses what it actually is, i.e. the abrogation of one and only one specific institution. The masses would not be able to distinguish the detail from the entity; they would conceive of such an abrogation as

a declaration of war against the Divine Will and as a denial of all Biblical authority. Should that happen, he realizes, the only basis of our moral existence would be shaken most seriously.

He then offers a counter suggestion. "History," he writes, "teaches us a homeopathic means, namely to replace one law by another law, thus lifting the people slowly over the sphere of dead legalism, and assuring us of successful results ..... People will be satisfied that since the destruction of Jerusalem, which brought so many changes in Jewish religious life, was brought about by divine plan, these laws of cleanliness have de facto lost their existence, and therewith also the laws to eat what is unclean have lost the right to existence."[8]. Unfortunately he does not mention what laws he would substitute for the discarded legislation.

Even though Dr. Einhorn's theory to enlighten the people and thereby convince them to discard empty symbols sounds very nice, we cannot agree with it. It must be realized that the average person is neither an academician nor a logician. The masses will listen politely to such a theory; individuals may even discuss it in a social gathering as a point of interest, but they will not change their mode of life because they have heard such an opinion. The reason is that they have grown up with the law as it stands, it is a tradition, a habit and a way of life with them, which cannot be changed by a

mere discussion.

The obverse of course may be true. Once the people have drifted away from rigorous legalism because of convenience and because of the change of the social structure and the therewith connected environment, they may seek to find reasons for what they consider religious laxity on their part, and may therefore adopt the theoretician's arguments as a means to appease their consciences.

As a result of his research Einhorn states that he is convinced that ritual slaughter owes its origin to humanitarianism, which Judaism recommends in general in the treatment of animals. In that respect he thinks ritual slaughter should be retained, but care must be taken that such practice be not caricatured, and that it work no undue hardships.[9] Since humanitarianism is the basis for the laws of טרפות, Einhorn feels that the "Mishnaic Law can be regarded only as an explanation of tradition, commensurate only to the opinions of that time, which must be subordinated to the knowledge of the time, so that slaughtering no longer can be decided by theology, but only by the science of physics."[10]

In discussing the prohibition not to eat the sinew of the thigh vein,[11] Einhorn states that Scripture really lists it as a custom and not as a law, which is expressed by the words "...unto this day" in the verse where the law is given. He then makes a very interesting statement: "Even if Scripture really expresses a law

here, the Talmud thinks this would put no obligation on us, being a pre-Sinaitic law, and not being included in the Sinaitic legislation."[12]. Unfortunately he does not enter further into the idea why a pre-Sinaitic law should not be binding for posterity.

In an additional article on the Mosaic principles of uncleanliness Einhorn proposes a quite fascinating theory, namely that two types of creatures were regarded as unfit for food by the ancients. These are: A. Any creature that repels by reason of its unpleasant appearance or by dangerous qualities, and B. any creature whose physical features appear incomplete and brings to mind the idea that the Creator has left His work incomplete.[13]. This theory sounds attractive, but the proof for its correctness lies in the realm of the psychologist.

APPENDIX D.

A Report of the Commission of the Third German Rabbinical Assembly at Breslau Regarding the Binding Force of the Dietary Laws.

Sinai, Volume IV : 193 - 202.
IV : 230 - 236.
IV : 257 - 266.
IV : 291 - 295.
IV : 339 - 342.
IV : 361 - 364.
V : 33 - 37.
V : 97 - 100.

A Report of the Commission of the Third German Rabbinical Assembly at Breslau Regarding the Binding Force of the Dietary Laws.

Vol. IV: 193-202.

The following report is to be put before the fourth German Rabbinical Assembly. This report was written by Dr. Einhorn; the other members of the Commission were Rabbis Holdheim of Berlin; Adler of New York; Hirsch of Luxemburg; Herzfeld of Braunschweig.

There is a great difference between law and life in regard to the dietary laws. Many people, despite their wishes, are forced to break these laws. Once they have thus broken with Judaism, they become more and more estranged from their religion; others, who observe them, have many disadvantages. Both material and religious life force us to change the dietary laws -- but many difficulties are involved in such a reform, since both the Biblical and the traditional laws are involved. Thus the members of the commission were not always in agreement about the suggestions, or the principles involved. Nevertheless there was general accord, except on one point which, from the practical view, was rather unimportant. The majority of the commission consisted of Rabbis Einhorn, Holdheim and Hirsch, the minority of Rabbis Adler and Herzfeld. The commission tried to be practical, and thus occasionally was not

STRICTLY scientific. Some laws, quite unimportant from the practical side, were for that consideration not mentioned here.

The main body of the laws is to be found in Leviticus 11; it deals with the categories of unclean animals. The view that these laws are merely sanitary regulations must be completely discarded from the point of criticism. In Deuteronomy 14 the Bible almost always adds to the prohibitive dietary laws the words טמא הוא לכם; in addition, in regard to a special class of unclean animals, it states: "You shall not eat their meat, and their carcases you shall not touch." Thus the command of not eating is on the same level as not touching, which means that these animals produce bodily defilement. The laws of cleanliness ceased to be in effect millenia ago, because they are rooted in theocratic holiness.[14.] In the dispersion of our people their real reason was lost. Thus the prohibitions regarding pollution as explained in the Bible had much less value outside of Palestine than the commands about pollution for priest and Nazirite by a human corpse; their effectiveness rising or sinking according to the degree of holiness involved. Strangers in Palestine,[15.] in case of pollution, because of the holy soil, were commanded to obey the laws to cleanse themselves, the same laws in effect for the Israelites. However, pollution itself was not forbidden to the stranger.[16.] It is probable that even though theocratic holiness (and with it the laws of cleanliness in general)

came into existence immediately after Sinai, the laws of bodily uncleanliness went into effect only after the nation had settled in Palestine, which act brought about more complete theocratic holiness. The process of settlement in Palestine was slow, and so the Pentateuch legislates that there was to be no pollution by eating of a torn animal or a carcass (נבל וטרפה לא יאכל לטמאה בה). But this law is restricted to the priests,[17] and concerns itself only with the sojourn in the desert. There is a similar instance in the case of Menoach's wife[18] where a woman is not permitted to drink wine or eat anything unclean, because she is pregnant with a Nazirite. We cannot speak of bodily uncleanliness outside of the period of the Temple, for, as the Kuzari[19] points out, the prohibitions for pollution apply only to the clean, not to the unclean (we cannot avoid touching a corpse sooner or later, and we all would thus be forever unclean, because cleansing by means of אפר חטאת is impossible outside of the Temple times.) For this reason Abraham ben David[20] denies the obligation of present day priests (כהנים) not to touch a human corpse. He states והכהנים בזה"ז טמאי מתים הם ואין עליהם חיוב טמא. Therefore, according to this, those dietary laws which are based on bodily pollution alone can no longer be of effect for us.

The Kuzari[21] states: נכון אסורה לנו הנבלה ולא מפני טומאתה אבל מצוה גרידא באיסור הנבלה וחנאי הטומאה תוספת: For rabbinic Judaism the dietary laws in question are thus independent of the commands regarding pollution because

1. Pollution (except at the time of the holidays) is not forbidden for either the Israelites or the priests (with the exception of pollution by a human body),
2. Merely touching or carrying a carcass (not the eating) is a טומאה בית הבריעה (unless there is a touching of the external bodily extremeties, or the carcass is carried with (in) the mouth; an exception is made only in regard to the carcass of a clean fowl), whereas in contrast to other polluting animals only eating, not carrying, produces uncleanness.) The Talmud, by "torn animals" understands also animals that have certain blemishes. Under those conditions the prohibition not to eat the torn or fallen animal means no more than a prohibition against bodily pollution -- for neither is this forbidden, nor is it brought about by eating of the unclean. But if we compare the talmudic principles (on which the binding force of the mentioned dietary laws rests solely) with the principles of the Bible, the untenability of the former becomes clear in that the pollution caused by carrying or touching unclean animals is forbidden for the Israelite, and eating of unclean animals pollutes in an even higher measure than the carrying or the touching of the same. Leviticus 11:8 states: "Do not touch their carcasses" (immediately after "you shall not eat of their meat"). No one can miss here the prohibition of pollution.[22] The Karaites even considered the touching of the unclean as a sin. Then why do the Rabbis permit the Israelites and the priests to pollute

themselves thus, despite the Biblical prohibition, except for the holidays? They say: "Pollution by a human corpse is forbidden by the Torah only to the sons of Aaron, not to other Israelites, even though a human corpse pollutes more than a carcass -- therefore all the less can pollution by the latter (a carcass) be forbidden."[23]. What an argument! that Holy Writ, in favor of such a sacred duty as the burial of a corpse[24]. -- which even the Rabbis stress among the most important laws -- should permit an exception, and that the Rabbis should bring proof from this that one also becomes unclean by touching a carcass!

The best refutation of the talmudic argument is to be found in Leviticus 5:12: "He who touches the carcass of an unclean animal ..... he is unclean, guilty." According to the Talmud he is guilty only if he partakes of sacred food during his period of uncleanliness, since pollution by itself is not sinful. According to this we must notice that the main motive (sinful action) is completely ignored, and it is unexplainable why the carcass of an unclean beast is mentioned, while that of a clean beast, which pollutes no less, is mentioned. It is also not explained why entering of the Sanctuary or eating of sacred food is forbidden to anyone who is unclean. Obviously the Bible here speaks only of the unpremeditated sin of pollution by touching the carcass of unclean animals[25]. in contrast to forbidden fish, fowl, and creeping animals where טומאה מגע is of no consequence. These animals, even if killed

by man, have a higher measure of uncleanliness than the carcasses of clean beasts, whose uncleanliness is limited merely to the torn and the fallen. A further distinction is that the carcasses of these (i.e. the unclean animals of Leviticus 11:24-38) may not be touched or carried, but the carcasses of clean animals may be touched or carried, even though there is pollution in both cases. For that reason also do we find only the prohibition against eating, not against carrying or touching of animals that are clean.[26] Similarly the second case in Leviticus 5:3 speaks of no other guilt than pollution by human uncleanliness,[27] although the Rabbis do not care to admit this. It is noteworthy that from the talmudic point טומאת גוי דאורייתא is not recognized, but it is represented.[28]

The Rabbis are also in conflict with the Bible as regards the fact that carrying and touching produces uncleanliness, but eating does not.[29] The Talmud has an excuse here also: Leviticus 11:40 merely determines the quality of the quantity of what pollutes by touching or carrying and that which is forbidden as food; the other two passages merely refer to the carcass of a clean bird. Eating of any other carcass, even though touching or carrying it pollutes, can as such not pollute -- but the carcass of a clean bird, the carrying or touching of which does not pollute, if eaten, does pollute. All this is deduced from the word בה in Leviticus 22:8!! It would be a mockery of all sound Biblical exegesis not to

recognize, that the eating of the unclean, (without carrying or touching it) does pollute. Even in cases in exact opposition to the talmudic view -- where all polluting power is removed from carrying and touching, as in the case of fishes, birds and certain creeping animals -- eating must pollute, since Leviticus 17:15, which speaks merely of pollution by eating, not by carrying or touching, obviously speaks of such cases. Such a burdening of eating as the closest unity with the unclean before all other factors of uncleanliness seemsto be justified in itself, and must be admitted by the Rabbis at least in regard to the carcass of a clean bird. If the eating of the unclean differentiates itself from the other two means of pollution by a more extended generative power for uncleanness, then it becomes obvious that the prohibition not to pollute oneself by eating appears as a general prohibition, extending to the carcasses of clean and unclean animals, no matter what species of animals may be involved, but the prohibition against pollution by touching or carrying is restricted to only certain species of animals. Once this argument has proved the references of the dietary laws as regards the unclean to be only in respect to the prohibition against pollution, then all further doubts against this view are removed by Leviticus 11:42-3, which states: "All creeping things .... not to be eaten, they are an abomination ..... You shall not make yourself unclean by them." This prohibition against

uncleanliness refers to all creeping animals; therefore it refers also to those that do not make unclean by their touch, and consequently it does not refer merely to eating. This then is evidently the basis of dietary prohibitions. It is true that Leviticus 18:30 states: ולא תטמאו בכל אלה, even though the laws mentioned there are purely religious ones; however there the expression טומאה, as the exegetes note correctly, means a psychical, ethical impurity, which is ascribed to sin everywhere, and which cannot be removed by any cleansing ablution. In this case, however, we are dealing with a physical, symbolical uncleanliness (by carrying, touching or eating) which according to the law can be removed by ablution, and from the Biblical viewpoint we can make no conclusion whatever of there being a psychical uncleanliness besides a physical one. Furthermore, Leviticus 18:26 forbids an ethical pollution to the stranger, but the prohibitions in our case never affect the stranger -- as a matter of fact he is formally excluded in regard to that which dies of itself. This proves that in the case of the dietary laws we may think of no pollution except a physical pollution, i.e. a ceremonial pollution, which is permitted to the less holy stranger, although he does have the obligation of cleansing himself -- which, however, in no way involves the prohibition against polluting oneself.[30] The talmudic view, according to which the Pentateuchal stranger is a גר צדק here and a גר תושב there,

needs no refutation. In addition it might be mentioned that there can here be no instance of a symbolical uncleanliness because according to Mosaism all creation, coming forth from the only God, is in itself good and clean. Were a religious instead of a ceremonial character to be ascribed to the dietary laws, this would signify a complete misunderstanding of the very essence of Mosaic legislation.

Only when the prohibition against eating unclean things has been traced to the command against bodily pollution can we explain why bee-honey, the product of שרץ עוף טמא is permitted.[31] It is of course possible that the Pentateuch speaks of "fruit-honey"[32] (nectar?).[33] From the rabbinic view, in which above mentioned dietary laws are considered as autonomous and completely independent of the laws of pollution, milk and eggs of unclean animals consequently are to be considered as forbidden for food. Permission to partake of bee-honey leads to the self-contradictory assertion[34] that honey merely passes through the body of the bee without absorbing any of the animal's products. On the other hand it is self-understood that if the partaking of the unclean is merely prohibited because of the bodily uncleanliness occasioned thereby, because all products formed in the body of the living animal are separated from it, can they after their separation therefrom be considered as a carcass as little as the living animal itself, and the milk and eggs (or honey) of such an animal cannot be considered as prohibited from the

Biblical viewpoint.

To this point the grounds for a reform of the dietary laws as regards unclean animals are the views of Dr. Einhorn. Not all of the other committee members were in accord therewith. Even the so obvious tracing of these laws to the prohibition of bodily pollution (already felt by the Talmud, and brought into harmony with its system only by the most obvious distortion of the spirit of Scripture),[35.] is admitted only by Holdheim. S. Adler objects: In his opinion of the process of logic in the Bible, it is unexplainable, why, if these dietary laws were merely to prohibit bodily pollution, the Bible does not simply prohibit all touching of unclean animals (in the carcass state). By this eating of the carcasses would automatically be prohibited, for eating certainly does not constitute a lesser pollution than touching or carrying, as the Talmud opines.

Vol. IV: 230-236.

These circumstances speak, as the Kuzari points out, for the independence of the dietary laws from the uncleanliness occasioned by them. This view is further strengthened by the fact that the Bible, already at Noah's time (when there was as yet no mention of physical, levitical uncleanliness) decreed a difference between clean and unclean animals; furthermore, the second Isaiah,[36.] who usually does not strive for mere external rituals, registered a strong reprimand against partaking of the unclean. His own view -- so Adler -- thus would be for the

independence of the Biblical dietary laws as regards the unclean, even though he would deem a declaration of opinion on this subject by the entire assembly appropriate. However, he feels that these commands are merely of a ceremonial nature, and thus, as all ceremonial laws, are to be suspended when they are hindering and difficult in life, as is usual in the case of soldiers in the service, in travelling, etc. Milk and eggs of forbidden animals must be regarded as permitted; not because the Bible, which speaks only of fruit-honey and not of bee-honey,[37] permits the same, but because Scripture merely speaks of the meat of certain animal species. Even the traditional rule of the Mishnah הי׳ואא מן הטמא טמא cannot be applied to the milk and eggs of unlean animals, but only to טמאה שילדה כמין בהמה טהורה. This concept of the Mishnah, however, far removed as it may be from the earlier Gemarists, must have been recognized by the later ones, for one of them seeks to base the prohibition not to eat the eggs of forbidden animals on a special (incidentally self-contradictory) deduction. Furthermore Maimonides admits that the partaking of milk and eggs of unclean animals does not incur the punishment of flagellation. It cannot be denied that the Mishnah does prohibit milk of unclean animals, but this must be understood as a rabbinic and not as a Biblical prohibition.

These arguments by Adler are now answered by Einhorn: As regards the question whether the dietary laws are to be regarded as autonomous or merely as an

attempt to forestall physical pollution: The evidence of Adler cannot weaken the views of the autonomy of the dietary laws, which rest on such secure grounds. Adler stated: If the dietary laws were based on a forbidden pollution incurred by partaking of such food, the Bible would be satisfied to state the prohibition of carrying or touching of unclean animals, and the prohibition of partaking of the same would be superfluous. But we have proved conclusively that eating pollutes even there where carrying or touching does not make unclean. Furthermore pollution by eating is forbidden also there, since in the case of the carcass of a clean animal pollution by touching or carrying is permitted. As regards the differentiation between the clean and the unclean in the time of Noah: This is to prove that animal uncleanliness is to be regarded as being not symbolically but physically defiling, since we cannot even think of a symbolical view in Noah's time (Adler did not indicate why he holds that opinion). If it is not physically defiling, then the defilement must consist of a psychical defiling quality for the eater, inherent to the animals nature. Following this line of reasoning, how, according to the Bible, could everything unclean in the time of Noah be eaten by man, and merely be regarded as unfit for sacrifical purposes, since this -- as claimed -- purely religious concept was already known and recognized at that time? Thus here, to the contrary, only the symbolical part of the animal impurity has been proved, which forbids the communion of the animal

with the sacred; that is to say at first only with God, later on, after the giving of the Law, also with Israel which was sanctified by God. Furthermore Adler, who on the one hand deems the pollution in consequence of partaking of unclean animals for more than bodily, is in striking contradiction to himself, and on the other hand admits merely the ceremonial character of the dietary laws, and thereby emasculates the proofs against Einhorn, which were taken from the Second[39]. Isaiah. Also, if the prohibition to partake of unclean animals is to be regarded as an autonomous prohibition, even though milk and eggs of such animals are to be regarded as permitted, then above named prohibition (to partake of unclean animals) is difficult to comprehend. Such permission of the older tradition can be vindicated even less, since the Baraitha pictures the milk of unclean animals as Biblically prohibited.[40].

Hirsch also declared himself against the opinion that the dietary laws, as regards uncleanliness, were based on the prohibition against physical pollution. His reasons are: Pollution is not forbidden at all -- the older and younger exegetes are mistaken if they take ובנבלתם לא תגעו as a strict prohibition. Scripture by this merely wishes to indicate that the animals pollute only in the carcass state, not while alive. Scripture thus -- according to this view -- negates two actions, the eating of the meat, and the touching of the carcass,

all in the same verse. Of these, one is to be regarded as strictly prohibited, the other not. Besides this, however, the above cited passage from Leviticus 5:2 alone already establishes the prohibition of pollution beyond doubt. The main objection of this committee member -- also of Holdheim (who admits that prohibition against pollution is the main reason for the dietary prohibitions) -- is that we do not have the right to lift the dietary restrictions on these grounds. He claims that only from the rabbinic viewpoint, where pollution per se is permitted, and only entails the prohibition of not entering the Temple and to partake of consecrated foods, the laws of cleanliness could have ceased at the time of the destruction of the Temple, simply because they had to cease. Holdheim stresses further that if the laws that fall in the orbit of the laws of cleanliness, which were not in direct connection with the Temple, did during the dispersal also disappear from usage, that also is only a consequence of the peculiar talmudic exegesis. If such exegesis is not recognized, and in the present instance pollution is regarded as being prohibited in itself, then all basis is lacking to declare this prohibition or any other laws of cleanliness outside of the Temple time as no longer binding. Such a declaration is only justified if Judaism on its present level of development is to be regarded as having left the symbolic view. In such a case the sus-

pension of the dietary laws, having only a ceremonial aspect, would need no further justification, especially if we cannot determine what religious thoughts are within them. We might then as well admit openly: The dietary laws, in regard to the unclean, are for us antiquated and thus, being empty symbols, have lost all significance, and therefore all obligations on our part have ceased. The objection by Holdheim in Geiger's Monatsschrift (August issue) does not convince Einhorn that his reasons are inadmissable, or that his arguments are superfluous. Let us disregard the following circumstances for a moment: A. In addition to uncleanliness by pollution through a human corpse, in which case the obligatory laws in regard to cleansing have become impossible after the destruction of the Temple, the laws of pollution as noted by the Kuzari cannot be applied any longer; B. That the laws of cleansing and especially the prohibitions against pollution had their lease on life in the theocratic constitution and had to disappear with it; C. That the prohibition against bodily pollution symbolized no other religious thought than that of the physical, i.e. the tribal sanctity of Israel[41]. in that the profane may not be kept in a state of uncleanliness,[42]. and the sacred is forbidden to be polluted.[43]. This religious thought is on the level of the sensual religious view which Israel as a special nation occupied, and which is in direct contradiction to the idea of a messianic kingdom in which all nations will be smelted to-

gether with only one Law. Even were we to disregard all these factors, the prohibitions against uncleanliness would already have to be discarded since this symbol no longer has any life in it, as we do not know by what quality the named animals achieve bodily pollution. The removal of a dead symbol, however, brings as much of an advantage to Judaism as the keeping of a live symbol which clearly expresses a religious thought. The dietary laws are dead symbols, and whatever their grounds may be, would not that alone be sufficient to remove all obligation as far as they are concerned? Because we are not dealing here with mere theory, but with practical reforms, it would not be advisable, yes, even dangerous, to give up very suddenly a Biblical law, because the people cannot grasp its full significance. We must recognize that the people still live largely in the sphere of legality. Nevertheless -- we need have no illusions -- they know how to distinguish as little between the dead and live limbs of the body of Judaism, and perhaps even less, than between its body and soul. Were we to abandon this law completely, it would be for them like declaring war formally on the Divine Will, it would seem to be a denial of all Biblical authority, and thus the only basis of our moral existence would be shaken most seriously. History, however, teaches us a homeopathic means, namely to replace one law by another law, thus lifting the people slowly over the sphere of

dead legalism, and assuring us of successful results. 'If we can prove that the dietary prohibitions are a reminder of a symbol dead for millenia, then the way is cleared for Reform, and the nerve of life is cut for the dietary laws within the very heart of Judaism, without Biblical authority suffering thereby. People will be satisfied that since the destruction of Jerusalem, which brought so many changes in Jewish religious life, was brought about by divine plan, these laws of cleanliness have de facto lost their existence, and therewith also the laws to eat what is unclean have lost the right to existence.

Vol. IV: 257-266.

The dietary laws in regard to animals that die by themselves or have been torn, no matter what their Biblical background is, should remain as they are. However, the later expansions thereof need a thorough reform, which should not be too difficult. Experience has shown us sufficiently that the carcasses of such animals, called טריפות, according to tradition can be consumed without any harm to health, whether the prohibition regarding that which has "fallen by itself" originally referred only to a morally ill animal, whose organic ills would sooner or later be fatal (כל שאין כמוה חיה), or whether such ruling came into being later on by an extension of the original ruling -- in either case these traditional rulings cannot of force for us, because they fill no religious need; they

even hurt religious feelings, unless they have already stifled these.

Just as little without foundation are the traditional rulings in regard to טרפות from the view that the tradition came into being simultaneously with the Written Law. Here there is so little seeking for the inner grounds of the religious regulations, that rabbinic Judaism will permit us to eat the flesh of a dying animal, while there are as many as seventy blemishes which will make an animal unfit for food without its having any sign of illness. This led even a Maimonides to say: "Blemishes ..... not mentioned by the ancients even if medicine regards them as fatal ..... still cannot be regarded as fatal ..... and thus cattle afflicted thereby do not fall in the category of the T'refah ..... ." For exactly from this point the obligation to observe a tradition must depend on A. the fact that it is not challenged, and B. its compatibility with the Written Law. These two checks however show the artificiality of the traditional rulings in question. If animals with certain blemishes were to be listed as unfit for consumption, without listing this prohibition under the category of a Biblical dietary law, then its genuineness could not be challenged from at least that side, because of its independence of the Bible. But if it appears as an interpretation of the Biblical concept of T'refah, we must question such interpretation. We need

not mention that Exodus 22:36[45]. deals merely with an animal torn by a wild beast, not with the traditional T'refah.

Tradition also is not in conformity with Leviticus 17:15,[46]. "A native ..... or stranger ..... becomes unclean by eating of a carcass or of what has been torn." As long as an animal is still alive it cannot make itself unclean, even if it has been hurt in a fashion mentioned among the seventy categories. If this animal is slaughtered ritually while hurt or wounded, then according to the Halachic view it is non-polluting שחיטה מטהרת טרפה מטומאה. If it is not ritually slaughtered, then it falls in the category of a carcass. Here there can be meant only an animal actually killed by a wild beast, unless we take refuge with the talmudic curiosum מי שיש במינו טרפה, in which the word טרפה is left hanging in the air. Furthermore there are differences of opinion even amongst the Rabbis, some forbidding what others permit in the name of tradition. From all this we might expect that even from the side where tradition is regarded as having been originated simultaneously to the Written Law, there will be no objection to lift those traditional regulations which are forced on the original Biblical T'refah laws, and hang heavily around the necks of Jews and Judaism, making the latter contemptible for some, frightful for others. Adler, desiring to harmonize tradition with the

present religious movement stated: The old tradition set up the general rule of כל שאין המוה חיה טרפה, and declared a fatally ill animal unfit for consumption according to the spirit, if not the letter of the Bible, because it raises an aversion, and does not agree with the ethical nature of man. The term טרפה is merely adopted as an antonym to נבלה, the Bible wishing to point out that a fatally ill animal, if normally slaughtered, is not fit for consumption, but is not polluting. The Mishnah sets up various categories of T'refoth. These we cannot regard as tradition, but we must rather accept them as explanations from the older schools, according to the degree of veterinary science then known. Thus, in discarding these rules, there is no question of theology or breaking traditions involved here, only a question of veterinary science. Adler's view then leads to the same results. Hirsch: The Bible, in forbidding carcasses and torn animals out of religious and not sanitary considerations, holds the view that the ecclesiastical sanctity of the people must be demonstrated by external symbols. For us this ecclesiastical sanctity exists only of ethical religious actions. However, Adler, Herzfeld, and Einhorn were opposed to Hirsch's view.

We also have no longer any obligations in regard to ritual slaughtering. The words שחט, זבח, which are used also in regard to slaughtering demons and

even human beings[47]. have certainly nothing to do with ritual slaughter. The following even speaks against the Biblical significance of the same. According to tradition, all that is not ritually slaughtered falls in the category of נבלה, except what has been wounded by men or wild beast, which is termed טרפה. Tradition sets up the principle: כל שנפסלה בשחיטה נבלה כל ששחיטתה כראוי ודבר אחר גרם לה ליפסל טרפה. Where this type of death of an animal is mentioned, the Torah only speaks of וכי ימות[48]. -- i.e. a natural death. Exodus 21:28 states: "An ox that gores ..... is to be stoned ..... not to be eaten." This intends clearly that an ox that has not gored a human being may be eaten, for were we to accept the very forced talmudic dictum שאם שחטו לאחר שנגמר דינו אסור באכילה, then the Biblical verse would have to read: "..... its meat is not to be eaten, but it has to be stoned." A bird brought as a sin or burnt offering to the priest had its neck broken. According to the Halachic view that ritual slaughter was necessary according to divine command for birds, a carcass was brought as a sacrifice, and was permitted to be eaten by the priest. This is an impossible supposition, for it would be incomprehensible to have everything in connection with the Temple kept exceedingly pure, and then bring a polluting carcass for a sacrifice. The Rabbis think they have a Biblical support for the

traditional procedure in Deuteronomy 12:21 -- however the context shows here beyond a doubt that the words כאשר צויתיך have reference to a previous prohibition (v.13) against sacrificing outside of Jerusalem, and that only slaughtering for a profane usage is permitted outside of Jerusalem.

Another point leads us to doubt the validity of the laws here involved: There is a difference of opinion among the Talmudists whether ritual slaughter for a fowl is Biblical or not; furthermore, whether ritual slaughter was or was not commanded during the sojourn in the desert. This latter point is especially important, because we may well doubt our obligation to laws that came into effect only with the settlement in Palestine, and not immediately after the giving of the Law at Sinai. In this respect the Talmud raises the question בתחילה הותר להם בשר נחירה משנכנס לארץ נאסר להם בשר נחירה ועכשיו שגלו יכול יחגר להחירו הראשון -- which argument is only refuted by calling upon the authority of the Mishnah.

Without doubt then ritual slaughter owes its origin to that humanitarianism which Judaism commands in regard to the treatment of animals.[49] Therefore this seemingly easiest type of death is chosen. Even the Cutheans, who usually did not care for tradition, adopted this practice. In this respect we would recommend the keeping of this custom, but we must guard

that it be not caricatured and that it work no undue hardships on men as has been the case with Jewish travelers. Adler admits that ritual slaughter, because it is a ceremonial act, may, like all ceremonial acts be omitted in urgent cases, but in all other cases he claims tradition to be in the right, and that we are therefore obliged to retain it. He believes that ritual slaughter has developed from the Biblical prohibitions against T'refah. He sees no difference whether an animal is slain by man or a wild beast. — If it is slain by man then the meat should be even more forbidden, because a transgression has taken place by the hand of man, and we cannot contradict this by saying that the teachers of the Mishnah name an abnormally slaughtered animala נבלה, not a טרפה. Such expressions cannot be a gauge for the origin of a tradition, because in the terminology of the scholarship of those days they have become terms for concepts which the Bible does not even know -- e.g. נבלה as a polluting substance, טרפה that which may not be eaten but does not pollute. The formula of the school כל שנפסלה בשחיטה נבלה only means that the non-ritually slaughtered is equal to the Biblical טרפה. We might even go further without being too daring and assume that ritual slaughter was already a pre-Sinaitic rite.[50] In regard to the stoned ox the prohibition ולא יאכל את בשרו means that Scripture prohibits

his meat not only for man (for whom this meat is forbidden anyway) but, in contrast to the usual טרפה, prohibits its eating even by dogs, for otherwise the words of the verse would reach ולא תאכלו. As regards מליקה עוף, this finally proves that it was not necessary to apply ritual slaughter to fowl. Adler agrees with this, but claims that ritual slaughter must be retained for cattle and game. We must also stress the fact that the Mishnah does not know בדיקה הסכין, and that it does not take as פסול what later was known as פגימה, in that it only condemns the toothed scythe and the saw as unfit for slaughtering.[51].

Vol. IV: 291-295.

Based on this, the Gemara states,[52]. had the Palestinian scholars asked a question, they would have received the categorical answer that all kinds of notches do not make a knife unfit for slaughter, as long as the same was not made to be like a saw. In this respect then slaughterers have no further rules to obey then the five laws of שחיטה already mentioned in the Mishnah, which rest on purely humane, rational grounds. In that the Mishnah pictures traditional slaughtering as a result of the development of the Biblical טרפה. This view, at least in the beginning, hardly admits as does Maimonides, that the Bible by T'refah understands only that which has been torn by wild beasts, but

does not in any manner forbid that which has been ritually slaughtered. This tradition, obviously beyond the Biblical scope, is justified, and thus made obligatory, in that the Mishnah claims that it cannot see any difference in killing an animal by the hand of man or by beasts. Supposing that no such difference could be discerned -- then what does tradition (incongruous as it is to the word of Scripture) give us that is better or more comprehensible? What is the difference then in such a case where or by what instrument the killing stroke is delivered? If we desired to trace all these traditional laws exclusively to a humane handling of animals (which is not possible), then these laws could be reckoned as nothing less than a natural development of the Biblical commandment of טרפה, which positively cannot have such a basis. Since similar claims are made for the laws of טרפה, then in this case the old tradition is to be regarded merely as a general rule, according to which an animal must be granted the lightest possible type of slaughter. The Mishnaic laws can then be regarded only as an explanation of tradition, commensurate only to the opinions of that time, which must be subordinated to the knowledge of that era, so that slaughtering no longer can be decided by theology but only by the science of physics. Later on, during the beginning of ritual slaughter, these laws were challenged as a development from the Biblical טרפה prohibitions, and

were admitted as being post-Biblical institutions, but then there is an attempt to make ritual slaughter a pre-Sinaitic custom by reference to the law that the first born of the ass must have its neck broken, whcih is to say: Such a firstborn is not -- according to custom -- to be slaughtered and eaten, but it is to be killed in a non-ritual manner, and is not to be consumed. In this (somewhat strange) proof it is overlooked that the law in question is merely a reference restricted to the sojourn in Palestine, commanded for the post-Sinaitic period, and the meat of an ass would not be fit for consumption even by ritual slaughter. לא יאכל in regard to the stoned ox merely is a prohibition that one might not give the meat to a dog, a view fitted for talmudic exegesis, but hardly for us. As regards מליקת עוף, which puts the post-Sinaitic origin of ritual slaughter beyond any doubt, it is merely, so they claim, an exception because of the lesser life of a fowl. But they do not state to what degree ritual slaughter is to be based "the amount of life" present in a given animal, a matter which can hardly be determined. If this rests on a humane attitude, as it certainly did originally, then we could only speak of the amount of pain involved in slaughtering, but hardly of the amount of life. The fact that no rule is given for the killing of a fish is due to the fact that a fish is considered as dead as soon as it leaves the

water. The difference between the killing of an animal by man or beast can well be understood. The animal kills by instinct, a blind necessity to kill[53]. which is put on the same level as a natural death, since this is provided for by nature (בידי שמים). Killing an animal by the hand of man, however, is an act of free will, since the animal is destined for death by the man's desire to partake of its meat.

In regard to the prohibition not to eat the sinew of the thigh-vein,[54]. this is listed by Scripture as a custom, not as a religious law. The verse contains the words "..... unto this day," expressing clearly that this is not a law, but a custom. Even if Scripture really expresses a law here, as the Talmud thinks, this would put no obligation on us, being a pre-Sinaitic law, and not being included in the Sinaitic legislation.[55]. The Rabbis claim that the law of the sinew is really from Sinai, and is only transferred to its place in Genesis because of its connection with the events related there. This assumption[56]. is based on the obviously false premise of Genesis 45:21; 46:5, that Jacob's descendants were called sons of Jacob, before Sinai, and after the revelation were called sons (children) of Israel. Maimonides at least indirectly recognizes the Sinaitic character of this law by the recognition of the Halachah that stems from this command.[57]. However, weaving back

and forth between Biblical and rabbinic Judaism,[58] he connects this law with the evening prayers, as ordered by Jacob himself, in which case the expression ויעקב הוסיף -- in contrast to נצטוה -- proves, that we cannot think here of a divine command, just as little as we can do so in the ordering of the three daily prayers.

Vol. IV: 339-342.

Thus the prohibition of not eating the thigh sinew is nothing but a custom, which, if Jacob really originated it, is much less obligatory for us than the תפלת ערבית, which he supposedly also introduced, and which the Halachah recognizes as a רשות. There is no command involved here, just as there was not when Jacob's name was henceforth to be called Israel,[59] which command was made in the name of God, and can thus lay more claim to being a divine command than the law of the sinew. Hirsch objects to this: Beginning with the premise that the sinew incident developed into a custom and not a law -- just the spraining of a sinew would not have been significant enough to remember that incident by a custom. The people must have seen something significant in this event, and consequently this custom is a religious, and not a historical one. Such a religious custom is on the same level as an actual law, for what life recognizes as a Biblical religious custom, that is religious law. We could only abrogate this custom on the basis that it no

longer fulfills any function, being a memorial for an event that has become so dark for us as to leave the present time with no religious gain thereby. If this incident portrays Israel's battle and victory in the world, this sign is very inept -- and furthermore Orthodoxy does not recognize the symbol as such. In addition this idea needs no symbol to present itself.

Einhorn: Hirsch thus takes a non-religious custom, makes of it a religious custom, and then changes it once more to a non-religious custom. Not the spraining of the sinew is the main event here, but the saving of the life of the family's head. We need not wonder that the saving of Jacob's life became an event celebrated for many generations, but there certainly was no thought there of eternalizing the custom. A custom is not made at all, it simply grows naturally from circumstances and lives as long as it can. Neither could this event have been religious in character originally, for then it would have had to become a law -- and the changing of Jacob's name, which took place on the same grounds, could not have ceased so soon to be counted merely as a custom.

Vol. IV: 361-364.

In regard to cooking meat and milk together, the Bible defines its law quite clearly. The basis of the law may well be according to Maimonides a heathen custom, or according to Philo and Samuel ben Meir an in-

humane action, i.e. the cooking of an animal in the milk of its mother, which we would not tolerate. Even the Talmud can bring no further Biblical proof to stretch the idea, but since it accounts this fact as a Halachah, it must take recourse to unbelievable syllogisms to justify this.[60] The laws were probably extended only to prevent a possible interchange of the mother's milk with that of another animal, for which reason the law applies only to mammals, and even then, apparently, originally only for the same animal or those closely related.[61] The Rabbis, however, do permit the boiling of the meat of fowl with milk, which was a dish in several places, or to eat meat and milk together if cooked separately.[62] Thus even the Talmud lacks a Biblical basis for all the facts of the command. In brief, we should battle this rabbinical rigor, and return to the Biblical spirit, so that the only thing forbidden remains an animal boiled in its mother's milk. Adler objects, he feels that only that should be permitted which is Biblically permitted from the talmudic viewpoint, i.e. fowl cooked in milk, or meat and milk cooked separately. Reasons for this were not given.

Leviticus 3:17; 7:22-6 states that fat is the Lord's and not to be used for eating. Ibn Ezra states that this refers only to the fat of a sacrificial animal; the chief proof for that is מן הבהמה אשר יקריב ממנה אשה לד'.

Rabbinic Judaism, however, (which, by the way, also forbids non-holy fat), designates only that animal species whose fat is expressly forbidden, so that Scripture here does not speak of an actual sacrifice, but an animal that is fit for sacrifice, thus excluding merely the fat of a wild beast. Even the Rabbis see the weakness of their argument, and so base their opinion merely on the words כי כל and בכל מושבותיכם.[63] The extension of this prohibition to all communities in Palestine does not prove anything against Ibn Ezra's view, because long before the time of the Temple sacrifices were offered there on the hilltop, and the Talmud[64] takes in this sense above mentioned facts (that all animals whose fat is forbidden fall in this category). More important is the proof cited by Nachmanides -- if Scripture (according to Ibn Ezra) regards said fat not as fat per se, but rather as a carcass -- then why the prohibition at all? But closer inspection will lead us to recognize that there is a necessity to prohibit fat as a carcass or as something torn. The prohibition to eat of a carcass or something torn is connected by Scripture with Israel's sanctity. The reason for this prohibition is that the animal nature in man, by a desire to destroy, can drag us down to a position unworthy of an Israelite. Close to this lay the thought that fat, the best part of an animal, even in its departed stage, cannot sink so low

as to injure Israelitic holiness by being utilized as food. The same reason that makes this fat fit for sacrifice also cannot make it unfit for food. To oppose this, the fat had to be prohibited as food. Ibn Ezra takes v. 24 as a gloss, believing that v. 25 refers back to v. 23.[65].

Vol. V: 33-37.

Besides the fact that the Bible closely connects the prohibition regarding the fat with the sacrificial cult, the following also is opposed to the rabbinic view. It is difficult enough to comprehend how fat can be used for sacrifices, since it is forbidden as food -- a difficulty already sensed by the Gemara. It is even more difficult, from the talmudic viewpoint, to understand the difference which is made in the legal stipulations in regard to the use of fat for the purpose of work between A. The fat of an animal that died a natural death and B. An animal that has been killed by a man, unless we have recourse to Ukzin 3:9, where the fat of a carcass is pictured as being non-polluting. Targum Jonathan ben Uziel, agreeing with Ibn Ezra, explains this very simply: Only the fat of a carcass or a torn animal can be used for work, but not the fat of the sacrificial animal which belongs to God.

Supposing that the fat of animals that are (fit for but) not being sacrificed was prohibited by Biblical decree -- then the prohibition, because it is related to

the sacrificial cult, could be of force only during the time of the Temple, not for the present time. Fat at that time was not eaten because Mosaism[66]. permitted the eating of meat of animals fit for sacrifice only when they were brought as peace offerings. Consequently later on when the eating of meat had to be permitted away from the Sanctuary because of the distance involved, the fat was simply not eaten. What belonged to God, if it could not be sacrificed, at least was not used for food by man. This reason of course is no longer valid for us, especially after the pronouncement of the second Rabbinical Assembly in regard to a reconstruction of the sacrificial cult. S. Adler: The limitations of the prohibition against fat in regard to sacrifices was not clear enough to give it practical consequences. Ibn Ezra's arguments strongly speak for such limitations, Nachmani's against them. Even the connection between this prohibition and the sacrificial cult is conjecture, and not clearly proved. Life also does not press for such reforms, since the prohibition to eat certain veins and skins and the custom of porging[67]. have neither a Biblical nor a traditional basis, but are merely rabbinical additions, for the preservance of which there is no reason. For this reason, he thinks, it would be better to leave this question go temporarily.

Leviticus 17:3 and Deuteronomy 12:23 command

that blood be not eaten. The passage of Leviticus connects this with atonement. That is because the blood mentioned there is destined for the altar. Taking that away then would incur a double sin and penalty. In regard to animals that are not being sacrificed, the blood is mentioned as the soul, the seat of life, and as such is forbidden for consumption. This has nothing to do with the sacrificial cult. Leviticus 17:4 portrays the shedding of animal blood almost as a blood-guilt, as murder, except it be for higher purposes. All through Mosaism the use of animals for food is tolerated more than permitted. Originally man lived on vegetables alone; only after the deluge were animals permitted for food.[68]. If the divine Law merely makes a concession in the regard of eating meat, then it is only natural that blood, in which the very life lies, be prohibited. Man must know that the right to destroy a life created by God is merely an unsurped right. Therefore he must abstain from this blood, even, as a witness to his shame, bury it, as he must do with other lowly necessities.[69].

It is understood that only the דם קילוח דם שהנפש יוצאת בו (that which runs off) cannot be eaten according to the letter or the spirit of the Law. It does not refer to the blood that remains in the meat or limbs, דם האיברים. That expansion is talmudic, but

the Talmud did free the eating of דם האיברים of the Kareth punishment. It also restricted the non-eating of the blood to cases where the blood has left its original place, so that raw meat may be eaten, even without salting. Scripture only speaks of letting the blood run freely from the meat before the latter is consumed, it does not speak of an artificial removal therefrom.[70] Furthermore eating of unsalted meat from the talmudic view, according to very important authorities, is merely prohibited rabbinically, since blood (boiled, i.e. in the meat) is not fit for sacrificing, and does not fall under the forbidden categories.[71]

Hirsch: Salting and porging are no longer necessary. The prohibitions against the eating of blood can be no obligation for us. The Bible says blood is the seat of life, but this view is gone, blood for us is no longer the seat of life. And even if this were so, this would apply only to raw, never to cooked or disintegrated blood. It cannot be discerned, however, on what basis the Biblical view, that blood is the seat of life, is antiquated today.

Vol. V: 97-100.

In regard to cooking utensils, in which forbidden foods were cooked, there are no prohibitions in Scripture. Leviticus 6:21 refers only to the desecration of holy vessels by profane usage and their cleansing or disposal.[72]

Numbers 31:23 speaks only about the vessels of the Midianites that have become unclean by contact with a human corpse, where, because of the stronger degree of uncleanliness, a purification by fire instead of the usual washing is to be used. This is only to lift the pollution that comes already by touching these vessels, but not for the sake of removing particles that these vessels might have absorbed. The connection with the previous, and the prescribed cleansing במי נדה, identical with the sprinkling of Numbers 19, prove that the passage of Numbers 31:23 speaks of the cleansing of such vessels that were polluted by contact with a human corpse. (The Talmud, incidentally, deducts the prohibition to use vessels in which forbidden foods were cooked from the passage Numbers 31:23). When the Gemara[73] declares that מים שהנדה טובלת בהן, this can hardly be taken seriously. All Bible commentators, even Rashi, find it incompatible with a correct exegesis. An object polluted by a corpse besides a sprinkling (הזאה) also must undergo a special cleansing טבילה.[74] This is to be done by fire if the object can withstand fire אשר יבוא באש, and those that cannot withstand fire אשר לא יבוא באש shall be cleansed by washing. Nothing here even remotely suggests that the objects of this discussion would be eating or cooking utensils. The Rabbis, who understood Numbers 31:23 to mean the removal of absorbed food particles, twist the

meaning of Scripture so far as to understand by "All that does not enter the fire" utensils that are used to preserve or prepare cold foods. However, the Talmud does have a correct interpretation[75] where the chief reason from their view is to be found, namely טעם כעיקר לאו דאורייתא, and where so little notice is taken of the Biblical commands regarding the Midianitic vessels.

Adler: Not only the Bible, but also the older tradition, which is the only true views for him, know nothing of a prohibition in regard to utensils in which or wherewith forbidden foods have been prepared, although they are cognizant of the fact that a taste is given off to a vessel by foods previously prepared therein, which mixes with foods cooked in them later on, even though the Rabbis take טעם כעיקר as forbidden. This is because the latter rule is in force only where the טעם passes indirectly, i.e. by the medium of the vessel's walls, from the forbidden foods to the permitted foods. Only if an אסור הנאה was cooked in such utensils did the Mishnah not permit the use of these for permitted foods, for then the taste of the forbidden could be discerned in the permitted, even as the Mishnah forbids the usage of utensils for cooking food in which food has been cooked for an idolatrous orgy.[76]

As far as the mixing of forbidden and permitted food is concerned, we should abandon the principle

חד בחרי בטיל as well as the talmudic juridical considerations between liquids and solids, equal and unequal foods, etc. We do know, however, that when Scripture forbids certain foods, these are forbidden only as the substance of food, but not if a particle thereof is mixed perchance with a permitted food. Even though limited by the Talmud, and mostly made unusable for practical life, these following principles should be applied here: דכב שאין מכרסן מוחר and כל איסורין שבחורה אין לוקין עליהן אלא כדרך אכילתו . Even the Rabbis disagreed whether a food substance had to be of a certain quantity to count as food, and can thus be permitted or forbidden.[78]

The dietary laws for Pesach were assigned to another committee, and thus were ignored here. As regards the purely rabbinic dietary prohibitions גבינות של נכרי, סתם יינם פת של נכרי חלב שחלבי נכרי, these have practically disappeared from the modern Jewish people, for those laws rest on totally unfounded fears, and also aim for the social separation of the Jews. Their discontinuance needs no further motivation, and a simple pronouncement by the Rabbinical Assembly should suffice.

This commission has finished its task, and requests that decisions be made by the entire assembly in accordance with the principles contained in the report.

APPENDIX E.

The Mosaic Principle of Uncleanliness.

Sinai, Volume V : 129 - 133.

The Mosaic Principle of Uncleanliness.

Vol. V: 129-133.

The dietary laws are closely connected with the so-called Levitical uncleanliness, which had already lost much of its significance during the talmudic age; for us, all of it is lost. This view is shared by Geiger and Holdheim.[79] Rightfully it was claimed there that the analysis of the dietary laws was not complete until the concept of Levitical uncleanliness had also been explored.

Everything is unclean for Mosaism in which the animal vitality appears to have been destroyed centrally (i.e. not locally), and that which leads to a degeneration of the divine creative powers. Thus menstruation leads to a lessening of the Nephesh (כי הדם הוא הנפש); the emanation of the life-giving masculine seed; the status of leprosy; according to oriental conception death,[80] a corpse or a carcass -- they all are unclean, because they give false testimony to God's creative omnipotence, being contrary to the Mosaic principle וירא אלהים את כל אשר עשה והנה טוב מאד . The Mosaic principle does not conceive of the sinful as unclean, but only that which, because of its animal condition, can lead to sin. For that reason the unclean is polluting. Contact with the same is to be avoided according to the degree of its uncleanliness, which in -

creases with the measure of lost vitality and the value of the loss. A corpse defiles for a period of seven days, a carcass only until sundown. The periods of uncleanliness for the bearers thereof are as follows: In the case of sexual relations or a simple pollution one day; for a menstruating woman, an individual afflicted with leprosy or a man afflicted with a diseased flow of seed, seven days. The methods of purification range widely -- for the medium clean person plain water suffices, for defilement by a corpse several things besides water may be involved, as for example sacrifices and a sin offering. The latter especially has occupied Talmudists and Biblical commentators a great deal, but is quite clear in our exposition. For if the principle of uncleanliness is the awakening of degenerating concepts in regard to God's creative powers, then the purpose of the Lawgiver can be no other but to lift the status of pollution by an appropriate equivalent (Einhorn probably means antidote). The factors in this process of purification contain two means: A. The mixed or unmixed water, B. A period of waiting. These two factors are easily comprehended: Water is the original element of creation, and thus eo ipso the symbol of divine creativity. As regards the number seven, it is sacred everywhere, it is the number of world creation, i.e. the perfection of the work of creation.

The positive proof for this thesis is Deuteronomy

21:23 "..... he that is hanged is a reproach unto God, that thou defile not thy land .....", to which passage Rashi declares: זלזולו של מלך הוא שאדם עשוי בדמות דיוקנו וישראל הם בניו.

We need hardly mention why this principle is not applied to animals killed by man for the purpose of food, for no natural death is involved. Man simply thanks God for the power He has given him, and for the manner in which He has provided for His creatures. The principle of uncleanliness in regard to unclean animals[81.] is extended further: The following creatures are included:

A. Any creature that repels by reason of its unpleasant appearance or by dangerous qualities;

B. Any creature whose physical features appear incomplete, and brings to mind the idea that the Creator has left His work incomplete.

In brief, it includes animals that can lead to a קללת אלהים. We must follow the Mosaic trend of thought to understand this principle completely: The ideas are very lofty, yet simultaneously very primitive, in that everything is brought into direct connection with God. Similarly the Law fought heathen polytheism, which created its gods according to changing impressions of appearances on the human mind.

Bohlen[82.] attempts to connect the Biblically unclean animals with the creatures of Ahriman. Such an opinion hardly needs a contradiction. It is poor critical

methodology to take single apparitions from Mosaism out of their context, and to give them a spirit of completely external matters, when that spirit is negated completely by the context. Mosaism must be regarded as an entity; it has the creative and truly divine power to take even heathen customs and impregnate them with a spirit completely hostile to their previous environments. Such is the case with circumcision, the sacrificial cult, the Cherubim, and many other institutions. The form is merely the hull, only the spirit is important, bringing the matter to life. We find this best illustrated by the two unclean animals, the eagle and the lion, which bear the throne of God in the vision of Ezekiel.

[illegible]

opinion [illegible]

N O T E S.

to

PART II, SECTION A, CHAPTER 4.

Notes.

1) There may be some confusion about the "third" and "fourth" assembly. The report was written for the fourth assembly, but the committee was empowered by the third assembly.

2) Israelit des XIX. Jahrh., 1847.

3) This new edition has some minor additions.

4) Sinai, Vol. IV, p. 193.

5) Ibid., p. 195.

6) Ibid., pp. 234-235.

7) Ibid., p. 235.

8) Ibid., pp. 235-236.

9) Ibid., p. 265

10) Ibid., pp. 292-295.

11) Genesis, 32:33.

12) Sinai, Vol. IV, pp. 294-295.

13) Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 132.

14) Cp. Kuzari III:46.

15) Cf. Ibn Ezra to Numbers 19:10.

16) Cf. Deuteronomy 14:21, which states that a stranger may eat of the unclean.

17) Cf. Leviticus 22:8.

18) Judges 13:4.

19) Cf. Otsar Nechmad to loc. cit.

20) To Maimonides Neziroth 5:15.

21) Kuzari, loc. cit.

22) Cf. Ibn Ezra to loc. cit.: הנוגע בזדון יש עליו מלקות כי עבר על ליית.

23) Rosh Hashonoh 16b.

24) Cf. Leviticus 21.

25) As listed in Leviticus 11:24-38.

26) Cf. Exodus 22:30; Leviticus 22:8; Deuteronomy 14:21.

27) Prohibited in Leviticus 15:31.

28) Cf. Yoma 80b; cp. Rashi to Chullin 35a.

29) Cp. Leviticus 11:40; 17:15; 22:8.

30) Leviticus 17:15.

31) Cf. Judges 14:8; I Samuel 14:26.

32) Cp. Mishn. Lamm. to Maim. Issure Misbeach 5:1.

33) This can apply only in the case of I Samuel, for in the passage from Judges bees are specifically mentioned.

34) Bechoroth 7b.

35) Cp. Meilah 16b פתח הכתוב באכילה וסיים בטומאה.

36) 66:17 (we know now that this is Trito-Isaiah).

37) Cf. note 19.

38) Bechoroth 1:2.

39) Cf. note 22.

40) Cp. Keritoth 22a; Kethuboth 60a.

41) Cp. Leviticus 11:44; 20:26.

42) Leviticus 11:32-6; 17:15.

43) Leviticus 22:3.

44) Cf. Maimonides in his foreword to his Mishnah commentary.

45) Cf. Maimonides' interpretation of this verse. He states that an animal mortally hurt by an unknown cause is forbidden as food, since we cannot determine whether its wound was natural or inflicted by an extraneous agent.

46) Also Ibid. 22:8.

47) Genesis 22:10; Leviticus 17:7; Deuteronomy 32:17; I Kings 13:2; and 18:40.

48) Leviticus 11:39.

49) Maimonides Moreh Nevuchim III: 26, 48.

50) Cf. Exodus 13:13 ואם לא תפדה וערפתו which assumes that only the normally slaughtered is fit for food, but not that which had its neck broken or was killed in another fashion.

51) Cf. Chullin 1:2.

52) Ibid. 17a.

53) Not always!! In most cases hunger drives to killing, blood thirst is the exception rather than the rule!

54) Genesis 32:33.

55) Cf. Maimonides in his Mishnah commentary to Chullin 100a.

56) Chullin 101b.

57) Cf. Machaloth Asuroth 8:8.

58) Melachim 9:1.

59) Genesis 35:10.

60) Chullin 144a.

61) Cp. Ibid. הרי אצמה בחלבה.

62) Pesachim 44b and Maimonides Machaloth Asuroth 9:1-4.

63) Cf. Pesachim 43b and Kiddushin 37b.

64) Zebachim 3a.

65) Cp. also Rashi to Chullin 37a.

66) Cp. Leviticus 17, Moreh 46.

67) Cp. Chullin 92b.

68) Cf. Genesis 1:29; 9:3.

69) Deuteronomy 23:14, 15.

70) Cf. Leviticus 17:13.

71) Cf. Menachoth 21a and Tosafot to Chullin 109a.

72) Cp. Targum Jonathan to loc. cit.

73) Aboda Zarah 75b.

74) Cf. Numbers 19:19.

75) Cp. Sabbath 58b, and Sanhedrin 39, and Rashi Ibid.

76) Cf. Aboda Zarah 75b and Zebachim 11:8.

77) Sabbath 133a and Pesachim 24b.

78) Cp. Yoma 74a חצי שיעור מותר מן התורה אכילה אמר רחמנא וליכא.

79) Cf. Geiger's Wissensch. Zeitsch. VI., H. II.

80) Numbers 12:12.

81) Cf. Leviticus 2.

82) Genesis, p. 88.

P A R T II.

SECTION A -- JEWISH THEOLOGY.

Chapter 5.

Freedom of Will.

Freedom of Will

After having examined some of Einhorn's negative views on theology and ritual, that is to say old dogmas and rites which he wished to abolish, let us now turn to a more positive aspect of his theology. We have already mentioned[1] that he had attempted to write a systematized theology, Das Prinzip des Mosaismus, the first volume of which was published in Germany. In the Sinai of 1861 he published an article on the Nature and the Extent of Human Freedom of Will, which would have been a chapter of the second volume had it been published.

We might incidentally state something extremely remarkable about Einhorn. Whatever he wrote of a strictly scientific nature has not been surpassed to this date. Usually a pioneer will lay the foundation and his successors will erect an edifice upon it. Not so Einhorn. Not only was he the first to plow great areas of virgin soil, he also implanted seeds in it and watched the plants grow to majestic heights. This holds true of his exposition of circumcision rites and his analysis of the dietary laws, as well as of the article with which we are about to deal. Later theological writers or scholars who presented their findings to scientific assemblies could in essence add only very little to what he had already stated. Unfortunately his findings were written in German, and quite cumbersome German besides.

Rather than translate his works, these later writers simply paraphrased what he had already written, and we cannot but add a gentle rebuke to these later scholars that they did not make more acknowledgment to him than they have. At best we find Einhorn's name only mentioned in an occasional footnote, and then only on some relatively insignificant point.

But let us get on with the issue before us. Einhorn begins by stating that freedom is an integral part of Mosaism. Then he asks: What is freedom of will? "Freedom is not limited to the desire to do something or not to do it, but it includes the further possibility of doing something actually in either a positive or a negative manner."[2]. Therefore, he feels, desire must be considered as well as action. As for the latter he recognizes that both positive and negative actions are on occasion forced, so that their execution or abstention therefrom may lie beyond the power of man.

Unforced execution of a deed rests on man's will power. It "..... is that faculty, peculiar to man, which enables him to decide on an internal or external act or intention. This is to be distinguished from the faculties of desiring and coveting, which belong to animals also. The one has its seat in the mind, the other in the נפש, i.e. the animal power of life. The will is the product of the first faculty, the decision itself is satisfied with inner action without outward manifestations ...."[3].

Einhorn then proceeds to explain that while man cannot control forcing circumstances, he can set his will against them, for the will is the result of a free choice which cannot be forced. Force, however, is always opposed to man's will, but man can never be forced to do what he desires to do. Einhorn writes that for this reason "The accountability for an act does not rest on the absolute freedom not to commit it, but solely on the absolute freedom not to desire it."[4].

Einhorn then points out that certain matters are predetermined for man, but these are morally indifferent actions. Man may think that he is making a decision according to his own desire, but that is only an illusion, for his choice was in reality pre-ordained by God. He modifies this statement later: "God knows each individual's free choice ..... beforehand, and merely adds a certain stipulation to this decision, which stipulation is no more forcing than a punishment for a crime forces the committing of the crime."[5].

* * * * *

This chapter concludes all that the Sinai contains on Jewish theology. Further studies of Einhorn's endeavors in this field contained elsewhere must be left to the future. Let us now analyze Einhorn's concept of what the Jewish liturgy should contain, and then conclude this section with a study of his ideas in comparative theology and practical theology.

APPENDIX F.

The Nature and the Extent of Human Freedom of Will.

Sinai, Volume VI : 334 - 339.
VI : 359 - 371.

The Nature and the Extent of Human Freedom of Will.

Vol. VI: 334-339.

Free Will is regarded as the cornerstone of Mosaism already by Maimonides, Yehudah Halevi and others. Besides the fact that Scripture already mentions the capacity of man to overcome sin, and the fact that man has the power to choose between life and death, good and evil, this capacity is a premise for all Mosaic Law, for without it man can take no responsibility for his actions, so that we cannot speak of commands and prohibitions, reward and punishment without it. Heathen religions also teach of human freedom of will, but this is restricted in a moral sense by the doctrine of innate sin. Mosaism, however, gives man unlimited freedom of choice. The question which we wish to discuss here is: What is freedom of will? Freedom is not limited to the desire to do something or not to do it, but it includes the further possibility of doing something actually in either a positive or a negative manner. Thus action and desire towards action are to be considered. But does man have the power always to execute his good or bad will? Experience teaches us that even with the best intention execution of a desire is at times impossible, and that both negative and positive acts can on occasion be forced. This difficulty is usually circumvented by the statement that we are free within the bounds of human possibility.

Albo[6] states: "... human acts are partially free choice (בחירה) and partially necessity (הכרח). To the first category belong those actions which fall into the sphere of possibility, i.e. they can be done or not done; they give full room to human deliberation and effort, they bring praise or censure and belong in the sphere of commands and prohibitions, bringing reward and punishment .....; to the latter class belong those which fall in the sphere of necessity, and are predetermined by external influences or by divine providence. In regard to the latter, human power is of no avail and man's striving is fruitless, for they are not subject to man's free choice." At closer inspection this explanation is not sufficient. Once it is certain that man in many instances does not act out of free choice, but out of necessity, then the partial capacity of free action can determine the responsibility only if we can say of a certain act that it was the result of free will and not done out of necessity. This can be determined only by an unmistakable sign of the moral quality of the act in question -- not only for the person who commits the action, but also for others for whom God is Judge. But what is this sign? How can man ascertain whether an act could or could not have been accomplished, whether it falls in the realm of possibility or necessity? We might say: The fact that God commands or forbids an act puts it in

the realm of free will. But this is contradicted by the fact that it is never fully within the power of man to execute or to abstain from a divine command or prohibition as an external act, for all acts of man are partially out of necessity. Without a decision of this question all human acts lose their moral character, and all Mosaic legalism becomes unclear. To reach a decision, we must also answer the following questions: How and in what respects can human actions be necessitated, by divine or earthly, inner or external power, in a recognizable or an unrecognizable manner? The vague בחירה of Albo and other dogmatists gives us no explanation. In general, because of this unclarity, the second motives of free will and free action -- בחירת הרצון and בחירת המעשה -- are not separated from each other, and the first is even dissolved in the latter.

In fact, however, the בחירה mentioned and everywhere presupposed is a distinct concept, which we shall explain by the following.

Will power is that faculty, peculiar to man, which enables him to decide on an internal or external act or intention. This is to be distinguished from the faculty of desiring and coveting, which faculty belongs to animals also. The one has its seat in the mind, the other in the נפש, i.e. the animal power of life. The will is the product of the first faculty, the decision itself is

satisfied with inner action without outward manifestations, e.g. the decision to love or to hate someone. That decision then appears as a surrender to the intent of the emotions of love or hatred, as a deed and not only as a drive. On the other hand it can have an outward manifestation as its object, e.g. to avoid or to influence someone.

Freedom of will then means man is not forced to any decision by any internal or external power. True, man is guided and destined in his decisions by internal or external forces. His will is based on motives and causes, which also must be within or without him, but all these cannot force him, they can be resisted in that man can desire the contrary of what they want. Man cannot make an end to his animal drive, his reason or his fate, but he can set his will against them. Thus divine and earthly, internal and external forces are guiding for man, but they cannot force his will, for it is the result of a free choice. In one sentence: God keeps any forcing influence away from human desire and decision.

But it is otherwise with the expression of this desire or decision. In this respect man has no unlimited freedom, he is often opposed by unsurmountable obstacles.[7.] Man cannot always act as he wishes, he can be forced to act contrary to his desire. Such force, however, is always contrary to his will, never in agreement with it. Therefore

any action stemming from his own will is always free, and he is accountable for it. Man can be forced not to execute what he desires to do, or to execute what he does not desire to do. But he can never be forced to execute what he does desire to do, because the will cannot be forced and an act cannot be represented as having been wanted and forced simultaneously. It is not always in man's power to follow his own will, but an act of his own volition is his own, his merit or his obligation. Man is thus accountable for such an act. The accountability for an act does not rest on the absolute freedom not to commit it, but solely on the absolute freedom not to desire it. It is of course possible that the desired action was forced by some power against the will of him who commits it, but this cannot change the fact that the action, committed out of a free will, was not forced by either God or man. The view of rabbinical Judaism, e.g. that had Jacob struggled against going to Egypt, God would have had him brought there in chains, -- this view can be shared without detracting from the character of the free will by which Jacob's journey to Egypt actually did take place.

Vol. VI: 359-371.

Two questions now arise: A. By what means are actions forced? B. Is this accomplished in a recognizable or an unrecognizable manner? These questions are easily

solved. If only reluctant actions are forced, but never willing external actions, then the force employed must be a natural one and must follow a natural process; every secret, unrecognizable force, whatever its grounds, must be excluded, for in the contrary case freedom of the act done according to the individual's volition is problematical in so far as forcing influences of a mysterious nature cannot have a part. If, for example, someone were forced to commit a murder by outside influences, by divine providence or by an innate drive, then neither the human judge nor the individual himself could judge this action.[8] Even the acceptance of absolute freedom negates all mysterious forcing influences on human actions. For if there were such influences on human actions there is no way of telling why these should not apply to human desires also. Absolute freedom of desire and action have the premise that visible forcing influences are removed from man's inner and outer actions. Where there is a forcing influence, it must be recognized by man, and such recognition takes place only in the case of actions which run counter to desire. Thus we have a criterion of free external action. Where no visible or recognizable force is behind an action, this action must be the result of free will. Here we have the conviction that these motives from which the action originated would have permitted contrary action, even though this contrary

action could possibly have been prevented by the addition of other recognizable motives of a forcing character.

There is no doubt about the principle of Mosaism's free will; it is the God-likeness of the human being; the spirit of God in man is the likeness of the freely acting Creator. For that reason desire, as a purely spiritual potentiality, has an unlimited measure of freedom. Execution of this desire, however, in which that part of man which lacks the Godlikeness takes the main role (i.e. the physical part), is only partially free.[9]

The Mosaic view also decides the scope of freedom of will, and what objects fall within this circle. It includes everything which potentially can become the subject of human will or decision. Were we to restrict freedom of will merely to the moral sphere, and declare that desire, action and non-action are unfree, then the human freedom of will would be in sharp contrast to the Godlikeness of the human spirit. Moral freedom of will cannot be ascribed to God, Who is Sanctity and Perfection, and therefore cannot possibly desire evil. When the human mind possesses moral freedom, then this is despite its God-likeness, and this freedom is due only to man's נפש, the animal drive within him. By means of this connection with the נפש the free will takes on a moral character.

The free will per se, however, is man's Godlike image, and cannot belong to man only by means of his animal vitality. This latter, nevertheless, cannot have any will, only drives. Even though the Yahvistic code does not give man the same high original dignity as the Elohistic code, we cannot doubt its intention of giving man freedom of will. Aside the fact that the spirit has Godlikeness as a result of having conquered it after the catastrophe of Eden, the development of moral power seems to have the condition of an act of freedom of will according the Yahvistic code, and thus freedom of will is independent of the development of moral power. Thus Mosaism.

The rabbinic view restricts the scope of freedom of will to moral objects and teaches that in matters not pertaining to morals man's action is subject to divine power. This most important difference oddly enough is not touched by the dogmatists, but it is present.

The following rabbinic principle speaks for the correctness of our assertion: הכל בידי שמים חוץ מיראת שמים.[10] This signifies that all human action, outside the moral field, is under the power of God. A further principle הכל בידי שמים חוץ מצינים ופחים[11] deals with human fate: Everything is in the hands of God except the physical goods and evils which man has during his life time, but does not have at birth.[12] This denies the talmudic view that man is able to interfere in strange spheres of life

without God's guidance. In this case we are concerned with human actions, with the movement or rest of the limbs, and at best also with innate properties, good as well as evil.[13] Maimonides[14] attempts to hide the sharp contrast between his view, which is that of the Bible, and the partially fatalistic talmudic view. He refers the expression הכל בידי שמים חוץ מיראת שמים to natural qualities and events, which are not under the category of man's free will anyway, e.g. the size of the human body, fruitful rains or draught, etc. It does not refer, according to him, to human rest or movement which is always under the jurisdiction of free will. This explanation is hardly in need of contradiction. The rule cannot possibly speak of anything but the exception. When the latter takes moral rest or activity exclusively as the object of free choice, then the former must speak of morally indifferent rest and movement. If the Rabbis wished to oppose only such matters to moral behavior, which do not even belong within the scope of human will, then the exception is far too narrow. Instead of moral behavior (יראת שמים) they would have to mention behavior in general (תנועות האדם ומנוחתו).

Also excluded from the scope of human freedom of will are morally indifferent actions ארבעים יום קודם יצירה הוולד בת קול יוצא ואומרת בת פלוני לפלוני בית פלוני לפלוני שדה פלוני לפלוני . According to this principle

certain matters are predetermined for man. He thinks he is making a choice according to his own desire, but this is only an illusion, for his choice is a product of necessity, ordained by God. Maimonides recognized this view's contrast to that of the Mosaic Law's freedom of will, and thus fights against it, but he does not mention its talmudic origin. He even made an attempt, described above, to find a talmudic basis for it. In truth, however, the talmudic principle utilized by Maimonides for the proof of Mosaic freedom of will is the true commentary for the anti-Mosaic claims of the Rabbis. By it all objections raised by Maimonides are removed. Maimonides[16.] states the following: "Be heedful of the misbelieves of the astrologers, who believe that man by birth comes into possession of praiseworthy or reprehensible qualities, and that his actions are subordinated to coercion. Both our holy teachings and Greek philosophy ascribe freedom of will to human actions ..... coercion would suspend the entire divine Law. When our wise men taught: 'All is in the power of God, except the fear of (reverence for) God, this is true and is compatible with the above. Many of our people, however, labor under the delusion that man, in those acts which are under the jurisdiction of his free will, is under coercion; e.g. to marry a certain individual, or to acquire a certain amount of money. This is not true, for either the marriageable individual is permitted for wedlock, according to the

divine Law, the fulfillment of which Law is never enforced by God, or else the marriageable individual is forbidden for wedlock, and if such takes place a sin is committed, which also is never forced by God. Similarly God never forces a thief to steal, on the presumption that a certain sum of money is destined to be stolen ..... and when the Rabbis state: 'All is in the power of God .....', they speak only of natural matters, which do not fall in the realm of free Will .....".

All objections against the verse בת פלוני לפלוני שדה פלוני לפלוני are removed by the maxim הכל בידי שמים חוץ מיראת שמים. All religious decrees or prohibitions are free, all other actions lack this freedom. Nobody is forced to steal, but we are forced to the morally indifferent buying or underselling of a field. There is no force about a commanded or a prohibited marriage. It is man's free choice to obey or to transgress the command to marry, for in these cases a moral act is involved. On the other hand the choice for the purpose of marriage between two permitted women is morally indifferent, and consequently is forced by God by an intrusion into man's will. The objection might be raised that if force is employed for the purpose of marrying a <u>certain</u> person, then marrying in general is involved, the freedom not to marry at all is gone, and thus entrance into a nuptial partnership, which from the rabbinic view

is a religious law, is forced. The truth of the matter is that the maxim בת פלוני לפלוני does not lift the freedom of will to marry or not to marry. God knows each individual's free choice to marry or not to marry beforehand, and merely adds a certain stipulation to this decision, which is no more forcing than a punishment for a crime forces the committing of the crime.

In the Bible the following principle is valid: Man is not forced to the acquisition of property, nor to the choice of any certain property -- in both cases he acts with full freedom of choice. Without God's predestination man cannot acquire anything, no matter how strenuous his efforts. This is necessary for the obtaining of good results. This comes to pass only by the divine foresight of man's free choice, and does not involve any force towards the accepting of such acquisition. On this premise it might be possible to think of a special enactment for a certain property without removal of free choice for this instance, but Mosaism lacks any basis for such a concept which came into being when the Rabbis produced the teaching of inspontaneity to all morally-indifferent actions.

The following is special proof of the consistency with which talmudic Judaism removes non-morally-indifferent matters from the scope of freedom of will. יסורין בשעה שמשגרין אל האדם משביעין אותן שלא תלכו אלא ביום פלוני

ולא תצאו אלא ביום פלוני ובשעה פלונית ועל יד פלוני ועל סם פלוני[17]. Thus man is forced to choose a certain physician, and this physician is forced to choose certain medicines. The Rabbis do not admit of a moral obligation to let oneself be healed or to heal. Both are permitted (רשות), but neither is מצוה or a חובה, and therefore becomes an object of divine enforcement. Maimonides[18] states ומרפאו רפוא' נפש, and with him other commentators[19] state that the physician is obliged to heal, but this is contrary to the talmudic view. This passage is of special importance as the belief in special destination which the Mishnah does not mention is here pronounced in the name of R. Akiba. Thus this belief was known already at the time of the Tannaim, and was pronounced by a Rabbi who points out moral freedom of will most emphatically with the words הכל צפוי והרשות נתונה.[20]

The fact that man's rest and action are not free is clearly expressed by Bachya[21]. וכשתבין סוד התנועה ותשכיל ענין אמתתה ורוחיותה ותדע כי היא מפליא החכמה האלהים תכיר רוב חמלת הבורא על ברואיו -- אם יתברר לך כי כל תנועותיו נקשרות בחץ הבורא יתעלה והנהגתו ורוצונו הקטנה והגדולה שבהם והגלויה והנסתרת חוץ ממה ששם ברשותו

מבחירת הטוב והרע. As for the origin of the significant differences between Mosaism and Rabbinism, this is easly proved. The principle of Mosaism, as already mentioned,

is the Godlikeness of man's spirit. This in itself is sufficient reason for the freedom of human desire, and simultaneously it is the strongest antithesis to the limitation of free choice to moral objects. The Godlike spirit, because of its origin, could not have freedom in moral matters without being connected with man's animal vitality. Maimonides[22.] attributes בחירה to the angels, but denies it in a moral respect. Thus, if the spirit would have free will only in moral matters, but this free will was not innate, then this capacity would be due to that power which gives the spirit a moral character, viz., the נפש, which in itself has no type of freedom. From the Biblical view the difference between moral and unmoral matters in respect to בחירה would then be without foundation -- yes, even be absurd. The rabbinic view, on the other hand, is based on the belief of forcing sidereal influences, a belief that dominates Talmudism throughout. Even the view אין מזל לישראל does not negate the influence of the stars on man, but merely the possibility of שינוי מזל, the attainment of a favorable star by special piety. These מזלות also appear as angels, but only insofar as these stars were thought to be under the guidance of angels.[24.] According to Niddah 16b and other places each man's star determines his fate, his physical and his mental personality, and thus it also determines his actions or his abstain-

ing therefrom, his rest and his movements. The Godlike spirit is completely free by nature, and does not attain this height by the amalgamation with the unfree נפש , but the sidereal influences exert an antithetical pressure, shackling the spirit, except in moral instances when free will obtains. Even there the sidereal influences make themselves noticeable,[25.] but they are no longer forcing. What caused the Rabbis not to consider human actions (or abstentions) completely free, is the view originated and developed by them: God utilizes the subjection of man's actions to a higher will as a medium by which to guide mortals. This constraint is the necessary result of divine foresight, השגחה . This also explains how rabbinic Judaism harmonizes the questionable subjection of the human to the divine will and the actuality of the inconsistency of this will even in morally-indifferent matters. Not the will per se, which in itself has no influence on fate, but only the will interpreted in external action is bound. The will itself, as a product of the Godlike spirit is free, and therefore changeable, but action is the product of divine watchfulness, it is guided by God's angels so that man by his activity fulfills the divine disposition.

How predominant this anti-Mosaic view became for the Rabbis is proved by a passage from Josephus,[26.] which speaks of the Pharisees. Obviously it does not

speak of human fate, which the Pharisees[27]. ascribe only partially to divine disposition, but of human actions, which were ascribed to God and to fate. These (the actions) were at the disposal of man only in the case they were of a moral character (at times with the help, that is the non-forcing drive of fate).[28]. This teaching is simply called Pharisaic. The Sadducees on the other hand deny fate, i.e. the sidereal influences on man, and attribute full freedom of will to man.

N O T E S.

to

PART II, SECTION A.

Notes.

1) Cf. the biographical section.

2) Sinai, Vol. VI, p. 334.

3. Ibid., p. 336.

4. Ibid., p. 339.

5) Ibid. p. 365.

6) Ikkarim IV:5.

7) Cp. Proverbs 16:1.

8) According to Paul, Romans 7, the spirit is never accountable for sin, it is the work of the flesh. Man was not responsible for its actions before the appearance of Jesus. Op. Cit. 8:7.

9) Cp. Maimonides, T'shubah V:1.

10) Niddah 16b.

11) Ketuboth 30a.

12) Tosaphoth to Megillah 25a.

13) As Tosaphoth Niddah loc. cit. explains: הכא איירי בתולדות האדם ובמדות

14) שמונה פרקים, chapter 8.

15) Sotah 2a.

16) שמונה פרקים, chapter 8.

17) Abodath Elilim 55a.

18) Commentary to Mishnah Nedarim 38b.

19) Op. Cit. 41b.

20) Aboth III:19; Cp. also Maimonides Commentary ibid.

21) Vienna ed. 1853, p. 113.

22) שמונה פרקים 1:8 and Moreh III; chapter 7.

23) Sabbath 156a.

24) Cp. Nachmanides to שופטים p. 148d.

25) Sabbath 150a.

26) Bell. Jud. II:7.

27) Antiquities XIII:7.

28) Cp. Antiquities XVIII: 2.

PART II.

Section B.

A New Liturgy.

A NEW LITURGY

The need for a Reform liturgy was imperious in the early days of the Reform movement. Without it the movement would have collapsed, for it would have been ridiculous to preach one ideal and to practice another. No one recognized this need more keenly than Einhorn, and since he considered the earlier attempts at editing a modern prayerbook insufficient, he decided to publish one himself. "The prayerbook of the Berlin Reform Community.....does not lack in sharp Reform distinction," he writes in 1856,[1] "however it is wanting in other respects -- as is well known to us from our experience in Pesth -- which has become noticeable more and more." He continues in his introduction to his new prayerbook[2] that what Reform congregations desire most in their liturgy, and naturally so, is a decided expression of their religious convictions. Coupled with this resoluteness must be the depth and the warmth which already characterizes the traditional liturgy.

He writes: "The editing of a new liturgy must be filled with a double purpose: A. It must prove the truly positive basis of the new religious conviction, and B. It must fill the gap left by changing from the old, with its genial remeniscences, to the new, with its vastly intellectual appeal,"[3] and "Prayer must encompass the entire man; it is a matter of the heart and not only one-sidedly of the reflecting intellect."[4] In general the

Jewish liturgy is realistic, and leaves but little to the imagination,[5]. it is wholesome and expresses the sentiments of the worshipper well. For these reasons Einhorn thought it well to change the old cult as little as possible, and to mold the new thoughts in the old forms as far as that was feasible. Indeed, his aim was not to change the old cult, but rather to rejuvenate it. "Whatever blind romantics ..... may say about our 'unhistoric procedure,' the inability of our liturgical arrangement to hold the present generation is an undeniable fact; the old liturgy has become an untruth for present day circumstances and views, and neither organ or choir music nor childhood memories connected with the Sanctuary are sufficient to cover this weakness, to overcome irreverence, or to fill the empty halls."[6]. He feels that by remaining close to tradition wherever that is possible it will be easier to win the wavering souls for the new system.

Humbly Einhorn remarks that his new liturgy is only an experiment and, whether this experiment is successful or not must be gauged by results. That the "experiment" was a success is fully attested by Professor A. Z. Idelsohn in his book on Jewish Liturgy.[7]. Speaking of the Union Prayerbook, now used by most (English-speaking) Reform congregations in the world, he writes: "In its structure and choice of Hebrew texts this prayerbook is based mostly upon that edited by D. Einhorn,

Olath Hattamid ..... ."

Einhorn then proceeds to describe the mechanics of the prayerbook, which, however, we shall not analyze here, since the work has already been done exhaustively by Dr. David Philipson.[8] But it is worthwhile to see how Einhorn himself characterizes his work. He writes:[9] "In a dogmatic respect the new liturgical order distinguishes itself from the traditional in the removal of prayers for the reinstitution of the sacrificial cult, the return to Palestine, respectively the restitution of a Jewish Commonwealth, and a change from the material concept of a resurrection of the dead to the idea of a spiritual continuance after death."

Einhorn mentions that "The Rabbinical Assembly"[10] already decided for the exclusion of prayers for the return to Palestine, and the reinstitution of the sacrificial cult. "All our desires and hopes," he writes,[11] "must rule over our religious thoughts; not the latter over the former." He then continues to say that our entire religious trend of thought is in sharp contrast to that for which we have prayed in the past. In a somewhat dubious analysis of Orthodoxy he states: "Orthodoxy sees in it (the sacrificial cult) the pride and joy of the Jewish cult ..... as a suitable substitute for which the Israelites outside of Palestine (where sacrifices cannot be offered) are not offered prayer and atonement, but primarily suffering (יסורים)."[12] We are forced to disagree with this statement. The traditional liturgy cannot honestly be accused of indulgence,

in self-pity or masochistic tendencies, nor can our people be held responsible for the bitter lot which history has bestowed upon them. The reading of martyrologies is rather motivated by a desire to encourage the Sanctification of God (קדוש השם), even if the extreme price is to be paid for it.

Einhorn's thesis is that Orthodox Jewry preferred to return to Palestine, with all the involved difficulties, rather than to endure the pangs of גלות. But since present religious development has completely broken with these sentiments (which were true on an earlier level of development), Judaism finds in true willingness to atone, in reverence and in sanctification of life not only a true substitute, but its real goal and transfiguration. This conviction is substantiated by the utterances of the Prophets, as Einhorn correctly states, who in many passages place religious sincerity and strict adherence to Jewish credal and moral law above streams of blood and thousands of rams.

The desire to return to Palestine, expressed in the Orthodox liturgy, is intimately connected with this problem. The old system has as its basis the principle that Israel suffered exile only because of its sins. With this theory Orthodoxy cannot forego the hope of a return to Palestine, with all allied theocratic ceremonies and institutions. In such a return Orthodoxy recognizes complete fulfillment of its aims and fulfillment of the promised deliverance. It is true that even

talmudic Judaism envisions the worship of the Lord by all nations, but even then it claims a certain distinction and separateness for the Jews, according to which the nations will be obliged to keep only the Noachian laws, but the Jews will have to fulfill the תרי"ג מצוות.[13] The lofty ideal of one humanity, united in belief and in love, which has accompanied Judaism throughout all its various phases of development, must retire before the other view, that Israel will rise above the nations.

Einhorn then continues to state that the new Judaism also has the deepest respect for the mission of Israel, however "..... it conceives of the goal of its mission the ..... spreading of divine recognition and exaltation amongst all the people of the earth; a unification mediated by the teachings of Sinai, without privileges for any people, without tribal sacredness, without separateness."[14] On these grounds the downfall of the Jewish state cannot be regarded as a calamity occasioned by sin, but it must rather be viewed as a means towards the fulfillment of the Israelitic mission. "Yes," Einhorn writes,[15] this (event) actually marked the beginning of the messianic kingdom!"

The Biblical passages referring to a return to the Land must be understood symbolically, as the philosophers of the Middle Ages already did, or else

they must be understood as references to the era of the Second Temple.[16] The belief of a universal humanity in the God of Israel is the central nerve of Judaism, as was already implied in the promise of God, that all the families of the earth would be blessed by the association with Israel.[17] Einhorn writes: "In our prayerbook we do not only stress the messianic ideal in general, but even the idea of a personal Messiah, but only as the Israelitic people in its entirety in view of its calling to save all peoples. This seems to us to be the highest point of the Reform idea, the highest transfiguration of Jewish-messianic hopes and an unexhaustable fount of inspiration for the new Israel."[18] This idea originates in Isaiah 53, which chapter describes the personal dignity of the messianic individual. On this basis Rashi actually wrote האומות מתכפרין ביסוריהן של ישראל,[19] however, this view is not shared by the Talmud. Einhorn states that strictly speaking he cannot agree with this view, but nevertheless it is of great significance, for it casts Judaism in a messianic role.

Einhorn now explains his attitude regarding תחיית המתים. The concept lacks a definite Biblical basis, and for that reason the talmudic Rabbis are very unsure of themselves so that they take refuge in artificial explanations.[21] The Rabbis partially admit

that the statements of Ezekiel 37 cannot be taken literally, and admit that the passage must be understood to refer to redemption from exile. Strangely enough the Talmud almost bypasses Daniel 12:2, which speaks directly about a resurrection. Ibn Ezra thinks that this verse refers to the redemption of the exiles; Saadya sees in it an actual promise of resurrection. Ibn Ezra, referring to Saadya's statement, closes his own remarks with the words: "The thinker (philosopher) will know which of these two explanations is to be preferred." Maimonides states explicitly:[22] "In the future world there are no bodies, only the souls of the righteous, which exist like angels without a body." Einhorn continues to cite other authorities, and finally cites the true reason for his rejection of the entire concept. "According to the Mosaic teaching death is not the result of sin, but a natural institution premeditated in the divine plan, by which body and soul ..... return to their place of origin, the one to the dust, whence it came, and the other to God, in Whose image man was created."[23]

Einhorn then comments on various institutions which he purposely discarded in his new liturgy. The ritual of "calling up" (עליה) is rabbinical and not Biblical, he states. Originally the individual called

a portion from the Torah, but since our congregants today are not conversant in Hebrew it is better that the בעל קורא do the reading. The German Rabbinical Assembly at Frankfurt [24] expressed itself that there is no legal significance in "calling up," but temporarily left matters as they were for practical reasons. However for the sake of the dignity of the service Einhorn feels that the custom should be done away with.

The Lulov, Einhorn thinks, is a dead symbol today. It expressed the joy of the inhabitants of Palestine over their harvest. Maimonides points out that the fruits and plants were native and easily accessible. Since that is not the case here, it is best to omit the Lulov, but it would be desirable to bring native fruits to the Sanctuary, fruit which would be representative of our harvest.

Let us finally consider the עצרת festival, which Einhorn dedicated to the high calling of Israel. He decided to follow the views of Nachmanides, [26] who explains that the term עצרת pictures the Israelitic community as the focal point of divine treasures enclosed within it. While Nachmanides' version is tinted by a somewhat mystical coloration, it nevertheless contains a true and illuminating thought.

****

In another article[27] Einhorn discussed the wedding ceremony contained in his prayerbook. His aims are as follows:[28]

1. To remove from the traditional ritual anything that would detract from the equality of either party of a marriage, or is based on concepts which must be rejected as unethical.

2. To lend a noble simplicity to the ceremony, and to remove all superfluous additions, which might detract from its dignity.

3. To use such forms as are sufficient for our religious conscience, and yet to utilize traditions as much as possible, with a view to ascertaining that the marriage cannot be challenged from the rabbinic standpoint.

Einhorn continues that Reformers agree that the woman should not take the passive part in the wedding ceremony which was assigned to her in the spirit of the Orient. She must be given an opportunity to state of her own free will that she is willing to enter the union. The ברכת אירוסין, however, which we must reject as decidedly unethical, have never been discussed in this respect. These benedictions do not picture marriage as a religious necessity, and mention only the forbidden and prohibited sexual relationships.[29] R. Asher, in a true talmudic spirit, solves this problem. Not the ceremony, he says, is the main point of a marital union, but the sexual procreation, so that an individual who fulfills this duty with a woman designated for this

purpose (פלגש) is released from the duty of marriage.[30]

It is superfluous, Einhorn states, to examine such a view more closely from our religious viewpoint. It is sufficient to state that such views are completely outdated. True, at the end of the blessing מקדש עמו ישראל ע"י חפה וקדושין (or חפה בקדושין) ethical sanctification is expressed, but again it is of a negative character, for it only prohibits עריות and ארוסות. The oldest version simply ends with the words מקדש ישראל , and thus does not even contain the negative sanctification. The Rabbis unqestionably tried to invest the wedding ceremony with a religious character, but since the ethical aspects were not involved from their viewpoint, they had to be satisfied to connect the ritual at least loosely with religious concepts.

Einhorn then advances the theory that the later version, which contains the words מקדש עמו ישראל ע"י חפה וקדושין, is a reflection of the union between God and Israel on Sinai. This is substantiated by the fact that Christianity sharply emphasizes a similar symbolical meaning in the wedding ritual, and also the Karaites actually pronounced the prophetic section from Hosea[31]. in which Israel is betrothed to God. The book עקדה actually states to the portion

הדבוק האלהי עם האומה הישראלית הוא כעין זווג : ואתחנן
איש ואשה ע"י קודושין כמו שאמר הנביא וארשתיך לי לעולם

The Rabbis of course did not aim to find the religious meaning of marriage in this similarity. However this benediction illustrates that they did not attempt to replace the lack of religious motivation by a suitable parallel.

In contrast Einhorn's prayerbook elevates marital union to its full ethical height, in that it stresses the Biblical thought והיו לבשר אחד, the unification of the two partners into one personality. It also pictures all extra-marital relationships as the subject of a divine prohibition, thus lending to the marriage a moral motivation from that side also.

The benediction over the wine is omitted, for even the Sages did not know its purpose. Karo actually states דבר פשוט הוא שאין כום מעכב ואינו אלא מנהג. We might not [illegible] is correct in stating that the drinking of wine was only a מנהג, nevertheless there are ample grounds for the use of wine at any happy occasion, as the Bible already points out in many instances, e.g. לחם ויין ישמח חיים[33]. and ויין ישמח לבב אנוש[34]. He then states that according to his opinion the custom originated from the tendency to connect קידושין with the קדוש היום, which occasion was also observed with a cup of wine.

****

Let us now look at some other aspects of

the American Reform Liturgy. As is well known, Einhorn's prayerbook was published almost entirely in the vernacular, i.e. German at first, and later in English translation, both with very little Hebrew. At the Rabbinical Conference in Frankfurt, 1845, Einhorn justified this procedure. He said that no doubt could be entertained as to the legal permissibility of any language for prayer. "Nay, I go further," he said, "and state that the introduction of the vernacular into the service is necessary. Hebrew is the language of the study of the Law, but it is not the organ wherewith to express the feelings of the people. Aforetimes prayer was only a cry of pain; a scarcely intelligible expression sufficed for this; but now people need a prayer that will express thoughts, feelings, and sentiments; this is possible only through the mother tongue."[35].

In an article entitled The Penetration of English Elements into the German Reform Congregations[36]. Einhorn states:[37]. "It takes little familiarity with the conditions of American Jewish religious life to recognize that the English element under the present circumstances is a brakeshoe to Reform strivings. German research and science are the hearth of the Jewish Reform idea, and German Jewry has the mission to bring life and recognition to this thought on American soil."

Even though this statement at first glance seems to be an expression of rank teutomania, further analysis will show that reason was on Einhorn's side. True, the fact that he was raised in Germany and was educated at German universities must have been influential to cause him to express himself in these terms. Nevertheless the facts militate for the correctness of Einhorn's statement. As he correctly points out the idea of Reform was born and nurtured in Germany. Mendelsohn was the first to make overtures in that direction, and the famous school of Jewish theologians that succeeded him in the first half of the nineteenth century kept the young ideal alive. Because of the locale where Reform originated all its proponents were German and taught their message in that language. When the idea was brought to America it was brought by Germans who had little or no command of the English language. In addition Reform found its roots in the New World in German speaking congregations.

It is axiomatic that the second generation of immigrant stock is bilingual. Since the social intercourse of those people is largely in the milieu of the new home, it is only natural that the language of the children be supplanted by the language of the land. Therefore it was not surprising to see English penetrate to an ever increasing degree into the Reform

Temple.

Einhorn recognized that this was the natural course of events. Nevertheless he sought to stave off the inevitable for a while. Whether this was prompted out of a selfish motive, namely to gain more time to familiarize himself with the new vehicle of expression, or whether he did this out of sincere conviction is difficult to ascertain. Be that as it may, he does have at least some reason on his side. His arguments for retaining the German language in Reform services are as follows: "Desirable as this may appear," he writes,[38] "and necessary as it will certainly be sooner or later to represent the cause of religious revision orally and in writing in the English language, for the present such a change must be considered an impossibility ..... the Reform idea is still too young ..... to be stripped of its original covering, the German language." "Besides that," he states,[39] "at the present time, and presumably for several years to come, there is a lack of Jewish teachers for the people, teachers who have absorbed German theological science and simultaneously know how to han[illegible] English language with sufficient skill."

He then states that congregations which have adopted the English language have come to a standstill. As an example he cites Dr. Adler's difficulties with the

board of trustees of Temple Emanu-El. "It may be put as an axiom," he writes,[40] "that a German congregation with a trend towards English elements simultaneously exhibits a strong tendency towards a religious standstill .... ."

While the adoption of the American native tongue may lead to conservatize certain elements in its subjects in that they adopt the situation of their surroundings and do not wish to budge from that standpoint, in general this is not the case. But even if that were true, we feel that that would be no warrant whatever to state categorically that such a change must carry over into all fields of endeavor. Because Congregation Emanu-El of New York manifested this phenomenon is no proof that this must happen everywhere. Quite to the contrary: It seems to us that a people which makes the drastic change from one language to another would not hesitate to make parallel changes in its mores, in its code of ethics, and in its religion. American Jewish history has documented this theory amply. Most Jews who left the Old World left as pious Orthodox Jews. Upon becoming acclimated to the American environment we usually find that their rigid Orthodoxy relaxes gradually, until in generation after generation they become less and less Jewish,[41] nay, if we may be so bold as to say it, in some instances actually violently

antisemitic!

Einhorn then cites part of the controversy which Dr. Adler had with his congregation in regard to wearing hats. He also admonishes his readers that certain outdated customs must leave the Reform ritual.

These are all the pronouncements Einhorn made on the liturgy in the Sinai, and we are now ready to turn our attention elsewhere.

NOTES.

to

Part II, Section B.

Notes.

1) Sinai, Vol. I, p. 98.

2) Ibid., The New Liturgy Order of the Har Sinai Congregation in Baltimore, Vol. I, pp. 97-100; 129-139.

3) Sinai, loc. cit.

4) Ibid., loc. cit.

5) There are a few notable exceptions to this, e.g. Singer The Standard Prayerbook, 1939, p. 46. However we must not confuse the fantastic with poetic sentiment, e.g. as expressed in the לכה דודי, which speaks of "Queen Sabbath."

6) Sinai, ibid.; p. 99.

7) A. Z. Idelsohn, Jewish Liturgy and its Development; Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1932, p. 278.

8) David Philipson, The Reform Prayerbook, in D. Neumark's Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy, pp. 69-82; 210-223; published in 1919.

9) Sinai, ibid., p. 100.

10) Probably the Rabbinical Conference at Frankfurt, 1845, is meant here. Cf. D. Philipson, op. cit., p. 75.

11) Sinai, ibid., p. 100.

12) Ibid., pp. 129-130. Because of the very involved sentence structure of the original, the syntax was changed in translation.

13) Cp. Maimonides', Kings 8:10; 14:4; 12:1.

14) Sinai, ibid., p. 132.

15) Ibid.; loc, cit.

16) Cp. Albo, Ikkarim, IV:44.

17) Cf. Genesis 12:3; 18:18; 22:18.

18) Sinai, loc. cit. p. 133.

19) Rashi to Isaiah 53:4.

20) Cf. Sukkah 55b, where the view pertains that Israel is atoning for its sins in exile. Rabbi Jochanan there states that the nations actually unwittingly sustained a loss in destroying Jerusalem, for the seventy steers that were sacrificed there on Sukkoth atoned for them, but after the destruction they were deprived of this means of atonement.

21) Sanhedrin 91 and 92.

22) In his Yad Chazakah, T'shubah 8:2.

23) Sinai, ibid., p. 137.

24) Protokolle, p. 139.

25) Moreh Nebuchim, III:43.

26) To Leviticus 23:36.

27) Sinai, Vol. III, pp. 1019-1023; 1051-1053.

28) Ibid., loc. cit. p. 1019.

29) Cp. Joseph Karo to Tur Eben HaEzer, 34.

30) Cf. also the controversy between Maimonides and Abraham ben David in Hilch. Ishoth I:4.

31) Hosea 2:21.

32) Joseph Karo to Tur Eben HaEzer 34.

33) Ecclesiastes 10:19.

34) Psalms 104:15.

35) Quoted from D. Philipson's work on the liturgy, op. cit. p. 75.

36) Sinai, Vol. IV, pp. 161-169.

37) Ibid., p. 161.

38) Ibid., pp. 161-162.

39) Ibid., loc. cit.

40) Ibid., loc. cit.

41) Cf. the study by R. B. Gittelsohn, Modern Jewish Problems, UAHC 1943, pp. 3-5.

P A R T II.

SECTION C.

Comparative Theology.

COMPARATIVE THEOLOGY.

Einhorn wrote only one article on the subject of comparative Theology. It is difficult to say what prompted him to do so, unless it was part of his general program to enlighten the Jewish public.

I. M. Wise once advised the radical Reformers to join the Christian Unitarians.* It might be surmised that the comparison between Christianity and Judaism was the answer to that statement from Dr. Einhorn's pen, however we do not believe this to be likely in view of the fact that Wise's accusation was made in 1856 and this article did not appear in the Sinai until 1860.

Rather than to give a summary of Einhorn's work which needs no amplification, the article itself is hereby appended in abbreviated form.

*Cf. above Part I, Section 2, The Cleveland Conference.

APPENDIX G.

The Different Teachings of Judaism and Christianity.

Sinai, Volume V : 193 - 197.
V : 225 - 232.
V : 322 - 325.
V : 355 - 359.
VI : 101 - 105.
VI : 240 - 244.
VI : 299 - 302.
VI : 331 - 333.
VII : 117 - 121.
VII : 291 - 295.

The Different Teachings of Judaism and Christianity.

Vol. V: 193-197.

The Jewish spirit gave birth to two ideologies which belong to the most exalted of history: Judaism and Christianity. When the latter was born, the former was already well established. At first their relationship was most cordial, even friendly. There was no particular offense about entering the Christian circle from Judaism.[1.] This was due to the harmless relationship of the new religion to its mother. The original Christian group was considered as a Jewish sect, an offspring of the Essenes, observing Jewish Law, and accepting Jesus of Nazareth as a human Messiah, who taught disdain for earthly matters and love for all of God's children. When heathens were eventually admitted, this Jewish sect adopted a different form. The son of David became the son of God, who came to free the world of sin -- and the Mosaic Law. Life with its urges came first, and then the theory. For the heathens a son of David meant nothing, but the idea of a son of God found familiar ideas already present which appealed to them. They were not obliged to keep the Mosaic Law; according to Jewish concept they were not even permitted to do so. To recognize such laws as obligatory only for the Jewish members of the

new sect was an impossibility in view of the quality of all men, preached by the founder of the new religion. Also the self-chosen poverty and the communal ownership of goods by the Jewish Christians, called אביונים did not agree with the heathens' way of life. Then Paulus, a rabbinically educated Jew, appeared on the scene, and formulated a system that has a curious mixture of rabbinic and heathen elements. Its thesis was that the Mosaic Law was merely an educational system preparatory for salvation by belief in the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ. The Mosaic Law was completely abolished by this new religion, and the true descendants of Abraham were not those who lived according to the Law, but those who lived according to the new faith. He went so far in his opposition to the Law as to declare the adherents to the Law, despite their Christianity, as having lost God's mercy.[2] Paul was a man of action, not satisfied with ideas alone; he did more for Christianity than even Jesus, for the only independent act of Christianity was the release of the Jewish ethical Law from ceremonial Law. This release had to be paid for dearly, the cost was the loss of Jewish dogmatic truths, and tremendous concessions to heathenism. The thought that the ceremonial Law was merely an educational system to reach a higher level of sanctity moves Judaism again today, but not on the grounds of Christian Paulinic views,

but in a contrary direction. Yes, Judaism at its present degree of development distinguishes itself even far more from Christianity than it did from its old viewpoint, since it has broken completely with rabbinic principles. Christianity has never received as high a respect from us in regard to its historical mission as at the present time, but the dogmatic rift between us has unquestionably grown far wider. This contradiction will be enlightened from several angles by the following discussion.

First of course is the Christian teaching of the trinity in its sharp contrast to the One and Only God of Judaism. How innate the idea of a trinity was already to heathenism is well known. The idea of creation, preservance and destruction is portrayed by Indian teachings in the following way: There is an only high being, called Brehm, who in creating the world became known as Brahma, i.e. creator. As Shiwa he destroyed it again, and finally as Vishnu he recreated it. The earth is the symbol of Brahma, fire the symbol of Shiwa, water that of Vishnu. The mother of God is called Bhavani. Brehm encloses these three personalities, he is the true original, and the world is merely his name, his picture.[3.] Egypt has its Amun, Pythas and Osiris, i.e. omnipotence, wisdom and love. Osiris, the good, dies by the hand of Typhon; the divine

must feel and suffer as a human being. Love drives Osiris to his death, that he might become the savior of his people.[4]. Plato taught regarding a son of God. Not the highest God created mortal beings, the philosopher claimed, for then they would have to be immortal, but he ordered the gods to create them, and he himself only added the immortal part to their existence. It is God from whom everything is created through the son, and this son is an eternally living being, the example for the world, the picture of God, in which alone the latter can be recognized. Christianity of course implanted a more ethical spirit into this philosophy which heathenism lacked completely, because even at its greatest heights it could not raise itself to the concept of a holy God. However, in adopting such concepts, Christianity completely broke with Judaism, which excludes all division of the divine Being and accepts God in the strictest sense as the One and Only, or as Maimonides puts it, every attribute of God is God itself. Alexandrian philosophy wanted to introduce these foreign concepts into Judaism. Philo taught: The Logos, the שכל הפועל, as far as it influences the world, is God's first born son, which He used as a means for world creation and world government, and this son is called מלאך ד' by Scripture. Even rabbinic Judaism has such a split, so that the Talmud contains a prayer ascribed to God: יהי רצון מלפניך שיכבשו רחמי את כעסי. But Judaism only had such foreign

particles superficially, they never penetrated into it.

Vol. V: 225-232.

But does not Judaism speak of a son of God? The Bible calls Israel בני בכורי ; It says בנים אתם לי אלהיכם. Every man is a son of God,but Israel, by virtue of having received the divine revelation first, is the first-born son. We cannot take this merely as a figure of speech. The Bible's philosophy is simpler, but nevertheless much deeper than that of Plato or Philo. They call the divine idea of creation the son of God; the Bible calls Adam, created בדמות אלהים, the image of God; It teaches that man's spirit was not created as other things by God, but from God. This principle encloses the pre-existence and immortality of man. The Mosaic cosmogony is very precise in its portrayal, and it is thus impossible that the words ברא and עשה were used interchangeably and carelessly. ברא is used for the first act of creation, for the first living animal and finally for man; עשה refers to "becoming," or, more succinctly, ברא is the verb used for creatio ex nihilo, בריאת יש מאין, and עשה means formation out of materials at hand. Later on these two terms became synonymous, but creations by human beings were always designated by יצר never with ברא, and later on the three mentioned expressions are pictured in unmistakable contrast.[5] In this sense God created the original elements (prima materia),

and from them heaven and earth. These original elements were earth and water.[6] Once this basic creation (of the prima materia) had been finished, that signified the end of creation within a definite sphere, and then the process of formation began, signified by עשיה and יצירה. The first period closed with the formation of light, the elementary fire, source of all warmth, movement and expansion. Then followed three additional periods, the partition between upper and nether waters with the suspension of the firament, separation of water and dry land, plus vegetarian fructification, the shining of the sun, moon and stars -- all manifestations of the prima materia by means of the light -- until the fifth period; when something completely new, at least according to appearances, may be noted on the scene -- the living animal soul, the נפש חיה. Here the power of light was no longer sufficient, God had to interfere, and thus there was another בריאת יש מאין . The physical structure belonged to the basic elements, but the נפש חיה required a direct intervention on the part of אלהים . Then other animals were added, and only man was missing -- whom God created in His image. We might be surprised here,[7] at the usage of the verb עשה (..... נעשה אדם), we would expect נברא instead of נעשה, all the more since the Elohistic Code portrays the God-likeness of man as being innate to Him and not, as the Yahvistic code

pictures it, the result of his own striving. But examined more closely the verb עשה which had to this point excluded all divine intervention, in this case becomes the expression of the highest divine direct intervention, for which purpose the verb ברא is not suitable. This is due to the fact that Adam is not considered in the divine speech according to his physical aspects, but according to his spiritual, God-like essence. Recognizing this, God did not create him ex nihilo, but from the Divine Being par excellence directly, as a חלק אלהים. The following narration (v. 27) is a factual one, as is proven by the phrase ברא אתם זכר ונקבה, and thus speaks of the physical factors involved. Therefore, the form ויברא is used again, pointing to a creatio ex nihilo. Thus the human body is pictured on the one hand as being far below the spirit which comes from God, on the other hand it is farabove the mere animal body, which comes from a materia prima, and which does not constitute a direct act of divine intervention. Only the spirit of man is God-like; the external form can make no such claim, but, being higher than a mere animal, it is a microcosmos, and as such a צלם אלהים, i.e. a central point of divine creative power. It might strike us that the Elohist does not stress the creation of the human spirit out of God, and not as a fact -- but that also is not lacking. Genesis 5, an Elohistic chapter, which supplements Genesis 1-1:4 stops this gap by the words

בדמות אלהים, and thus presents the origin of the human spirit from its divine source as a fact. נר אלהים נשמת אדם -- thus Scripture names the human spirit; it distinguishes sharply between רוח, "spirit," and נפש, "soul." רוח is the son of God, the human intelligence, נפש is animal vitality, whose seat according to the Biblical concept is in the blood, and is possessed by all living beings. This spirit, and none other, is the true logos -- on earth to rule as king, not to divide the honors of its Father, God, but to proclaim them.

The concept of original sin is closely connected with this. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, said: "But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin." To free man of the sinful flesh, which cannot even subordinate itself to God, God sent His son in the garb of sinful flesh to die as a sacrifice for man. By the first Adam sin and death came into the world, by the second both were lifted. The difference is that the first ...ought disaster for all men -- even those who do not believe in original sin -- and the second Adam restricted his salvation to thos

who believe in him. The blood of Christ was too precious a medication to be used for small ills, and thus the snake that misled Adam and Eve became the universal Satan, to be tamed only by the dying Christ. A proper motive had to be found for such self-sacrifice, and thus arose the dogma of the impurity of the flesh, the heritage of moral evil, to poison all succeeding generations. But this concept is not originally Christian, it stems from heathenism. Heathenism believes that evil is innate to man. Heathenism does not recognize world creation as an independent act of God, but regards everything in nature as an emanation of the Divine Being, or a self renunciation. Everything existing thus appears necessarily a priori as an offal of God, and consequently bears the seed of death within itself, which must lead to downfall. From this view everything that exists is sinful. Even Zorasterism, highly superior in moral character to all heathen faiths, pictures all things as having been created in a battle between good and evil forces, and thus regards them as hermaphrodites, in which Ormuzd and Ahriman have equal parts. The Indian religion sees evil in all egocentric endeavors; it demands of man to sink himself into God to the oblivion of self. Mosaism rejects all such concepts; it views creation as a free act of God and completely good. It cannot take the position that God had put evil into the nature of man at the very outset. Christianity also conceives of God

as a free Creator, and since it cannot accept an ethical rift in His Being, it had to make a detour via heathen concepts to adopt the innateness of evil. It admits that Adam originally was pure, but according to its concepts he was poisoned, so that all his successors bring material sin into the world at birth. In order to introduce this theory into Mosaic Genesis, the snake was interpreted as being Satan. But since it is not possible that God could have created Satan as an evil being from the very outset, he appears in the Gospels as an angel, originally good, but fallen from grace by his own fault. This is exactly according to the example of the Persian Ahriman, also originally an angel of light and fallen from grace by the hand of the light-son Ormuzd, who, even as Christ, overpowered the devil.[9] Christian original sin then seems to be the product of a double fall, one in heaven and one on earth. The Jewish Bible knows nothing of all this. However, we may glean from this that the snake of Genesis and the deed to which it prompted Adam gave him his Godlikeness, i.e. the power to distinguish between good and evil. Thus the snake itself is not sin, because sin was created only by its causative act. This act led to a great historical epoch, by which man broke the fetters of instinct and rose to the full realization of his freedom.

Vol. V: 322-325.

The Satan concept entered Judaism with the

Babylonian exile as an imitation of Ahriman. But even from thereon, it appears in the Bible in an original setting, in a very ethical spirit. Satan does not act as an exiled member of the heavenly host, but as a messenger of God to provoke man to sin, to force him into a battle for his highest salvation. The purpose is that Satan be conquered to crown the victor thereafter. Judaism has the same view of evil: The evil drive is not innate to man, but the drive to evil is innate. This is a necessity so that man can gain sanctity by striving to overcome it. Evil, as good, is the product of man's free will; the יצר הרע, innate to us, is an angel created by God which wishes to be conquered, and, as in the struggle of Jacob, gives its blessings once it has been overcome. True, it lives in the flesh, for man's spirit, born from God, cannot contain such a being. Zechariah speaks protestingly of the two sons of light which serve next to God, and obviously are an allusion to the Persian Ormuzd and Ahriman. Our ancients recognize in this the יצר הרע and the יצר הטוב, the former insofar as it has been conquered and now serves the Holy (מתהפך בזכות התורה). However under Christian influence the Rabbis do speak of inherited sin and the Satan as the evil principle. They say the snake and Eve had sexual relations, and thus their descendants were soiled, until the revelation at Sinai interrupted the stream of evil.

for Israel.[10] The Midrash Yalkut[11] states

בשעה שהפיל הקב"ה לסמאל מקדושתו מן השמים אחז בכנפיו של מיכאל להפילו עמו ופלטו הקב"ה מידו לפיכך ונקרא שמו פליט [12]

But these parasitical plants could never take full root in Judaism, they were always rejected. The Scriptural work terming man's body a מקדש ד' made all such concepts as hereditary sin an impossibility.

There are two pasages in the Pentateuch which seemingly lend support to the concept of Satan in the non-Jewish sense. A. The passage of the בני אלהים who married the daughters of Adam. Onkelos, Rashi and other exegetes see in this human marriages among different classes. The Midrash sees in these בני אלהים fallen angels, נפילים, who had descended from heaven. B. One of the rams of the Day of Atonement is dedicated to Azazel, which really means nothing but "sending away." It was interpreted as being Satan. The Talmud connects these two passages in that it states that the עזאזל was to atone for the sins of עזא ועזאל, the two angels, who, once they had fallen, had entered into forbidden marriages with human beings.[13] Rashi adds that the עזאזל is to atone for the committed ערוות. This, by the way, unquestionably is the reason for reading the passage about forbidden marriages on Yom Kippur.[14]

Vol. V: 355-359.

A strange connection between the בני אלהים and the עזאזל which consists of an amalgamation of various

heathen myths is found in the Midrash Yalkut.[15] A student asked R. Joseph regarding the atoning ram. He answered: When the corrupt generation of the delugian era began to prosper, two angels, שמחזי and עזאל came to God and said: Did we not protest mightfully, O Lord, when we asked at the time of the creation why You put man so high, and did not apportion the full measure of Your mercy to us, who are pure spirits? The divine Mercy answered that if they, the accusers, would live on earth, they would be even worse than men: Thereupon the angels begged permission to live amongst men. This was granted, and שמחזי , on earth, fell in love with a girl named אישתר . To escape him, the girl sought to gain knowledge from him regarding the tetragrammaton. He gave in, she pronounced the Name, and still pure she ascended to heaven. For her perseverance God granted her a place in the כימה (Pleiades). שמחזי and עזאל married women and begot הירוא and עזאל . הירא obtained a position in which he supplied women with seductive adornments. שמחזי then received a message from Metatron to the effect that the world was to be destroyed. The fallen angel was very much shaken; he was afraid, especially for his children, who daily consumed a tremendous number of camels, horses and oxen, and who, after the destruction of the world, would have no food supply. הירא and הרוא simultaneously had a dream. One dreamt that a huge stone was spread out over the

earth, covered with many inscriptions. An angel descended from the heavens and with a knife-like instrument wiped out all these inscriptions, except for four words. The other dreamt that he saw a beautiful garden with many trees, an angel appeared with an ax, and hewed down all trees with the exception of one which had three branches. Upon awakening both hurried to their parents and there were told of the impending doom. They were consoled, however, that their names would never be forgotten among the descendants of Noah. They will be called upon when accidents happen, when precious stone are brought forth from the earth, and when ships begin their voyages. שמחזי then repented his sin, and inflicted punishment on himself by hanging himself in an upside-down position between heaven and earth. עזאל however did not repent and continued to supply women with cosmetics and all kinds of seductive means. He is the Azazel who is loaded with the sins of the people on the Day of Atonement.

So far our Midrash. The name איסטהר, the name of the virgin who resisted the angel and was placed in Pleiades, is obviously synonymous to אסתרא , the Greek Asteria, the Star-woman, the oracular name of Venus,[16] which the name of Queen אסתר is also connected.[17] But here Asteria signifies Maja, the "magnificent one," who, according to Greek mythology is one of the seven women whom Jupiter transferred to heaven, and which constitute

Pleiades. This Maja also, as her sisters, was pursued by the passionate love of Orion, a giant, until Zeus took pity on her and transferred her to heaven. This Maja is frequently regarded as Venus.[18] Similarly שמחי and עזאי have their counterparts in mythology; they are imitations of the Dioscuri, Castor and Pollux. These two brothers also went out to find wives, they kidnapped women, were involved in a war, and Castor lost his life. Pollux was grief stricken, but finally Zeus granted that he might give one half of his own immortality to his dead brother, and so the two brothers dwelled interchangingly a day on Mount Olympus and a day in the realm of shadows. This changing sojourn is pictured symbolically by two heads, one in a normal position, the other upside down. This latter picture then is that of שמחי, and in both instances we find the peculiar situation of a selfinflicted punishment. In the one case it is brotherly love, in the other it is willingness to atone. Also the Dioscuri were regarded both as protectors of marriage and of ships in storms.[19] Thus our Midrash is also strongly related here, as well as in the name שמחי which seems to be a derivative of Symmachos (confederate). The sons were named הי"א and הייוא, that is "hoi" and "heya" -- the former is a cry of mourning, the latter a cry of encouragement.[20] These cries are customarily used in dangerous undertakings,

especially by sailors and treasureseekers, because it was part of the task of the Dioscuri to adorn women and to protect endangered ships.

Vol. VI: 101-105.

One of the basic differences between Judaism and Christianity is the teachings regarding atonement, which are best expressed by Christianity in Hebrews 9 and 10. Paul teaches there that the Temple and its sacrificial cult are only of exemplary meaning for the Christian means of atonement and salvation. Christ is the high priest who obtained salvation by his own blood, and not by the blood of sacrificial animals; this blood is a more effective means of purification than that of oxen and rams, or the ashes of the red heifer. Without bloodshed there is no forgiveness. "Sacrifices and bloodshed Thou wouldst not, but a body hast Thou prepared me; in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin Thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I: Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me), to do Thy will, O God."[21]. Paul hereby does not merely cast the Mosaic sacrifice in a certain role, he goes so far as to deny it all power of atonement, and only recognizes in it the power to keep the feeling of guilt alive.[22]. The Biblical support of Paul's theory already shows the weakness thereof. The text of Psalms 40:7-9, used here, speaks of nobody whatever -- only of the ears God has given the

pious singer to hear God's voice. (אזניים כריית לי). That is the only obedience God requires, not sacrifices. Here we find the oft repeated warning that à sacrifice without betterment of conduct is a useless ceremony. The Septuagint has another version, which contains the verse "you have prepared the body for me," but the obvious meaning there is "He Who has prepared a body for me has not need of that which serves for its food."[23]. A close scrutiny of the Mosaic sacrificial cult shows that this theory is without a basis. True, atonement in the Pentateuch is always connected with external sacrifices, but it is never an external action only, to which position the apostle lowers it. Sin is a condition of internal impurity, and when the Day of Atonement speaks of a cleansing before God, then that can be only in reference to internal cleanliness. This is of course not achieved by the sacrifice itself, but by the corresponding action within the offerer. According to the rabbinic view the sacrificial animal formally takes the place of the sinner, and goes to death for him. Eventually this idea was changed so that sin was laden on innocent people who were willing to accept this burden; pious or holy people were preferred. The Talmud [24]. states that the death of the high priest also had atoning powers. This eventually developed into the self-sacrifice of Jesus. Bähr[25]. thinks that the sacrifice is the symbol of the killing of the animal-desire in man, which, as the principle of evil,

has its seat in the blood (i.e. the נפש). As the offering of the sacrificial animalblood delivers the animal to death, thus the same happens with the selfish, evil desires of the sacrificer which are situated in the blood. But this does not finish the function of the sacrifice. In addition to giving up this animal-desire to God, there must be an acceptance on the part of God, and He, in turn, must give true life to the sacrificer. This latter positive act makes the sacrifice a sacrament. This sacramental meaning is clearly pointed out in the Biblical words: "I have given it (the blood) to you to atone your souls." How, Bähr asks, can the blood of an animal attain to such a sacramental character? Man is not capable to lend such sanctity out of himself to the offered object, because the principle of holiness is not within him. Only God can determine the means of sanctification, and then only such as is external to the atoning individual, and yet is not strange to him. But what connection is there between the pure Nephesh of an animal, and the Nephesh of man, a moral being? Here the impossibility of atonement by animalblood, as claimed by Paul, reveals itself -- the future true and complete sacramental means of atonement is the blood of Christ.

This theory was termed artificial by De Wette and Winer, for it conjures up difficulties not even existent from an anti-Christian viewpoint. It hides the full majesty of the Biblical sacrifice in a sacramental

cloud that hides God from man, and does not disappear until it is dissolved by Christian blood. Mosaism knows nothing of a supernatural sacrament as a means of salvation or atonement, nor of an innate principle of evil in man. It denies the naturalness of sin and therefore also the super-naturalness of the medication. The animal-desire in man is the source of evil according to Judaism; never, however, is it unclean or evil in itself. The principle of sanctification or atonement of a Nephesh that has freely chosen sin is by the free spirit that rises up to God. There is no question here of "killing" the נפש, but merely a process of purification. In Mosaism man is both subject and object of atonement and sacrifice. The latter's central point is the sprinkling of the blood against the altar; i.e. the animalblood as a symbol of the human נפש is thus sacrificed. This animal-blood of course cannot remove sin, as Scripture so often stresses, but the thoughts of the human heart, pictured in the symbol, can remove sin.

Vol. VI: 240-244.

Another basic difference between Judaism and Christianity is the relation between reason and belief. Rabbinic Judaism, which does not take reason to be a necessary attribute of true belief, nevertheless is far from seeing reason denied for the sake of belief. For rabbinic Judaism the belief in the basic Jewish principles is put ahead of cognition, whether such cognition be rooted

a priori in the human mind, is based on sensual perception, or depends on historical observations. Thus in the case of Abraham the belief in the One and Only God is presented with the words הכיר את בוראו, as a product of the natural functions of his high mind. The belief in divine revelation (תורה מן השמים) is based on the historical event at Sinai, witnessed by a whole people.[26] It follows from this that the Jew must recognize as holy that which is contained in the Torah whether it agrees with reason or not: Even if Talmudism does teach that it is impossible (for man) to find reasons for all the laws of the Torah, this is not the same as the blind belief of Christianity, for human cognition is always the last basis for keeping such laws holy, in as far as the recognition of their divine origin is involved. According to talmudic Judaism the measure of merit attained in fulfilling divine commands is according to the degree in which the animal-desire of man struggles against the decree. A Jew should not say he has no desire to eat of what is forbidden. To the contrary, he should say that he has such desire but abstains from it because of the divine command. There is no acquired merit in recognizing the Torah as God's Law. The new Judaism denies blind belief even more sharply. It does not take divine revelation as an external pact, delivered completed and sealed millenia ago, but as a development step by step of the

Divine in man. It started with the first members of our people, it reached its climax at Sinai because there its principles were fully clarified, and a whole nation undertook the mission of spreading it. According to that view the essence of belief is only rational cognizance -- and that can be of no more merit than physical vision. This relation of Jewish belief and human cognition is best brought out in two Biblical passages: A. Deuteronomy 29:28 "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but the things that are revealed belong unto us and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this Law." B. Deuteronomy 30:11: "The Law.....is not in heaven.....it is in your mouth and in your heart to fulfill it."

Our passage in the Bible seemingly contradicts this view: והאמין בה' ויחשבה לו צדקה.[27] The fact that the belief in God is not involved here, but only a belief in God's promise, does not alleviate the difficulty. If belief in God is to be reckoned as merit, then such merit would be much higher in a world of heathendom than in a world where God is recognized generally. Even the ancients noticed this phrase; Nachmanides in his Torah commentary states: ואני מבין מה הזכות הזאת למה לא יאמין באלהי אמן והוא הנביא בעצמו ולא איש אל ויכזב

R. Joseph Bechor Schor asks this question also, and answers: Abraham reckoned it (the promise of descendants)

as a mercy of God. This answer, though ingenious, is nevertheless wrong. With our more unrestricted Bible exegesis it is not too difficult to find the answer. Abraham's God concept, according to the testimony of the Bible, was still limited and far behind that of Moses:[28]. Abraham was merely the first to recognize God as the Ruler of heaven and earth, Moses recognized God's unity. One of the consequences of this is the immutability of the divine will, which according to Albo[29]. is one of the bases of the revelation of the Divine Name אהיה . That Abraham's concept of the highest Being was not firm is proven by the test in regard to the sacrifice of his son, from whom God had promised Abraham a numerous descendancy.[30]. Paul seeks to lift this contradiction by the assumption that Abraham believed God would re-awaken Isaac from death,[31]. forgetting that thereby Abraham's courage in passing the test is diminished as much as his faith is increased. Furthermore, the patriarch's wavering in this regard is shown in that he demands a token of the Covenant as security for the promised possession of Canaan.[32]. In the case of the promise of many descendants Abraham was so certain of the fulfillment of the divine promise, that there was no doubt within him. This trust, despite his uncertain knowledge, was accredited to him as a virtue. There is in this case then no merit in having a belief built on plain insight, nor is there a sanctification (or even

tolerance) of a belief without insight.

Christianity, according to its most essential dogma, has that as a condition which is contrary to all reason. It requires belief in a mystery which is not in harmony with a single factor of human reason, and to top it off it makes the salvation of the whole world dependent on it. Indeed, Paul twists Moses' words which deny any rift between man and the divine Law to such an extent, that the קשיא becomes the פגיעה.[33]

Vol. VI: 299-302.

One of the main differences between the two religions is the relation between their concepts of this world and the world to come, as well as the concepts about the latter. Christianity differentiates between this world and the next as it does between b[illegible] and soul. As the body is innately impure for Christianity and is the incarnation of evil, so the material world is impure. It preaches discard for worldly goods; it is not tolerant towards temporal enjoyments, and puts retribution mostly, if not completely, into the future world. Mosaism, in contrast, regards everything created by God as good; it denies the heathen identification of the temporal and the bad, and even sees a mirror of divine love and mercy in those works of God which are destined to perish. It insists on care of all that is alive, on a joyful acceptance of the temporal divine gifts, and where-

ever it speaks of retribution it restricts itself to this world. This does not mean of course, as some have contended, a denial of immortality. Immortality cannot be expressed more positively than Mosaism expresses it in the principle: Man was created in the image of God. Immortality was already expressed in the patriarchal age: Jacob speaks of Sheol, obviously the same as the Greek Hades. The designation of life by Jacob as ימי מגורי has as its basis the thought of the Egyptians that earthly life is only a short stopover, but the grave is the eternal home. When Moses mentions retribution only in regard to the earthly life then that is in the interest of harmony between body and soul of the present life. Life on earth, despite its transitoriness, is a gift of God of independent value, not merely a substratum of the life to come. The Law is close and not inaccessible to man.[34] God is amongst men on earth as He is in the heavens; in this world and the next. He dwells among His people (ושכנתי בתוכם). Furthermore we must mention that the basic principle of divine justice is betterment, atonement, restoration, and the return of the נפש (in which sin is rooted) to its original purity: As a father punishes his son, so does God punish man. From that view alone punishment must be earthly! Of course one who does not correct himself after punishment perishes of his folly. Immediate punishment is an act of justice as well as of

mercy. Moses stresses the non-postponement of divine justice. ומשלם לשנאיו אל פניו להאבידו לא ואחר לשנאו אל פניו ישלם לו [35]. We do not wish to stress the interpretation of Rashi and Onkelos that God repays His enemies during their lifetime, but would rather translate אל פניו with many commentators as "to his face" (i.e. directly), in contrast to the restriction of punishment to descendants, down to the fourth generation. At any rate this לא יאחר is most significant for the exclusive mention of retribution in this world. It must be admitted, however, that rabbinic Judaism no less than Christianity relegates the earthly life to a mere shadow of the future life in this respect. As a rule it states that punishment follows in this life, but it restricts the rewards for piety to the future life שכר מצוה בהאי עלמא ליכא. It even goes so far as to state that God often sends the pious undeserved sufferings (יסורין של אהבה) to increase the reward in the world to come.[36]. Onkelos and the Rabbis say that evildoers often get their rewards in this world already, so as to increase their punishment in the world to come!!

We could ask: Is it not strange that Moses never indicates the continuance of retribution after death, since the world-to-come is a great encouragement for obedience to the Law of God? This question also is not difficult. The claim of Maimonides that the people

in the time of Moses were still used to heathenism and therefore were not ready as yet for the teachings of immortality is not very sound, for such teachings were well known in ancient Egypt. It is more reasonable[37.] that Moses wanted to suppress all heathen beliefs which might have been aroused amongst a people of that particular level. This is understandable if we consider the phantasies of the Egyptian religion, according to which the soul of man remains in his body until the body's complete disintegration, then undergoes a 3000 year transmigration through the bodies of various animals to return eventually to another human body.

Vol. VI: 331-333.

It is completely erroneous to think that Mosaism negates a life in another world because it mentions only retribution in this world. This is proved by the example of many heathen religious systems. The Sabeans teach the immortality of the soul, but limit both reward and punishment to this world, for they believe that the recompense for an act must come in the same place where the act took place. The Sadducees never denied the continuance of the soul. Their protest is only against the dogma of a bodily resurrection, which was grafted on the Judaism. The derivation of this sect from the saying of Antigonus "be not as servants who serve the master for the sake of reward," shows the sect's

instability best in the misinterpretation of this verse, which is obviously directed only against mercinariness. These people attempted to use the meaning of this verse to deny retribution both in this world and the next -- which former is of course denied by Moses' words. We cannot even admit that the command of the levirate marriage has for its basis the people's lack of belief in immortality. Man desires to have his name and work continued even after his death, no matter how firm his conviction of immortality may be. The best proof for this are the Parsees, whose foremost dogma is immortality, and who have a system of levirate marriage similar to ours. The desire to have one's name continued after death would more likely be connected with the idea of immortality than with disbelief therein, for if a man believes that he is mortal he would harly care how he is remembered by his survivors. It is most unlikely that the Lawgiver intended to satisfy the desire for immortality by the institution of the levirate marriage, and thus to push aside the belief in immortality which at that time was still connected with so many heathen concepts. The levirate marriage was known a long time before the Sinaitic legislation, as proven by the story of Tamar. The origin of this custom is heathen, and when we consider that Moses prohibited the wedding of a brother's wife in other cases as incest, and that a levirate marriage is a forced one, completely contrary to the legislation's

ethical spirit, then we might consider the suggestion that Moses disapproved of this heathen custom, but for the sake of the people permitted it and surrounded it with many extenuating circumstances, making it easy for a brother-in-law to evade this barbaric custom.

Vol. VII: 117-121.

There are also differences between Judaism and Christianity in regard to the concepts of the future world. According to the rabbinic concept of the immortality dogma, which adopted some more or less Christian concepts, the difference is not big, but nevertheless characteristic. In both religions the future world (עלם הבא, לעתיד לבא)begins with the resurrection of the dead. According to Christian dogma the resurrected forms are of a heavenly nature, angels, and as such are far from all temporal necessities. Paul teaches[38] that there are earthly and heavenly bodies, each having a different appearance. Even as sun, moon, and stars have a different light, it is thus with the resurrection of the dead: The perishable is sown, the imperishable will arise....an animal form is sown, a spiritual form will arise....flesh and blood cannot acquire the Kingdom of God, the perishable can have no part of the imperishable. In agreement with this Jesus states against the Pharisees that at the resurrection there will be no marriage, but all shall be as the angels of God in heaven.[39] The

Pharisees portrayed the resurrected bodies with earthly necessities, they reproduced and fed themselves.[40] These bodies, despite their needs, were without blemishes and were immortal. This difference lies in the dissimilarity of basic principles, which principles were never completely blotted out in Judaism. Christianity accounted the flesh as evil and so the earthly body had to be replaced completely by the heavenly body in order to attain the true Kingdom of God. But even in the places where Judaism is inclined towards hereditary sin it never takes flesh and sin as identical. Rather, even for the people who were at Sinai, the stream of evil and ruination was broken.[41] Thus the people of the world to come can be without sin without being angels, having flesh and bone and the therewith connected necessities.[42]

It is not strange that these bodies are immortal and free of blemishes despite their earthly forms (עומדין במומן ומתרפאין). According to the old view death and physical defects are products of sin, which evils disappear when the individual involved enters a state of sinlessness.

Christian dogma teaches that the Messiah will arrive (i.e. the return of Jesus) at the time of the resurrection of the dead. The Rabbis separate the resurrections of the dead and the arrival of the Messiah:

כל הנביאים כולם לא נתנבאו אלא לימות המשיח אבל לעולם

חבא עין לא ראתה אלהים זולתך[43]. The Messiah is to found the Kingdom of God on earth. According to Christian dogma this is impossible because of the existence of sinful flesh. According to the more sober Jewish view such a moral revolution can take place without the disappearance of man's natural qualities, even though the Rabbis did not envision a state of complete absence of his sin under the messianic order, as they did envision at the time of the resurrection of the dead.[44]. Geiger's claim[45]. that the future world (i.e. the resurrection of the dead) is the same as the days of the Messiah in the text of the Midrash is completely unfounded. Only a later mystical trend identified the messianic age with the insurrection, as this trend in general catered to Christian concept and regarded the Messiah as a supernatural being in existence even before the creation of the world. Talmudic Judaism keeps these two periods separated strictly so that the messianic age has all ceremonies, but those resurrected from the dead do not have to observe all ceremonies.[46]. Following this strict separation, a trend arose in the Amoraic period depicting the world to come as supernatural without physical necessities.[47]. We cannot claim that Abba with his pronouncement wished to deny physical resurrection in contrast to the Tannaim. It is certain, however, as Maimonides points out,[48]. that

purely spiritual permanence is the ultimate goal of the future world.

We have already discussed the Biblical view of these matters: Man, the spiritual son of God, lives eternally -- in the spirit. The body returns to the dust whence it came. The belief of a physical resurrection is of Persian origin and is rooted in the dualistic view, according to which the good and the evil principle share dominion over man. Christianity adopted this view, and reached the point where it taught a physical resurrection in a transfigured angel's guise. Judaism, once it had reached the stage of understanding God as devoid of corporeality, lost all concepts of a physical resurrection.

Christianity at its inception already found the teaching of immortality in Judaism; the second benediction in regard to the resurrection of the dead was composed by the members of the great Synod.[49] The only addition made by the new religion was that of the heavenly bodies. But even there Christianity was behind the mother-religion, for according to Josephus the Essenes already taught the purely spiritual permanence of man's soul and rejected physical resurrection. I might add the following: Christianity believes that people who know each other in this world will meet again in the next world. Some Jewish religious texts have expressed the same thought, but without any proof from our older literature. One might think that these

Jewish books adopted that idea from Christianity, but it is exactly the other way around. It originates in the rabbinic teaching of resurrection, according to which bodies will be resurrected in their former individual guise, and will shed all blemishes only after the resurrection has taken place. Distinguishing characteristics will thus at first be noticeable, and people will be able to recognize each other. It is natural that people were inclined to such a belief, which expresses one of the most deeply felt desires of man. A question pertaining to this matter was asked of Jesus: To which of the seven brothers will the woman belong after the resurrection?[50]. Saadya[51]. asks whether those still alive will recognize the deceased. This is answered in the affirmative. The following question asked was: If a man with blemishes dies, what happens to him at the resurrection? The answer is that he will rise with these faults, so that he might be recognized, but that God will heal him after that by a special miracle. In Christianity, which hopes for a resurrection in heavenly bodies, the external signs will thus disappear, and recognition will be by spiritual qualities. At any rate, in this instance also Christianity adopted a Jewish concept, namely the teaching of a bodily resurrection, which in turn comes from a heathen dogma, and has lost all significance in Judaism.

Another difference between Judaism and Christianity lies in the belief in miracles. Wonders are of great importance in Judaism, but their significance is restricted to the documentation of the divine mission of the prophets and to open the hearts of the people to their teachings: Provided such be in harmony with the pure laws of God and the ethical Law which emanates from this. The purpose of the miracle is to introduce the prophet to the people, or to do away with insurrection against the Law;[52] however the contents of a prophecy is not secured through a miracle, so that a prophet who becomes rebellious against the divine Law is not protected against capital punishment by all the miracles in the world.[53] This extremely relative meaning of miracles is exemplified especially in Exodus 7: 2-13, in which passage the magicians of Egypt imitate Aaron's trick, and are surpassed by him only by a superior trick. We must stress that **אות** and **מופת** by no means signify a reversal in nature. Most miraculous narratives of the Bible are only mythical imitations of natural phenomena, e.g. the plagues of Egypt. Their miraculous character consists of their appearance at the strategical moment. Saadya discusses this question in his **אמונות ודעות**.[54] He states that many think the people believe in Moses only because of the miracles performed by him, and consequently they must

believe anyone who can perform miracles. But quite the contrary is true: We believed Moses and any prophet who taught something good; only after they had proclaimed their message was documentation requested. What, however, if a prophet did not care about a request for documentation, and then showed a miracle despite our desire? If his teachings were good, there is no argument, but if his teachings were bad, then we would act as we are forced to act when anyone attempts to convince us of something irrational by some sort of a wonder.[55] Miracles are so little a support to Mosaism that the Elohistic code ignores miracles completely, for in it the principle of world-completion rules. This idea, represented by the Sabbath, teaches that God finished the world at the very outset so that it was equipped for all times, and there would be no necessity at any time in the future to break the laws of nature. The later Judaism, which senses the dichotomy between the Elohistic Sabbath idea and the belief in miracles, saw itself forced to the assumption that miraculous things were present at the conclusion of creation either in a germinal or in a completed stage.[56] As for Christianity, it stands or falls with the beliefs in miracles. The appearance of the Son of God in human guise is the miracle of all miracles, and the resurrection of Jesus is most basic to the religion.[57] The miracles of Jesus have no end: Where he walks, nature must yield. For that reason also Christianity eventually had to give up

the Mosaic Sabbath, for its thirst for miracles was in contrast to the Elohistic Sabbath idea. Its universalism could not permit the Jewish national coloration of the Sabbath in the second decalogue, i.e., as a reminder of the exodus from Egypt.

N O T E S.

to

Part II, Section C.

Notes.

1) Cp. Graetz. Geschichte der Juden, IV: 93-95 (no edition mentioned.)

2) Galatians 5.

3) Cf. Creuzer, Symb. I: 395.

4) Cf. Creuzer, Symb. II: 47, 52, 95.

5) Cf. Isaiah 43:7, where בּרא means "creation," יצר "formation," עשה "completion."

6) At this point we must raise an objection on the basis of Dr. Einhorn's premises. The Bible's very first verse mentions that God created heaven and earth, it says nothing of a prima materia, unless we read various philosophical and Midrashic interpretations into it, to wit that שמים is formed of אש and מים. As regards the later verses which speak of a firmament, there is no proof that such a (רקיע) is identical with שמים .

7) Genesis 1:26.

8) 7: 23-25.

9) Cp. Winer Bibl. Reall. in Article Satan p. 385.

10) Cf. Sabbath 146a.

11) To Genesis #68.

12) Cf. also Boraitha de R. Elizer, Chapter 48, and Yoma 67b.

13) Cf. Yoma, loc., cit.

14) Cp. Tosefta to Megillah 31a, cf. במנחה , and Ture Sahab, Shul. Aruch, Orach Chaim 622, #4.

15) To Genesis #44.

16) Cp. Creuzer, Symb. II, 98.

17) Aruch, s.v. אסתרא .

18) Cf. Creuzer, Symb. III, 678.

19) Cp. Creuzer, Symb. III: 26.

20) Cp. Aruch s.v. ה״יא .

21) Hebrews 10:5-7; cf. also Psalms 40: 7-9.

22) Cp. loc. cit. v. 3.

23) Cp. Psalms 50: 7-14.

24) Makkoth 11b.

25) Symb. II: 211.

26) Cp. Maimonides Yesode Ha-Torah 8:12.

27) Genesis 9:6.

28) Cf. Exodus 6:3.

29) Ikkarim, 2:27.

30) Cp. Midrash Rabbah to Genesis, #56.

31) Cp. Hebrews 11:19.

32) Genesis 9:8.

33) Cp. Romans 10 :6-10 with Deuteronomy 30 : 12-14.

34) Deuteronomy 30:11.

35) Deuteronomy 7:10.

36) Cp. Berachoth 5, 6.

37) As Holdheim points out in his מאמר האישות p. 65 f.

38) Corinthians 15.

39) Matthew 22:30.

40) Cp. Sanhedrin 90b and Midrash Rabbah to Leviticus, #13.

41) Cp. Sabbath 146a: ישראל שעמדו על הר סני פסקה זוהמתן

42) Cp. Midrash Rabbah to Genesis, #14: כשם שיצירתי בעה"ז כך יצרתי בעה"ב בעולם הזה מתחיל בעור ובבשר וגומר בגדים ובעצמות כך לעתיד לבא מתחיל בעור ובבשר וגומר בגידים ועצמות.

43) Sabbath 63a.

44) Cp. Maimonides to Kings 11:2.

45) Mishnah p. 43.

46) Cp. Niddah 61b, Megillah 4a, and Eduyoth, end.

Jerusalem, II 7a.

48) Hilchot Teshuvah, 8:2.

49) Cp. Zunz, Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden, p. 367.

50) Cf. Matthew 22:24-28.

51) משנה תורה, VIII/95.

52) Cp. Exodus 44; Numbers 16611; I Kings 186.

53) Deuteronomy 13:2-5.

54) משנה תורה, III:25.

55) Cp. also Albo's Ikkarim I:18, and Maimonides in ספר המצות, Chapter VIII of ספר התורה.

56) Cf. Abodah 55-66, Pesahim Rabbah 55.

57) Cf. Continuations 155 12-15.

P A R T II.

SECTION D -- PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

Chapter 1.

Introduction.

Introduction

By "practical theology" we mean those functions of the ministry which are not learned from textbooks, but are studied in the school of life. Only experience, trial and error can make a man thoroughly familiar with this field.

Einhorn describes only a few cases in the Sinai. None of those is of a personal nature, they all deal with either the entire community or his own congregation. Because of the lack of source materials we do not know how he deported himself in individual cases, but judging from the general character of the man we might draw some conclusions, which, because of the above stated reason, must remain open to challenge. Because of the gigantic structure of the man as a preacher and because of his impressive stature in the community it is very likely that people came to him with their troubles. We do not doubt that once he accepted such cases he struggled with them until he had solved them. It may be generally stated that an individual who was as valiant a fighter as Einhorn, whenever he was attacked, or who was so capable of aggression against everything he felt was wrong, would not hestitate, yes, even be eager, to champion the cause of the oppressed or those in need.

The cases described in the Sinai are stated very briefly and concisely. Let us consider them seriatim.

P A R T II.

SECTION D -- PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

Chapter 2.

The Procedure to be Followed with the Deceased.

The Procedure to be Followed with the Deceased.

In the regular rubric of "News Dispatches" the Sinai brought to the attention of the public every instance of a "Scheintod" that Einhorn could find.[1] In the middle of the nineteenth century, when medical science was still in a relatively elementary state, considering the gigantic advances it has made during the course of the last century, it was often very difficult to ascertain whether an individual was actually deceased or had merely passed into a coma. The Torah[2] legislates that an individual who was legally executed may not remain exposed on the gallows overnight. Even though this passage referred only to criminals, the Rabbis applied the law to all who were deceased, so that every Jew who passes away must be buried before sundown.[3]

In an article entitled The Bad Custom of Quick Burial[4] Einhorn protests strongly against this custom. He cites the fact that in Europe (Germany) the state decreed that at least two or three periods of twenty-four hours must elapse after death before burial is permitted. Since the state does not interfere with burial in this country, Einhorn feels that the congregations themselves must correct this evil. Einhorn himself in the two and a half years that he was in America (this article was written in 1858) officiated only twice at funerals within forty-eight hours after the demise, and those were very special circumstances. Since then, upon Einhorn's urging,

his congregation built a funeral-home, and now a minimum of forty-eight hours must elapse in all cases before burial may take place.

It might be mentioned here that even Orthodoxy recognized the dangers of quick burial. In a post-talmudic treatise[5]. it is pointed out that it was customary for the relatives of the deceased to visit the grave for three days after burial to see whether the buried individual was actually dead. Einhorn apparently overlooked this passage, however he was fully justified in his suggestions since this custom had fallen by the way. Naturally his procedure also was far more humane.

In a later issue of the Sinai[6]. he published an article entitled About the Procedure with the Deceased, in which he renders the opinion of a Jewish physician, Dr. Abraham Arnold of Baltimore. This opinion, to which Einhorn subscribed wholeheartedly, is to be found in the appendix to this section. Einhorn promised to deal with these suggestions from the theological viewpoint, but he never did this in the Sinai. In a later issue[7]. he did publish an article by Frederike Kempner, originally published in Breslau, 1856, in which the author merely cites many authorities who are opposed to the custom of quick burial, and who advocate the building of funeral-homes where the body of the deceased might lie in state for some time before burial.

P A R T II.

SECTION D -- PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

Chapter 3.

Observance of the Sabbath.

Observance of the Sabbath.

In an article entitled The Sabbath Must be Recaptured Einhorn relates that approximately forty members of his congregation decided to close their businesses on the Sabbath as a result of his latest Yom Kippur Sermon.[9] This was perhaps the finest answer Einhorn could give to the accusations of I. M. Wise[10] that Einhorn wanted to shift the Sabbath to Sunday.

"Talmudic Judaism," he states,[11] "conceives of the prohibition against work on the Sabbath mainly as the type of work that is productive in nature, and thus leaves loopholes for certain people who have businesses that are not of a productive character.....[12] In contrast to this Reform Judaism, in harmony with the pronouncements of the Bible,[13] prohibits all business, be it of a productive nature or otherwise.[14]

He also writes:[15] "If American Jewry continues to trade away the Sabbath and play off Sunday, within a decade nothing will be left of Judaism." While we would be the last to deny the importance of preserving the Sabbath, we nevertheless feel constrained to state in the light of the evidence produced during the last century that the observance of the Sabbath has in general been overrated by most writers.

In closing Einhorn states that he is supported in his efforts by his colleagues Drs. Hocheimer and Illowy.

P A R T II.

SECTION D -- PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

Chapter 4.

Miscellany.

Miscellany.

The Sinai contains several instances in which Einhorn appealed to the community by means of his periodical.

There are two cases in which he appealed for money, once for the Israelitische Bibel-Anstalt,[16] a German organization headed by Dr. Ludwig Phillipson of Magdeburg, which wanted to publish the Bible in German; the other was an appeal for financial aid for the Dutch-German Jewish Congregation of Jerusalem to build a home for the Jewish poor of that city.[17]

In another instance Einhorn recommended that people buy the book by I. I. Benjamin, Eight Years in Asia and Africa, 1846-1855. This gentleman had traveled throughout the world like Benjamin of Tudela, collecting accounts of incidents of Jewish life in strange places.

APPENDIX H.

Objections and Suggestions Regarding Procedure with the Deceased by Dr. Abraham Arnold of Baltimore.

Sinai, Volume III : 988-989.

Objections and Suggestions Regarding Procedure with the Deceased by Dr. Abraham Arnold of Baltimore.

I. Objections:

A. Often, while a sick person appears to be on the brink of death, his co-religionists are summoned to say prayers. Since the sick individual may rally and have relapses several times, this procedure is repeated again and again. This is often injurious to the patient, and unnecessarily multiplies the pangs felt by relatives.

B. The bystanders often oppose the physician in his ministrations, such as the offering of a beverage or the arranging of bedclothes.

C. It is a rule among our co-religionists to send away the nearest relatives at the moment of death. This is inhumane.

D. Burial follows death too quickly; this must be remedied.

E. Rigor Mortis has hardly set in when the body is placed on the floor which was previously covered with some straw, and a sheet is thrown over it. The cleansing of the body is also a bungling affair, so that the public entertains the notion that we scald and curry our dead.

II. Suggestions:

A. After death the eyes of the deceased should be closed gently.

B. The jaw should be tied up to prevent its falling.

C. One hour after death the corpse should be washed and its hair combed. It should be dressed in fresh linens and placed on a table in any room of the house, and be covered with a thin white sheet.

D. In the coffin the head should be supported by a small pillow.

E. The lid of the coffin should not be closed until the hour of burial. It is also advisable, that the corpse should be constantly watched so long as the deceased is left unburied.

N O T E S.

to

PART II, SECTION D.

Notes.

1) E.g. Sinai, Vol. III : 889-890.

2) Deuteronomy 21 : 23.

3) Cf. Sanhedrin VI : 4, 46a, b; Maimonides אבל IV : 8; Yoreh Deah 357 : 1.

4) Sinai, Vol. III, pp. 891-897.

5) Masechta Semachot (Ebel Rabbati) VIII.

6) Sinai, loc. cit. pp. 987-989.

7) Op. cit., Vol. VI, pp. 212-220; 243-249.

8) Op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 289-291.

9) Op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 295-311.

10) Cf. above, Part I, Section 2, The Cleveland Conference.

11) Sinai, Vol. IV, p. 290.

12) Cp. Bezah 37a.

13) Cf. Exodus 16 : 26 and Isaiah 58 : 13.

14) Cf. The Protocolle of the Breslau Rabbinical Conference.

15) Sinai, loc. cit.

16) Op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 161-168.

17) Op. cit., Vol. VI, pp. 33-38.

18) Op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 225-230.

169297

VOLUME II.

P A R T III.

The Preacher.

P A R T III.

Section A.

Introduction.

Introduction.

Reading the collection of Dr. Einhorn's sermons in Sinai is a peculiar experience. The first sermon captures the reader's interest and holds him spellbound to the last word; the second and third sermon are fascinating and attractive. However, soon the realization comes that the basic substance of all of Einhorn's sermons is the same, that he always preaches a few ideas in an ever new guise.

This repetition of the same pattern lends a certain monotony to his sermons if they are read one after another, but never to the point that one completely tires of his works.

The ideas preached can be summed up in a few sentences. The first topic is Reform Judaism by both a positive and a negative approach. Einhorn's procedure was to point out the weaknesses in the structure of Orthodoxy, and then to propose Reform as the only true Judaism. The rigidy and the stagnancy of the old system lent themselves well to this method; its hopeless standstill in the progress of time and its unwillingness to accept current practices and ideologies left it vulnerable to such attacks. After pointing out these fallacies Einhorn built up Reform. He emphasized the new as an offspring of the old. The theology and the cult practices of the older institution were carefully scrutinized and then separated into what was worth retaining and that

which must be discarded. Carefully he sought for proof in the classic works of Judaism to substantiate his teachings, even though he paradoxically had on many occasions denied some of these their authority. We gain the feeling that even as the poet is permitted license and may manipulate language to suit his purpose, even so the preacher may utilize sources and statements which would not be acceptable in a scientific exposition.

Another subject which was treated often from the pulpit was the concept of sin. Bitterly the philosophy of original sin is attacked, over and over again Einhorn pointed out that the original character of the universe and of man is basically good, for God created it, and anything created by God cannot be anything but good. Although he couches his reasoning in popular terms, essentially it is the same as the Anselmian (ontological) argument. בדמות אלהים עשה אותו is to Einhorn conclusive proof of the goodness of man, and only man's own inclinations can drive him to sin. In discussing this subject he often attacked Christianity, and especially Catholicism, the chief proponent of original sin. Of course after the Mortara affaire he was more bitter than ever against Catholicism, and let no occasion go by in which he could attack it.

A third favorite subject was liberty. Man is praised as the king of created beings, created in the

image of God, and therefore not to be enslaved. Not only as individuals, but also on the national level should man be free. This subject always led Einhorn to the messianic ideals of Judaism. No longer is Judaism expecting an individual Messiah, but rather Israel is the symbol that will lead the nations to a messianic age. Israel is the priestpeople, the chosen of God, because it chose God. As such it must by precept and example show the world the correct way to God, to a republican system of government which devotes itself to theocratic ideals.

This constant repetition of the same subjects had excellent reasons; not for a moment may we believe that it was due to a limitation of vision or a lack of ideas. The solution lies in the historical background of Reform. In its infancy Reform was a movement of laymen, and not of scholars. The Mendelsohnian era ushered in intellectual freedom, the French Revolution brought factual liberty. Once the desire for freedom had been kindled, and such freedom was not to be found in the fold of the existent Judaism, many of the faith left their religion. Others who had firm religious convictions but had tasted of the world outside of the Ghetto wished a modification of Judaism. Simultaneously the movement of the Jüdische Wissenschaft arose, spurred by young intellectuals who thirsted for the knowledge of the world. The masses,

however, remained with Orthodoxy. To convince them of the new system of thought was no small task, and so the leaders of the new movement, on whom the burden of proof fell, became missionaries in the literal sense of the word. This method was a simple one: Over and over again they drove home the same point, condemning the old, advocating and extolling the new.

Einhorn belonged to this generation of leaders, hence his repetitious preaching. Yet even though the subject matter did not change, he always managed to add a new twist by his brilliant ability as a homiletician. His ingenuity in expounding a text, his ability to put a different cloak on the same form every time, his amazing versatility in handling the German language, the tool of his trade, his inexhaustable store of Midrashim, and the genius he displayed in applying them, and above all his poetic nature and deep sincerity -- all these factors cannot do anything but charm the reader and impress him with the gigantic figure of the man. If we can attach the appelation of "a prophetic stature" to any man of recent times, he would be a most worthy candidate for the title. He was a spiritual pioneer in the most literal sense of the term, he taught what only a few other men had dared to preach from the pulpit: The truth, as he saw it. He followed the teaching of Hillel: "In a place where there are no men, strive to be a man." (Aboth II:6)

Considered from the technical homiletical viewpoint, Einhorn's sermons were masterpieces. His technique was as follows: The verse, or group of verses serving as text, were stated beforehand. This was followed by an exordium, usually consisting of textual exposition. This in turn was succeeded with a clear proposition, outlining the salient points of the main body of the sermon to follow. The points were then taken up individually, the appropriate portion of the text was repeated and fully expounded. The sermon was then concluded with an appeal to the listeners.

We might note that, should a modern preacher attempt to employ Einhorn's style, he would in all probability be termed "verbose," "lengthy," "long-winded," etc. We must not forget, however, the times in which Einhorn lived. A sermon less than an hour long was unheard of. This practice was perhaps חקת הגוים ; its merits need not be argued here. Suffice it to say that popular opinion has shortened the weekly sermon. This does not necessarily speak ill of the preacher, but is rather a reflection of the times and conditions. With our modern methods of communication, with the popularization of intellectual endeavors, and, above all, our numerous other opportunities for diversion, we have no longer the time nor patience to concentrate on one speaker for so great a length of time, unless we are faced by a special

occasion. In his days Einhorn was not "long-winded," rather he provided an intellectual stimulus for those who heard him preach, and who were privileged to live through the religious revolution that was about to take place in Israel.

****

The sermons that are hereby appended were preached from 1856 to 1862. For the sake of convenience they are divided into two groups. The first group is arranged according to the order of the holy days, irrespective of when or where they were preached. These are followed by sermons for special occasions. The second group were regular Sabbath sermons; they are arranged in chronological order as they appeared in the Sinai. Whenever possible the sermon title is rendered, as well as the date and the place. The Roman numerals indicate the volume of the Sinai, the Arabic numerals the pagination. It must be kept in mind that these are merely condensations, and by no means the entire sermons. For the sake of clarity the writer of this dissertation undertook to number the various subheadings. As much as possible the syntax was not changed; however anyone familiar with the style of nineteenth century German will realize the difficulties involved in precise translation, and will appreciate the necessity of occasional changes.

P A R T III.

Section B.

Installation Sermons.

P A R T III.

Section B.

Installation Sermons.

Chapter 1.

Baltimore.

Installation Sermon by Dr. Einhorn, Har Sinai Congregation.

Preface to Volume I. Text: Exodus 3:11-14.

Baltimore, September 27, 1855.

Dr. Einhorn begins his inaugural sermon with praise of God. He has come across the seas to exchange the staff of the pilgrim for the staff of the priest.

Moses spoke to God and asked: "Who am I that I should go to Pharaoah to lead the children of Israel out of Egypt?" The Lord answered him and told him that when he had led the people forth, they would serve the Lord at that mountain (where this talk took place). His name, so God told Moses, was אהיה אשר אהיה.

Dr. Einhorn then continued: It is a strange soil on which I am about to work, and every step may be opposed by some obstacle. Moses also faced the dilemma. He had been raised in Egypt, he had seen the hard lot of his brothers, and had been full of bitterness towards the oppressors. Then he was banished, he spent a long time in the desert, and there in his loneliness the flame was fed more and more, until it finally broke forth. But still he quaked when the moment of decision came, and the voice of God called him to be a shepherd of the Lord. Then he asked: "Am I the right man for this task, is not my power too little?"

I, one of the least disciples of Moses, also quake at your call. There is no Pharaoh here, there is

no force, no religion of the state, for this is the sacred soil of freedom of worship. The hindrances from within our community also cannot stop us. You have already given liberally to mend the gaps in our edifice. The difficulty lies in the magnitude of our goal. All of Israelitic religious life is in a dangerous crisis at the present time. The old world lies in ruins, and a new world must be built from these ruins. Across the debris we clasp hands to contribute our building-stones. The question of course is: Are we up to this task? Are we using the correct means, or are we putting up tombstones instead of building stones? Do we correctly conceive of our task, and are we properly equipped for it? But courage! To us also the call goes out: "This is your sign -- on this mountain shall you serve the Lord." It is our task to mold the Israelitic Religion according to the demands of the present time, but never to swerve from the path of God, to keep alive our fervor by trust in the certain ultimate victory of our cause, even though our endeavors are still quite unique.

The name Har Sinai urges us to change our religious life in conformity with the present time. The events on Sinai point to the difference between the essence and the form of religion. It is our duty to change the latter in favor of the former. The most impressive event of Sinai was the giving of the Ten Command-

ments. Heathendom was shaken by them, they constituted the first big step towards the education of society, which heretofore had had license as its cult, and had sought to drown its guilt feelings in human blood. Israel received its God-concept at Sinai, in a few strokes the relation of man to God, to his neighbor, and to irrational creatures were portrayed. There Israel received the basis for the salvation of the individual, the pattern for family life and society. There a framework was erected for all Biblical, religious, and ethical teachings, which, despite its age, is fit for a picture of the messianic age. Our Ancients rightfully compared the עשרת הדברות with the עשרה מאמרות of creation. The one is the foundation of the moral order of the world as much as the other is the basis of the natural order of the world. World history knows of no other event as important as the giving of the Ten Commandments, and Sinai is the cradle of all temporal and eternal salvation for all the generations of mankind.

The Law of God has, even as man, the son of God, a mortal body and an immortal soul. The body is the servant of the soul and must go when the soul leaves it. The soul is the religious and ethical Law represented by the Ten Commandments, amongst which is the Law of the Sabbath (cf. Ibn Ezra to the passage). The spirit of the Covenant between God and man is for all time, for all men

and all nations, predetermined to become the communal property of all through Israel. Its demands must become higher and higher throughout the millenia, to flood all eventually like a stream. Compared to it all other divine precepts are but signs of the Covenant, fences to the Law. We do not claim that man can ever completely do without concrete tokens, but these must undergo changes according to man's knowledge, national customs, occupational, social, and political circumstances. In its course of development religious thought can no more be bound to its original premises than a blossom can return to being a bud, or a butterfly to its caterpillar stage. Even as the Israelitic religion grows internally, its transformation requires it to circulate throughout the world. The cults of heathendom threatened Israel's worship of God with entirely different dangers than the Church, and each situation required a completely different antidote. The Israel of Mount Sinai surrounded itself with completely different bulwarks than the Israel which moves about in the ocean of nations, enriching them from its spiritual treasures. However, this Israel sees itself summoned more and more, whether willingly or unwillingly, to an amalgamation with its surroundings. Indeed our religious history has accomplished a transformation of religious Biblical forms to such an extent that since approximately two thousand years the greatest part of them have disappeared from Israelitic life.

Of course the pious spirit of our fathers clung to these lifeless forms, it mourned over the death of these institutions, and comforted itself that it was not a death, but a trance. The oldtimers thought that the house of David had not disappeared forever, with its offerings, priests and Levites. They thought that the house of David would some day be re-erected, and Israel would return to Zion. However, instead of adapting the body to the soul, they attempted to make the soul to conform to the body, and even applied a ceremonial yardstick to the ethical Law. Long faded away are the voices of the ancient prophets who made the spirit of religion the true banner of Israel around which all nations shall some day rally; against which all ceremonial pomp, all offerings and fasting would appear worthless. At the destruction of the Second Temple they would have cried out: Be comforted! The old husk is dead and empty, but from its grave the unfettered soul shall arise, to spread its wings over all the earth; from the ashes of the Second Temple will arise the giant Temple for all mankind, regarding which the Lord spoke: בֵּיתִי בֵּית תְּפִלָּה יִקָּרֵא לְכָל הָעַמִּים, and from the ruins of Judah a messianic world shall be built. The mortar to cement the stones of the building will have to be the blood of our hearts, but such a goal is worthy of our sacrifices, more than the sacrifices of rams and bullocks!

Everything at the present time exhorts us to act, to work for a re-formation of our inner and outer religious life. Judaism must cut away those external ceremonies which have no life left in them, both to hold its adherents and to protect them from ethical decadence. Because of the impact of life there is a great break between what we do or do not do and our religious convictions. The continued preservance of such circumstances would constitute the greatest catastrophe that could happen to Israel. We break our ceremonial laws constantly, yet we feel that we are obligated to observe them. In worship we utter religious wishes which we do not mean, which are in direct contradiction to the spirit of the teachings of Sinai. This can only lead to either a blunting of our religious convictions or cause us to take refuge with another confession. Praiseworthy attempts have been made to restore attraction to services by lending them at least external harmony, but they have been in vain, for they have only covered over an inner rottenness, giving them a coat of varnish. The problem must be attacked at its very foundation, at the root. We must release Judaism for ourselves and our children, to prevent them from releasing Judaism.

With all this however, we must never depart from the divinely revealed word. Our name Har Sinai reminds us of this, for it contains the exhortation הסיבו אל צור חצבתם. We must let go of what is rotten, but our only purpose in

tearing down is to build up, not out of a lack of piety, but because of the burning desire to protect our Sanctuary from threatening danger. We do not desire a cult that is created by us, but a belief based on the teachings of Sinai. Our faith must be truly Israelitic and built on the rock of divine revelation. The focal point of our religion is monotheism. The priests may some day be Israelites or non-Israelites, וגם מהם אקח לכהנים ללוים, and then והיה ד' למלך על כל הארץ. We must raise teachings like these, which are our spiritual treasures, from our Scriptures and display them to all the world. But Judaism does have need of some symbols, for man is used to sensual perception, as long as these have religious significance.

Education also is of the utmost importance. We cannot teach our youth outdated customs, we must acquaint them with the saving powers of the immortal Sinaitic teachings, of their triumphs, of the martyrdom suffered in their behalf, of the mission of Israel.

Last, but not least, we must keep alive our enthusiasm by the thought of our eventual victory. The talmudic Rabbis already saw in the divine choice of Mount Sinai for the revelation a testimony of God's preference for what is outwardly small. Choreb was chosen despite the fact that there were several much larger mountains close by. We see this also in our Biblical literature

where the few, who have willingness to sacrifice, are always chosen. Many obstacles are in the way, but in the end הקטן יהיה לאלף והצעיר לגוי עצום. May that be our motto also! Though few in number, we shall happily commence the work of God. He who wants to achieve great works must look far beyond the present time, and must build for the future on the past. When Moses asked how to proclaim God to the people, he was told that he should say אהיה. According to the Midrash this means "I shall be with you, I shall be glorified in your midst." But then Moses went and proclaimed God as the God of the future as well as of the past. Thus, if we are asked regarding our Judaism, we shall say that it is the Judaism of our children as well as of our fathers. It is not a widow mourning for Zion, but a bride adorned for marriage with mankind.

May then the hour in which we have been united be blessed richly, may our Har Sinai be like a rock in the middle of the sea -- not by power or by might, but by the spirit of God.

P A R T III.

Section B.

Installation Sermons.

Chapter 2.

Philadelphia.

Installation Sermon by Dr. Einhorn, Congregation Kneseth Israel.

Volume VI: 270-285. Text: Isaiah 5: 1-7

Philadelphia, August 24, 1861.

Prayer: אם ד' לא יבנה בית שוא עמלו בוניו בו. Every pact, not sealed in the name of God and in His spirit, is doomed to death. We pray that You might bless our Covenant for us and our children. Responding to Your holy call I have again taken the wanderer's staff in storm-stressed times -- let it be planted in Your vineyard as a vine to become ripe with precious fruits.

My entrance into this congregation takes place under unusual circumstances -- I am not a stranger in your midst, for many years we have been closely connected in spirit. I helped found this congregation, it took part in my battles for truth. There is no honeymoon, often only the predecessor of bitter disappointments, there is only the sealing of connections begun long ago. There is no novelty, but this is replaced by holy seriousness. What is lost in fantasy is gained in heart and spirit, and that is what we need. It is the chief evil of Judaism that many of its adherents have lost it as a mixture of hollow forms. Such a vacuum cannot be filled with glittering forms -- it requires a religious revolution to make people know that religion has been planted among men as a vineyard, that its spirit, as wine, must gladden the heart

and refresh the soul. This is our goal, this is the task of Reform congregations, for this purpose we are united. But what is the essence of such a revolution? Let us discuss that today -- the subject seems to me the most worthy introduction of my teaching service in your midst.

Wine is the significant symbol that was never lacking in ancient Israel where a Covenant was sealed with God or in the name of God. With the winecup we consecrate Israel's sons to the Covenant, with it we greet the Sabbath, with it we consecrate matrimony. This noble fruit which gains in value with age shows that all which is noble and filled with the spirit of God gains strength with time, and thus is both a sign of endurance and of the rising ardor of the Covenant. Thus Noah planted a vine after concluding his Covenant with God. And when Abraham's seed was destined to spread through all the world to bring forth more and more precious fruit for the quickening of all mankind -- what more fitting name could have been found for this people than גפן ישראל? The prophet changed the symbol of the vine to that of the vineyard. The vineyard was well taken care of, but it produced only wild grapes. Let us then speak of our vineyard and the nature of its change. This consists of the refinement of 1. Its cult; 2. Its life; and 3. Its school.

1. Its cult. Strictly speaking the cult has always been the central point of the Jewish glorifica-

tion of God. As soon as the Israelites had a chance after leaving Egypt, Moses ordered the building of a tent for the purpose of worship. In this Sanctuary human needs were satisfied by sin offerings, meal offerings, etc. There peace came to disturbed consciences, there everyone was reminded of his great Benefactor, there was the reminder of God's everlasting mercy. But this holy place was consecrated especially for worship by the עלה, which lifted all men to the feeling of their imperishable dignity as sons of God, causing them to pour out their hearts before Him. This tent eventually became the proud Temple, and this in turn the simple synagogue, but the essence of the cult remained the same despite all changes. The Rabbis explain our text: וירבן מגדל בתוכו זה היכל, its foot on earth, its peak in heaven -- וגם יקב בו זה מזבח. The Jewish House of Worship has had this same destination at all times. Its calling is to be a giant tower in all depressions of life -- to make it always more pure, more palatable and stronger. The priestly garment, the sacrificial blood of animals, and the altar flame have disappeared 2000 years ago, but the priestpeople still lives, having worn the garb of slavery during this period, and having sacrificed their own blood. And whence could they have drawn their courage, but at the place where the flame of divine enthusiasm is nurtured constantly, where

poor tortured souls, even after their cries of woe, began again their songs of praise for the One and Only? Even if these pious martyrs called the Synagogue only a מקדש מעט , a weak reflection of בית המקדש , even if the most fervent prayer for them was only a poor substitute for animal sacrifices as they hoped for the restoration of Zion -- we do not insult them, when we, on a higher level of religious development and historical experience, designate their views as mistaken, seeing the Mosaic sacrificial cult only as the first ray of glowing reverence, and in Zion's Sanctuary the tower-like tribe that received its crown in our synagogues. It is another question to ask whether our synagogues always fulfill their purpose. To this, unfortunately, we must answer 'No' most emphatically. Reverence is almost gone; the buildings have become more attractive, the services have gained outwardly; quiet and decorum, choral song and organ music are regular features, but genuineness is lacking. Jewish congregations no longer know how to pray. Or is it prayer merely to murmur words without thought, to lament over pains long past, to voice wishes, the fulfillment of which would be regarded as a calamity? In the old Israel most people knew Hebrew, and those who didn't at least spoke to God in an inner, living language. Their mourning over the destruction of the Temple was real, their laments true, but today only a distorted picture remains of all this. The words and feelings

of the so-called Orthodox cult are dead. They mourn about persecution in the midst of full civil liberty, they pray for the restoration of Zion, but think seriously only about our destroyed Union. Thus our public services have become empty lipservice, the tower of our ancestors a ruin! Semi-Reform cannot help this evil either -- it is only a covering of the decayed, a polish over what is rotten. Semi-Reform gives rose-scented water instead of the strong wine, it produces actors in the pulpit and beautiful overtures -- those are its ideals. We must stop this. Our Houses of Worship must again become Sanctuaries, as a tower in the vineyard, rising up to God. We must not cripple the vineyard of our old cult, whose fruit has been sweet to us so many centuries. לא תזרע כמך כלאים -- we must not sow two types of religious views, ויעזקהו ויסקלהו , we must redig it and remove the stones from it -- the stones of dead laments, wishes and hopes, ויטעהו שרק , that the pure grapes of belief and trust in God may blossom again. והגפנים סמדר נתנו ריח -- if our cult is like a blossoming vine, then it may bring pleasant odors, then chorals and organs are in their proper place, a ריח ניחח לד' -- but where life and sincerity are lacking in the services their pleasant odors can only serve to cover the stench of the decayed.

Even as we must purify the cult, so we must also purify our teachings. In the time of the Second Temple, when Hebrew had become strange to the people, the reader was

assisted by a מתורגמן. Our בית הכנסת must not be only a בית תפלה, but also a house of learning. It is the purpose of prayer to integrate the human will with the divine will, to cleanse it of all that is impure, and to make the heart a vat full of noble wine. For this purpose the tower of the Sinaitac teaching must be known. But here also time has made a breach. The Methurgeman is gone, the Bible is read in a language not understood by the people, and its treasures are lost for them. The Jew has become a stranger in his own house, in his own Book of books. Only the recently introduced sermon can prevent disaster, for a mere translation of the Torah without explanation is of no value. The sermon, in order to fulfill its task properly, also must undergo a reform: Hollow phrases and empty sentiments must be eliminated; the sermon must bring pearls of thoughts from our 4000 year old history, it must give people an insight into the Bible, the Talmud and the Midrashim. The soft and beautiful must be paired with the serious and the strict; if the path to be traversed is to be steep, it must be strewn with flowers. But this chain of flowers must serve a purpose: To scale the heights of God's Law, there to raise the noble vine of a life saturated with divine thoughts.

2. A life saturated with divine thoughts: That is the goal of our religious revolution. When we

look at the present Israel -- the priestpeople of God -- what a sad spectacle meets our eyes! Everywhere there are wild grapes, everywhere God's exhortation ואנכי נטעתיך כלה זרע אמת -- ואיך נהפכת לי סורי גפן נכריה . Hundreds of thousands of Jews are connected with Judaism only by birth; occasionally there are vague reminiscences, but these are always rejected. We have many of such Jews here -- as young people they left the old world, and by breaking with the chain of slavery they thought they also had to break with the links of Judaism. They believe that they stand above any confession, on the top of pure humanity; they think that they can breathe fully only if they are outside of any religious community. Even when our hearts enclose all of humanity we still need a small, homy circle to set in motion the levers of our activities from there. What would one say of a so called citizen of the world, who neglects his own family and home? Judaism is, and does not wish to be anything more than the purest humanitarianism, nourished by the thought of the One and Only. At its very inception it proclaimed blessing for all families of the earth; its prophets were enthused when they spoke of the unification of all nations. To reach this goal the divine spirit of world history chose a small space at first, a small nation, to implant within it the noble vine. For protection this vine was at first surrounded by fences, but the plant was expected to grow

beyond these. And should it be too small for us in such a community? Go, dare say it: The God of Judaism has become too much for you! This giant Tower of the vineyard -- He is too much for you! It is a pity that your God cannot rule the world, so that at least very quietly He may retire to whisper softly שמע ישראל! Others, and their number is legion, fight for anything old with fervent ardor, but wish to know nothing of any change in tradition. Their motto is: Not a stone may be removed from the vineyard of Israel! While they speak thus, they trample the vineyard like bears, they keep hardly any ceremonial law sacred if it interferes with physical goods. They have a formal selection among מצות and עבירות, according to the measure in which they bring them comfort and money or affect their palates. Is not that a desecration of God? Were Elijah to appear among us would he not cry out: עד מתי אתם פוסחים על שתי הסעיפים ? If God is Master, follow Him; if Baal, then magnify him! And what of Reform circles? Are the grapes wild here also? It is easy to adorn oneself with the name of Reformer. But true Reform is not satisfied with an enlightened stomach -- it requires a deeply religious spirit, a heart willing to sacrifice. It requires Israelites who will cling to its eternal truths as to life, who will not break with the old out of frivolity, but rather because it restrains the living religion. It requires men who will openly bring honor to Israel, and will shy away from any חלול השם .

True Reform desires Prophetic Judaism, which knows nothing higher than ethical sanctification in the name of God; it desires to glean the stones from the vineyard, the House of Israel. The adherents of such a Reform are not overly many. Most who call themselves by this name go as far as possible -- in negating tradition. But if sacrifices are required, if a higher discipline is requested as the toll of daily life -- then Reform is shown the door, because it is too obtrusive, what was praised yesterday is thrown overboard today. Then we can ask: Are these really the descendants of thos who gave their property and lives for their convictions? We may admit it openly: For countless Israelites Judaism has ceased to be a vital power. To spend an hour in worship each Sabbath is too much. With its Sabbath Judaism has conquered worlds and raised slaves to kingship; it is the tower that has kept Israel above the mire of lies in its low periods. Today this tower is not even the height of a molehill, even for those who usually make an elephant out of a ceremonial fly.

Thus life in Israel without God is without ethics. This must be stopped if we wish to speak of a religious ennoblement. Reform must see to it that Judaism is not only a phrase, but that the precious juice of its grapes will again strengthen that which has become cold -- that religion is unfettered from dead dogmas, but life be

bound by religion.

3. The education of our youth is the third and most important goal of our religious revolution. וכרמינו סמדר (Canticles 2: 15). Our children are the buds on the vines, most easily harmed by damaging influences. The questions are: Has the worm of indifference already begun its work, and shall the children's teeth be dulled because the fathers have eaten sour grapes? The present generation is torn, at best we can mend it a little. But as to our children, it is in our hands whether they will be the pride or the shame of Judaism. There is no inner conflict in them, but their education is spiced with danger. Tell them Judaism hinges on a menu, and without hesitation they will eventually throw Judaism away with the menu. Teach them that the עשרת הדברות are the heart and soul of Judaism, teach them of the One God and one humanity, and they will be proud of Judaism, will even sacrifice themselves if need be. The children must be taught that Judaism stands within and not outside humanity, that Jews had to leave their former home to proclaim God's name everywhere. The child's mind is קרן בן שמן, a fat soil, from which both good and bad seeds will grow. Rashi and the Midrash to our text state that man is a vineyard full of vines; the mind, the product of God, is built in it like a tower, to be a מעין נובע מקור חכמה. It is the duty of education to gain rich

fruits from these young vines, and not to permit thorns and thistles to grow.

Einhorn closes this sermon with a brief prayer for success in his new calling.

P A R T III.

Section C.

Holy Day Sermons.

P A R T III.

Section C.

Holy Day Sermons.

Chapter 1.

Rosh Hashonah.

Rosh Hashonah Sermon.

Volume III: 1062-1074. Text: I Samuel 2: 1-10.

ראש השנה is designated in the Bible only with the obscure words זכרון תרועה, and is thus usually called יום הזכרון. The Synagogue ties to this term the divine decisions made on that day for all human fate, the divine judgment over all human actions, the divine revelation of Sinai, and the eventual messianic recognition of a theocracy over all men. The prayer אתה זוכר states זה היום תחלת מעשיך, this is a day of judgment, of remembrance of the world's first day; it is a day of law for Israel. ברוה"ש כל באי עולם עוברין לפניו כבני מרון. We pray for the rule of God over all the world. Take away the covers put on this basic concept by time, and we find the truth: When God created the world, He had already thought of all the generations to come. The Psalmist states: "None of my bones was hidden from you when I was created . . . in Your book . . . all the future was recorded." The Midrash comments on this: God already showed Adam the book in which all the future was recorded. Moses prayed: "Lord . . . our Refuge of Old . . . eternally You are God." As the deluge story relates, the Jewish Ancients thought of the fall month as the beginning of the year, even as Nisan is the beginning of Israel's origin as a nation of God. In truth this day is not one determined especially for judgment, rather one which, be-

cause it points to creation, reminds us of the divine judgment, the eternal predistination of the human lot, God's care or השגחה פרטית , which at the creation of Adam had already determined our ways. It is also a יום הזכרון because we are reminded that we are all written down in the ספר הזכרון -- there is a Providence that has known us long before we were born. Whatever the years may change, all men have the same Keeper and Protector. As the seventh day points to the fact that God guides His work according to the unalterable and wise laws of nature, thus the seventh month indicates the leading of the human world according to all-just, and from the beginning pre-determined laws of fate. Let us see in what way Israel's truths, remembrances and hopes are tied to this festival, by pondering how it (the festival) can serve us. 1. It will convince us of the existence of the laws of life, of God's law, already in existence before the creation of Israel; 2. It will let us recognize in Israel's marvelous guidance a sure security for our high, divine calling; 3. It will encourage us to a nevertiring battle for this high calling; and 4. It will give us unshakeable hope for the winning of a glorious victory.

1. Hannah praised God Who lifts the poor out of the dust, and places him on the throne of honor -- not an earthly throne, but a spiritual one. "He puts him next to nobles." Who are the nobles next to whom the Lord puts

the poor? They are the ones who are collectively called King and the Messiah at the end of the song. Since Israel had no king at the time this song was written, this must mean the Israel which is to rule by the sword of truth. But is this sword given to Israel only? Hardly -- in lifting the poor, God gives him a new birth, puts him on the same level which Israel is to reach in the future. He causes the same flame of the Law to burn within him that Israel received on Sinai. God has not closed the portals of salvation for mankind, neither before nor next to Israel, to force it to be emprisoned in darkness. From the beginning, even as the law of nature and the laws of fate, God also set down the laws of religion, which stamp the divine seal on man, and without which freedom would be a deadly weapon for man. There is a legend amongst our people, which was esteemed to be important even by Maimonides, (cf. Beth Hab'chir'ah, II): The altar of Solomon's Temple was built on the same spot where the עקדה took place, where Noah sacrificed when leaving the ark, where Adam was called to life. ממקום כפרתי נברא -- this place, which was later to become a place of atonement, produced the earth of which Adam was made. Our festival then reminds us of the origin of the world and the creation of Adam, and thus becomes also the festival of the original divine revelation which came to the father of all men on Moriah. It was merely renewed

at Sinai, and there a nation was created to serve it. Rabbinic Judaism feels a contradiction in this, that Israel was chosen, and most of the world apparently was cut off from the blessing. Later the Rabbis therefore, in contradiction to the Bible and the Mishnah, said: The divine watchfulness is for each Israelite; with other people, however, it is only for the whole nation as a unit. Therefore Israel had a special revelation; the other nations perceive God's will only to the extent of human reason. For that reason they only have to fulfill the laws of reason.* Some even said that Israel is under direct divine supervision, while all other nations are under the aegis of angels and heavenly constellations. But this view, unworthy of the divine dignity, with its root in heathenism, is contradicted by the Bible: משמים הביט ד׳. The Synagogue never tore away from our original faith, even though much was diluted in the course of the years. Thus a very glowing account of revelation is given in the מוסף of ר״ה , even more so than in the Shevuoth liturgy, so that our calendar is not reckoned from the liberation from Egypt, but from the beginning of the world, and humanity from ר״ה.

2. The thought of the festival also reminds us of Israel's wonderful guidance, a certain proof of our high divine calling. Today, when we look back at the past,

---

* מצורות שכלית .

we need to doubt this less than ever. "This people," a philosopher once said, "is the greatest irony of world history." Yes, an irony to our enemies and to the heathens. Of course he who sees nothing but chance in human fate can solve the riddle readily, for where there is no rule there cannot be exceptions; blind chance casts the lots, and they fall as they may. But he who believes in fate, and recognizes the idea we have in mind today "the Lord will judge the ends of the earth" (v. 10 of our text), he will recognize that God guides the foot of the pious, he will recognize that sinners are destroyed in darkness, כי לא בכח יגבר איש -- only the spirit of God prevails. He will see our task, that despite our history there is a definite regulating Law, according to which no nation can finish its career until it has completed its task; we can resist all forces until we have done that for which God has sent us.

3. Today's festival also encourages us to steel ourselves for untiring battle: אם ד' לי מה יעשה לי אדם. No matter how others try to upset us, אדיר במרום ד'. No matter how far culture advances, man, creating avenues for himself through rocks, oceans and the air, so that messages can go from one end of the earth to another in a moment -- man can only gain, never lose, by these advances; they only serve to make our activities even more effective as a roller that splinters the rocks of

heathenism, to grind their hills of idol worship into chaff. But those who cling to the dried up twigs of Judaism and take them for the pillars of the earth, who do this in the midst of present progress -- they may have fear, they who seek the word of God in old graves and not on the heights of Moriah or Sinai! Their Judaism is dead -- while ours lives! No longer is our religion childless, as Hannah was next to Peninah, moving its lips silently ורקולה לא ישמע, nor is it sent back by the priests with the words: "How long will you be drunk? Put the wine from you!" No, it is an אריאל, a lion of God, calling Israel and the nations to freedom! The old Judaism, in <u>its</u> time a רבת בנים is now an אמללה which is dying -- but the younger, formerly an עקרה, is now fertile and fruitful. The older still is stronger in numbers, but it is dying rapidly. The old has led only to religious indifference, giving up the younger generation to immorality. We have brought light, and have torn away many from their indifference. We find new hope in our new prayerbook, which is being used for the first time today in this Temple. He who steeps himself therein will soon recognize that true Reform not merely negates the old, but seeks to draw from the depths of God's word; it cuts away the dead, and builds up the new. What we need to secure a great future for our holy cause is dignity for our own institutions, participation therein, and courage for the fray.

4. Unshakable hope -- and who, in the face of the truths displayed for us by today's festival, can still doubt? Especially after having heard the words of Isaiah: "Shall I bring to the birth, and not cause to bring forth?" He who called אל תגעו במשיחי, Who made us an אבן שתיה -- could He let us fail? Not in vain do we pour out our רוח קשה, our troubled spirits before God -- like for Hannah, so our Samuel shall come! תקטן יהיה לאלף והצעיר לגוי עצום. We must wait, at the proper time our moment shall come, God will select it. Not as other nations do we count the years by historical events -- we count from the creation of the world. The birthday of our religion is the same as that of mankind, and therefore our religion must weld all mankind into אגדה אחת -- one community! Yes, He who judges the ends of the earth gives glory to His priests, and raises the horn of His annointed!

P A R T III.

Section C.

Holy Day Sermons.

Chapter 2.

Yom Kippur.

Yom Kippur Eve, 1859.

Volume IV: 342-353. Text: Mishnah Aboth V: 9

We are now at twilight, the time of the struggle between light and darkness, and light is victorious. It is our purpose to follow the call of God: "Return to Me, and I shall return to You." We all hope to be born anew this day. This reminds us of a legend: God created several things בערב שבת בין השמשות הקשת והמן והמטה והשמיר הכתב והמכתב והלוחות המזיקין וקבורתו של משה ואלו של אברהם אבינו. Of those things which God put into nature itself, at least their germs must have been there already at the close of creation; that which is the greatest ornament of man's spirit came last in creation as a seal from God's hand. What at first merely appeared as a germ of life, and developed only in the course of time, that was created at twilight, waiting until it could come to the light of day. This points out to us several principles for our return to God: 1. Sin does not come from the fall of Adam, but from nature; 2. The calling of Israel was already enclosed in the calling of Adam to be the king of nature; 3. God's Covenant with Abraham was not to invalidate the older Covenant with all mankind, but was rather to be the centerpoint thereof.

1. Sin does not come from the fall of Adam, but from nature. As מאיר explains, evil spirits are the drives of nature that cause evil thoughts and actions

in the hearts of men. God Himself planted them within us, they were the heritage of Adam already before he committed his sin. Nature is pure; man with his free will chooses to do good or evil. Sin is a challenge to us, an angel of God. We ask הלנו אתם אם לצרינו ? The answer is: אני שר צבא ד' -- your friend if you overpower me, your enemy if I conquer you! This is Jewish conviction: Man stands at the head of creation, girded with a sword to fight evil. Not sin brought death to the world, but sin is death! The death of the body has no connection with sin, it is rather a means to begin a higher career, an order from ששת ימי בראשית, from creation, which rules even over the highest and noblest among men. Even Moses' grave was selected at the time of creation. For what could we hope from a God Who has condemned us before we were capable of sinning? The cry of the prophet is: "I don't desire the death of the sinner, but that he might leave his way and live!" לפני ד' תטהרו. Darkness is not God's, it is man's. Physical drives are messengers of God to be used properly; but we must dedicate ourselves to God ...

2. The calling of Israel was already enclosed in the calling of Adam. As evil, so also God's Law was planted in man at creation. The לוחות were made at creation, giving man the only weapon with which to conquer evil. We may not think Adam only had one prohibition, i.e. that of forbidden fruit. Our Ancients say: The forbidden fruit tasted good, but it was harmful and shortened life.

This prohibition seemed to be the representative of all ethical law, (in its lowest form only), in the sense of prohibiting what was pleasing to the senses but harmful spiritually. Since this was the only prohibition, of course there were no laws for Adam against murder, adultery, theft, etc. The true לוחות , those which were כתבים באצבע אלהים were the tablets of the heart, where the mind rules, and the emotions desire, where decisions are made rationally. These tablets appeared at first only in a twilight, for man's mind learns to know itself only slowly, and in the process learns to know its God and His will. It took a long time until Abraham arose, the אב המון גוים , and his even greater (spiritual) son (Moses). But what happened at Sinai was already created, it was not something new and external. It was within us at all times -- and the divine nobles of our people were destined to bring it forth and reveal it. Grasp hold of it, it alone protects us. That is what our prophets preached -- sometimes softly with sweet promises, at other times as a lament or as a thunder. Moses, Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah -- they all expressed these teachings. Yes, we have another basis than the letter, that straw in the wind; we have the tablets of the Law which cannot be overthrown. The morning at Sinai revealed in light what Adam had only seen by evening twilight.

3. God's Covenant with Abraham is not to in-

validate the older Covenant with all mankind, but is rather to be the centerpoint thereof. The ram sacrificed instead of Isaac -- its horn, the שופר which was sounded at Sinai, these also were prepared at the time of creation. This is the horn that in the future is to proclaim the coming of the Messiah. At the twilight of creation there was already the germ of that seen of which Isaiah said: וראו החמה יהיה שבעתים כאור שבעת הימים. The rainbow of seven colors, the preceptor of the sun, was in the heavens already at creation, as a sign of peace in man's heart, of the Covenant between God and man, between Israel and the nations. No matter how good we are as Jews, we are separated from Him as long as we believe the division between us and others to be eternal. Such division separates us from men; it leads to the belief that the specifically Jewish ceremony is not the source of the confessional and ethical laws which are some day to be the property of all men, but that they are merely Jewish property. Such a separation leads to the belief that the ethical Law is exclusively Jewish property, a royal garment to hide the holes and tears of the coat of ceremonial law! This leads to a situation where many will answer the question איכה "Where are you?" (Which God asked of Adam) by saying עברי אנכי I am a Hebrew -- the human being is gone, but something better remains: The Jew. I am a thief -- but there's a Mezuzah on my house;

I eat food obtained with many a tear of oppression -- but it is kosher. Remember: A Jew is not above other men; he is to be only a good, noble being. As the שמיר prepared the stones for Solomon's Temple, on which no iron was to be used, so the תולעת יעקב, without iron weapons, must prepare the stones for God's Temple בית תפלה יקרא לכל העמים. This Shamir was already to be found in Adam, and whatever pretends to be specifically Jewish, without growing from the soil of humanity, that did not exist at the time of creation. With our feet in the times of twilight, the sword of right on our hip, we shall fight for right, with the sevenfold sun of Sinai as the crown on our head.

****

Yom Kippur, 1856.

Volume I: 308-320. Text: Leviticus 16: 1-34.

Our Torah portion today describes the Temple -- cult on Yom Kippur, the day when the cult had its proudest moment of the year. With deep respect we think of the heritage of our religion. We also think of the great cleft that exists between those days and today, for this cult was the mirror of a world which has now disappeared forever. That world was the spiritual cradle of all coming generations, a cradle so deep that we are still overawed at the thought of it. Our Haftarah* today shows us how the

*Isaiah 58.

spirit of God broke the bands that tied it, and lights our way across thousands of years. This is in contrast to the Law of Moses which enwrapped itself in forms clear as a crystal to its contemporaries, but petrified into rocks for us. Behind these we hear what sounds like a voice from the grave. But the longer we look at this picture, the more the impression of rigidity disappears. The reasons for this are atonement, reconciliation, and the redemption of the creature born of dust from the yoke of the consciousness of guilt; the removal of the dividing wall between father and child: The renewal of the love-covenant after faithlessness. Moses, in recording the Law, and Isaiah, in his prophetic enthusiasm, both saw the figure of a man who came from the clefts of sin to a reunion with God. To become such a figure is the goal of this day; its aim is to prove that noone should feel himself more called upon to better his life than the Israelite. The knowledge of this possibility to tear onself away completely from sin; the knowledge of this necessity and need to become reunited with God; the consciousness of our priestly position -- these factors force all Jews to an active healing of their life.

In scrutinizing our Torah portion, we find in it the teaching of unlimited freedom for man, the power to conquer sin completely. It has often been disputed which creature Scripture means by "Azazel," a being which simul-

taneously opposes the Divine Being, but also takes an equal portion of the sacrifice. The Rabbis, who wished to ascribe evil to an independent, evil-desiring being, thought Azazel was the same as Satan or Samael. The animal dedicated to him was not slaughtered as the one which was dedicated to God. The entire procedure was not a sign of honor to the demon, but a kind of a bribe to move the accuser to intercede for Israel. But Judaism rejects the belief in Satan as incongruous with the teaching that all which was created by God was pure; Judaism knows no other origin of sin except the drive of evil in man. Here again we see how the Jewish religion, already on the primitive level, was motivated by the same ethical ideals which make an appearance in their full purity later on. Azazel was not a <u>being</u>, but the <u>act</u> of removal of sin. The animal chosen for this purpose represented the evil drive in the hearts of men. The heart itself is good, and so challenges us to fight the evil, to win over it and to put the crown of victory on man's head. Both evil and good come from the source of God's love. The purpose of the act is that people who have raised themselves from depravity will fight for the palm of divine forgiveness, so that the prosecutor will become a pleader before God; for higher than the innocent man is he who wishes to atone, for whom the broken fetter has become a wing, an ugly wound which is a beautiful sign

of victory. Two animals, according to the Mishnah alike in color, height, and value, were to be chosen, the one was to represent the יצר הטוב, an offering to God, the other was to represent the יצר הרע ; the bearer of sin, destined to carry sins into the distance. However, before taking this load of sins to be put before God, the animal had to be brought alive before the priest, and had to be found worthy to take on these sins. This was done ostensibly as a sign that the inclination to the unclean also has the ability to be absolved from sin, and is capable of fulfilling its high destiny to appear in the Temple of the Lord as His servant. This contradicts the assumption that man has in him an indestructable "sin substance," which acts as a wall between him and God. The choice of a lot by the high priest as to which animal was for God and which was for Azazel had as its basis the thought that man himself chooses his lot for eternity, that he has complete free will to choose between life and death, to sow his seeds in good rich soil -- often amidst bitter tears -- but only to harvest with great happiness; or else to sow the wind, and to harvest the bitter fruits of storms. Yet it is that which ties millions of people lifelong to sin, namely the belief in the innate corruptness of our being, the heritage of a poison passed by the snake to Adam and to Eve, and on to all generations; a poison that defies

all efforts to destroy it completely. This teaching says: Only to a certain degree can the moral will oppose the power of destruction, like a prisoner who can move, but only within certain limitations. Having reached this limit, he is forced to renounce God to bow to certain idols. How easy it is to break the Law in the name of this doctrine, to say: "I could not help it!!" How easy to say: I am strong enough to resist the forbidden fruit, but I am too weak to permit my needy brother to partake of mine which is permitted! I am strong enough not to steal and to murder, but I am too weak to resist the exploitation of my brothers! Under seeming coercion we can readily make a free choice between God and Azazel, and when our guilty conscience leads us to God's judgment throne, then the Azazel carries the burden -- to make room for new sins! If we come from a poison-soaked root, who can accuse us, when the root blossoms? If God is our Father, then sin is our mother; if our spirit is of heaven, then our body is that of the snake! Under this system there is an external dichotomy, the desire to be an angel to our last breath, but the necessity to be a devil! Under that system only death can build a bridge between God and man. All heathendom stood on this ground. In that system sin was not guilt, but a natural evil, a necessary result of our being. The adherents of that system thus neither had a feeling of guilt, nor did they experience the need

for atonement. They only had a feeling that a cleft existed between God and man, and this cleft could be bridged only when death destroyed the body, and sin with it. Judaism has broken this belief, it has put man on the high level of freedom of will, an image of God which by its own decisions strives after the archtype of perfection, or else can sink deep below himself. Once he has sunk to such a depth, he can by his own strong efforts rise anew to the full height of his own glory. The proclamation of Sinai was: Man is born free, sin couches at the door, but it can be overcome; the body is not a snakepit, but a Temple; life is a preparatory school which will open the portals of salvation; death is a transfiguration of the holy, but never an atonement for the unclean! What then can be an excuse for our sins; for us, who profess such teachings? We can't use the excuse of the "fetters of the flesh," for that misconception was long ago destroyed by the divine call: Holy shall ye be, for I, the Lord your God, am holy! Even talmudic Judaism, which could not rid itself completely of inherited sin, permitted this power to be broken by the revelation of Sinai. So there is nothing for us to do but to choose between life and death, between God and Azazel.

As we have the knowledge that we can fulfill our our religious obligations, this conviction must force us

to a bettering of our ways. Our position of purity can only be restored by a close connection with God, for neither only belief or external offerings can replace moral life. This also we found in the symbolic acts of Biblical atonement. The animal had to carry the sins אל ארץ גזרה. This points to the necessity in the future to give up all association with sin; all symbolical acts are merely means for such a disassociation. Even more: "On this day the priest will atone for you, he will cleanse you. Of all your sins before God shall ye be cleansed." Twice the term "cleansing" is stressed here, while in all the Holy Day laws no mention is made of sanctification, with which the Law of Moses usually designates the task of Israel, the essence of piety. This is noteworthy, since this festival deals with a holy day dedicated exclusively to the restoration of the disturbed relationship between God and man. Yet this is the very key to the problem: The Day of Atonement, by its very nature, can only be the "front yard" (sic.) of holiness: As the name כפור indicates, it means "atoning," blotting out sin. No more, no less. Its task is to free man of sin, to make him pure: But purity is not holinesses, innocence is not virtue. Purity was originally the property of all creatures, holiness must be earned. See how all creatures follow the command of their Creator; everywhere there is purity, but there is no holiness!

The child, for example, has only purity, it has no holiness! -- for it has a peace without the triumph of a victory. Then look at man: He has a divine fire in his heart, he has reason -- but nevertheless his eye looks at evil! He has the inclination to turn ever more towards evil, but then the royal free will of man says: No! I want to follow the will of my Creator! This is more than purity, this is holiness! Such holiness can only be prepared by atonement; it cannot be granted, it has to be found on the battlefield of life. What does Judaism say to this? We saw before what it opines of "I can't fulfill God's Law completely." Here another type of excuse crops up: Not man's work, but his belief accomplishes everything; man only has to hold to that to be cleansed of all sin! If I hold to that, man thinks, I can count on exceptionally holy people to cover my sins by their excess of virtue! And besides that there are external offerings: If I have unlawful goods in my possession I shall give them as an offering! No matter what my sins are, even before they existed they had already been annulled by my pious forbearers. If I am unclean, I shall pray and fast. The question then is: Why obtain virtue, if one can get by on the virtue of others? The flaw of the theory is that its recognition involves a denial of Judaism's dogmas. Judaism teaches us: Belief is not the fulfillment of obligations; it is the natural outcome of knowledge and

the seeking of knowledge; it is not a sacrifice, but the crown of all of man's privileges. Belief is the root of bliss, it consists of a feeling of thanks to God. The higher we rise in belief, the more the good and noble must flame in our hearts and spur us on to noble deeds. Our Ancients taught: Not recognition, but the application of what has been recognized is the main thing. Only our own works can connect us with God, only self-earned virtue can redeem us. Even as another's fault is unable to make us fall, so another's merit cannot save us. Least of all can external sacrifices or ceremonials without the practice of their aim possess healing power. According to the prophets, the application of such forms in this manner is a misuse of the Divine, a desecration of the Holy. Thus Isaiah scolded the people for the misdeeds they committed in this fashion. Therefore, Israelites, count not on heathen lip service, it is not heartfelt, and does not bear fruits. Look at life -- where the hungry desire bread, where the slave craves freedom, where temptation seeks to catch its prey -- there fast, there offer! There we can give proof of the purity of our striving, there we can give witness to the power of Judaism. In our House of Worship there is no room for the cry: "We have, O God, no Temple, no priest, no offerings to atone for us." For we know that these institutions are merely a cloud around our Sanctuary, which at the right time will dissolve and shower

blessings on us. We agree with the prophets that the fire of true remorse is stronger than the fire of sacrifice. Therefore all the more urgently we must feel called upon to strive for the crown of sanctification, to make our house a shrine, our heart an altar, our life a priestly service!

Yes, a priestly service! That is the correct word for our calling. Why did the priest first atone for himself, and only then for the people? Because he who wishes to fashion a path to God for others must first be fit to make that way for himself; he who carries the curse of dissension with God in his own soul, cannot bring harmony with God to others. In this there was a warning for the high priest: You are the keeper of the vineyard, but you did not know how to keep your own vineyard, -- you need forgiveness for yourself first! The same holds true for all Israel! We are the priests of mankind, because of this we are sacrificial animals sent out אל ארץ גזרה , to bear the sins of all men. ביסוריהן מכפרין האומות של ישראל -- Israel's sufferings are to clear a path for others! Our exemplary endurance, our fighting for the right, our hope for victory in times of degredation are witnesses to our religion, they exalt the name of our God to other peoples. Every fetter born by Israel for the sake of its religion is a link in the chain of all men, each sigh a harmonious tone for the harmony of a messianic world. We wonder often

why all Jewish behavior is judged so strictly. It is merely the consequence of our high mission. In the circle where the light of divine revelation has raised its banner since the beginning of time for all nations, each fault, each shadow is clearly seen. No nation on earth amounts as much with its religion as we, none so little without it, as we. Our religion is our origin and our continuance, our past and our future. The sanctification or the desecration of God's Name are the poles of Jewish life.

Let us see now, Israel: Have we kept our garments clean? If not, we must watch ourselves. Do not say: I shall have peace if I follow the dictates of my heart! There is only one way: Go to God's bosom, promise what you wish, but pay what you promise! Then you will find peace, a peace that will sweeten your life; a peace which will grant on the other side of the grave that which the human tongue cannot express!

****

Yom Kippur Sermon, 1857

Volume II: 713-726. Text: Deuteronomy 14: 1.

We are God's children; today (that is Yom Kippur), He has "born us anew." What does a father ask of his children -- that they bow their head as a reed, that they be ruled with an iron fist? Would He burden them with a religion according to the letter of

the Law? He rather desires the unfolding of the children's strength, their possibilities, that they imitate Him. The prophets spoke: You shall walk in My ways. Wherever we look in history, we always find the eternal law of justice. In some people this court of justice is represented by a conscience, for the masses it is the world judgment, after which forgotten seeds will become beautiful trees.

"Walk in My ways" -- that is our calling. Man's mind cannot fathom everything, but it is the symbol that we are God's children, and it is the judge of our decisions. Moses taught us laws to keep . . . . "for this is your wisdom and understanding before the eyes of all nations." "My way is of kindness and love" -- let our way be similar! No matter how much learning we possess, without kindness and mercy we would be unworthy of the appelation "children of God." A noble heart is more than the richest treasures of the mind -- therefore pardon your enemies, be kind even to dumb animals. "My way . . . justice" -- God revenges and rewards; therefore let us imitate Him and also be just. God recognized Abraham because he kept God's ways. Moses stresses often אחרי ד' אלהיכם תלכו. This means according to the Rabbis the מדותיו של הקב"ה are to be our precepts מה הוא מלביש ערומים אף אתה הלבש ערומים. הקב"ה ביקר חולים אף אתה בקר חולים. הקב"ה נוחם אבלים אף אתה נחם אבלים. These are our duties, these are

the basic concepts of our religion. This statement simultaneously speaks the death sentence over all mystery in Judaism, it denies all empty formalities.

But is Judaism satisfied with just walking externally in the ways of God? It is often called the "Religion of the deed" -- but is the deed all-important, and not the source? Hardly! The explanation is that we are the children of God: He desires love, He desires full obedience, but it is displeasing to Him for us to strain under a yoke of duty, for He desires us to fulfill our obligations happily. Would such a God like deeds without a soul, or would He like empty lip service? Hardly! He requires sanctification -- קדשים תהיו כי קדוש אני ד' אלהיכם. To be holy means to glorify God by fighting what is evil, to proclaim His great Name. His own works glorify Him, He is a warrior Who conquers darkness. Here also we must imitate Him. We can be holy to God by removing any shade of a difference between Him and ourselves. We must not only follow Him, but we must get close to Him as a child -- הצנע לכת עם ד' אלהיך, our secrets must be with Him: That will give us the crown of sanctity. In that light we must examine our ways in regard to God, the community, our children, and our fellow men! There can be no sanctification without some means. These means are headed by the Sabbath and its services. Do we keep them? Many must answer negatively to their great shame. There also can be no sanctification without love: ואהבת את ד' אלהיך .

Never! The practice of duty might cost a conquest of self, but the recognition of duty is rather an unfolding of self. תורה and מצוה are the אורים ותמים on our hearts, which are not hidden. God's Law is a sanctification of life, denial thereof is unnatural. Unnaturalness wishes to subdue God's work on earth, it gives the impression that the illumination of the mind is artificial, and only enslaves us. The belief in the teachings of Judaism is natural, it is not forced, it is our happiness, a weapon to reach the crown of sanctity. We can and should live within the Law, because the Law lives within us. The prophet's task is to free the רוח הקדש within us by his very own רוח , that we might be prophets and hear the divine message with our own ears, so that the אש דת might burn on the altars of our hearts.

We are children of God -- that is the assurance that the sinner's way is open to God by means of repentence. A strayed child needs no intermediary to return to its father, its tears are enough. God's call is: "I desire love, not sacrifices! Return, and I shall return to you! Ephraim, next to Me, of what need are idols? I am your evergreen fir tree, from Me you receive your fruit!" אין כפרה אלא בדם -- this is a heathen teaching. The heathens sacrificed to avoid God's wrath. The priest instead of God swung the sword of justice, on a creature which was a substitute for the real sinner. That was the only punish-

Where this is so, there love is poured out and passed on to the coming generations obeying the command: ושננתם לבניך. Where this is practiced, there the education of youth is the cornerstone of temporal and eternal welfare. Parents -- have you heeded this? Have you seen to it that your children are being properly educated? Furthermore there is no sanctification without kindness and mercy. Have others always found our ears and arms open? Did we do everything in our power for the poor, the helpless? Are there no unclean goods in our hands? For these tests we are gathered together, that we might find our way back to the heart of our Father.

We are all children of God. He has given us a holy Law. A father does not give commands on which the temporal or the eternal welfare of His children hinges. He does not speak by an intermediary: If you don't obey, you will become an outcast. Can He require obedience without giving surety that the command is His? To an intermediary the children would have to say: Give us a sign. And if there are many intermediaries, even with contradictory commands: Whom should they then believe? Would God, with so many means at His disposal, rely on such communication? All beings who are not free find God's commands in their natural instincts -- and man, who has free will, even the desire to go against the command, should he be uncertain of the nature of the command?

ment, there was no mercy. The priest was the symbol of the avenging deity. How opposed this is to the ideals of the Mosaic sacrifice! Here the sacrifice is often made by a layman, and then by the order of the person who brings the sacrifice, symbolizing that he is willing to shed his own blood for God. Here the scepter of divine love rules, and not an avenging sword. The burning sacrifice is a symbol of the cleansing which the returning sinner does within himself. But such a symbol is only for our childhood, we need it no longer. We know the true atonement for the נפש; Isaiah told us to feed the hungry and to clothe the naked; not to bring sacrifices ..... but to withdraw from no one of our flesh that is to say, be he of a church, a synagogue, a mosque or even of a temple of idols. We must do those things not only when we are in a good mood, but always, because we are all children of one Father. We mourn for the original image of God in man, never-seen; for the poor, the orphaned, and for the dollar chaser. We mourn that mankind has permitted such degeneration in its own ranks. Our aim is not to restore the Temple of wood and stone, but rather the Temple of human nature. Humanity is the destroyed Zion, there we must build. For that Israel has been called. We are the בני בכרי ישראל, the first born of the nations, we had the divine revelation first. It is our duty to spread this doctrine to all men, that we, together with the nations,

will be encompassed by God's glory as by a חומת אש, that the empires of hatred and lies might perish, and all men be united into a people of the Covenant, as children of God.

****

Yom Kippur, 1859.

Volume IV: 295-311. Text: Zecheriah 4: 1-13.

TEXT: The candelabrum of gold with its seven arms, and the two oiltrees are the sons of lights.

Today כ', we all feel in need of atonement; we call out נחפשה דרכינו ונחקרה ונשובה עד ד'. What is it that is torn within us, and needs healing? A want of union exists between 1. Spiritual and sensual life; 2. Law and life; 3. The weekly Sabbath and the yearly Sabbath; 4. Man and man.

1. Between spiritual and sensual life. God planted man on the earth like a golden candelabrum, with seven arms -- those are the seven decades of normal life. Next to it are two oiltrees, permitting oil to run directly into the candelabrum. These trees are the fleeting powers of the body, and the imperishable power of the spirit (mind), both called to serve before the Lord. One receives the light from the other i.e. the son of the earth from the son of heaven. If separated from his companion, the son of the earth would become a מלאך המשחית. But under the influence of his companion, under the tent of the

spirit, he becomes a רוח אלהים , producing children, that will outlast even his seven decades. As Rashi says to our text: יצר הרע מתפך בזכות התורה -- the evil inclination can become a power for good. Man, not a child, is the picture of perfection: Not powerless innocence sanctifies, but an earned peace. Do we have such peace? Daily life says "no," there is a pseudo-peace everywhere, rottenness is left undisturbed, materialism rules, אלה אלהיך ישראל . Time is money, and no one looks for character or moral and spiritual dignity, gold is our sun. Thus we raise our children; not to look at the oiltree, but to look for superficial things. Our children are equipped with everything that brings material gain, anything that is of the latest fashion. For what purpose religion, why do they need Judaism? Why give them something that has never enriched anyone, which they must hide in "decent" company? Why indoctrinate them with a difference that exists between theoretical and practical life? Give them freedom from 4000 years of tradition -- from the stem, from which the shoot takes its sap! Briefly: It is a foolish generation that cuts itself loose from its forebears and despises the tower of its learning ....

2. Between law and life -- this is due to our spiritual suicide, the difference between present forms of Judaism and its directions on the one hand, and the external position of those who profess it. The present degeneration could not be stopped, because within the

religion we have permitted mutually opposing views, because there was worship of what was dead. Our text speaks of two trees that give oil: The one is the word of God as handed down from Moses; the other is history with its many branches. By their power God's will is felt -- at times like lightning, at other times like a mild wind. Both trees have the same root. What is written on their leaves may occasionally seem contradictory, but משפט ד' אמת צדקו יחדו . History could and would not change what is written within us, only we can't see this writing equally clearly at all times. It is history's task to raise the intellect of men to a higher usage of the treasures handed on to us, to envelop them with protecting covers -- or to rend these covers apart if they become too tight. We call that "historical development," the time during which it happens is called a period of transition. The old system claims the rights of the first-born -- the new has the task to tear down the old walls, to build not next to the old, but on the old. We have had those periods of transition often, and the new has always won. Prophetic spirit has in such times been ridiculed, but no fanaticism can ever stop the truth. What could Korach do against the new priestly institutions after the golden calf? What good were tears after the destruction of the Second Temple? There was no more fire from heaven for sacrifices, no longer was there רוח הקודש of the

prophets. The golden years of childhood and miracles were gone, our people had become more manly after Babylonia, more fit for action. The seven decades of Babylon were like the seven branches of our candelbrum through which the oil flows. No longer was the נביא the place of revelation, but the national treasure of reason. The courses of events were the sources of inspiration. The old could not stand up to the new; the grandeur of Jerusalem today lies in memories. Moriah has no Jewish Temple, it has a Mohammedan Mosque --- but the Mohammedans pray to our God. Is not that a greater triumph than Israel bringing bloody sacrifices there? Did the Spanish Inquisition stop our great thinkers? The writings of Maimonides were burned --- yet today they are the light of Israel. Orthodoxy which once condemned Maimonides' writings now uses them regularly; because of their age they have become sacred. This is the same Orthodoxy that always hated the new and loved graves. Today again we have a fight on our hands. We never had one like this before, because today we are culturally completely assimilated to the nations among whom we live. The world has discovered that Jews are like other people, that one does not have to believe in a three-in-one God to have a noble spirit. On the other hand we Jews have discovered that gentiles also were created in the image of God. These factors are the driving powers of the whole

present religious movement. They removed the sense of Jewish innate holiness, and substituted the idea of our mission, that all men have תורה אחת כעיקר אחד . No wonder we changed our ceremonial laws -- the voices of the prophets now sound louder than ever before! We had to discard ceremonies that were practiced without thought, and those that had lost all sense. We want to keep only those institutions that are alive, that the oil might flow once more to enlighten our mind, not that the dryness in us would absorb the oil!! In the other camp they cry: The letter commands. The call of the times, the changes of the intellect, these are merely the calls of Satan! The wires of the מיים are from God, those of the telegraph -- from hell! The taxes on Jews, yellow badges, these are from a divine מדה -- that the English parliament has opened its portals to Jews, that America welcomes us -- that is the work of the devil, of Azazel. There is the rift: Life goes on, they stand still, widening the distance. Masses don't know what to do, they pay religion a percentage, a toll; but even that is becoming smaller and smaller, the more business grows. Home and Synagogue usually are the Azazel -- in the Synagogue we shall lament about the exile, so people say, but outside we shall rejoice in it. The מנוי is the price we pay to buy ourselves loose from the dietary laws, at least outside of our own homes. With this kind of confusion many live

ceremonies are cast overboard with the dead. Many Jews who still have ethical feelings, but not the strength to fight out this battle for themselves, turn their back completely on religion and try to find peace by following their sensual desires. The cure for this illness lies in the bridging of religion and practical life; in the recognition that historical development is a commentary to the Torah, and that both are sons of light. These two must be unified (Law and Life); what is left of these two from the resulting fire must be a complete unity. Life must do away with superficialities, the Mosaic principles must rule. He who knows our religion will recognize that such a merger will not impair life, but will raise its standards; only the foam will be lost in order to win the precious treasures.

3. Between week-sabbath and year-sabbath. We must recapture the first as well as the last. Both are called שבת שבתון by the Bible. They also are two oil trees for Israel, it is their task to restore what is torn. Today they are both together, (i.e. this כ' falls on שבת), and we sing out הנה מה טוב ומה נעים שבת אחים גם יחד. Yet we can't be happy, for the one says to the other בניך גדלתי ורוממתי והם פשעו בי. The weekly Sabbath moans: "I appear regularly with the olive twig of peace, but I am rejected." The Sabbath, firstborn of the two holydays, can well ask הנה אנכי הולך למות

ולמה זה לי בכרה? We must save the Sabbath, it is not only a ceremonial law, it is an ethical law, called to be continued in the messianic age. Isaiah makes it a messianic institution, a Covenant between God and man.* Judaism cannot tolerate just a chasing after money -- the golden calf -- all our efforts are vain until the day of the Lord is saved. It clearly is our duty to resurrect this festival.

4. Between man and man: The rifts between individuals and groups also must be healed. This constitutes the highest of all atonements, leading to Israel's high goal. We have the thought ויעשו כלם אגודה אחת. An idea, contrary to Orthodox thinking, could arise here: האומות מתכפרין בייסוריהן של ישראל -- this idea that we atone for the nations, that our tears are the priestly anointing oil for all men. We have given up all national ambitions; Israel's redemption can only be achieved by the redemption of all mankind through the Law of Sinai, in that Israel and the nations are also two sons of light. We pray today for אגודה אחת, not for our old institutions and ceremonies. All our strivings are for הנה מה טוב ומה נעים שבת אחים גם יחד -- for the brotherhood of all men under one God.

****

Yom Kippur, 1862.

Volume VII: 266-281. Text: Exodus 25: 17-23.

Only once a year was the high priest permitted to

*(cp. Einhorn's Prinzip des Mosaismus, pp. 144, 156)

enter the Holy of Holies. Moses, however, went before the ark whenever he felt the necessity to do so. A strong desire, as that of a child for a parent, still pulls Israel in spirit to that holy place. There is something magical about the cherubim above the ark that millenia could not break; from there God spoke to the greatest of the prophets, and we all feel that from there refreshing exhortations come for us also. Let us regard this picture! It will teach us regarding that for which we need to atone, to close the rift within us, the rift between 1. Body and soul; 2. The outer garment and the inner contents of Judaism; 3. Between Israel and the Sabbath; 4. Between man and man.

1. Between body and soul. According to our text the cherubim had wings, which, meeting at the top, covered the ark. Tradition tells us that they had human faces, the one was a male, the other a female. Our Ancients already distinguish between נפש and רוח. The רוח makes us free, thinking beings, the children of God; the נפש is our animal-vitality, seated in the blood. Judaism, as several other ancient religions, regard the רוח as male, the נפש as female. בה"י thus sees in the two cherubim a unification of רוח and נפש in the service of the divine Sanctuary. The רוח has wings, extending even to the throne of God. The desire for the eternal carries it far beyond and above the dust that sur-

rounds it, and destroys the shackles of the temporal nature drive, which keeps the animal emprisoned. The blood, in which the נפש rests, also has wings. It yearns for happiness, it can cry out in joy or in pain. It never finds rest, until its last drop is gone -- unless it yearns for the most holy, as the sacrifical blood sprinkled by the high priest on the ark, and unites its wings with that of the רוח to carry man up to the mountain of God. Even as God married man to woman, and gave them an Eden in which to dwell peacefully, so must רוח and נפש dwell together. It is the strife between them that changes an Eden into a desert. This rift is the essence of sin. When the blood tears itself loose from reason, which is divine, then it begins to fall into the abyss, and attempts to carry the higher cherub, the רוח with it, even as Samael according to Jewish tradition attempted to carry Michael with him. Unfortunately such is the fate of millions of our people, especially in this country. It is the material that swallows the whole man. Everything in man is taken up by the desire for riches and glamour. All waking and dreaming is occupied with the solution of the great riddle: How one can become a clod of earth after many clods of gold and silver have been acquired. Our Ancients had a wise saying: Consider whence you come, wither you go, and to Whom you must give account. Many of our people interpret this: I come from retail, go to wholesale, and give account

when I have met my notes. Anyone thinking a higher thought is accounted as a fanatic, a dreamer, or a fool. Religion, because of a dark feeling of fear, is tolerated, but when material interests are at stake, it must play a secondary role. Is Israel different? The people which fought lies and erroneous ways in the dungeons of the middle ages has raised a petty generation, a generation which in days of well-being boasts, and moans in the hour of danger. Such people, had they to decide whether the blackest lie or the greatest spiritual victory of our forefathers was to be triumphant, would answer: Be it angels or monsters -- we don't care, as long as only we and our property be saved -- change the abyss into a goldpit, and build us a ladder of happiness on the ruins. Poor Israel! איך נפלת משמים הילל בן שחר ! God chose us as an example to the nations, the antithesis of heathen אדום which was כלו אדמדם -- we were destined to be a spiritual people! As long as we were shackled, as long as we gave our blood for our God, we were a light unto the nations, but in freedom על במותיך חלל , we became tired, because the light has disappeared from our midst, and our blood (i.e. our senses) had become our god!

2. To close the rift between the outer garment and the inner contents of Judaism. The closely connected cherubim of our text point to this also. The male cherub signifies the offspring of the רוח , eternal truth and

ethical law, which are innate to man, not having been revealed to man from the outside. These are the מצות שכליות. The feminine cherub signifies ceremonials, the concrete expressions of truth and obligation, which the nature of man requires. These are the מצות שמעיות, gathered from the outside, and not innate to man. These two cherubim combine their wings ופניהם איש אל אחיו, looking at the ark אל הכפרת יהיו פני הכרובים, towards their source of life, the עשרת הדברות. On the sacred rock of the Sinai revelation the life of both must be based, מקשה תעשה אתם, as if they were made of one piece. The ceremony is to portray to men endowed with a sensual nature the true God ideal and the truths and obligations that stem from it. The other cherub, the immutable spirit of the Law, is to lend life to this ceremonial system. The formless spirit escapes our sensual eye, we need visible signs. The form without spirit, however, never flees, for it has no wings, it is dead, it is a corpse, which, if not buried, poisons all religious life, and according to Isaiah, as we read in our Haftarah today, reduces all religion to a farce. There is plenty of proof that ceremonies were observed without thought in the course of time, and many have actually come to be without thought. As everything physical changes in the course of time and must make room for new things, so also the body of religion. Many things full of value for Israel in its youth have become outdated today. The sacrificial

offering; the tithes to priests and Levites; laws of purification for man, houses and utensils; the decrees for the Sh'mitah and jubilee year; the entire Mosaic criminal and civil code -- most of that has disappeared long ago. The high spirit of those ancient forms is still the same, only it has outgrown the forms and has thus torn away its old coverings to put on new ones. Our concepts of the divine Being, of the relationship between God and Israel, between man and wife, and man and man have become much purer -- not because we have grown to be above the Law of Moses, but because we have entered deeper into its spirit. This development is pictured in the cherubim. Both of these had the face of a child. The eternal truth, the eternal ethical law on the one hand, and ceremony on the other, thus did not appear in their final guise when they first appeared in Israel, but as youths, to grow into giants, whose wings would reach into the heavens. The Midrash tells us of a conversation between a Cuthean and Rabbi Meir. The former asked אפשר מי שכתוב בו הלא את השמים ואת הארץ אני מלא הי' מדבר עם משה מבין שני כדי הארון. R. Meir answered הבא לי מראות גדולות. The Cuthean saw himself in his full image. The same was then repeated with a small mirror, and R. Meir asked: You can enlarge or diminish your picture at will -- and should God not be able to do this? The deeper sense of this Midrash is that a Being such as God cannot be confined in such a small

space as between two cherubim -- but It also cannot be viewed by any creature, not even the greatest of all prophets. What Moses saw was only a reflection of God's magnificence. This can be concentrated in a small room; It can appear to various persons in various places -- to some lightly, to others more darkly. Thus when Moses saw God באספקלריא המאירה, more clearly than all the other prophets, then this image became most clear to him in viewing the cherubim. Is it then not clear that the divine spirit of the Mosaic Law can appear more lightly or more dimly in various eras of time, that it does not shine alike in equal strength and magnificence? And all the more so the religious form, the mirror of the mirror: Should it claim immutability? The completeness of the divine Law stands no more in contradiction to the development possibilities of its recognition than the magnificence of God in His revelation to Moses from the cherubim. That this truth has been misunderstood and the Jewish religion has been understood to be immovable and closed, is the very root of our evils. Judaism thus became for many the antithesis of present day cultural life; for most of its confessors it is only a rigid mummy, deaf and dumb amidst progress. Since man does not exclude himself from cultural life, religious demoralization could not remain away. Some laugh at it, others ignore it, a third plays the fanatic with the old Judaism, fools himself and simultaneously steps

all over it. And do our Reform congregations have the spirit they should have? Let us not fool ourselves! There, too, tearing down is loved better than building up; there, too, the devotion is lacking for the great cause of Judaism. Our institutions are alive and exalted, but our spirits are cold and dead. Our service has excluded everything that is dead; it has elevated all Jewish religious ideas, so that teaching and reverence shade it as two cherubim, to lift us up to God. But many people prefer to crawl in the sand rather than to be uplifted. Some are not seen in the Synagogue all year long, or only rarely, they think their silver is the ark to bear the cherubim; others require the cherubim to dance like marionettes according to their temporal interests or their political passions; they desire that the cherubim look not on the divine testimony, but rather upon them. Let the שליח ציבור hurry, so that a few minutes be not wasted in the Temple! Let the preacher not proclaim what is unpleasing in critical times! They desire him to desecrate the table of the Lord by unclean bread.

The situation is not much better with the education of our youth. The cherubim with the child faces are a picture of our children in the Sanctuary of family life. The children's faces are lifted trustingly to God, Who alone can show them the secure way on the path of life strewn with cliffs and flanked by abysses. Yet there are

many parents who regard religious education as a subordinated subject, and consider every day that the children leave school earlier a day gained. They can hardly wait to harness the child into the yoke of life, to break the newly gained wings! He who means well with Israel may indeed cry with the prophet: על שבר בת עמי התשברתי and והצורי אין בגלעד אם רפא אין שם!

3. But there is such a physician, only he is no longer fashionable -- his name is Sabbath. The children know him only from hearsay, but you -- your heart quakes when you think of him that has fled. Fled? No, exiled! His voice still cries out like a voice in the desert, but he is always rejected! Yesterday and today you have opened your gates to him, but not for his own sake, but for the sake of his brother, the Day of Atonement. Both have the name שבת שבתון, both are cherubim that protect the Sanctuary of Jewish teaching and Jewish communal life. The Sabbath does not permit sin to gain its breath, יום כפור attempts to kill its pestilent odor; יום כפור raises the lowly, the Sabbath holds man erect in the full glory of his divine origin. Do you think the Day of Atonement can be honored without the Sabbath? Do you think you can reject Eden, and be healed by the pain resulting from the loss of Eden? Do you wish to attain the mercy of God with such frivolous play? The Day of Atonement is to serve as a גורל לעזאזל, but is it too much

for you to bring a גורל לה' in His sanctuary, while you are dwelling in the desert, while you and yours die of thirst in your pompous parlors? Is not your inner happiness departing from your family more and more? When our people had to creep through puddles of hatred to earn a piece of bread, a man found full happiness in his home. The Sabbath brought him the מלאכי השלום, fitting even the poorest huts with consolation and songs of jubilation. The chains of slavery have been broken, but family bands have been loosened. The huts have been changed to palaces, but under the expensive rugs there is only decay and rottenness. Days follow each other without interruption, there is no festive mood, the house is not a home any longer. Every hour spent with the family is counted as lost, and even on the days dedicated as days of rest by the government, people seek to flee their families to play exiting games, to forget. If this continues -- what is to become of our youth? We must recognize this danger and brave it. We must regain the lost Sabbath! Listen to the cry of the Day of Atonement, listen to Isaiah's thunderous call! Tear out these poisonous roots, and change the desert into Eden, where the two cherubim שבת and יום כפור will stand guard!

4. Then, as our Haftarah proclaims, Israel will rise to the heights of the earth, it will atone for torn humanity. Heathen delusions, heathen worship of nature

and of men has made a rift in humanity. Where no higher might than the blind power of nature exists, where man seats himself on the throne of God, where the gleaming dew drop wants to be the sun, there can be no other law than might, there everything in heaven and on earth must fall into ruin. The catastrophe -- we see it with our own eyes -- still threatens, because millions who broke with heathendom millenia ago still worship at its shrine, now called by another name. The world has seen many messiah's already, heroic fighters for light and truth, but none has as yet founded the messianic state אין הדור ראוי, as our Ancients said. Only when Israel's task will be fulfilled, ויעשו כלם אגדה אחת, וישתחוו לפניך כל העמים, when evil shall disappear כעשן תכלה, only then shall sheep and wolf gather together around the one great Shepherd. There is no unity for mankind outside the divine truth, even if one network of trains would encompass the whole earth, or man could fly over oceans in moments. Mankind once was עם אחד ושפה אחת, but it did not know the eternal Source of Peace, and thus a Babel came into being. But simultaneously God raised an Abraham, the father of the world-blessing family, the first to proclaim the world-uniting teaching, which knows no higher or sweeter promise than to unite someday Jewish and non-Jewish humanity, the son of Abraham and the daughter of Babel, as a pair of cherubim, looking in their inseparable Covenant on the

divine testimony.

This promise of the most beautiful Day of Atonement shall not be lost, even as no word of God is lost. A new מקדש will be built, a בית תפלה לכל העמים, there Cherubim will appear also -- not as symbols, but in living form. Man will embrace man, his spiritual wings directed upwards to his Father, his face turned to the Ten Commands of Sinai. From between these cherubim God shall speak to all men, even as to Moses, and He shall say: The Lord, the God of Israel, is King, and His dominion extends over all!

P A R T III.

Section D.

Holiday Sermons.

P A R T III.

Section D.

Holiday Sermons.

Chapter 1.

Shemini Azereth.

Sh'mini Azereth, 1860.

Volume V: 307-314. Text: Numbers: 29:35.

This day is not only to conclude Sukkoth, it is, as our Ancients already said, a יום בפני עצמו -- an independent festival. The Bible only mentions it as an עצרת which may mean retention, taciturnity, and sovereignty. Let us inspect the festival. It encloses the highest religious truths, those connected with the previous festivals. It is a reminder 1. To watch ourselves according to God's Law; 2. To recognize in Israel's calling a means to awaken the sleeping ray of light in men; 3. To regard the ceasing of the Jewish state as the beginning of the fulfillment of our messianic calling.

1. Sukkoth pointed to God's merciful guidance, the annual harvest, the way in which He took care of our ancestors in the desert. The living in a hut symbolically points out how God took care of the desert wanderers under the ענני כבוד. God is our Keeper, our Shade -- ד' שמרך ד' צלך -- this is the cry of Sukkoth. The seven days are reminiscent of the השגחה פרטית, God's providence, called by our Ancients, שבעה עיני ד' which משוטטים בכל הארץ. But God's care has its limits -- it does not extend to the field of human morality. Here man must choose for himself. To the laws of fate, regarding our temporal existence, we are blindly subordinated, in that respect we are as all irrational creatures. But where our highest

salvation is concerned, God has made us king and we can decide for ourselves. הכל בידי שמים חוץ מיראת שמים. This is a teaching of the עצרת festival -- its symbol is the leaving of the Sukkah. There we obtained the blessings of divine benefactions, the seed was planted under God's protection -- but the higher blessings must be earned outside the Succah -- Moral goods and evil do not come from God's hand, they are our own work עצרת תהי' לכם. The festival is to remind us that even there, where we are no longer under the divine guidance, we must voluntarily seek good, and must bend before Him with true love. The same thought is expressed in our Haftarah today: Solomon prays that God be with him as He was with his ancestors -- he does not pray for divine determinism of Israel's choice of good and evil, but for the merciful fate that kindles in the heart a childlike thanks and enflames it to voluntary obedience. We also pray: May God not leave us! We cannot help but thank Him for the past, and pray that He will further guide us on an even path. Do we have the same desire להטות לבבנו אליו? Do we merely eat in His house and wax fat to forget Him? The future will tell us. It will be well for us, if we can call out with the repentful of the שמחת בית השואבה : אשר זקנותינו שכפרה את ילדותינו -- hail our old age that can deny our youth!

2. Israel's calling: This means to develop the

ray of light in man. Our Ancients said that the seven days of Sukkoth are equal to the seven first periods of the world, six days of creation and the Sabbath. The עצרת is Israel, the eighth period -- it is called עצרת because in it are hidden all the treasures of the divine revelation (cp. Nachmanides in his Torah commentary p. 106; cf. פרי חדר and עצרת.) Our forebears, however, regarded us as innately holy, from birth on, an eternally preferred tribe. Examined more closely, this interpretation really shows the opposite. In this direction -- what truth is expressed by this symbol of living in the Sukkah? It means that before Sinai the divine Law was already present in the hearts of men, but with the eighth period, Israel's entrance into world history, it left the sheltering tent to pour itself into the dark spaces of heathenism. Thus the seed was already in the first man, the divine image, and the people of God are not a new human species, but an ענף עץ עבות -- a leaf on the thickly foliaged tree; that is the truth we must learn! The old Judaism teaches on Rosh Hashannoh, the יום הדין, that all men are judged before God. Counting our years since creation, we celebrate the birthday of the first man on ר"ה. The sacred conviction of the unity of all men is in strong contrast to any kind of nobility by birth; the blessings of Yom Kippur extended even unto the repentent stranger who lived in the midst of Israel. Judaism teaches

that Yom Kippur atones for transgressions against God, not transgressions against men, until we have obtained forgiveness from them, regardless of their religion. On that day we said אתה הבדלת אנוש מראש ותכירהו לעמוד לפניך. On Sukkoth we heard the call: Rejoice in your festival ... son, daughter, ... slave, stranger. All this expresses the equality of all men. God loves all men אף חבב עמים .

3. With the end of the state our messianic career began. Our prayerbook, in ascribing a messianic meaning to this festival, stands on historical grounds. The Talmud states that the seventy steers sacrificed on Sukkoth were to atone for the seventy nations. On the eighth day only one steer was sacrificed -- פר יחידי כנגד אומה יחידי . Abarbanel explains: היום הזה רומז שאז תתחדש מלכות בית דוד and לקבוץ גליות עזרת Jacob's rule will commence forever. To the Old Judaism Messianism means the return to Palestine, a sovereign state, and restitution of the Davidic dynasty. It can foresee all nations worshipping one God, but it pictures Israel as being much closer to God than the others. All this from the promise that Israel is a strange shoot grafted on the trunk of humanity. But if Israel is a פרי עץ הדר , then the inevitable result must be: One Law and one privilege for all. Then all walls between all men will be torn down, all people will become one nation. Then

the only עצה, the only sovereignty, will be the unifying spirit of God -- ויעשו כלם אגדה אחת . That is the message of our festival. May these past holydays re-echo within us throughout the entire year, that our Sabbaths be not days of mourning, that our Temples and schools be protected from devastation, and our Covenant may ever be a Covenant of life and peace.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION - CINCINNATI, OHIO - LIBRARY

373711

P A R T III.

Section D.

Holiday Sermons.

Chapter 2.

Simchath Torah.

Simchath Torah, 1859.

Volume IV: 370-379. Text: Isaiah 12: 3-5.

"Draw waters with joy from the wells of salvation" -- thus the crowds called in Jerusalem on the שמחת בית השואבה . Thus we call also today, when we end and begin the Torah again. Some books are read once, and are not worthy of reading again -- others can be read over and over again, because for those who thirst for God there is no better advice than הוי כל צמא לכו למים. But how is God's word like unto water? The Midrash to Canticles states:

1. מה מים חיים לעולם כך תורה חיי לעולם.
2. מה מים מן השמים כך תורה מן השמים.
3. מה מים בקולי קולות כך תורה בקולי קולות.
4. מה מים יורדים טפים ונעלים נחלים כך תורה.

1. Water is always in movement, it is constantly "alive" in streams, the sea, etc. Water is not only a picture of life, but of eternal life. Whether the earth perishes or endures, Israel's truths and ethical laws will always remain the same. They cannot be limited to a small people -- Jewish nationalism and symbols are not their shores, they are merely vessels with which the shepherds of our people drew water and gave it to the thirsty herds of Jacob. These vessels often accumulated a residue of mud -- but the ocean of Judaism cleansed them over and over again. Thus it was

that after the incident of the golden calf the priesthood was taken from the first born and was given to the Levites; thus, during the time of the Temple, synagogues arose to meet the needs of the people. These innovations always met obstacles, because the people thought of the vessels and the water as inseparable, not realizing that water is best when it flows freely. Thus it is today: All protests to the contrary cannot keep us from drawing fresh water. We cannot tell the thirsty people: Cry about the ruins of Jerusalem, and drink your tears! No, we must open the wells of salvation, and happily draw waters from them for the thirsty, that we and others might drink from them and live together.

2. Torah, as water, comes from heaven. Primitive people thought that water and snow were stored above the heavens whence water came. But the writers of the Bible already knew the way of nature ואד יעלה מהארץ והשקה את כל פני האדמה (cp. also Taanith 9b). As the angels descended Jacob's ladder, so fogs and rains עלים וירדים. It is the same way with the Torah. Primitive people thought of God as being in heaven, and so they thought that everything divine had to come from heaven. We get Torah even as we get rain from the heavens -- the Law מן השמים was planted in the hearts of men, the divine image. At first these blessings were hidden in a fog of darkness, and this darkness gathered into heathen clouds -- until

these clouds broke and the Law of Sinai poured forth as dew to the thirsty hearts of men: Not as a foreign body, but as their own property. These convictions, despite all attempts to darken the picture, will rule in Israel and in the world, and Judaism, the pillar of these convictions, will gain the dominion. We also believe in תורה מן השמים. We have overthrown the belief that God ever revealed anything but in the mind of man; we don't believe that a perceptible voice ever spoke to a prophet. But does not nature come מן השמים ? Is not its invulnerable Law חק נתן ולא יעבור the best proof of God's wisdom? Only nature comes from God -- the unnatural is delusion and sin. Even as snow and rain water the soil to bring forth seed, so God's Law takes root in all free men: The higher manna will grow in a spiritual soil, which takes happiness from its heavenly source and will receive from it eternal life.

3. Both water and Torah give their richest blessings during the most violent storms. Amongst thunder and lightening we have most rain -- and amongst thunder and lightning the Law was given on Sinai. It is very sultry before a storm, everything thirsts for water, lightning comes down, which might kill! But lightning is only Elijah -- Rain, the Messiah, follows it. After the rain there is peace לא ברוח ד', לא ברעש ד', לא באש ד' do we see God -- We see God in the peace that follows in קול דממה דקה

His mild mercy! The same is true in history -- the earth was full of abominations, altars dripped of human blood, and man, earth's highest being, groaned in the closeness and sultriness -- but the mind, divine, mourned in this destruction of the holy as the prophet mourned over the ruins of Jerusalem. But then came a storm over Sinai, ארץ רעשה, then אף שמים נטפו מפני אלהים זה סיני. Then the rains came גשם נדבות תניף אלהים נחלתך ונלאה אתה כוננתה. Later when Israel went amongst the nations, again there was a storm -- but we built our huts of peace; our teachings, like arrows, penetrated the nations! Should we then be afraid today because there is a storm brewing once more? Those who doubt Judaism -- they may tremble, but not we! We hear a voice: Draw waters joyfully from the wells of salvation. This spiritual fight brings not death -- but development and life!! Not the new, but the old collapses. The foolish seek to silence the storm because of comfortable traditions! One might as well tell the ocean to keep quiet!

4. Water descends in drops. How will Israel be prepared for its task? Water descends in drops, and then becomes a stream. It is thus with Torah -- eventually it will fill the earth, after coming in drops from Sinai. Our text states הודיעו בעמים עלילותיו. With all the progress of the present time -- is it too much to hope for religious progress also? After two thousand years of internal prepara-

tion, and another two thousand years of suffering -- is it too much to hope that we might finally spread our Law, not by mere endurance, but by planting our banner proudly amongst the nations, to reveal our treasures to them? Despite obstacles of hatred, there is a general trend today towards fraternization -- why should not Israel now proudly proclaim its creed? Some say the world is not ready for the messianic age. But must the time not come sooner or later? Why shall we not do something to promote the effort? It is foolish to pray for a Messiah daily, but otherwise to care neither for his honey nor his sting. We may not finish this task -- but we can work for it! If we produce only a few drops of this lake, God will accept this drink offering, and we shall know we have had a part in this שמחת בית השואבה. Then we can say מה טובו אהליך יעקב ומשכנתיך ישראל. Water shall flow from our vessels, and our seeds shall grow by the rich waters.

P A R T III.

Section D.

Holiday Sermons.

Chapter 3.

Chanukkah.

Chanukkah Sermon, 1858.

Volume III: 1157-1168. Text: Zecheriah 3-5.

לא בחיל ולא בכח כי אם ברוחי אמר ד' צבות.

(A Polemic and Defensive Word at the Correct Time).

"Not by might, nor by power, but by My spirit, saith the Lord of hosts" -- thus called the prophet when the leaders of the people began to fail in their desire to build the Second Temple, because of posed inner and outer obstacles. Thus called out the Maccabeans, when they had to put out the heathen idols of Antiochus from their Temple. In both cases it was the spirit of God that manifested itself, and its supporters were successful in restoring their Temple. They were able to overthrow religious tyranny, to preserve their teachings. We also must recall this cry, for the snake of religious tyranny is not dead yet. To the shame of our culture we can still see that the Roman chief priest may sprinkle his garments with the blood of our people.* No angel comes to take it from him, so that the men who supposedly teach love are again goading others to religious fanaticism. And in our own midst? Do we not see how some heroes of the Torah are treated, while other men merely chase mammon? Yes, we must revive the old slogan. Thus, for Chanukah, I (Einhorn) want to prove the dominion of God's spirit in 1. Our teachings; 2. Our fate and 3; Our calling.

1. In our teachings: Our teachings are called to be our wisdom and our rationality in the eyes of the

*This is a reference to the Mortara affaire.

nations. It is the outlet for our innate God-spirit, the moral law of nature engraved within us -- truths which our Ancients suspected when they said הארון נושא אתּ נושאיו : The ark was borne on human shoulders, because it was not a burden, but acted as wings for its bearers. To which of our teachings would a man free of prejudices not agree? An only God -- the universe His handiwork! No Persian god-mother, no twins or sons of light and darkness! No trinity, which, in opposition to reason, is one. Our religion has only the highest rationality and love. Does our God have a son? Yes! Not a <u>divine</u> man, but <u>divine-like</u> men, who have a ray of His spirit בנים אתם לי אלהים -- even though we are splintered into different tribes and languages! Therefore let us not have quarrels, let us love one another. Don't fool yourself that you have privileges by birth -- we all are sons of God! הן לד' אלהיך השמים ושמי השמים הארץ וכל אשר בו. He takes no bribes אשר לא ישא פנים ולא יקח שחד . He practices justice: עשה משפט יתום ואלמנה -- He loves the stranger: ואהב גר לתת לו לחם ושלמה . Away with the theory of innate sin, because Adam ate of forbidden fruits; away with the tale that Satan holds us til the priest speaks his magic formula -- the priest who has nothing but his ecclesiastic clothes, and often under them unclean thoughts! וירא ד' כי טוב -- everything came clean from God! And man, the crown of creation, was born with a curse in his heart? Hardly!! The very thought is a curse, for it caused

artificial means of salvation, and with them the belief that only the intervention of priests can bring salvation, or eternal damnation for those who do not believe in them. However, God's heart is open to all: יעזב רשע דרכו ואיש אין מחשבותיו וישב אל ד' ורחמהו ואל אלהינו כי ירבה לסלוח. This is the only true salvation. Away with the delusion that man's salvation lies exclusively in heaven, that this earth has nothing but tears. That is a comfortable theory for secular of ecclesiastical tyranny. People cry for bread while the great feast. Then it is easy to say: Starve in this world, there will be salvation for you in the other! Judaism gives happiness in this world already. It teaches: Have a clean conscience, be modest in your requirements and indulgences, יגיע כפיך כי תאכל,be happy with what God gives you הנה כי כן יברך גבר. Judaism cannot do away with the hardships connected with life on earth, but it can at least give encouragement, trust in God, and the rigid command of active love. We do not deny, of course, that the freed soul, relieved of the work of the day, is more capable of happiness than that which is bound to the earth, but we deny that the earth is only a vale of tears. Indeed our history has proven that even in our misery we manage to stand courageously straight. We stress not life after death, but eternal life, which includes the present. Trust in God and you will not fall כי שרית עם אלהים ועם אנשים -- we shall

battle with fate and evil men and come forth victorious! Thus our faith and our ethical teachings are most natural, very rational and wholehearted, appearing as two olive trees, whose strength is expressed as: לא בחיל ולא בכח כי אם ברוחי אמר ד' צבאות .

2. In our fate. This Mortara affaire, with all its pains, is still only like a drop in the sea compared to our sufferings in the middle ages. We have a history of martyrdom like no other people. There are things far worse than to die for your cause: To live for it, constantly in danger, in pain, to be chased continually from your home. Thus Israel lived for centuries! It is terrible to think of that poor child (or the even more unfortunate parents!), afraid of death, with the שמע on his lips, and afraid at all times of forsaking his God. Would it be the most difficult thing for those parents to die -- when they merely have to be baptized officially, and to remain Jewish secretly in order to receive their child back? No -- it is far more difficult to live and to remain Jewish. They show their heroism by their loyalty to their faith. This type of heroism has been common in Israel throughout history. Is not that the strength of לא בחיל ולא בכח כי אם ברוחי אמר ד' צבאות ? What else could crown slaves, or give weapons to the unarmed? What else but God's spirit kept our scattered people together? What could save the dove in the lion's mouth? The answer as

to "How?" is God's word אתם עדי. All nature recognizes God's greatness -- except man. The beauty of the masterpiece made men forget the Master! Then Israel appeared to bear witness to Him, that the waves of the nations might shatter (their ideas) on the rock which God himself had set up.

3. Our calling. How are we to proceed in our aims? Again we say: Not by missionarism -- souls "saved" that way are not worth the trouble. We don't haggle in religion. Jacob already was disgusted with Laban's insinuation למה תנבח את אלהי. We never thought to use force to persuade others, even when we were a national power. When a father prosalytizes to Judaism the children can annul their Judaism on reaching majority if they so wish (Kethuboth 11a). Not by power or trickery, but by God's spirit we want to triumph, by truth, by our willingness to sacrifice! Our teachings, our existence and our faith -- those are our missionarism. Some day Jews and non-Jews, as two sons of light, will serve God together. Let the Roman priests hammer away at our foundation stone -- they can't break it. This stone will outlast St. Peter's church and chair; we shall outlive the modern Rome even as the old. The Jewish high priest of our text was accused by Satan and defended by God's angel. With the Roman high priest we find the reverse: He will be defended by Satan and the angel of God will be the accuser! This angel is

the holy law of nature, the basis of Judaism. The voice of humanity cannot be drowned out by dogmas which call for hatred. This humanity is already being recognized by all cultured Christian nations, all of whom give recognition to the old Mosaic saying: "One right and one Law for you and your companion of another tribe or faith." This principle is already employed by many nations, especially the strongest in the world, England and America. Can we still doubt? If God is stronger than Satan, then Jerusalem must win over Rome.

P A R T III.

Section D.

Holiday Sermons.

Chapter 4.

Pesach.

First Day of Pesach, 1856.

Volume I: 116-122. Text: Isaiah: 9: 5.

The occasion for today's festival is the birthday of Israel, for on this day a son was born with obligations on his shoulders, miraculously freed by God, and chosen as His people from the midst of the nations. Figuring from the time of Abraham, our tribe had already existed for several hundred years, but its calling as God's champion began only with the redemption from Egypt. Israel today is old; we are like a child that puts a wreath on the silver head of an old father. Let us then turn to the questions which must occupy every faithful son of our house on this birthday: 1. Of what age is the oldster? 2. What has he accomplished? 3. What has been his lot? 4. How is he at the present time? 5. When will his career achieve its goal?

1. Of what age is the oldster? As long as spring adorns man's head, such a question is of little consequence; youth cares only for the present, not for what is passed. For an old man, however, this question is ominous. Nevertheless on his birthday we must inquire as to his age. Ask all the nations, did they see his cradle? No, they did not even see the spring of his existence! His cradle lies in unmeasured distance, behind countless graves; the world owes him its oldest remembrances; there is no one equal to him in years or in experiences. This son, born

unto us, is a miracle, we would take his appearance as a phantom, were he not before us everywhere in the flesh! He deserves to be feasted by his descendants -- yet there are those who are ashamed of him, who wish to blot out the features inherited from him, and even leave his house to beg of those who live from his gifts. We must be jubilant that our presence forms an uninterrupted link between the present time and the very childhood of the world.

2. What has he accomplished? Many people say: "Who cares about nobility of birth or an old lineage. The nobility of the individual man is the only thing that counts!" I submit that the longer an existence lasts, the more it rises above all human concepts, and with all the more right people will ask regarding its efficacy. In this also the son given us that day is unique. The recognition given him is still very small, he has few official titles, but the Book of Life calls him the advisor of the almighty God: God Himself named him at the Exodus from Egypt as His priest and firstborn, his name signifies a victorious hero* who strives for God against man and other world-conquering powers. Is he worthy of such a title? Question his history and all mankind! Is not his teaching the basis of all knowledge, the basis of the belief in one eternal Father? Is he not still an angel

*Apparently an illusion to the name ישראל; interpreted as a contracted form of ישר אל: Cf. Jewish Encyclopedia, article Jacob.

with a flaming sword to keep strange materials from the tree of life and God's Sanctuary? Does he not still fight for the only God, against heathenism with its deification of nature and man, against philosophical systems that bear and swallow one another? It is his teaching that helps man on the brink of death, that enlightens man with the knowledge that he is created in the image of God, teaching him that he is immortal, and thus adds zest to our very existence. His teachings are the basis of true ethics, for he teaches of one God, of one humanity in His image, of the way of peace and love, of the sanctity of life among human passions. For centuries he was the only bearer of culture. His holy documents are still a well of solace for millions. Not in vain has he lived. His is the highest call among the nations, he serves as the divine light for all men. He has not reached his goal yet, but he has attempted to reach it with some remarkable results. He is the son born for the salvation of the world, and what attests his mission is not resurrection from death, but the fact that he eternally defies death.

3. What has been his lot? His has not been a smooth path, he has not always been loved and blessed. His enemies are countless, his only weapon has been the תורה . The storms passed by, but the train of dust has persisted. The times are now better; we, the Israelites of America,

have experienced a new Exodus. Fools might say: "Only pressure has kept Israel together, freedom will become Israel's grave." But Israel has suffered too much to die in liberty.

4. How is he at the present time? Is he still vigorous or is the end in sight? Some say he can exist many more years, but only as the ruin of what was formerly a palace. This appears true if we regard those of our brethren who cling to the old, worn out garments of the ancient pilgrim, who believe that every new thread woven into it by history was woven in by impious hands, without distinguishing the sacred kernel from its covering, and not realizing that history has constantly been mending the old garment. There are others who say that the nourishing fount of our hero is dried up, and that manipulation can only hasten his death. We might believe that if we look at the many Israelites who have torn themselves away from Jewish life, if we regard the internal quarrels of many of our congregations. We say: Israel lives and shall live! There is a crisis now, but we shall come forth rejuvenated, as we have outlived Pharoah, the destruction of the State and the Temple, and many other crises. A heavy tempest rages at the present time, but it is not like the killing winds of the fall, it is like the awakening winds of the spring. We have been smitten grievous wounds by our indifference, but congregations will arise that will heal this attitude by their solicitude. Israel is not like the ruins

of a palace, it is like the cornerstone of a new palace, where all nations will some day kneel to ד' צבאות. No, our oldster lives, and we can see a call on his facial expression: Come to me, for you bring me balsam and rejuvenation.

5. When will his career achieve his goal? Some say as soon as the crown of thorns falls from his head. We, however, must not only lose a crown of thorns, we must gain a wreath of victory! Israel is a שר שלום, it must bring peace to a torn world, a peace that will calm the storms of passion in the hearts of men, that will lead them to one confession, which says: We are all children of one Father!

Yes, you have traversed a long path, dear oldster, but we feel sure that you will never tire!

****

The First Day of Pesach, 1857.

Volume II: 522-533. Text: Exodus 12: 1-14.

This passage is remarkable, insofar as we find here the first commands to Israel as God's people. The paschal sacrifice was ordained in this passage, the execution of which constitutes Israel's first religious act. Passover is the birthday of Israel, or rather the day of the engagement between God and Israel -- the "wedding" was the Sinaitic revelation. The "Divine wedding ring" was the first link in the chain of love between God and the people. In a human engagement there are festivities; be-

fore the marriage the parties involved decide on its stipulations. It was thus also with Israel: The laws of Pesach, the engagement gift, had engraved on it 1. Israel's destiny; 2. Israel's obligations, 3. Israel's promises. In this regard let us look at the commands of this text:

1. The call to us was: Israelites, you are all priests of God! As the Bible expounds in a later passage ואתם תהיו לי ממלכת כהנים . Not a few selected individuals, but every Jew must bring the Paschal sacrifice. All other sacrifices were to be brought only by the priests; this, the most important, could be offered by anyone. This can only be explained by the fact that all Jews are to be priests. The later restriction of sacrifices to the Aaronides was an educational measure: While the people were not as yet fully prepared for their task, the Aaronides were to do all the offering, but this was only a preparation for the time when all Jews would be prepared to assume the duty of the priesthood. The gathering of Israel in Egypt, their living together there, was the process of education; their scattering from the homeland was the time when they were to go out to the peoples of the earth to apply what they had learned. Rejoice in this day: On it the people was born to its mission, and simultaneously it was chosen for the highest office. But we must recognize the high obligations that go with this job. The obligations

of the Aaronides of old are obligations for all of us today. The ceremonialism of the priesthood died with the destruction of the Temple, but the soul of these ceremonials still lives. In ancient times it was an obligation for all members of the Jewish household to gather in family groups to offer the sacrifical lamb. Today it is our obligation to gather for a spiritual offering of thanks for the first deed of grace of God did for His people, and for the many miracles He has performed for us since then. He has preserved us from ancient times to this very day from numerous enemies; He has upheld our hopes. We must thank Him for the renewal and the solidification of the Covenant. We have also gathered to renew within ourselves a constant trust in God amidst the vicissitudes of life. The priestly prohibition not to partake of strong drink before entering the Sanctuary to bring a sacrifice is gone today, but the spirit of that prohibition still exists. In the House of God we must concentrate completely on the Divine, so that the word on the lips and the thought in the heart might harmonize, to follow the call: "Prepare to meet your God, O Israel!" "Let your words be few" -- but sincere. The law states that a man cannot be a priest if he has a physical defect. This law is dead, but its spirit also remains: A man with moral deficiencies cannot be a priest before God. It would be a חלול השם to be

externally a priest of God, and internally corrupt! The prophet told us what is required of us: "It has been told thee, O man, what is good, and what the Lord does desire of Thee: Only to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God." When Nadab and Abihu died, Aaron commanded his remaining sons not to display excessive signs of mourning. This law also remains in effect to this day. In times of bereavement we are not to grieve excessively, for the signs of excessive grief (tearing of clothing, plucking out of the hair) are heathen symbols, not worthy of the priests of God!

2. Let your house be an altar of God. Our text tells us that the lintel and the doorposts were to be sprinkled with the blood of the paschal lamb, no leavened bread was to be found on our premises on Passover. The latter command refers to Israel's haste when leaving Egypt. But the command of the unleavened bread was given already before the Exodus! In reality the unleavened bread is merely a sidedish to the paschal lamb, and the basis for its usage as such is the verse כל המנחה אשר תקריבו לד' לא תעשה חמץ. That is to say there was to be no חמץ on the divine altar! For the Mosaic Law, whatever is leavened is a symbol of degeneration in life, and as such must be kept far from the life-bringing altar (even as the death-bringing iron was not to touch the altar). Our Ancients termed the lintel and the two doorposts as

מנחות ז' and therefore no leavened bread was to come to this altar, the home. The usual sidedish for a sacrifice (but this sidedish never was on the altar) was partly leavened, partly unleavened; on Pesach it was all unleavened. We have in these laws the Mosaic call: Your home is a divine altar!! Holy fire must be on it day and night! In your home heart and spirit united must flame upward to the heavens, day and night, in times of both good and evil fortune. Remember whence both good and bad come, and bless God for the one as well as the other. On the altar there were sacrifices in the morning and at night. Let the incoming and the departure of day be observed in your home also! On days-of-God, as the Sabbaths and the festivals,there was a special offering in the old Temple: Let it be thus in your home, devote those days to meditation, to praise of God and to worship. In short, devote those days to everything that belongs to enlightenment and self-sanctification, contemplate on the past and prepare for the future. The purpose of the usual week's activity is to enable us to live. Well then, on the rest-days -- live!! Also on the altars the people brought שלמים , offerings of peace and thanks, symbolic of the fact that we receive our continual necessities from the hand of God, that we can always depend on Him. Let it be thus in our homes, let your table be surrounded by those who give thanks for God's all-sustaining gifts; never leave it without thanks for his bounties. Sin offerings were

sacrificed on the altar: Let it be thus in our home, let us always attempt to heal all rifts in our house. In brief: Our couch is a Sanctuary, our tent is the dwelling place of God, our home is an altar, we are the offering priests, who always give עצים בבקר בבקר, and prepare anew daily the flame before God.

3. Be prepared for a hard, long-lasting battle! It is the lot of the priest to wander and to fight. The paschal lamb was always accompanied by bitter herbs, not as a remembrance of past misfortunes, but as a preparation for future suffering, a constant reminder of Noblesse Oblige, that God's people must tread on a path of thorns. Likewise the girded loins and the staff of the wanderer point to the wandering life of Israel in pursuit of its high task. In it is the call: "Gird your loins with strength, you chosen one of the Lord! You need a hero's courage! Be ready as Abraham, for your job as a teacher permits no rest! Many will drive you, even as Egypt did, that they, through you, may be saved! You, the priest of God, are also the "scapegoat" of the world, שה פזורה ישראל, like a shorn, tied up lamb of the servants of Baal. But never fear, God will guard you always!! Israel knew this, like no other people it tasted of the bitterness of life, it earned its לחם עני, but it never failed in its love for God. Even this לחם עני was a sacrificial bread to Israel; its miserable hut, surrounded by enemies,

was its altar! Even now Israel still calls out לשנה הבאה בירושלים -- today we are slaves, tomorrow freemen .....Can we then fail? Or be discouraged, because our seed did not flourish immediately? Should we doubt, we who have seen the relatively giant steps of progress made in religious rebirth in recent years? No matter how slow the masses move, they will reach freedom!

4. Indeed everything points to the last lesson of our text: Our priests with their pilgrim staffs shall shatter mountains and overpower our enemies! Our text states: "The blood.....on the lintel of your house..... shall be a sign, that you live therein.....I shall pass over." This means God will protect us, while destroying heathenism. Even more clearly do we find this promise in the fact that the Passover-meal was to take place at eventide. Then God's light will shed its first rays over Jacob's sons, as the prophet spoke: "The day shall come" .....when....."at eventide there shall be light.....and .....God will rule over all the earth." Each day begins at evening in Scripture, and so each day ends in light. This signifies that good will triumph over evil in the end. Go one step further: Light was created on the first day; the sun, moon and stars on the fourth. The Rabbis explain: The extant light of the first day built itself into bodies of light after four days, that is to say the light had to gather to assume a shape, and then it poured out its rays

over the world. In our text we have a parallel situation: Between the appropriation and the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb four days elapsed. The appropriation constituted the dedication of Israel to its priestly office, the gathering of the light. The actuality of Israel's priesthood was symbolized by the sacrifice -- after four days -- when the light had been gathered, and was ready to send out its rays. The process of the formation of this light must give a feeling of security to even the most doubtful. No, not in vain did the angel of destruction pass over us for millenia! He fulfilled the mission on which God sent him. He took the pilgrim staff at the sight of the Passover-lamb, and some day, when he sees another lamb, he will put it down.....when he sees the lamb that lies next to the wolf.

PART III.

Section D.

Holiday Sermons.

Chapter 5.

Sefirath HaOmer.

Delivered Between Pesach and Shevuoth, 1856.

Volume I: 181-188. Text: Psalm 90: 12.

"So teach us to number our days, that we may get us a heart of wisdom." The full meaning of this "numbering" comes to us only when we connect it with another "numbering," namely that of the days between Pesach and Shevuoth. "And you shall count unto you from the morrow after the day of rest, from the day that ye brought the sheave of the waving, seven weeks shall be complete; even unto the morrow of the seventh week shall ye number fifty days; and ye shall present a new meal offering unto the Lord." Compare this to the words of the Psalmist ימי שנותינו בהם שבעים שנה, and we note a similarity between these seven years and man's seventy decades. The counting of our years must not be taken literally any more than the childish custom of the counting of the Omer-days, which practice was not even known yet in the older talmudic period. "Numbering" means to compute a certain period of time, to reckon it as one unit. In this sense we may interpret our text to mean: Count the days of your existence! 1. Number the favors bestowed on you daily by God; 2. Number your own good deeds; 3. Count the steps you must take forward to the high goal!

1. Number your days and the favors bestowed on you by God. This is pointed out by the counting of seven weeks of the offering of the Omer until the offering of the

two loaves of bread and the first fruits. The first harvest in Palestine began during the Pesach festival and continued for seven weeks. It was begun and ended by offerings. At the beginning the Omer was sacrificed, and thereafter the people were permitted to partake of the new fruits. At the conclusion of the harvest season there was a formal thanksgiving, the Feast of Weeks. During this period of seven weeks the Israelites were continually reminded of the Almighty's favors and His kindness, so that they might not fall prey to the illusion that it was "my strength and my strong hand that earned this host of goods for me." The seven weeks were dedicated to God the Provider, Who sends His dew from heaven. But such, O man, should be your entire life! We hope anxiously for the fulfillment of the seventy years, we count the beat of the pulse, but we must not forget to count the benign favors bestowed upon us, for without them all our work is in vain. Often we hear the complaint ויהרגם עמל ואון -- but if you dare, recount to God the damages and the wants of your fate! And then number the benefits, if you can, that He gives you daily! It is only your greed that spoils everything! Continually God strengthens us with life's necessities, often in overflowing measures. Both in the physical and the spiritual world thousands of unexhaustible wells of pleasure are available to us. God raised us as rulers above all earthly creatures, He gave

us a light far stronger than sun, moon or stars, in that He gave us our senses, emotions, and the power of reason; He gave us memories and hopes, which, if properly used, give life constant new and fresh attractions. Often what appears to be a lack turns out to be a boon. It is our own fault if we starve in the presence of such treasures; it is our own fault if we are torn from God, which event can change a blessing into a curse and can magnify pain thousandfold. Count the days of the harvest, from the cradle to the grave, recognize your loving Guide and offer Him thanks, the thanks of a childish heart, and give Him the first of your fruits. והניף את העמר לפני ד' -- wave it triumphantly before God. Then life will no longer appear as though wasted by the wrath of God, but it will be sated by God's mercy.

2. Count your deeds, and remember God's favors! Measure carefully your obedience to your greatest Benefactor! This teaching is also contained in the seven weeks of the counting of the Omer. The Zohar tells us that between the redemption from Egypt and God's revelation at Sinai (Shevuoth) there had to be a period of seven weeks, since Israel could not be transferred suddenly from the unclean status of idol worshippers in Egypt to priestly sanctification as a covenant people. In regard to this ethical uncleanliness a period of seven weeks for a gradual purification was just as necessary as a period of seven days was

needed for cleansing from a physical uncleanliness, as it is written וספרה לה שבעת ימים ואחר תטהר. Thus the periods of seven time units are transition periods, steps in the preparation for the reassumption of the individual's dignity as a human being, or for the attainment to a higher level than before. Thus a circumcision takes place after seven days have elapsed; an animal is not fit for sacrificing until seven days after its birth have been completed. The greater the distance between status and rank-to-be-attained is, the greater is each of the seven time units that must elapse before fulfillment. Thus man's seven decades on earth are a step in preparation for the reaching of the very highest, namely an eternal, purely spiritual, contented life in the presence of the divine Majesty. Our immortal spirit, the sprout of God, after the well understood Biblical teaching, knew the eternal Sabbath long before its union with the body, before the beginning of its earthly career. Before that it existed in spotless cleanliness, but its Sabbath lacked its main ornament; its portion was peace, beauty and magnificence, but it lacked the victory crown of sanctification which is to be gained only in the struggle with evil! This crown is to be gained only in temporal life, so that the spirit eventually, on its return home, might attain on the ladder of perfection a proportionally higher rung than before its appearance on the earth. That is our task here, therefore we hear the

call: Number your days! See to it that the seven weeks of your pilgrimage will be perfect, תמימת תהיינה. This is the period of struggle, of testing, cleansing, and sanctification; we are in the "front hall"[1]. of the Holy of holies, and death will open that portal for us if we have lived to justify such a reward. Sow in the morning, rest not at eventide! Let the priest in you swing your offering now gladly, and at the end of the harvest you will have a יום הבכורים, an eternal day of happiness! Use your available time, count your days! The day is short, the work is great![2]. You have obligations to yourself, to your family, to the community and to society. For your soul your earthly career is a ממתרת השבת, a preparation for the higher Sabbath. Reap of the eternal goods before time puts its sickle on you to cut the silver thread that binds body and soul! For then you cannot lament about the quick passing from existence, for your physical powers shall become an Omer waved before God.

3. Count the days you must take towards the higher goal, strive restlessly for them with effort and zeal. Seven weeks elapsed between the Exodus from Egypt and the revelation at Sinai. Our Wise Men taught: Man counts the days, hours and minutes impatiently in the expectation of a happy event or a triumph. Rapidly winged time creeps too slowly for his quickly moving spirit, the smallest interval

1. Cf. Aboth 4:16.

2. Cf. Aboth 2:15.

of time seems like an eternity. In such a spirit of impatient love Israel was to count the days until its union with God was consummated, until it took possession of its most precious gem, the Law of Sinai. In the same manner Scripture prescribes the seven Sabbatical years until the Jubilee year, when every man can return to his own. There is impatience until the promised event is realized, and in waiting we may see the lack of the still unfulfilled and the excellence of the culmination. Well then, Israel, count your days as Judaism commands, and be conscious of your higher calling. Don't be satisfied with the present status, ennoble it and perfect it! Break with the decayed forms of religion, both in the Temple and in life! There is no peace between life and death! Before, and not behind us lies the great Jubilee year -- do not count the number of our membership, do not count the sacrifices that must be made: Count the pulsebeats of the sick Judaism, the days until it will be freed from dead forms! Even were we to live a thousand years, the work of the spirit would know no standstill. The measure of virtue and insight gained is never enough. "The pull backward" in us is the material; the intellect is the pull forward. The tendency to go back to our childhood retards us, youth must go forward in preparation for manhood. This is often painful, but we must not count the pains, but rather the days that separate us from our goal שבע שבתות תמימת תהיינה -- we must count

the full seven weeks. Only an old man does not count, he looks back. Therefore let us count days, let us be wise, that at the end of the seven weeks we shall be filled with God's love, and may be jubilant for the length of our life!

****

Between Pesach and Shevuoth, 1860.

Volume: 236-247. Text: Numbers 31: 19-25.

The Zohar states: The seven weeks between Pesach and Shevuoth are like the seven days needed for an unclean individual to purify himself. Israel had become impure by Egypt's idolatry and needed a period to become clean before receiving the Sinaitic revelation. Our text states: He who killed someone in the battle with Media, or touched a corpse, had to stay outside of the camp for a period of seven days, and had to be sprinkled with water. The same applied to the ethical pollution of Israel by Egypt. Only seven days after the removal of the ethically slain Israelites from the camp, the צבאות ד' could rejoin the מחנה ישראל, to hear the divine call וזרקתי עליכם מים טהורים וטהרתם מכל טמאותיכם ומכל גלוליכם אטהר אתכם. Let us then speak today of this cleansing of all that is dead and hypocritical. We fight no longer with the sword, but with the spirit. Many of our ceremonies are dead, and our cry still is הבדו נושאי כלי ד'. Some hold on to what is dead, thousands of others are cold to and don't care about anything religious, as though anything

religious were a corpse. But our call still is heard. Thus I came to this altar with the thought כל דבר אשר יבא באש תעבירו באש וטהר. Let us nourish the sanctifying flame of God by deliberating on the truths of our text:

1. Israel's holiness is not innate, but rests in its priestly calling, to carry the light of the divine Law for all nations; 2. Dead religious ceremonies, in the interest of religious life, must be removed; 3. The sick condition of our present religious circumstances can be overcome only by pious enthusiasm.

1. Israel's holiness is not innate, it rests on our priestly calling.....This is the basis of Reform. The talmudic tradition is that with the departure from Egypt Israel became forever separated from the nations, and is to be separated even in the messianic age. The Noachian laws are to be the common property of all God's children, but Israel is to have separate ceremonial laws, and is to return to Palestine. This tradition was a pillar of fire for our ancestors -- it is easy to ridicule this desire, but that is not the way to overcome it: There are many slaves who divide their shackles! We must respect this opinion in order to raise ourselves above it. Our text tells us that thousands of warriors had to undergo purification; this law was originally intended for individuals only, with heavy penalties for non-fulfillment: Most laws were to be enforced upon arrival in Palestine,

this one already before then. Scripture elsewhere states the reason for this: טמא כי מקדש ה׳. Man's body encloses God's spirit, and is thus the highest of all Temples. This thought alone is sufficient to carry Mosaism to heights never reached by any other religion, for other religions degrade the body as much as possible, whereas we make of it a בית המקדש. There is no stronger protest than this to the idea of original sin. This law of purification is here applied to both the Israelitic warriors and to their captives, אתם ושביכם, for each man, friend or foe, enclosed within him God's spirit. The Talmud finds this idea so strange, that it states: לא שהעוכ׳ם מקבלין טומאה וצריכין הזאה -- this does not mean that heathens must undergo sprinkling, but it means: אלא מה אתם בני ברית אף שביכם כשיבואו לברית ויטמאו צריכין הזאה -- they must fulfill the command of purification only when they enter the ברית! Our text, however, does not speak of Jew or Gentile, it says "a man who....," i.e. any man. (cf. Nachmanides and Ibn Ezra). The principle of man's body as a מקדש ה׳ is for everyone; no matter how different we are, we all are children of God. One God and one humanity, all created in His image, that is the teaching of Moses. We are separated by our calling -- but not by birth. In the messianic age there will be only one God for all men, there will be no king on earth but man, crowned with true recognition of God. Israel's only

triumph will be to see all men worshipping God. The purifying stream of water that flowed from Sinai will engulf all men as an ocean, for all men are בני ברית.

2. Dead ceremonies, in the interest of religious life, must be removed. Reform Judaism regards ceremonies as mighty levers for religious awakening. לא נתנה התורה למלאכי השרת, -- it was given to human beings, and as sensual individuals we need sensual modes of expression. With the prophets we hold that such ceremonies are not holy in themselves, but they are means to attain holiness. Those signs that don't awaken responses in us any longer are dead. According to our text a human corpse pollutes more than a carcass. The Mishnah says: לפי חיבתן היא טומאתן. The higher the regard of an object in its state of perfection, the greater is its polluting power once it is dead. Because the human body is a shrine, we shrink back from it once its soul is gone. A flower picked to pieces inspires us with sadness, not with repugnance. But man, the loveliest of all creatures, the moment he is gone, as soon as possible, he is returned to the womb of the earth. The greater the holiness in life, the greater the pollution in death. That also holds true of ceremonies. As soon as their souls have fled, their bodies should be done away with. Some say that that which is God's Sanctuary can never die, but this is not true, for does not the human body die? Only our credal and ethical laws exist forever, not their forms -- they are perishable.

Ceremonials will live eternally, i.e., their spirit will live forever, not their form. The form must always be discarded in accordance with the times to give the spirit opportunity to rise higher, to envelop itself in new forms, to lead Israel ever further on the way to its high goal.

3. The sick conditions of our present religious circumstances can be overcome only by pious enthusiasm. Here the manner of religion is ordered as utensils which have become unclean by touching a corpse, and are in need of cleansing. For those not used in fire water suffices as a cleansing means. Those used in fire must be purified by fire. Talmud Sanhedrin tells us: A rabbi and a gentile had a conversation in regard to what was the best means of cleansing. The gentile said water: The rabbi said עיקר טבילותא בנורא . The gentile was thinking of baptism, the rabbi of אש דת . The thought here is that even as only fire can cleanse utensils used in fire, thus only the inner fire of the divinely born spirit can free us of all that is ethically dead, of blind glowing habits or desires. This is also the thought of Reform -- to remove the dead and to retain the living. These two thoughts are inseparable. Reform has a tremendous majority wherever there is anything to tear down, but when it comes to building, there are but few!! Many say: Your building is not advanced enough, once it is finished we also shall join. Still others think we go too far in our build-

ing, everything must be left as it was! Privately they don't care, but outwardly they are Orthodox -- the stomach is טרפה , but the house כשר . משיח בן דוד lives in our prayerbooks, but not in our hearts. We take the כוס של ברכה in our hand for the Sabbath queen -- but we will not leave our business for her sake. That is to make a system of what is unethical! No -- water cannot cleanse such conditions -- only the flame of true enthusiasm for the preservation and the magnification of Judaism can do it! We must not cripple the old Judaism -- our אש דת must simply remove the dead and rejuvenate the living. We need the heart of the old with all its flames; we must seek to keep it free of all lust for fashionable desire and the indolences of living. This is the aim of our new prayerbook, which we will bring as a מנחה חדשה before the Lord next Shevuoth. It takes the shackles, not the wings, from the Seraph of reverence, to carry us upward to God. May this עלת תמיד be an offering from us, that we may cleanse ourselves every seventh day וכבסתם בגדיכם ביום השביעי that we may be purified by an ושהרתם אש אוכלה.

P A R T III.

Section D.

Holiday Sermons.

Chapter 6.

Shevuoth.

God's Voice on Sinai -- Shevuoth, 1858.

Volume III: 965-978. Text: Deuteronomy 5: 19.

TEXT: God spoke to the entire assembly..... and it was on no more.

This day is the birthday of the Sinaitic Law. The times of our text were still the days of primitive believes. According to the legend the people actually heard the voice of God. Even though only a voice was heard all peoples knew this Law, for it was distributed to all parts of the earth. The question is: How did Israel hear the voice of God? God spoke to the assembled congregation out of fire, out of clouds and darkness -- ולא יסף . Our Ancients interpret this variously. Some said: The voice was so powerful, that no amplification was possible; others: The voice was heard no more; still others (amongst them Onkelos): The voice did not cease to be heard.* The Old Judaism already gives important conclusions to these interpretations, which the New Judaism of the present time interprets with full clearness: The voice of God . . . 1. Was heard only in the mind; 2. It was heard according to the intellectual ripeness of the hearers in various gradations; 3. It sounds on and on through all times for all men.

1. It was heard in the mind alone. God spoke ולא יסף , i.e. as the Midrash puts it: שלא היה לו בת קול , there was no echo. That means there was no physical sound,

*(Cp. Sanhedrin 17a, Sotah 10a and Midrash Rabbah to Exodus, #28)

אין אמר ואין דברים, for no words can eminate from One Who אינו גוף ולא ישיגוהו משיגי הגוף . When Scriptures speak in anthropomorphic terms, e.g. קול ד' אל המים, that is figurative, or קול ד' שובר ארזים or קול ד' חוצב להבות אש. "God spoke" in Scriptures merely means "God willed." In the Creation story וי'אמר אלהים introduces an act. As Maimonides already stated in his מורה נבוכים : The Law of nature is called God's speech. The same is true of Sinai's Laws. These Laws were made for men of free will, and the divine will is engraved into the mind of man as God's son. In the course of time heathenism twisted these words and misrepresented their spirit, so that the pure word of God was no longer distinguishable from the forgery. In the name of God they declared what God had not said or willed, until Moses came and in the Ten Commandments gave mankind a mirror. The Midrash Yalkut to Jeremiah #306 records a conversation between R. Meir and a Cuthean. The latter asked: How can God .... speak from between the two sides of the ark with Moses? The Rabbi answered: Bring me a mirror. The Cuthean did.R. Meir said: You see your full self in a small mirror. Now you of flesh and blood can do it -- why cannot God? The Cuthean with his literalness took Scriptures according to the letter of the Book, not grasping its spirit. Of course we cannot change our original self, but we can change our image! The same, on a large scale, is true of God. He can appear in His magnificence

and reveal Himself anywhere, even though His essence is unchangeable. Only a spiritually crude people can misunderstand this, and can see in the Sinai revelation a disavowal of divinity. In the same manner one could misinterpret the Jewish creed: God is a pure spirit, and as such can never attain a body. Does this make Him less real? No, to the contrary, for what is in the mind is more clear than sensual perception. Thus also the revelation of Sinai in the mind is far more clear than if thousands of voices had spoken it physically. Only primitivity wishes to concretise its God, but the Sinaitic Law says: לא תעשה לך פסל -- God's only mirror is the human mind! By the teaching בדמות אלהים עשה אותו, our mind was lifted to the highest level of dignity, we are the only אסטקלריא המאירה . One might ask: Then why can't all minds see the same God? We answer with R. Meir: The divine mirror is not of the same clarity to all men, for according to their natural and ethical constitution some are stronger, some weaker.

2. The divine voice on Sinai was heard by each one according to his mental capacity in a different tone. The Midrash Rabbah to Exodus #28 quotes R. Jochanan on קול א' נחלק לשבעה קולות : ולא יסף -- it encompassed the entire scale. What was the significance of these various tones? The Midrash Rabbah to Exodus #5 and #29 states: הקול יוצאת אצל כל ישראל כל א' ואחד לפי כחו הזקנים לפי כחן הבחורים לפי כחן הקטנים לפי כחן והנשים לפי כחן ואף משה לפי כחו . The spiritual bread is like Manna. For

a suckling it is as milk, for youth it is as a strength bringing food, etc. For each it is according to his capacity. Tell a child: "God's spirit cannot be contained in the heavens," and you waste words. Say: "He is a Father who cares for His loved ones," and the child will understand, even though he doesn't care as yet about the world at large. For a young man God is the איש מלחמה, for older people He is a Shepherd. But much greater differences come with intellectual attainments, and with these the obligations also vary. According to our capacity of knowledge of God's work our minds grasp Scriptures more or less. Some men admire beauty in nature, others admire the laws of nature. Some see history as a chain of events in which there is no room for a God, but others will see His unfailing law of justice. Ignorance lacks understanding for the command to love one's neighbor like oneself, it fails to grasp that we must also consider animal life kindly. כל אחד ואחד לפי כחו has understanding. This was the secret of the men who lived at the dawning of the divine Law, who are still models to us even though according to our standards they are backwards in many ethical respects. For that reason early Mosaism tolerated slavery, polygamy, and blood revenge, even though these were opposed to the principles of mercy, to the axiom that husband and wife are one, to the truth that man is fashioned in the image of God. The Midrash Yalkut asks:

Why did God speak from darkness, not from light? It answers: This is like a king who at the wedding of his son wrapped the Chuppah in black: "I know," he said, "my son shall soon reject his bride." The same happened here: God spoke from darkness, knowing that Israel would soon reject the Torah, the wife of its youth. However the truth is the reverse: Israel left the Torah for idols because God spoke to them from the darkness, in a covered hidden way, because the beauty of the bride was not fully discernable to the groom in the darkness.

3. God's voice from Sinai is heard through all ages. The process of revelation has never been fully closed. It was finished at Sinai only insofar as its essence underwent no change, in that the foundation was laid, but this does not mean that its forms cannot be changed in accordance with the demands of life. The Rabbis said: לא הנביאים והכתובים קבלו מסיני נבואתן אלא אף החכמים העומדים הכל דור ודור כל א' וא' קבל את שלו מסיני. Even as each individual received the Torah according to his own ability at Sinai, so does each generation understand the Torah according to its ability. As time goes by, it must become ever clearer that the laws of each generation, in conformity with the time, are as holy as if received on Sinai, even if they contradict the Biblical letter -- as long as they obey the Biblical spirit. Fortunately this has always been the practice, even though it was not always

recognized as such. Without this procedure Judaism would have died long ago. The laws could not all have been obeyed even in Palestine without changes. Already at the time of the Second Temple many changes had been made. Supposing all Jews were to return to Palestine today: The people might stand for a reintroduction of the sacrificial cult -- but would they stand for the enforcement of the death penalty for Sabbath desecration? There are many other laws like that. Imagine also such laws in the diaspora -- they would have killed Judaism if carried out. That is why the prophets often stepped in with their interpretations. But the divine voice never was more powerful than now: "Make a path for Me through this desert!" People avoid the dead body of religion, but they also neglect the life in religion; they don't mention God's Name in vain -- they don't mention it at all!! All our efforts are to heal the festering wounds of Judaism. We do this in the spirit of Sinai and God, Who spoke to us there, and is speaking to us again.

He speaks not to us alone, but to all men. The Midrash Rabbah to Exodus #5 states: הקול יוצא ולא יסף and -- ונחלק לשבעים לשון כדי שישמעו כל האומות means that it carried to all people without exception. What God gave in the mind, He gave for the minds of all people -- through the priestpeople of Israel. Each people heard God in its own language: The Hebrews first, in

order to awaken all others. Eventually, in the wilderness of languages, there will be שפה ברוכה, a language of the spirit, which will unite all men to serve God לעבדו שכם א׳. Before Babel there was one language, but it was not the language of God, and so the builders were scattered. To unite them again there has to be a scattering of God's people -- so that eventually all will look to Sinai.

P A R T III.

Section D.

Holiday Sermons.

Chapter 7.

Tishoh BeAv.

9th of Ab, 1859.

Volume IV: 239-247. Text: Isaiah 9: 5.

TEXT: A child is born unto us.

Many ask: Why do we, who do not care to return to Palestine, observe the תרבן בהמ'ק ? This is asked only by those who see nothing in Reform Judaism but a matter of convenience. Many of them chant קינות (without fasting!), drape the Synagogue in black -- but don't shed a tear. For us, however, next to Sinai, this day marks the most important occurrence in our history. The Rabbis, in a prophetic spirit said ביום שנחרב בהמ'ק נולד משיח -- thus today we celebrate the birthday of the Messiah, i.e. Israel in the beginnings of its messianic activities. "A child is born unto us." On Pesach we celebrated the redemption from Egypt, our having been chosen as God's first born. But today we celebrate the birth of Israel as the redeemer of mankind, for on this day began our wanderings throughout the world. Already during the time of the Second Temple there was a longing for the Messiah. Our independence under the Maccabees was only a fictitious one, and as regards religious symbols of that time, there was much lacking that had existed during the time of the Second Temple. When that period ended people saw themselves cast into exile. The thought of exile because of sin was transplanted through millenia. Only occasionally there were flashes from chosen spirits; only the present generation fully comprehended the idea of

the birth of Messianism at that particular time. However, we are not unmindful of the tears of our pious forbears; we observe this day 1. With the fullest sympathy for the sorrowful fate of messianic Israel; 2. With rejoicing thanks for our salvation-bringing task; and 3. Glowing enthusiasm for the fulfillment of its message.

1. We cannot but be sorrowful about the path of this Messiah. Europe, Africa, Asia, everywhere the cannibalism of nations gnawed at our bones. Why is it that they treat the family of him so badly whom they have actually raised to divinity? We recall the cry of pain from our ancestors לא אליכם כל עברי דרך הביטו וראו אם יש מכאוב כמכאבי. The sorrow for the Temple of stone and wood is gone, but not so the sorrow for the many Temples of flesh and blood that were destroyed. With sorrow we remember our martyrs; we marvel about the fateful way of the Messiah, born in destroying fire, who had to pass through whole seas of flames without tiring.

2. This sadness, however, cannot hold back our rejoicing thanks for our salvation-bringing task. The pain of the messianic child may never blind us against the blessings it brings to us. Called as a שר שלום Israel came down from Mount Zion, like Adam from Eden -- afraid of the desert, still thinking of the burned cradle. Israel thought its crown had fallen from its head, but in

reality that crown had just begun to sparkle. The Rabbis said: "The Messiah נראה ונכסה וחוזר ונראה." Thus it has been with Israel: First it manifested its qualities of a divine people, then it withdrew within itself because of the need of its own nationalism, because of the necessity to gather its own strength, and to exclude hostile elements from the outside, in order to prepare and to ripen for its high task. We have a law that the life-shortening iron must remain far from the divine altar. This law did not really become a full truth until the destruction of the sacrifial cult. Henceforth no more life was to be taken, not even that of an animal in order to procure atonement. The prophet said that no sacrifices were required. What does God require? Only to do justice, to love mercy. Not the rod, but love was to be brought to God, an ethical sanctification after His example. Only now God's word of Sinai could appear in its full significance: ואתם תהיו לי ממלכת כהנים. The Aaronides disappeared, all Israel became priests to fulfill God's saying to Abraham: והתברכו בזרעך כל גויי הארץ. Jewish religious thought at least in part entered the nations, the Bible became the Book of the world. Greece and Rome, the two powers of the ancient world, translated the Bible into their own tongues, helping to spread its message. It was no longer a חפרוה שרים, a little well dug by the people of the desert with their staves -- its

waters today flow all over the world. With heathen influences a lot of dust and stones entered the clear waters, but at least all nations recognized the divine origin of the Mosaic Law, and so the way was cleared to unite all mankind into one congregation. Therefore no matter how great our pains, we still must give thanks for the birth of our Messiah. At Sinai the call was והייתם לי סגלה מכל העמים -- now we cry out: הרחיבי מקום אהלך ויריעות משכנותיך יטו .

3. This birthday is of no significance unless it spurs us on to active enthusiasm for the fulfillment of our high mission. The child has grown into a giant, but the giant still lies shackled. Many of our co-religionists are still looking for an individual Messiah; they do not realize that the burning Temple was our Elijah -- that the child has been born, and must now be raised. In this task many do not care to aid us. Still others merely worship dead ceremonies, they do not grasp a hold on the new life. The arms of the corpse of ceremonialism are heavy; when they rest on the shoulders of our people they rid themselves immediately of them, especially if they are in the way of temporal welfare or even amusements, but it does not matter to our people that the Messiah labors under this very same burden. Many people of Orthodox convictions break all Jewish laws, they even boast of it. Were a personal Messiah to come today, he would flee

from such a spectacle. Therefore, our task is all the higher, it is our duty to remove these dead arms from the shoulders of our Messiah, that he may spread his hands in blessing over all men.

P A R T III.

Section D.

Holiday Sermons.

Chapter 8.

Sabbath Zachor.

Sabbath Zachor, 1860.

Volume V: 75-83. Text: Exodus 17: 8-16.

TEXT: Amalek fought with Israel; Moses keeps his hands up to assure victory.

מלחמה לד' בעמלק מדר דר . Amalek is gone, but evil still remains. Sinai's revelation has brought good in many respects, but its work is not done yet. Many people still worship gold and silver idols. But how are we to conduct this battle against evil? Our text gives the answer: 1. On the top of the mountain with God's staff in hand; 2. With powerful mutual support; 3. With untiring endurance.

1. On top of the mountain with God's staff in his hand. Not with an iron sword, but with the staff of deliverance, thus Moses stood on the mountain. We also must climb the mountain, and try to hold even higher the staff given us by God three thousand years ago. We must rise to always higher levels of divine recognition, and attack more and more the heathen seed in our own tribe. Our ancestors gave everything for their Torah, for their God. But in their time there were prejudices in Judaism, which are denied by everyone today, no matter to what religion he belongs. With all its marvelous thoughts and excellent institutions, the Talmud still had many laws directly contrary to Mosaism. Who would today believe with the Rabbis that a poor man, who deliberately transgresses a religious law, should be left to die in

his misery? There are many other similar commands. Who would today not shy away from such laws, directly contrary in spirit to the Biblical verse בדמות אלהים עשה אותו ? We cannot break with our ancestors because of such erroneous notions; noone can tear himself away from his past completely, and so, what was completely ethical a few thousand years ago is today unethical for even the crudest person. Scripture tells of Noah that he was צדיק תמים בדורותיו , a righteous man in his generation. It would be senseless to put any blame on our patriarchs because their ethics of marriage were not as high as ours. Israel was the most ethical people on earth for its time -- צדיק תמים בדורותיו, but it could not divorce itself away from its environment. Today, however, every Jew has done away with the above mentioned talmudic concepts, because our time is more pure, more ethical, even for those who still ascribe divine authority to the dead letter. We must break with this self-deception if we wish to glorify Judaism both internally and externally. Openly we must declare that we recognize no law that is a mockery to the Law of God; we must proclaim that the world-embracing principles of our religion are to appear as an ever blooming staff. In practice as well as in theory, the purity of our ethical spirit must be apparent. Why do we blush if we read in a public paper that a Jew is suspected of thievery? We feel shame be-

cause we are members of a minority, even though we feel ourselves to be a people of God, called to battle Amalek. We feel we must serve God, but we cannot do that with rusty, outdated ceremonies!

2. With powerful mutual support. It was too difficult even for Moses to hold the divine rod aloft by himself, he had need of the help of others. What could we do without help? Our religion does not depend on large congregations, but on the zeal of the congregations' members, for even if small, such groups can withstand all onslaughts. The reverence at our public services grows with the participation of our members, because man feels himself lifted, even in his higher calling, if others work with him in unison. Everyone likes to feel that in the darkness of destruction his people stands all for one and one for all. With pride I see that only recently, for a second time, our congregation showed such spirit when there were plans to erect institutions that would throw Judaism back centuries -- that we acted in unison to oppose this חלול השם.* That is the correct spirit. We don't want indifference, saying: What do I care as long as it does not affect me? Let them call us disturbers of peace -- as long as we work for God and Judaism! That is what all those were called who did not go with the masses, but fought with holy conviction. "They always protest" -- this has been the cry of the world against us since the days of Haman; thus also has

*Einhorn probably refers to the Board of Delegates, to be discussed later in this dissertation.

been the cry of unethical priests against prophecy! Yes, we shall protest with our divine rod against all slander; against all that is rotten in our religious life, against hollow indifference and other evils. We shall protest עד בא השמש, until our last breath, with the cry מלחמה לד' בעמלק מדר דר.

3. With untiring endurance. That is another requirement. Why did Moses sit on a stone: Was no כר וכסות, was no pillow available? The Midrash tells us that Moses did not want to be at ease בשעה שישראל שרוי' בצער. He who, as Moses, truly wishes to do battle, may not waver in his fight. Can we, the disciples, complain about what the master took so calmly? אם בארזים נפלה שלהבת מה יעשו איזובי קיר? The vine is strong when it climbs up on the משה אלהים and can call out יעפו ! נסי ד' but וקוי ד' נערים ויגעו ובחורים כשול יכשלו יחליפו כח יעלו אבד כנשרים ירוצו ולא ייגעו ילכו ולא ייעפו. That is our cry -- our motto is נסי ד' -- we shall fight עד בא השמש, and even if we can't complete the task, we shall at least do our share.

P A R T III.

Section E.

Special Occasions.

P A R T III.

Section E.

Special Occasions.

Chapter 1. January 4, 1861.

Chapter 2. July 4 Sermons.

January 4, 1861 -- Special Day of Atonement and Prayer, by order of the President of the United States and the governor of the State.

Volume VI: 23-32. Text: Deuteronomy 32: 7-17 and Ezekiel 28: 12-18.

Circumstances are very sad in a country when its head is forced to ask the people to acknowledge its sins, even crimes, before God; to ask Him for help since all advice seems to have failed. That country is ours -- so rich in material treasures, that it is called כלילת יופי and משוש לכל הארץ . Whence this hopelessness and sadness? Have our treasures disappeared, are our streams dried up? No, it has not gone that far -- our enemies cannot yet say זה היום שקוינהו מצאנו ראינו . Despite everything our flag still waves -- the Union still stands. However one state has already seceded, the wall has cracked, and there is noone to jump into the breach. Most likely other states will also secede. Who knows, but where King Cotton grows today, there might some day be swamps, and a king of flesh and blood might rule there, with political and religious tyranny! We cannot deny it, we stand before an abyss, and must pray to God for help. But only a fool will believe that prayer alone can help us! There are deep moral evils in our country, which are the cause of the present situation. Such evils are not healed by God, but only by the free, ethical elevation of men. Only when that has taken place may we hope that God will stop the destruction caused by our foolishness. It would not have done any good for the

captain of the ship to rouse Jonah to call on God, had he not first lightened his ship as much as possible. What are our ethical evils? The American people have great ethical qualitis: A rare intelligence; they are practical and wonderdoing; they have wisdom and energy. We are kind to the weak and give bountifully to the poor. But we also have weaknesses: These are 1. Materialism; and 2. Pseudo-religiosity.

1. Materialism, an over emphasis on the sensual, is dangerous for any nation, especially a republic which has the difficult task of guiding itself. This is not a condemnation of the bloom of agriculture, industry, and trade: Quite to the contrary -- these are just as desirable as the healthy spirit that must reign within the country. But woe to the nation which forgets its higher mission because of these externals! Could I only call out to the American people: זכר ימות עולם בינו שנות דרודר and שאל אביך ויגדך , asks George Washington זקניך ויאמרו לך, they will tell you ימצאהו בארץ מדבר ובתהו יליל ישמן, yes, כנשר יעיר קנו על גוזליו. We seemed great on the stage of world history, fighting like a David against a Goliath. Thus we were in Eden, we stood and became stronger -- because with the heritage of our forbears their spirit also remained. But we waxed fat -- our spirit disappeared, it was consumed by our desires for trade and riches. No longer are we proud of our star of

freedom, but of our gold and our silver. The star-spangled flag on the Capitol no longer attracts our eye, but the precious metals in the shafts of mountains. Therefore our children struggle, and tear apart our heart, our unity. And you, as Jews, who have so much at stake -- do you understand your task as members of the American people? Do you remember that you are the banner-bearers of the highest ideals of ethics? Did not the spirit of trade almost replace the spirit of God within you? Are you more interested in the rise and fall of your nation's freedom, or in your stocks -- are you interested in your personal affairs or the great ideals of the world? Ask yourself -- you will have to admit: וישמן ישרון ויבעט and וינבל צור ישעתו -- therefore we have desecrated the Rock of our salvation.

2. Pseudo-religiosity is one of our evils. True faith, which consists of a profound and sincere belief in the ethically holy God, and ethical sanctification after His example, is unquestionably the central pillar of every nation. Humanitarianism is a hollow phrase when it ceases to be filled with God's spirit. Take the religious idea from society and you destroy it, it becomes an arena of unlimited passions, against which no force can be of any effect. Only God's hand can rule, only the legislature of the conscience can hold in passions. Each man is a union, a composite of various

powers and drives, always ready for secession, each always ready to act without the other. Body, heart, mind -- they are united states. Reason, the light kindled by God, is the president of these united states -- from its high seat it brings peace over and over again to the body, the heart, the mind. I say: Reason, the light kindled by God: For reason without God is a rebel, and would fan the flames, instead of squelching them. Under such circumstances, how could national unity exist? Especially in a republic, where the masses make the decisions -- let us spare ourselves the thought of what would happen if that were the case. History has preserved examples of such instances. The French republic once decided to free itself of the divine monarchy, making a formal decree to that effect -- but it soon saw what was bound to happen, the coming explosion of the machinery of state, the change of society into a group of beasts -- and so it decided to return the old God to power. Is it any wonder that such a republic had no permanence? Thank God our republic is not built on the principles of a Voltaire, but on those of a Washington and a Benjamin Franklin. They expressed themselves at every opportunity about their feeling of dependence on God and faultless ethics; they often stated that pure morality must be the basis of our national politics. Here also we cry to our people: Remember the days of yore ..... ask your father

and he will tell you ..... Franklin, who tamed lightning, who advised Congress that it should subordinate its counsels to those of the loving Spirit in heaven, Who had freed the American people from bondage! There is no more basic truth than that there is a connection in nature between virtue and happiness; between true principles of honest politics and the certain reward of public welfare. We may be certain that heaven will never smile on a nation which leaves the laws of justice, decreed by God Himself. Thus spoke Washington. Thus spoke and taught the founders of our republic. Those were not empty words -- they were spoken by men whom the nation regarded as prophets. Under their guidance this nation grew like a cherub among the nations. But this cherub became proud, it said: I am God. There are plenty of churches and synagogues -- but demoralization has nevertheless stepped in. No longer is it a shame to be immoral or to steal; provided one is not caught. Murder and manslaughter, accidents that happen because of carelessness on railroads and steamers have become common occurrences, hardly noticed by the populace. We have witnessed instances in which murderers were regarded as martyrs, confident themselves that they would step from the gallows into paradise. Everyone knows the courts' difficulties when justice and political partisanship collide! We cannot marvel if the genius of freedom mourn-

fully hides its face, when under such circumstances the flame of discord can burn brightly over the question whether slavery is an evil to be restricted to its present boundaries, or is a praiseworthy blessing. In a dangerous hour such as this there is only perplexity. Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it. And what of the house of Israel, to whom Isaiah told millenia ago of what the real Day of Atonement consists? Have we always praised God from the very depth of our hearts and souls since we have lived in this land, where He has shown us so much kindness? Have we always followed His teachings? No!! We have concentrated on earning as much money as possible; truth, reverence and ethics are tolerated only as long as no risk is involved -- to such an extent often that one might be tempted during this crisis to cross out the Bible's words: God created man in His image!

It has been said: The people must rise and help themselves. There is great truth in that. Yes, the people must rise -- to that divinely isspired spirit which wrote its constitution and awakened its freedom, to the spirit of the man whose ashes rest in Mount Vernon. And it will rise! There is a strong healthy kernel in this people which resists all decay, there is a drive in them towards the high and unmeasurable, which may not fulfill its mission even in centuries. God will not permit the haven

of the oppressed to perish, while by His command the rotten thrones of Europe are collapsing. Our pangs are not of death but of birth. Scripture tells us that a פליט, a refugee came to Abraham. And who was that? The Midrash asks. The answer is: The Angel Michael! When Samael was excommunicated from heaven, he grasped the wings of Michael, and sought to pull him down with him. This holds true in our day also. Rome (the Papacy) is sinking, it is attempting to pull the proud American eagle along, but God is holding the Cherub with His almighty hand, that the angel might come to Abraham as a פליט.

This sermon is followed by a prayer for guidance for the president, Congress, the governor of the State, and the Nation.

****

July 4, 1861.

Volume VI: 209-219. Text: Psalms 118: 5-25.

Again the day has come on which we cay call out: זה היום עשה ד' נגילה ונשמחה בו -- the birthday of our Nation, the day of liberation from the monarchial yoke. But our circumstances today are serious. Usually this day finds the population of our land filled with jubilation, but today fire and sword rage in its innards. Many ask whether we should not sing songs of mourning rather than songs of joy this day. Should we not listen for the last

pulse beats rather than for the first? Let us examine this situation in the light of Judaism. Judaism always takes a warm interest in world affairs, for it always embraces all mankind with a loving heart. With flaming eyes it always regards the flow of generations and the cultural progress of the nations, even as our prophets of old prophesied in regard to the non-Jewish nations. We have all come to lend religious sanctity to the present fort, to hear the voice of God's Law about our feelings towards our beloved land! This voice is to encourage us to celebrate the memory of the Declaration of Independence, which basically is built on Mosaic principles. We are to be reminded to do everything for the preservation of our institutions -- this voice, in brief, will arm us with 1. Confidence in victory; and 2. Willingness to sacrifice.

1. Confidence in victory. We cannot deny it, the republic is in great danger. There are mighty enemies within and they seek aid of the Union's external enemies; monarcy and papacy regard it with eyes of hatred, and now the South also is attempting to prepare a deathbed for it -- a deathbed made of cotton.

And yet the republic can cry out with the pious singer: "The Lord is for me; I will not fear; what can man do unto me? The Lord is for me as my Helper; and I shall gaze upon them that hate me. They compass me about like bees; they are quenched as the fire of thorns; verily,

in the name of the Lord I will cut them off." Yes, even as Israel, so the Union shall come forth gloriously from all battles! It rests on Mosaic principles, which, once they have taken root, cannot be displaced by lies. These truths are that all men are called to freedom, are born equal, and are endowed with unalienable rights. Not the institutions of the republic per se, but the sacred seriousness, the high standards of ethics, and the world embracing heart accomplished these miracles. Since the fall of the Jewish state the world has seen no other state with such lofty majesty of principles. It is this relation, this satiation of the divine spirit of the Sinaitic Law, which fills every Israelite with proud hopes for the future of our land. After three millenia the small country built by the greatest of all prophets, which had to be dissolved to carry its seeds to all regions of the world, has found its imitation in these United States, as it lived in the mind of its founder. Even as Israel could not be destroyed, so must this country succeed. Our Declaration of Independence states that all men are born equal. As with all great ethical truths, so here also imprudence has criticized. Man, so many say, are not born equal. Some are rich, others poor, some are healthy, others have organic blemishes. But men are equal in the qualities that make them men, distinguishing them from animals, such as speech, erect bearing, free will and

reason. These essential similarities are not influenced by difference in race, fate, spiritual and physical goods. Would we divide our genus according to accidental characteristics, then we would find countless splinters within each tribe. Is a man less a man because the omniscient Creator made him a moor? Do we have a right to hurt this dignity? God gave all men the same patent of nobility -- are not our primeval, yet daily renewed records greater than those written on parchment -- written often on robbers' roosts? Noone has ever been born with a royal crown on his head or a slave jacket about his body! No, nature decreed equality for all, and this equality, as it is stated in the Declaration of Independence, gives everyone certain unalienable rights, headed by life, freedom, and the right to happiness. This document judges all religious and civil tyranny as a rebellion against God's will and a desecration of His divine Sanctuary. I say: God's will -- for without reference to the great Creator the Declaration of Independence, the foundation of our Constitution, would be suspended in midair. In a self-created world there is no other law than the will of the strong. There one can speak of independence, but not of inalienable rights; the tyrant can be exiled, but not blood-thirsty mobs. The thought of God alone is the fount of freedom and equality. Such also was the basis of the Jewish State -- freedom was its

first breath. The words of the divine Sinai Constitution are: "I am the Lord your God, Who brought you up out of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." There is no greater proclamation of innate equality of all rational beings than the teaching בדמות אלהים עשה אותו , and וירדו בדגת הים . Mosaism knows no other king over man than מלך ד' . Samuel calls the choice of an earthly king a rebellion against God. The prophets never spoke more eloquently than when they exhorted the loosening of the fetters of bondage, and proclaimed the coming of the great day when all men will gather as an אגדה אחת under one God. We may have to wait millenia for such truths to be fulfilled, but humanity is progressing surely, if slowly, to this goal. Thus the greatest of all prophets had to tolerate slavery -- but the principle of equality had been written down as a promise to be fulfilled eventually for all men. Proof for this humaneness, hardly understood in our South, are the laws of conduct towards slaves in the Mosaic code, the impossibility of enslaving a coreligionist. From this it follows that when all men will accept the Law of God, slavery will become an impossibility. Our constitution worked in the same manner: It permitted the Southern institution, but proclaimed the equality of all men, leaving it to the power of religion and culture to complete the work. Indeed the world has progressed. Man's thoughts fly through the air like lightning, trains carry whole cities. Catholic bishops

speak for the emancipation of Jewish slaves, half-barbaric Russia frees millions of serfs. But what does the South care? Cotton also has made progress, and thus the South made some wonderful inventions: Slavery is an institution sanctified by God; an independent nation of slaves is the height of civilization, and is compatible with the doctrines of the innate equality of men! Those are lies that desecrate God!! Yes, their Bible exegetes even declare that the snake that misled the first humans -- was a "nigger"!! Thus they try to falsify Scripture and nature, to sanctify the curse of slavery of millions of human beings. Could that succeed? Never! The spirit of our republic, however, with confidence of victory, cries out לא אמות כי אחיה ואספר מעשה יה יסר יסרני יה ולמות לאנתנני. David came to Goliath crying: "I come in the name of צבאות ד' Whom you have slandered" -- and the weak won over the strong.

2. Willingness to sacrifice. The faith in the justice and holiness of our cause should not cause us to be idle. Today's festival should encourage us to work actively and to be willing to sacrifice for the victory of freedom for the preservation of the Union שמר רוח לא יזרע וראה בעבים לא יקצור. Thus it is with the storm-wind that now goes through our land, and the clouds that are gathered about the Star Spangled Banner. Pious wishes alone are not enough -- if everybody would look at the

clouds to see if it is going to rain dollars, then our country, now in need, could not even sow for future triumphs. To gain victory we must know the value of the goods in danger. We must give everything in the interest of communal welfare. And from whom could greater sacrifices be expected than from us, exiled strangers without a home for two thousand years, who have found their first home here? Noone has more to gain or lose than we, whose brothers still suffer under slavery in most of the countries of Europe, whose partial freedom is merely a reflection of the light that dawned here? Fools, they who think that the dogma of the equality of men, the cornerstone of our constitution, can be overthrown without its hurting the idea of religious freedom. We have, aside from this, an obligation of thanks to this country, to serve it with all our power. We entered this land with the cry: פתחו לי שערי צדק אבא בם אודה יה. When the tribes of Gad and Reuben requested of Moses that he lead them not over the Jordan, but let them live where there were rich meadows for their cattle, the prophet cried out to them האחיכם יבאו למלחמה ואתם תשבו פה ? Would not Moses cry out again if we were to think of our own interests in the face of this upheaval -- when civilization and barbarism are in the scale? In more than one respect this war will decide our future in this country. We are being watched sharply,

the press has already thrown more than one barb our way. When this storm will be finished, we shall be judged whether we seek the proud eagle in this country that raises all the downtrodden, or the milkgiving cow -- which is fed by others. Let us be proud that our big cities have already brought honor to God's name, a קדוש השם, in that many of our faith have joined the ranks of the soldiers -- that this congregation has already sent three men to the army (Colonel Einstein, Captain Redelsheimer and Dr. Heller, regimental surgeons), who are now fighting a מלחמה מצוה. Let me utter the wish that "Einstein" (one stone) whom the builders of Pennsylvania rejected, might become an "Eck-stein" (corner stone) of Jewish patriotic fame.* Jewish men going out to battle evil with the sword in their hand, as Israel once did under Joshua against Amalek, bring Israel more honor than all Shochtim with their butcher knives! Not everyone can go to do battle, but everyone can do his share, sacrificing something on the altar of our country. א' המרבה וא' הממעיט ובלבד שיכוין לבו לשמים, little or much -- as long as the motive is pure. Such promises, brought our country on its birthday, entitle us to celebration. We can help to free the young giant of its fetters, by which Delilah, the South, has held it shackled. This gaint has

*A pun -- Colonel Einstein's regiment was not accepted for service by the State of Pennsylvania, but was called to the service by the federal government.

now found that he cannot serve Baal and the everliving God simultaneously -- we must help to dig a grave for this Baal. This new battle will prove, must prove, what Isaiah said of the battle between Israel and Philistia: משרש נחש יצא צפע ופריו שרף מעופף כי מצפון עשן בא ואין בודד במועדיו ומה יענה מלאכי גוי כי ד' יסד ציון ובה יחסו עניי עמו.

****

Fourth of July, 1862.

Volume VII: 183-192. Text: Haggai 2: 9.

TEXT: The glory of this latter house shall be greater than that of the former, saith the Lord of hosts, and in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of hosts.

The birthday of the American people returns this time under circumstances that are not desirable. During the past year there have been great victories for freedom, but the snake of the revolution has not yet been scotched, and at this very time we are fighting for the main fortification of the enemy.

Many ask: Would it not be more appropriate to mourn than to celebrate at this moment? I find this question natural in view of the events of the times, but fit for only those who care merely for their money purse,

for they are influenced only by momentary opinions and impressions. But he who can lift himself above these and has holy convictions, he who contemplates on the divine providence in regard to human progress throughout the millenia, cannot let a dark moment rob him of his conviction that the Republic will gain victory, to heal the evil from which the present conflict stems. As far as the structure of our State is concerned, we exclaim the divine words of our text: גדול יהיה כבוד הבית הזה האחרון מן הראשון .

This cry went out to the people returning from Babylon under Zerubbabel and Joshua. Among them were many old people who had seen the First Temple and looked with disdain on the task of rebuilding the Sanctuary, for they felt that the old state would never return. Man would like to see old conditions, which were destroyed in a storm, return to their former status, but nothing returns to the exact former condition once it has been destroyed. Such then was the mood of the older people when they returned. Everything had changed in the exile. Their relation to each other as a people, their religious concepts, public services, the Temple itself. They experienced that time cannot be pushed backwards. The prophets in the name of God called out to them: Why your sorrow? True, everything has changed, but it has changed for the better, and the glory of the new Temple shall be greater than that of the former!

The changes in our country at the present time

are similar. Most people have probably already experienced that the illusion of the state returning to its earlier form is false. Many feel as those old people in Zion felt. But to those we call out today: Do away with your mourning! Our state shall be more magnificent in its future form! 1. In the future, America shall no longer be disfigured by chains of slavery; 2. It will no longer cast blemishes on itself by disdain for its adopted citizens; and 3. The present indifference to the fate of other nations will disappear.

1. The Second Temple outranked the first in that which is the soul of the Jewish community: Faithfulness to God. During the time of the First Temple homage was often paid to strange gods, and lying prophets were not lacking. Is it any wonder that the Jewish state went out of existence and Israel was exiled? A nation which denies its own principles of life cannot and should not continue to exist. In heathen Babylon they learned to appreciate their own religion. This hard school of experience raised a better generation, filled with love for its God. They rebuilt the Temple upon their return -- with less external splendor, but richer in wisdom, borne by the unshakable pillars of the divine teachings. Our situation is similar. The Declaration of Independence states clearly that the unification of originally different nationalities into a national unit is for the exclusive purpose of the preservance of the principles of freedom and equality; that every being created in the divine image has the right

to rid itself of a tyrannical yoke, to repel attacks on his physical and spiritual goods, and to enjoy as much happiness as nature and conscience will permit him.

That is the inner drive of this great nation, even as the Jewish people had the God idea. A state that owes its development to these principles, and yet sanctions human slavery, which was condemned by Mosaic Law three thousand years ago, does it not act in strong contradiction to itself? Is not that similar to erecting an idol in the Sanctuary? Water and fire can be unified before freedom and slavery can be amalgamated. In a country where millions have found a haven from oppression, should other millions of human beings be born merely to act as animals of burden, to be bought, sold and whipped? Should the black man and woman have no other wings than the lash? Is Africa outside of the divine domain? Is a Negro not a human being with human emotions? Benjamin Franklin struggled against slavery from the very beginning, but his voice was not heard. Many thought to accept the evil temporarily, that time would heal the wound, and that the institution of slavery would eventually be abolished. This time has come, but as every great victory, by means of bloody battles.

Israel arose against heathenism only when it threatened its physical and spiritual existence. Similarly slavery had to shake the very foundations of the American

people before they recognized that they had to hack through this Gordian knot. It is unfortunate that the rift has to be filled with human corpses -- but from this seed of blood the genius of freedom shall arise far greater than ever before. In the new state human property shall sink to nothing, but man shall rise in worth. For noble sweat there shall be no lashes of the whip, but civil crowns. Despisement shall not fall against hard heads, but against hard hearts, not against black faces, but against black souls.

2. A further healthy change is coming about at the present time in the evaluation of adopted citizens. In the old Jewish state there also were such citizens. Every foreigner could settle in the land without formally adopting its religion, and yet before the Mosaic Law he was equal to the native. Nevertheless, during the time of the First Temple,he could never become a full fledged citizen, he was always tolerated only as a גר . Because Israel had not yet torn itself away from heathendom completely, it thought that its center of gravity lay in its nationalism and in its origin rather than in its teachings and its beliefs. During the time of the Second Temple, however, the people were filled by their great religious truths, and recognized in them the exclusive root of their power and their existence. If the stranger acknowledged the principles of the land, the land opened its heart to him and regarded him as an equal despite his foreign

nationality, even as one of the great prophets of the exile proclaimed: "ואל יאמר בן הנכר הנלוה אל ד' לאמר יבדלני ד' מעל עמו ... for My House is a House of Prayer for all people." A look at our circumstances here shows us a similar situation.

Americans had an excessive pride in having been born in this part of the world. The immigrant had the same rights, but he was looked down upon. People disregarded that America owes the greater part of its success to immigrants, that America's culture is founded on European culture. The present struggle cannot fail to bring about a change in this respect also. The nation sees its existence threatened by a revolution which was originated by native aristocrats in favor of the enslavement of human beings. Now the nation learns to understand that freedom is the rock on which it was founded, and on which its continual existence depends. The native aristocracy, with blind trust in its material goods, rejected the rock on which it was born; now the nation sees thousands of immigrant citizens risk their blood and their possessions for their adopted homeland. Does not this make it clear that the love for the country's institutions and the willingness to sacrifice for them are independent of the place where one was born? When native and stranger share the same grave in the fight against native traitors, would not every illusion pass that the

distances between cradles constitute a cleft between fellow citizens? Where such spirit of independence reigns, there the narrow-mindedness that boasts of a nobility by birth must disappear, and men cannot be judged by the side of the ocean on which they were born.

3. The present crisis will also end the indifference of the American people whether other nations are ruled in a free or in a tyrannical spirit. During the time of the First Temple Israel also did not care whether or not other nations leaned towards its elements of life and its religious truths. There was a constant oscillation between Baal and God in its own midst! It had not yet become conscious of its priestly calling, and could not recognize the world-embracing powers of its Law, for its nationality still stood higher than its religion. During the proudest time of the Jewish state proselytes were refused. Only when the Jewish people came into close contact with heathendom during the Babylonian exile and began to have a great influence on the religious thinking and feeling of the Babylonians, it began to dawn on the Israelites that the Jewish people had been called to be the bearers of salvation for all the families of the earth. Then the prophets proclaimed this high mission to the people in a flaming, convincing manner. The United States, even as Israel, remained indifferent to the transmission of its ideal to other countries until the first great test

came. At least we have never taken part in the many battles that were fought in this century by enslaved nations for the cause of freedom. This non-intervention, recommended by Washington, may have been purposeful, and even forced by the drive for self-preservation. In its early youth a nation is too preoccupied with its own affairs to cast its glance outward. Furthermore the leaders of the young nation knew that they were hated bitterly by all monarchies, and even if they were not afraid of an attack, such a fight could not be provoked. They believed that they would have to watch only this continent against plans of monarchial states, because they are bad neighbors for republics. But the Babel of the present revolution must and will give events another turn. Our country, once it has passed this hard trial victoriously, must learn to evaluate the friendship of tyrants according to its true value. We have experienced that as a reward for our non-intervention. They merely wait for an excuse to murder the hard-pressed side in our conflict. We must also realize, that with the means of transportation available between continents, the ocean can hardly be regarded as a separating wall, and thus, wherever there is tyranny, there an enemy lurks: What then stops us to rise to our high calling, and to aid oppressed nations? Did not Washington in his farewell address utter the wish that our Constitution might be a

light to all those nations not as yet as fortunate as we? The freeing of every nation gains us a friend, and loses us an enemy! Should the mightiest republic stand by idly when the victims of oppression rise to shake off their yoke? No! Let it be said of the future America גדול יהיה כבוד הבית הזה האחרון מן הראשון אמר ד' צבאות ובמקום הזאת אתן שלום . That time is not here yet -- but it is approaching rapidly -- as certain as the God of justice and love rules over the fate of man, as certain as He creates blooming lands from fields of corpses, and creates new worlds of light from streams of blood and tears.

P A R T III.

Section F.

Funeral Sermon.

Funeral Sermon by Dr. Einhorn for Dr. Leo Merzbacher. Volume I: 321-324.

New York, October 23, 1856.

This is not just another funeral, for in this loss we have all lost. I lost a dear friend whom I have known from youth on. Most was lost by American Israel. He built a congregation from almost nothing; truly he could say בני הם אשר נתן לי אלהים בזה . He knew that a mere glittering cover was not sufficient to protect his children against the cold of the outside, that the wound of Judaism had to be attacked at its very source. Thus he wrote his prayerbook. He had felt death coming for a long time, but without complaint he devoted himself cheerfully to his work. Like Aaron he died immediately upon taking off his priestly garments.* When he officiated at the recent High Holy Days he did not know that soon the call of The Neilah would apply to him: פתח לנו שער בעת נעילת שער כי פנה יום ! We call after him גור אריה יהודה מטרף !! יהודה אתה יודוך אחיך !! He was בני עליה. Our comfort lies in the fact that only the dust returns to dust, but his spirit goes to God. He, כהן לאל עליון, is no longer with us, but his blessings shall never depart from us.

Dr. Merzbacher died on the way home after having delivered a sermon on the priestly benediction.

You have left us on the עצרת festival, dear departed, to celebrate an eternal עצרת with Him Whom you served so faithfully. May God lead you henceforth, and sate your soul with His mercy! May He grant your orphaned plants blessing and growth, so that your descendants may continue to rebuild ruins, and build bastions for coming generations.

P A R T III.

Section G.

As a Guest Preacher.

Preached at Temple Emanuel, N.Y.

Volume I: 210-223. Text: Isaiah V: 1-3.

June 21, 1855 (?)

The picture of the vineyard is applied by Scripture to the bearers of God's Law as well as to itself. Behind it is a thought that contains the solution to the greatest riddle of world history, to Israel's victorious continuance under unprecedented hardships. This thought is that the laws of God share the characteristics of wine, in that they rejoice the heart of man, and penetrate the body in an invigorating manner -- in other words Judaism is Humanity ("Israelitentum ist Menschentum"). The Law is not forced or artificial, it is natural and innate to man; its divine charter is not brought from the heavens or from across the sea, it is close to us, to be fulfilled by word and deed. The question before us is: In what respect does Jewry certify itself as mankind? The answer is that Jewry is rooted in humanity, it has grown with it, and will eventually embrace all of humanity. This topic seems to be well suited for a man who has the privilege today for the first time to preach in a congregation which is like unto a vineyard located on the fat mountaintop of a refined religious perception.

Judaism has its roots in humanity, at the deepest bottom of the heart. Our Ancients connect the song of the vineyard with Adam, and thus with human

existence in general. Man is the vineyard, located on the fat mountaintop, at the peak of creation with its plentifulness of life, honor and glory; he is crowned above all other beings with immortality, fenced by a mortal life; he is born free of sin, pure and good. וישעהו שרק -- God planted His holy Law in man simultaneously with reason; that high impenetrable tower where watch is kept against the robbing powers of dark forces. Here also watch is kept on the heart, which is the winepress. There the noble fruit is pushed and pressed in the struggle between good and evil; there it must settle itself into the noble wine of pious determination, into deeds rich with blessing. Long before the revelation of Sinai came a divine call from that tower: Raise your eyes on high, and see Who created these! He Who brings out the host of stars, according to their number ....

Before Israel Adam was the priest in the מקדש of the universe. There countless voices sing the praise of God, there the way was shown him to life or to death. Jewish teaching is a law of sanctification of life, it is a sprout of the mind cast in the image of God, it is as old as the law of freedom of will. It is the moral order of the universe, the crown of its natural order. The common assumption that the Torah was created with Israel is wrong. Scripture testifies that with the creation of Adam the entire divine work was completed. The noble vine of God's Law was never withheld from our species at

any time. It was implanted in man originally, only heathen unnaturalness was a strange graft that brought forth the bitter grapes of Sodom and Amorah עשה אלהים את האדם -- God created men dressed in natural and moral splendor והמה בקשו חשבונות רבים and they sought out many inventions. Man sought to falsify his original nature; thus sin arose, and in its growth covered the noble vine; with its nightlike shadow it darkened the tower in the vineyard, that is the human mind, set by God as a watch, until at last the winepress overflowed with corruption, and through its own fault our species seemed destined to go to ruin. At the brink of this abyss Israel appeared as the redeemer, to return mankind to its original divine form, to remove the weed of heathendom. To be an Israelite means nothing more than to be a human being, to recognize and to practice God's truths. What is not found here does not belong in the realm of eternal laws or to the essence of the imperishable plant of God. At best it belongs to the fence around it, or is a prop of the noble vine. That which contradicts our essence, or wants to bind our spiritual or physical nature, is condemned to death by Judaism, the original planting place of true humanity, even if this sentence is not carried out immediately. The basic teachings of Israel are by no means forcing peremptory decrees to which we must close our eyes; they are far removed from demanding belief, or even from sanctioning a belief that rests on spiritual

selfdestruction, and is therefore already regarded as a merit in itself, constituting a sin-offering. These teachings are rather the crown of rational cognition; they are wings and not fetters of the mind, the resplendent contemplation of nature, which penetrates the essence of things, and rises on the ladder of created matters to the idea of the uncreated; words which are loudly proclaimed by heaven and earth, revealing to us with magic powers the deepest secrets of our own life and being. The teachings of the One and Only in their purity; the goodness and the excellence of the forces of nature as servants of God; the dignity of man and his calling from childhood as the image of the All-holy; the partaking of eternal happiness in the most intimate ties with God; God's care, in that He determines the fate of all creatures in love, God as our refuge before the mountains were created; the lack of flaws in the inviolable laws of nature; the messianic completion of the world in the future: All these teachings echo in our hearts. Judaism proclaimed the same kind of naturalness in its decrees. Here, in the place of heathen force, it sets peace and equanimity. Believes and works which are blind or dead are rejected. It demands a practice of religion which is rational in our eyes and in the eys of others; living, fruit-bearing deeds after the example of divine sanctity. Its main principles are that we walk with God, that we act

as God acts, that we take His justice, His love and His mercy as our example. That which does not follow these examples directly is only form or ceremony. To be valid, these must at least figuratively portray our relationship to God or His creatures. If they do not fulfill this requirement, then they are in sharp contradiction to God's dominion, and must be avoided as idolatrous. Even our bodies are divine Sanctuaries, partaking of temporal blessings; they are ennobled by the thought of the exalted Donor. Even on the level where the most rigid separation of Israel from others and a decided strengthening of its national feelings were necessary, Israel still showed close friendship for the stranger, and permitted him the greatest benefits of the Law. Thus the teachings of Moses are permeated by the purest naturalness; they are a blossom deep in the heart of man, who is the crown of the giant work of creation. The renewal of the Covenant on Sinai was necessary only because man had descended from the mountaintops, had thrown his crown in the dust, and had attempted to equalize himself with God, even as they who had attempted to build the tower of Babel. Thus nature became unnatural, reason was unreasonable. In this Babylonian confusion the stem of the vine was lost until Moses divided the sea, and the mountaintop, with its implanted vine, became visible again.

As Judaism has its roots in humanity, so it blooms with humanity. It did not appear immediately in its full splendor. Its source is the human mind, which it is to ennoble. It had to traverse the same steps of culture as the mind, it had to assume various coverings (guises) according to the age and the standards of culture, penetrating these as it best could. Judaism is a vineyard, surrounded by a fence of ceremonies against heathen intrusion. Outwardly this fence is a defense, inwardly it serves to strengthen and to unify our forces. Israel is the keeper of the vineyard. Its fruits could not ripen immediately, time was necessary for budding and development, and since many outside factors brought their influence to bear, the results were not uniform everywhere. The fence had to be altered occasionally when its wood became rotten; at other times a vine extended over the fence, and had to be set in completely new ground. History contains many examples of the vicissitudes and the procreational abilities of Judaism. Its calling is to ennoble itself constantly on the inside, and on the outside to break the petrified covering which often made a prison of what was intended to be a shelter. Like the light of the dawn, so God's divine revelation beamed on the world in its earliest childhood. These early revelations prospered further with the patriarchs. Because Abraham practiced God's Commands, Scripture tells us that he was worthy of the divine Covenant, and

was made the father of the priest-covenant people. ובגפן שלשה שריגים, the three patriarchs arose. But the revelations to them were still far inferior to those of Sinai. שמי ד' לא נודעתי להם -- they knew God as the world-creator and Judge, not as the loving God, אל רחום וחנון. This lack was also felt among men, who patterned themselves after God. Here too עשות צדק ומשפט was the highest ideal, but the crown was lacking: Love, which at Sinai was extended even to the consideration of plants and animals. Moses was the first to see the morningdawn fully developed into a light day; he was the first to see the full revelation, he penetrated to the highest ideals of divine thought. His law was complete in basic ideas, yet in practice the application was behind the ideal, for a nation, suffering in physical and spiritual darkness, had to be raised. This nation had lived among the heathens, therefore it was necessary to bring light to it slowly, not suddenly and blindingly, by introducing the new principles in forms to which the people were used. Evil institutions, such as slavery and blood revenge, could not be uprooted suddenly, but were surrounded by mitigating laws, to prepare them for the eventual exit. This process was speeded up later by the prophets, the true and radical Reformers, who taught that God does not seek the external works of man, but that He loosens the bonds of wickedness. If all the external aspects of the Mosaic Law, (e.g. death for the breaking of

a statute, the sacrificial cult, etc.) had remained in effect and would have been numbered among the essentials of Judaism, then our religion for the past two thousand years would have been like a trampled vineyard, left only with a remnant of its former glory, no longer capable of bringing forth new shoots. But history teaches us otherwise: Israel has never been as zealous for its heritage as since its dispersion. What is the significance of the battle of the heroic Maccabees next to the fight of our splintered tribe against oppressing millions? What is the blood of sacrifices next to the blood of thousands who died in martyrdom? What are all the shekels of former times compared to the tolls exacted from us to protect our lives, and compared to the money spent on our synagogues today? Where there is such enthusiasm, truly there must still be a flame, not only a spark. Our religion has gained, not lost, since the Temple was destroyed. We have gained in religious insight and moral ennoblement in such matters as our concept of God's nature, the immortality of the soul, the relation between husband and wife, and many others. Tearing down old fences is an ennoblement, not a degeneration. With the destruction of the Temple our "particular" priesthood was to become "general," the cult of sacrificial offerings was to change into true sacrifices in the sanctification of life; laws were no longer to be

obeyed because of fear of judgment, but through voluntary love. Distinctions were to be made between the body and the spirit of the holy Law, the latter was to rise higher and higher. The religion of mankind was to be a religion of sincerity, and man was to be ennobled by it. It was not to be an immovable rock, but a tree of life, which was to grow and bear sprouts. This religion was nurtured by "God's breath," which nothing can destroy, be it nations, time, or anything else. Our four thousand year old history is the winepress in our vineyard, it never ceases to press and to squeeze the noble fruit, to obtain the precious beverage for the tired and the thirsty, to bring purity and inspiration to the world. This press will never cease to function, it will work until we shall have wine of such a quality that it will shatter all vessels which would attempt to hold it. All attempts to halt this historical process will be without success. Jewry cannot limp on the crutches of times which are now gone, it must reach the peak of intelligence, it must not be buried under a collossal tower of rotten legalism, it must be a lighthouse for the nations!

Israel, like a vine rooted in a vineyard, is rooted in humanity, it entwines itself about humanity, embracing it with its ideals. Israel is a vineyard כרם ד' צבאות בית ישראל, planted atop the "fat mountain," surrounded by special walls of nationhood, with laws that

set it apart, and planted with the vine of God's teachings. This is a picture by the Psalmist, who calls Israel a vine transplanted from Egypt to Canaan, before which God uprooted others to make room, a vine that covers the mountain with its shadow. The segregation will not last forever, our Law is such that it cannot remain secluded, its destiny is to send out shoots all over the world. The segregation served to protect the young plant. Judaism, to this very day, fosters messianic thoughts of a world religion. This is the gigantic tower that leads Israel to God, from its height the watchmen of Israel called down: "Be unto Me a nation of priests." It is the destiny of God's Law to become universal. Kimchi comments that prophecy is the winepress where Israel was prepared for true piety, for the love of God and man. Nowhere are the prophets greater than when they predicted that a day would come when there would be no more idol-worship, when all nations will partake of Israel's religion.

Let us strive for these goals, let us practice them, for thus we can glorify Judaism.....

PART III.

Section H.

Sabbath Sermons.*

*In the order in which they appeared in the Sinai. For a list of texts (all sermons) cf. Addendum, after p. 548.

Volume I: 11-18. Text: Numbers 12: 4-9.

TEXT: God suddenly called Moses, Miriam and Aaron to the Tent of Meeting, and He said: "Hear now My words: If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord do make Myself know unto him in a vision ... in a dream. With Moses ..... mouth to mouth."

Miriam and Aaron slandered Moses, and they boasted that God spoke to them even as He did to Moses. Moses was silent, but God pleaded his cause. Let us then ponder today what was the prophetic distinction which Moses enjoyed, which made him greater than all other prophets. According to our text there were three distinctions by which the prophetic gifts of Moses were greater than those of all other prophets, namely: 1. Directness; 2. Clarity; and 3. Comprehension.

1. Directness. To a certain degree God has given all of us the means to know Him, for our mind is a part of His mind, and we are thus all sons of God. Every time we ask ourselves: "From whence do we come, whither do we go?"; every time that we contemplate the marvels of nature, when our conscience reproves or praises us, then God is speaking to us. But such light does not shine alike for every man, such understanding differs with every individual in degree. It depends on how much God has apportioned to us and how we use what we have. Prophets are those individuals whose intellect is extra-

ordinary, who have attained insight into an unusual thing which other humans cannot see. But even amongst the prophets there are gradations, and amongst them Moses attained unto the highest degree. His intellectual achievements, his cognition of God and his ethical purity were ahead of all other men by millenia. His prophetic insight was direct. Our Sages explain the words of our text פה אל פה אדבר בו to mean בלו אמצעי, without a middleman. Indeed our text confirms this: God speaks to others in visions and in dreams, but to Moses He speaks directly. History confirms this: All other prophets only saw God in dreams or in visions. In a dream Abraham was appraised of the fate of his descendants in Egypt; in a dream Jacob saw the angels ascending and descending on a ladder, which picture showed him the glorious future of his children; it was in a dream that Joseph's eventual dominion over his brothers was proclaimed. Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel -- they all had to sleep to behold God. But not so Moses. Not במראה and not בחלום, but waking he spoke to God. The material world with its many distracting influences did not hinder the rays of his mind to attain to their original fount. On the heights where he stood truth cast off its veil; there man hears sounds which do not reverberate, but do nevertheless shake the world in its foundation.

2. Moses also was greater in clarity than all

other prophets. ומראה ולא בחידות God spoke to him. Based on this the Talmud contains the following strange utterance כל הנביאים נסתכלו באיספקלריא שאינה מאירה משה רבנו נסתכל באיספקלריא המאירה. The prophets thought they saw many things which they really did not see, but Moses saw everything clearly and distinctly. Abraham, so the famous book עקידת יצחק tells us, did not understand God clearly when he thought that God had commanded him to sacrifice Isaac, for God had actually forbidden him this sacrifice on Moriah. The correct interpretation came to him only when he was about to slaughter his son. Isaiah, so our sages say, was looking into an unclear mirror when he proclaimed וארא את אדני ישב על כסא רם, for the revelation to Moses was: "No man can see Me and live." Such mistakes are of course the result of looking at pictures and dreams, especially since these are in need of interpretation, and are thus subject to misrepresentation. But not so Moses! His interpretations were direct, not the smallest doubt, error, or self-deception adhered to his proclamations! Amidst a people only recently freed from the fetters of bondage, in an arid desert full of hardships, he proclaimed the Law thousands of years ago which is still recognized by countless human beings as the eternal source of salvation, comfort and happiness. The Rabbis say Moses was enriched by the splinters of the tablets of stone. We say the world was enriched by

the fragments of his spirit. When all the world bowed down before sun, moon and stars, he proclaimed יהוה, the eternal Source of all being. When men had forgotten their origin, he proclaimed man as fashioned in the likeness of God, as the crown of creation. He pronounced Israel a nation of priests, proclaimers of salvation for all generations; he commanded love for the stranger, and decreed equal rights for him. While children were still being sacrificed, he did not permit the young of the bird to be taken from its mother.

Has mankind, at the present level of cultural development, outgrown these laws? Indeed, countless millions have hardly reached the first rung on the ladder that leads to their height! The man with the tablets still stands alone on top of the mountain, awaiting those that will come in the future. Because he was the only one to whom God did not speak in riddles, his message is still a puzzle for most men, and when we find the key to that puzzle we shall have the key to the messianic kingdom. Because his generation was so far beneath him he had to speak in allegories, and when later men of God sought to free the germ of its coverings, they acted in the spirit of the great master, who foresaw the different levels of cultural development, and in laying the cornerstone saw its proud dome in his mind.

3. Moses also had more comprehension than all

other prophets. He saw not only clearer and more correctly, he saw more, for the founts of revelation flowed more richly for him. בכל ביתי נאמן הוא . This house of God, as Maimonides explains (Moreh I: 54) is the universe, the Temple of nature; Moses penetrated deeper into the essence of the divine work than other prophets, and therefore he was richer than they in his understanding of the divine attributes and the divine will. Nature is the book into which God wrote His revelations, and as the heathens misunderstood the book and acted accordingly, so in the converse the highest understanding comes from reading this book correctly. And who could be compared with Moses in this respect? Who could like he read God's writing in the material and the spiritual world? What a marvel that amongst all the worlds and suns only one Law rules! What a marvel that man, a handful of dust held together by only a breath, should possess a ray of the Eternal, a ray which never is extinguished once it has commenced! And when did Moses voice these thoughts? Under the dominion of heathen darkness! And how did Moses express these thoughts? In inimitable simplicity, that captures the soul of a child as well as that of the wisest wise men! Had Moses to offer us nothing but three verses: A. In the beginning God created heaven and earth; B. God said: Let there be light, and there was light; C. God created Adam in

His image -- had he left us nothing but these, he would have been above all wise men and law-givers of all nations! Have you ever heard of a man who built an entire world out of two stones, on which a few verses were engraved? Well then, take these verses, and engrave their teaching on your hearts!

****

Volume I: 50-57. Text: Numbers 16: 2-4.

Whenever there had been a rebellion amongst the children of Israel it had been because of the hardships the people had to suffer, because of the people's desire to return to Egypt, or because of the inclination to return to idol worship. Now, for the first time, Moses is attacked in his capacity of being a prophet. Before the revelation at Sinai Israel had been told ואתם תהיו לי ממלכת כהנים וגוי קדוש.* "How then," so Moses and Aaron were questioned, "can you raise yourselves above the people?" This was not a rebellion of a mob, it was a cleverly conceived plot, which was based on the word of God, to overthrow the leader of the people. This case is unique in the Bible and deserves our attention all the more since it raises the question: Must not our faith in the mission of Moses be greatly shaken since his own contemporaries dared to attack it? We answer this question negatively for the following reasons: 1. Korach's proof against the divine mission of Moses was based on a proposition which expressed very

*Einhorn quotes this passage as a Midrash, but it is from Exodus 19: 6. This is one of the very few places where Einhorn was in error.

definitely recognition of this mission; 2. The accusation, brought on the basis of the divine word against the Mosaic institution of a special ecclesiastic tribe is unfounded; 3. Our belief in the divinity of the Mosaic proclamations rests on grounds which were not yet known to Moses' contemporaries.

1. Korach bases his accusations against Moses on a premise which clearly depicts Moses as the emissary of God! But was not this the very God that had been completely forgotten by Abraham's descendants in Egypt? Had not his forgetfulness come to the point where even the name of God had been completely forgotten by the oppressed? And then, as the rebels emphasized, God had taken residence amongst the people at a time when heathenism flourished everywhere -- to what was this due, if not to the divine mission of this rejected prophet? What a striking contradiction to recognize the priesthood of Israel and its high calling, and to deny the prophetic character of him who made this possible; to recognize God's message, but to deny the messenger. It is true that the insurgents attempted to hide these contradictions by distinguishing between the <u>essence</u> and the <u>form</u> of the religion. They did not dare to attack the divinity of the Sinaitic revelation, for in that case there could be no doubt regarding the distinction of Israel. Their attacks were solely against the institution of the

priesthood and thus against the entire structure of the cult, the divine origin of which they denied and ascribed to the arbitrary desire of Moses. The Midrash Yalkut quotes Korach as saying to Moses: וכי אתם לבדכם קדושים והלא כלנו נתקדשנו בסיני וכשנתנו לנו עשרת הדברות כל אחד ואחד ממנו הי' יונק מהר סיני ולא נתן לנו אלא י' דברות ולא שם הלה ולא שם תרומה ומעשרות ולא שם ציצית שמענו אלא מעצמך אתה אומר כדי לעשות שררה לעצמך וכבוד לאהרון אח"ך . Moses was thus branded as dishonest at the same time that he was recognized as the tool of the divine revelation. The fools took the tablets of stone, pointed at them with pride, and then hurled them at the man who brought them these tablets! They attempted to dig a grave for Moses with the same tool that made him immortal to all the coming generations!

2. The objections leveled by Korach and his followers against the separate priesthood lack all basis. Their idea of the overall priesthood of Israel and the equality of all tribes before God is of course based on the premises of the Sinaitic teachings. Nobody would deny these less than Moses, the proclaimer of the Law. However every page from the history of that period proves that the entire people was not yet ready to be entrusted with the observance of God's Law, and therefore it was best

to apportion this task to a tribe that had proved itself superior in its faith to God above all other tribes. Such distinction had been attained only by the tribe of Levi, and therefore it was chosen for the task. This choice was based not so much on ancestry or birth-right (which would be in contrast to the Mosaic teachings) but rather on noble precept and example. This distinction was not destined to last forever; it was an educational measure, a medium for the unification of all on an equal footing in the recognition and the worship of God. This educational process was ended with the destruction of the Second Temple, to be replaced by the general priesthood of the House of Jacob. Similarly in messianic times all nations shall be on an equal level with Israel according to the explicit prophetic teachings. Indeed, had Korach had a real objection to the preference of one tribe over the others in a religious sense, then he should have the same objection to the choice of Israel above all other nations. He only adopted the religious truth as an excuse to hide his own ambitions, he wanted priestly rights transferred to the entire congregation at a time when most of the people hardly knew of priestly duties, a time when God's Law was still like a seed requiring shelter, not to remain hidden in the minds of men, but to be protected against the frost of heathenism, to grow up proudly in the future.

3. The incident of Korach could not shake our faith since our faith rests on premises which were not yet in existence at his time. Those who believe in Moses because of the miracles performed by him must notice that the very individuals who saw his miracles questioned his divine mission. But our belief does not rest on miracles or signs which can be matched by other faiths with their wonders; our faith rests on Judaism's inner truths and its history, on its marvelous internal and external growth. The contemporaries of Moses did not possess a greater ability to comprehend the true Law of God than we. To the contrary, even as a mature man has more comprehension than an infant, similarly the Jewish teachings were not as beautiful in their infancy as in their magnificent orbit and victorious course through the world. What gave off only a vague glow at its first dawning now gleams in radiant splendor. In the Mosaic period the exhortation: "You shall be a kingdom of priests unto Me" was as puzzling a motto as the יעוי or any other truth that sprang forth from the mental ocean of the great prophet. Moses was therefore limited in his teachings, and had to fetter the wings of truth with the fetters of external legalism, so that the limping ones could keep up. We, however, recognize the beauty and the truth of his revelations. We have dropped hundreds of its coverings and have seen its immortal, unchangeable

soul rise higher and higher. The extension of the priesthood to all Israel took place when we left the narrow confines of the homeland for all the other parts of the world. In that process we dropped ceremonialism, the sacrificial cult and Israel's status as a nation, moving ever closer to the messianic goal. Let us remember the marvelous fate of Moses' teaching, how it was often trampeled down and raised again, its age, its power to attract all men. These are all witnesses to the divine mission of Moses, they are worth more than all miracles. More marvelous than the priestly staff of Aaron is the pilgrimstaff of Israel; more wonderful than the earth's opening its mouth to swallow Korach is that it often opened its mouth to swallow Israel, but was never able to do so. And with such testimony can we ever doubt that this was wrought by the finger of God? As long as there is breath within us, let us ever proclaim משה אמת ותורתו אמת , so that the day will come when that will be proclaimed by all nations!

****

Man's Body: A Divine Shrine.

Volume I: 84-93. Text: Numbers 19: 13.

TEXT: Whosoever toucheth the dead, even the body of any man that is dead, and purifieth not himself ..... he hath defiled the Tabernacle-of the Lord ..... that soul shall be cut off from Israel; because the water

of sprinkling was not dashed against him, he shall be unclean; his uncleanness is yet upon him.

According to Judaism everything that was created (by God) is clean and good. Evil came into existence only by the free choice of man. According to this teaching the body of man is not an evil that is merely tolerated. Quite to the contrary, Scripture tells us to safeguard and to respect even the perishable part of man. In our Sedra today we find a principle which is in sharp contracition to other religions, which proclaim the uncleanness of the human body. Our text actually calls the human body a משכן ד' . Some claim that these words refer to the אהל מועד, and state the "cutting off from Israel" refers to an individual who has defiled himself with a human corpse and then enters the משכן without having cleansed himself ritually first. This interpretation however is not correct, as we can see from another passage in this Sedra, which states regarding one who commits the sin of not cleansing himself כי את מקדש ד' טמא . Clearly then the divine Sanctuary mentioned here is the human body. Many ancient religions, especially that of the ancient Egyptians, describe man as "a small world" (a microcosm). No one up to that time, however, had stated that man was a מקדש ד' . After all, man is made of dust, and many misled religions cannot deprecate his body sufficiently. Let us then ponder today on what

basis this Biblical assumption rests that the human body is a divine Sanctuary.

The basis of this proposition is that man has the essentials of the Temple services within himself: 1. A priest; 2. An altar; 3. A sacrifice.

1. A priest. A מקדש ד' must first of all possess a priest, the harbinger of divine messages. The name of that priest in man is the human spirit, the דמות אלהים. We may marvel about the great divine wisdom that created man from the dust; but we cannot wonder that this divine edifice bears the name מקדש ד' . The spirit in man is a priest, a מלאך ד' צבאות, the only proclaimer of the eternal Law of God. The only way that man has ever had divine revelation has been in this spirit and by means of this spirit. The irrefutable proof for this is to be found in the Bible. God engraved His word in each of us. Sin is only the result of the corruption of our own beings. The well of divine revelation was not dug on Sinai for the first time; it already flowed for Adam, Noah and Abraham, even for the corrupt generation of the deluge! It even flowed for the heathen nations of Canaan, for had it not flowed for them, surely they would not have merited punishment. Moses only rolled the stones of heathenism from the mouth of the fount and deepened the well. The flames of Sinai only brought out more clearly the engraving on man which had been partially wiped out

and had partially not yet been recognized. Our minds are all different, and what one individual can find by independent searching often is at best only barely comprehended by another. But we all have in us the divine breath; the divine priest in us may hear the divine voice more or less clearly. Therefore logic and religion can never be enemies; unless they both deny themselves, unless reason becomes unreasonable, or religion becomes irreligious. It is the soul which brings us tidings from our Father, and calls out to us: It is God Who created the heavens and the earth. There is an omniscient conscience which rules and leads everything according to an immutable plan. Only a sick mind could have put blind chance on the throne of the world. Reason is the witness to our own limitations and to the existence of a unique God. It is a witness to our own high origin, of our likeness to God, our right to rule over irrational beings. It testifies to the high distinction of freedom of will so that we may bow down before the Most Holy by our own choice, to pray to Him, to accept His just, all-loving dominion as a shining example for human behavior. They who misuse their freedom and recognize no law above them, and deny their great dignity: They close their ears and eyes against the priest in them who is a constant reminder. Vain hope! God's messenger cannot be silenced. The less we listen to him, the more vociferous he becomes. Indeed

man's body is God's Temple, and in it His son proclaims the truth.

2. An altar. This is the heart. Here the flame of the soul must constantly be nourished, as the eternal fire was kept up by Aaron. The message of the invisible priest in us must become a flame on the altar of the heart. What concerns our moral behavior, our relation to God and our ethical activities, that is received by man with sincerity usually not displayed otherwise. The fuel for this lies in the heart alone, it must be joined with the soul to produce the holy flame, to give its pronouncements a religious character. It is often said to the disadvantage of religion: Religion is more a matter of the believing heart than of the thinking mind. But that is an error, for the recognition of religious truths and obligations like any other recognition depends on our higher powers of thought. The heart is the hearth of life where all the powers of human nature are gathered, but only when the priest, i.e. the soul, brings his torch there, will a flame burn that will enlighten our entire being. Thus religious thoughts become a reality only in the heart. The truths grasped by the mind only cannot enflame to pious deeds. No matter how strong a conviction is within us, it is powerless compared to passion, until this conviction becomes inflamed, a flame on the hearth of the heart, אש אכלה אש , a consuming fire

which consumes all that is unclean, going through the entire being of man. The mind recognizes, but the heart loves; the mind decides, the heart executes; the mind shines, but the heart burns and ignites. Together the heart and the mind are אורים ותמים, light and completion, whose symbol was always on Aaron's heart when he appeared before God. This symbol disappeared, but not the אורים ותמים of our מקדש, our body, which is better than all edifices of wood and stone, not excluding the Temple of Zion.

3. The sacrifice: We might ask the question of Isaac: הנה האש והעצים ואיה השה לעולה? But the sacrifice is not lacking; it is the desire for evil, the inclination to go contrary to God's Law. The divine Law recognizes in this drive Satan and the Angel of death, as our Rabbis taught: הוא השטן והוא מלאך המות הוא יצר הרע. The prize to be gained in the struggle against this Satan is the crown of holiness. Ours is the power to overcome evil, ours is the choice between the angel of life or of death. There lies the difference between Judaism and Christianity: Christianity teaches that the evil inclination is born with every man. We teach: What God gave us cannot have been bad. The drive for the forbidden is only bad if we give in to it. If we surpress it, then it becomes a messenger of God, who helps us to attain the highest rungs on the ladder of ennoblement.

Our Ancients taught: והנה טוב מאד זה יצר הרע. The inclination to sin is part of the basic scheme to the completion of God's handiwork. The two sons of light mentioned by the prophet Zechariah are יצר טוב ויצר הרע מתהפך בזכות התורה. Both of them are in the service of God, for by means of the latter we can enter the service of God. But our text gives us the most striking testimony, for if man's body is a משכן ד', then it cannot be impure! However, by our own volition we can contaminate this Sanctuary. Therefore we must guard our lips from fraud, our hands from reaching for forbidden fruits! We must guard against lurking sin, which defiles and poisons already if inclination becomes intention, even without having been activated yet. Our Rabbis taught: "Know whence you come and whither you go, and before Whom you must give account; then you will find protection against sin." Our text contains an even stronger exhortation: "Know Who has taken up habitation within you! Do not desecrate what is holy in you, don't gird your limbs, the כלי המקדש, against God!" And whenever sin tempts you, have the thought within your soul: "Away, unclean one! This is the habitation of God! Here is the exhorting priest, there the flaming altar -- may you be the sacrifice!"

****

Volume I: 150-157. Text: Numbers 21: 17-19.

The song of our text refers to a well which is

one of the most mysterious things in the Bible. The Rabbis tell us that this well was given to Israel by God at the beginning of its desert wanderings and was taken along everywhere. (This is the same well referred to in Aboth 5: 9). Whatever may be meant by this well, the Midrash claims that it is an allusion to the well of the holy teachings which Israel received in the desert. The words of our text read: "Spring up, O well -- sing ye unto it -- the well which the princes digged, which the nobles of the people delved, with the sceptre, and with their staves." The verse preceding this passage read: "..... that is the well whereof the Lord said unto Moses: Gather the people together, and I will give them water." These latter words would have been more fitting for another well. Water is a symbol of life and of the divine word wherever it occurs in Scripture. Isaiah said: "Draw water in joy from the well of salvation. He who thirsteth, come to the water." Jeremiah stated: "Me, the fount of living waters, they have left, and hewed but broken cisterns that can hold no water." Water quickens the thirsty, it strengthens the tired, and cleanses the unclean. All these are characteristics which in a spiritual respect apply to the teachings of Moses, which, as the prophet stated, will some day cover the earth as water the sea. If we analyze our text in this sense, we shall be instructed how to interpret the Mosaic teach-

ings, and how they apply to us.

1. Each word in the song points to the thought that religion is a never drying well within man. Religion is not a foreign thing to man, it is a living stream. The human heart is an ארון הקודש , where God preserves His Holy testimonies. "Spring up, O well" ..... that is also the call of Sinai. This fount of life and salvation was in existence ever since God breathed life into man, but the פי הבאר was lacking. While the world was young it did not recognize the treasure in its womb, the ever-living fount within it. The drive to selfdestruction and to the unnatural lay like a huge rock on the opening of the well. Man, wandering blindly, sought neither God, nature or himself; he quenched his thirst on his pictures of phantasy, on idols that drank his blood. Then came the tribes of Jacob, to remove this boulder, to permit the stream to flow freely from the depth of man's heart. First came the Patriarchs with their pure believes, then Moses and Aaron, the men of God: They were the noble men that opened the fount. No religion to this day has proven itself as wonderful as Judaism, simply because it is our nature, because everything within us praises God. His basic precepts are חקים , laws engraved by God into human nature, which can be repressed or forged as little as the חקות שמים וארץ . Our Ancients rightfully said: The Torah existed already before creation was fully com-

pleted, for the Jewish religion was given in the words: Let us create a man in Our image." While the world still awaited the crown of creation, man, God had already created this fount, which was hidden until the people arose of whom it is said יזל מים מדליו וזרעו במים רבים, until the cry was heard on Sinai עלי באר -- Spring up, O well, ענו לה -- let us sing to it!

2. ממדבר מתנה. Rashi and Onkelos explain: The well was given to Israel in the desert as a present. It was a מתנה, not an עול . It is one of the main characteristics of true Judaism that it rejects the lamenting type of religiosity, which sees a mortal enemy in every indigenous, joyous feeling, ennervating its believer physically and spiritually, literally reducing him to a caricature before it sees in man the image of God. Such a religion ascribes so little sanctifying power to its idea of the divine, and its demands meet opposition so great, that it must call to aid hell and devils, and cannot portray them black enough. True Judaism embraces man as he is, it seeks to elevate him in his own eyes, to free him from unnatural tendencies; it sees in him the reflection of the heavens; it sees him happy and yearning to fulfill his obligations, proud as befits the king of creation, who acts on behalf of the King of kings. Repeatedly it teaches, "And you shall rejoice before the Lord .....". It even teaches that the

prophetic spirit is only the inheritance of happy souls, and peace with God is impossible as long as peace and harmony are missing within ourselves, for they constitute true happiness. ממדבר מתנה . In the desert of heathenism, where man wandered without aim and languished under the pressure of fear of self-created monstrosities, God permitted Israel to find the well, to quicken the soul, to let forcibly restrained powers blossom in countless buddings. Henceforth the son of God was to take the place of the slave, and man-taught laws were to be replaced by holy statutes as religious obligations. The bloodsoaked scourge was to rule and to atone no longer, but the love for God and man was to hold forth. The Law of God, the result of the most pure and all-embracing love, was to be recognized as the greatest treasure. Those who do not understand Judaism speak of an עול תורה , for them the Law is a גזירת המלך, which, as fate, we must bear, even though unwillingly. But he who recognized the well, hidden in the depth of humanity since ששת ימי בראשית, and which emerged by the scepter of the prophets, he understands the challenge ענו לה he sings with David זמירות היו לי חקיך.

3. וממתנה נחליאל . The Midrash explains נחליאל to mean "the heritage of God." This also has a bearing on our interpretation of the well. The Law within us is not sufficient in itself, it must be recognized as being

God-given, it must be known as our divine heritage. Similarly our ethics must have a religious foundation, and the obeyance to Jewish Law must be based on Jewish belief. Judaism recognizes man's mind as the fount of revelation, its strongest support is the rationality of its teachings and regulations, but far be it from us to believe that man's mind is the highest dispenser of the Law, for that would be to mistake a ray of light for the sun. Our works are of value only if they testify of God. Without this, the root, i.e. the soul, is lacking. Every man has within him a goal for which he strives, but which he cannot reach. This goal is the "good," the "noble," and the "perfect." These are lights on the dark path only if man sees in them the reflection of God, if he sees in them a scepter to rule himself, with which to dig deeper for the well of salvation. The best, most noble work is without value if the reflection is cut off from the original light, or the well from the seas of the world. The most noble work is dead if it is not rooted in respect for God. The מתנה is accessible to us only if it is recognized as a divine heritage. Rationality is the magic wand with which we dig the well -- but the well is God on high!

4. רמז חליאל במרום. The divine heritage leads to a height, the flow of the fount is <u>upward</u>, i.e. the divine Law has high standards, drawing us <u>up</u> to it. In

Scripture we find that almost all our victories have taken place on הרים: Moriah, Sinai, Zion. They did not take place in dark caves, but on hills, close to God. Judaism has light, buyance; light and movement are its sacred pictures. And yet there are those who dare say that such a religion counts stagnancy as one of the main characteristics of its divinity! They claim that not an iota of this religion could be changed! They would make a swamp of the well. Were this so, Judaism would not be a present, but a burden; not a divine heritage, but a dead inheritance; not a height, but an arid desert. It is high time that we remember our scepter lent us by God, to make wider the opening of the well, that מים חיים might spring forth from it, to wash away the idols of lies and darkness.

Let the well then rise from its depth! Worlds have collapsed on it, but could not stop it! Let it rise up, and not only Israel, but all the world will praise it.

****

Volume I: 245-252. Text: Numbers 4: 1-33.

Our Torah portion today concerns itself with cult-laws which are no longer of any practical use, but their spirit is still of value to us. They are proof that the character of the Mosaic institutions must not be gauged by the fact that they are subject to change in the course of time, but rather by their immortal spirit. In

the portion before us each tribe is assigned a definite function -- a matter seemingly without significance for us, but of importance upon closer scutiny, for the subjects discussed here provide us with a link to the present time. The ark has long since disappeared, but its testimony remains; the table for the shewbreads is no longer extant, but we have the table on which the bread of heaven is offered each Sabbath to the hungry in the form of the pulpit. The golden altar and the candelabra are no more, but the eternal light that never ceases to enlighten our eyes still burns, and the sacrifices required by our religion have not ceased. All traces of the portable Tent have disappeared, it is not among ancient relics, for in Judah there could never be a desire for collecting antiques, because he who inherits so much that is alive could have no desire to exploit graves. But the people, Israel itself, is a portable Tent, overshadowed by the cloud of glory of God. Wherever we turn we find the Tents Jacob erected to His God. One must see Israel under all conditions to appreciate how it knew to preserve its vitality; in order to recognize that vitality is extant even in places where all life seems to have ceased; in order to fully understand Israel's calling. How amazed the world would be were Israel to decide to hide its sanctity no longer behind countless covers, but would appear in its full glory! How quickly all hearts would go out to

Judaism, were it to fly instead of to limp, were it to free itself from dead precepts, so that all nations could call out: רק עם חכם ונבון הגוי הגדול הזה !! But this time will come! We are still alone in this land with our wishes, but if we continue our strife, victory is bound to come! Let us then prove today 1. That we shall always be willing to make sacrifices; 2. That even though we stand alone we shall never hesitate or fear; 3. That we shall never doubt the sanctity of our cause.

1. זאת עבדת המשפחת הגרשני לעבד ולמשא. Among the Levites the family of Kehath ranked highest. They carried the Tent, while the other families of Levi were permitted the use of wagons. It is thus always in Israel: The higher the rank, the heavier the burden. The higher one wished to stand, the less his desire to rule had to be, and the deeper he had to bow before God. Thus Moses, for example, had no desire to rule, he only wanted to bear the burden of the people. The Levites had no earthly possessions, God was their only possession, it was their privilege to guard all religious treasures, to serve אישׁ כמתנת ידו. He who in our ranks seeks only negation of tradition and an easing of religious requirements does not understand our high task. We desire not to ease our own burden, but to free Judaism which today labors under a load of dead dogmas: The more we cut loose from these, the greater must be our obedience to the living Law. In

many respects religious sincerity is more rigorous than hundreds of ceremonies. As the prophet Isaiah told us, it is easier to fast than to share our food with the hungry; it is easier to say one hundred ברכות daily than to submerge oneself in thought. We must not sacrifice what is blind, lame or sick -- but we must sacrifice with all our hearts. As priests we must not bring carrion before God, but we must bear a burden, and the more heavy it is, that much higher shall we climb on the mountain of divine recognition.

2. If this will be the spirit of our efforts, then there can be no doubt of eventual victory. Our text teaches us that where the keeping of the Tent was involved, numbers did not matter, only the effort and the enthusiasm shown were of importance. The family of Merari was the smallest, but it had the heaviest tasks, for its members were the most capable. Similarly must we have zeal. A few, with the right spirit, can accomplish much. The truth, in the hands of those who are convinced by it, is mightier than a whole army of its opponents with its plans. The greatest harm done the cause of Judaism is the fact that many of its defenders do not act out of sacred conviction. Some fight to <u>win</u> all the world for the cause, others are completely without conviction; some see Judaism only as a staff for the crippled, and others want to see it adorned -- for a sacrificial death. By

such procedures many earnest truthseekers are repelled. If we can firmly establish the glorification of our ancestral religion, if we have a pious conviction, a planned continuation of our history, if we wash the jewels from the mine of our Scriptures in the waters of Sinai and place them in the messianic crown, and then place this crown on the head of Israel as the world redeemer, then we cannot fail, we must be victorious.

3. But is our cause sacred? Is there full justification for our departures from tradition? Would it not be better to remain with the old rather than to fight? Such peace efforts are merely attempts to lull us to sleep. If we do not listen to the call of the time, we shall soon stand at the grave of Judaism. We, as representatives of Judaism's basic ideals, are younger than the representatives of religious stagnation; but in sacred affairs the idea of the first born is of little importance, inner dignity is the important factor. Here also our text guides us. The Midrash states: The family of Gershon was the oldest family among the Levites, yet it was entrusted only with the care of minor implements. The younger family of Kehath, however, which was richer in the knowledge of God, was entrusted with the golden altar and the candelabra. Thus the privileges go to those who are more worthy, not to the older. We stand in relation to Israel as Kehath to Gershon. They carry the

implements, we carry the Sanctuary. Can we then doubt our cause? If we do, we might also doubt the right of the plant to rise above the decayed seed, we might doubt the rising of the soul after its departure from the dust of the body! It is not our right -- it is our duty, our duty to God, to ourselves, and to our children to wrest Judaism from its stunted position, to lead it to ultimate glory.

****

Preached the Sabbath after Chanukkah, 1856.

Volume I: 277-283. Text: Numbers 8: 1-4.

On the last Sabbath we occupied ourselves with the picture of the seven-armed candelabrum, at whose right and left hand side stood an olive tree. The prophet Zechariah saw this vision; it encouraged the leaders of the people to rebuild the Sanctuary. The picture was one of mystery; the oil flowed from the trees directly into the candelbrum, then the trees changed into "sons of light," and were placed next to the throne of God. We have the same picture in our text for today, only it is more simple, and thus more exalted; it is not a symbol seen only by the prophet, it is a reality in the Tent of Meeting. The candelabrum mentioned here is the handi-work of man, and immeasurable depths are expressed in it. Everything is natural, but it points to the high and supernatural. It was built as a tree with buds, blossoms

and fruits. On each side there were three arms like branches; on the stem in the center there was an additional lamp, making a total of seven. The Lampline ("Lampenlinie") ran from the Midday side to the Midnight side (South-North?), the center flame was turned towards the Holy of holies, and the rest of the flames ran towards the center flame. Finally the entire structure was created out of one piece of metal. This design was based on very lofty thoughts. The Psalmist praises the Temple of Nature ובהיכלו כלו אמר כבוד, everything in it proclaims the honor of the Master. It is thus in the Temple: Everything, big or small, is a witness to God's magnificence, and a reminder to god-like man to be worthy of the high position accorded him by His Creator. Let us look for the pure gold of God's teaching in the picture of the candelabrum. We shall find in it an עץ חיים, which, though it is rooted in ancient times, overshadows the present with its branches and will attain its full ripeness only in the future.

The first teaching is that God is unique, He is the Creator and the Ruler of the universe. All came pure and complete from His hand, man is His son, created in His likeness, the ruler of all other creatures. The golden lamp of our text points to the work of creation, the seven flames represent the seven days of the week. These seven fiery tongues continually sing the praise of God. Out of

one piece was the structure of the lamp created: One God, not many, as the heathens think, created the giant structure. One Law exists for the creeping insect as well as for the host of the stars. There is no unharmonious note, everything is one perfect unit הצור תמים פעלו. The central flame on the lamp, the one attached to the stem itself, represents the day on which man was created. He is the king of creation, his foot is on the earth, but his spirit is among the stars, and when this spirit reaches the highest point in its flight it prostates itself before the always hidden and yet ever present Master of all beings. Man is a microcosm, a world in itself, a צלם אלהים, the reflection of both the universe and its Creator. He alone may look on God with eyes of cognition, to consecrate the flame within him at its original fount, to sanctify it hereby. In man rests the light of God, which strives towards the Original Light, אל מול פני המנורה יאירו. Into the inner part of the Holy of Holies the light of the candelabrum could not penetrate. The curtain prevented this. Similarly the divine Being is forever hidden from man. The bravest, highest spirit must say in humility אמרתי אחכמה והיא רחקה ממני. But God's work is constantly manifested in nature: "The heavens declare the glory of God, etc." Six of the lamps face towards the central light: Thus all creatures must serve man, and bring him knowledge of what they know not

even themselves, and set his face towards the Most Holy.

The second teaching of our text is: Strive wholeheartedly to live with your God, and already on earth you will find happiness. Destroy not the peace with yourself, for that is the origin of all sin! God's wisdom created man of various parts: Destroy not the tie that binds these parts. According to the teachings of Moses, man is made up of three parts גוף נפש נשמה. The soul distinguishes all creatures from the inanimate, man shares it with every נפש חיה. In that respect even a worm is higher than the sea. All that has the power to be spiritually moved, whatever has fear or desire, feels love or hatred, that has a נפש. According to Scripture this category covers any living being in which blood circulates כי הדם הוא הנפש. A נשמה, however, is the exclusive property of man; it gives him the power to know himself, to raise himself on high, to be free, to overcome animal desires, to think and to make decisions. The animal soul possesses no conscience, it merely follows nature. Man has broken these shackles, he is of God's genus, he is a דמות אלהים. Body, soul, and spirit, these are the parts of man bound together by God. It is the soul's task to be the tie between body and spirit, to lead the bodily tool according to the spiritual desire. The spirit is the ruler, the body is the servant, but the master must not abuse the servant. To regard the flesh as

unclean is a god-slandering remain from heathenism. All that came from God is pure; Scripture prescribes the highest care of all that the body desires. The Law that prohibits us from harming a plant simply because it is a creation of God cannot possibly permit us to do harm to our own body. The reverse, of course, is also true: We must not let the body rule the spirit. That would mean the degradation of man to the level of a beast. That is the fate of those who say: "I shall have peace if I follow the desires of my heart, so that drunkenness and thirst shall multiply."* Do not believe such men, they display only their flowers, even though wilted, but not the snakes beneath the flowers. The Law of God alone gives man peace with himself, it alone harmonizes the various parts of man: דרכיה דרכי נעם וכל נתיבותיה שלום. The golden lamp of our text points to this in that it appears in the shape of a tree כי האדם עץ השדה, its roots are in the earth, its crown in the heavens. It was created of one piece, even as man was created pure. There were three flames to the left and three to the right: The first trio represented the different powers of the body, the soul, and the spirit; the second trio represented the three "steps" of man: Youth, middle age, old age. The central lamp is the heart, according to Scripture the seat of all our powers. All of them,

*An allusion to Deuteronomy 29: 18.

however, can function only when the central flame burns for God.

The third lesson from our text is that there is only one humanity, that all men come from the same stock. The Law of Sinai was given for all men. It is Israel's task to free humanity from the slavery of sin and error. The candelabrum with its branches represents all of humanity with its many branches. No matter how we are separated by color, custom or speech, we are all descendants of Adam and Eve. The lamp was made of one solid unit, all parts being equal, and thus it is with man: There can be no privileges for any one group. The six flames also have another significance -- the three on the one side represent the three patriarchs, the other three represent the כהנים לויים ישראלים. The lamp in the middle represents one humanity, which is eventually to meet on God's mountain. We do not wish to rebuild the ruins of our Temple -- we want to rebuild the ruins of humanity, the חרבות עולם. For this Palestine is too small, God's מקדש must be the entire earth!

****

Volume I: 347-353. Text: Genesis 4: 3-8.

TEXT: Cain and Abel make an offering, Abel's is accepted. Cain is angry, God says: "Why are you angry? If you are in the right, don't be angry, and if anger moves you, sin lies couching at the door, but you can

control it." Cain kills Abel.

Did you ever realize that the first death of a man was unnatural, a murder? The animals did not dare to kill a man, but one man killed another. Were this not in the Bible, we could not believe it, we would think a Satan wrote it. Just before this passage we found the words "..... in His image created He him." Does this seem like a contradiction? An image of God -- such a monster? No, there is no contradiction there. The Bible speaks the language of nature, it knows how to solve riddles. The solution lies in the words: לפתח חטאת רבץ ואליך תשוקתו ואתה תמשל בו. For us this verse is a common proverb, yet millenia of darkness and horror had to pass until Moses wrote these words, filled with a world-redeeming thought. When I can comprehend that the mind of a human being could grasp this thought, could elevate his idea of morality to such a level, then I realize that we are indeed images of God. Were all nations to fight each other like animals, and there was one individual among them with such an admonition, then he would serve us as a witness to the truth of this teaching. Such a situation would brand man as both an angel and yet a beast; it illustrates that ours is the choice between good and evil. The passage fully illustrates sin and opposes it with the spirit born from God. It says: "Sin lies before the door" -- it lusts for man as a lion for his

prey. But we also have a lion in us, the lion of God, an אריי אל, to fight Samael! This passage teaches us that 1. Sin is not innate to us; 2. God's Law is within us; 3. There is an avenging justice which reaches far beyond the grave.

1. If we really want to subdue sin, we must have the conviction that we can do it. The "animal" before the door is strong. We must feel that we are as strong, in order to begin the battle. When crossing a bridge over an abyss, we must have confidence in the bridge; under the circumstances described here we cannot afford to lack confidence in ourselves. Our feeling of freedom, the pride in our resemblance to God must give us strength. The lowered face of Cain is part of the picture: It shows the heavy burden on his heart, the sorrow he feels over the growing of the dragonseed within him, the desire to escape. Then the voice of God sounds out, loving and encouraging: Why are you angry, why is your face lowered? If you do right, it is well, if not, sin lies at the door -- but you can control it! Sin is not in you, it is not part of you -- it only lies before the door! The Rabbis tell us that Antoninus asked Rabbi (Jehudah Hanasi): מאימתי יצר הרע שולט באדם משעת יצירה ? Is evil thought within man already while he is a fetus, משעת יצירה, or does man acquire it after birth, i.e. is sin innate or does man appear clean at birth? At first Rabbi said: Sin is

present already before birth: The emperor disagreed with him. Finally Rabbi agreed with him on the basis of this verse: "Sin lies in front of the portal." Sin is not innate, but is acquired. Well then! Sin lies before us constantly, let us resist temptation, and never doubt our ability to do so. We are children of God with the sign of קדש לד' on our forehead -- a sign in the place of which the tempter wants to put the mark of Cain!

2. We might say if not sin, then the drive to sin must be innate! What is to contradict this heritage? God's Law? But that is external! How can the words on the tablets of stone (the Ten Commandments) displace the words on the tablets of the heart? This observation is indeed correct, for if God's Law is external, then we might even say that Cain's murder was no sin! For לא תרצח had not as yet been proclaimed! The belief that God's revelation is external is erroneous. It is written on the tablets of the heart! God gave us simultaneously the tree of life with the cognition of good and evil; He gave us both the tempter and the watchman at the same time! This is already contained in a talmudic legend: The child in the mother נר דולק על ראשו , carries a wreath of light on its head, it looks all around the world ומלמדין אותו כל התורה כלה , it is taught the entire Torah, ומשביעין אותו, and it then takes an oath to keep it. But when the child is born: בא מלאך וסטרו על פיו ומשכחו כל התורה כלה -- the angel of sin comes and takes

the knowledge from him; therefore it is said: "Sin couches before the door." With other words man has the ability to know God. Only the outside world and its influences hide the divine testimony from man. The conscience gets its fire from an innate torch, not from an extraneous legal fire, and never can evil thought say: I am first born, mine alone is the dominion! Man is קדוש מרחם, he is dedicated to the service of God! Resist the angel of evil, and when he calls out the words that the Midrash puts in the mouth of Cain: ליח דין וליח דיין, "There is no judgment, there is no judge" -- then listen to the flaming tongue within you that makes that angel a liar!

3. This tongue does even more: It tells us not only of an external judgment, it points out to us the Judge's chair before which we must stand after life. Even then, when the body is gone, still the pain of self accusation, of happiness or of satisfaction within ourselves remain: We are either accepted by God into His host, or we are rejected. According to the Rabbis the meaning of this verse is: לפתח קבורך -- sin lies at the opening of the grave. The same angel that said: ליח דין וליח דיין becomes the accuser. Throw down this angel -- leaving off the speech הנה אנכי הולך למות ולמה זה לי בכורה. The first-born of God never dies. Only the <u>desire</u> for sin dwindles, not the remembrance of what

sin has brought, not the conscience with its blessing or its curse. In a sense the words "In the course of time ..... Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering to the Lord" refer to all of us. At the end of our life each of us brings the fruits of his earthly sowing before God. They are accepted or rejected according to our activities. Woe the "soiled" spirit -- in deep mourning he appears at the gate of heaven and is asked: למה חרה לך ולמה נפלו פניך ? The accuser answers for him by pointing at his prey. But hail to him that has overcome temptation; for him also sin comes, but not as an accuser, but as a witness, as a conquered angel with whom the defendant has wrestled all the night. This angel now gives the defendant the palm of victory with the words שלחני כי עלה השחר .

****

Israel Under the Picture of the Dove with the Olive Leaf in Its Beak.

Volume I: 377-384. Text: Genesis 8: 1-12.

TEXT: God remembers the inhabitants of the ark, the water begins to recede. The dove returns to the ark; seven days later Noah sends it out again. It returns with an olive leaf; after seven more days it is sent out again, but does not return.

One of the most beautiful pictures in Scriptures is that of the dove. "When ye lie among the sheepholds, the wings of the dove are covered with silver ....." .

(Psalms 68:14). In the Song of Songs Israel is called a dove, freed by God from the Egyptian bondage. Let us regard this name for Israel in the light of our text. The dove, with the olive leaf in its beak, appears to us in three respects: 1. According to its high calling; 2. Its remarkable fate; and 3. Its lofty willingness to sacrifice.

1. Its high calling. In ancient times the oil tree was a symbol of priesthood and sovereignty, whose bearers were annointed with oil. Israel, the עם כהנים, was called to be the spiritual ruler of the world in the future. Regarding this it is said: תורת אמת בפיהו * -- and שפתי כהן ישמרו צעה. Israel was pictured as a dove with an olive leaf in its mouth, as our Ancients said: מהר המשחה הבאה אותו. The oil tree was also a symbol of light, of freedom and of peace. מצות ד' ברה מאירת עינים -- The Law of God is pure, enlightening the eyes and כי היא חייך וארך ימיך רפאות תהי לשרך ושקוי לעצמותיך. It shall be health to your navel, and marrow to your bones. דרכיה דרכי נעם וכל נתיבותיה שלום. The bearer of this light, its keeper, and the messenger of peace is Israel, the dove with the olive leaf in its mouth. The Midrash states: מה יונה זו מביאה אורה לעולם כך ישראל מביא אורה לעולם : As Noah's dove brought light into the world, so Israel shall bring

---

*Malachai 2:6 has תורת אמת היתה בפיהו.

light into the world. After the flood the earth was once again a תהו ובהו, it had to be cleansed of the corrupt generation. Only a healthy seed remained, from which a better generation was to arise. This seed was Noah and his family. Not only Noah's fate was in doubt, but the fate of the earth as well, for the earth without man would not fulfill its purpose. Thus when the dove returned with the leaf from the oil tree, this leaf was nothing less than a ספר תולדות אדם for the coming generations. The messenger-role of Israel is similar to that of the dove. Noah became the second bodily father of mankind, Abraham was the spiritual father, the אב המון גוים. In his time also the earth was at the edge of a precipice. This time it was not water, but fire which was needed to cleanse it, an אש דת. God made a Covenant with Abraham, from among all the heathens He called him alone אחד קראתין. He made him the pure dove that was to fly from its own home to proclaim God's majesty. לך לך מארצך וממולדתך ומבית אביך ; to teach the word of the one God, that was Abraham's task in life. ולא מצאה היונה מנוח לכף רגלה . As the dove found no place to settle, so Abraham could not find a permanent footing, and equally his teachings could not grasp a permanent foothold. Throughout life he remained always the man of of the future. Only when the dove appeared as a messenger the second time in the form of Moses and Israel did it

find a footing. Two mountains were visible in all the wilderness: Sinai and Zion. There finally the dove found an opportunity to get its olive leaf and to develop it into a ספר תולדות אדם.

2. Its peculiar fate. Canaan, the land promised to our forefathers, was the ark where there was a shelter for the dove from the waves of the heathen nations. But Israel, like the dove, was sent forth from the ark! First Jacob and the seventy members of his family were sent to Egypt. He went unwillingly, yet since he had to go he went with the hope in his heart that he might sleep his last sleep in Canaan. Indeed the dove found only misery in Egypt, for with the tyrants it sank into the marsh of idol worship, and forgot Him Who had sent it. But God had pity, וישלח ידו ויקחה and He carried Israel back to its home. Later the dove was sent out again, this time to Babylon, whence it returned after seventy years -- again with an olive leaf in its mouth, for in Babylon Israel learned to love its God and to obey His commands. But Israel had not yet become sufficiently steadfast to permit a prolonged absence from home. The Second Temple was built, but by now only a shadow of the once mighty people was left. The necessity arose for a renewal of its cult. The more Israel's nationhood declined, the more its religious sincerity arose, and approached closer to the goal of its mission. In order to fulfill

this mission, Israel saw the Second Temple destroyed. The dove went out for the third time ולא יספה שוב אליו עוד -- never to return. Not the separation from other nations, but union <u>with</u> all other people is the messianic goal of Israel!! Once all silver and golden idols have been thrown away by the nations as it was predicted by the prophets, why should Israel seclude itself? He who has coursed through the ranks of hostile nations for millenia as a man, and has won a victory with the sword of the spirit, can never return to his childhood. A Messiah may kiss his cradle, but he can never trade it for his crown of victory.

3. Its lofty willingness to sacrifice. The Midrash asks: Why did the dove take from the bitter products of the oil tree rather than from a well-tasting plant? It answers that the dove wished to show Noah מוטב מר מזה ולא מחוק מתחת ידיך -- Better is the bitter from God, than the sweet from man. Besides this beautiful sentiment, there is an even deeper significance to this statement. I, the priest, so speaks Israel, picked an olive leaf. For a bitter lot is the lot of the priest! My way goes over many waves, yet I went to gain the leaf that promises salvation! That is the voice of Israel, the hoary sufferer. We hear the cry: Except that the Lord was with us, men would have swallowed us alive. Our soul escaped as the bird from the bird catcher. And for whom must we bear all this suffering? For our

enemies, for the treasure is in our keeping. The Midrash says: מה יונה זו מכפרת כך ישראל מכפר על האומות. The dove is the sin offering of the poor, and thus Israel must serve the poor nations of the world, those who are deprived of the light of God. Our backs are the road that will lead them upwards to God. There is much temptation on our way, but we always avoid it by saying: This leaf may be bitter, but it is sweeter than all your gifts! What I carry in my mouth and in my heart brings me much pain, but it also brings great happiness, and that will some day be yours also! I am a dove, sent to you by God, even though you have become a raven, a bird of prey, to me. The fact that the dove does not tire easily in its flight, whereas the raven does tire easily, is explained by the Midrash by the way it flies: The raven uses both wings at the same time, the dove uses them alternately. It is thus with Israel: Dispersed all over the world, the fate of each part is continually different than that of another part elsewhere. Truth, even though oppressed and cast down, will always rise anew. Only birds of prey, only lies must use all their forces simultaneously in order to keep on. A fighter for God as Jacob may limp externally, but inwardly he cannot be stopped. The dove will not drop its leaf until it comes to the סכה שלום, the hut of peace for all the world, as it is said: Mountains may quake ..... but My love for

you and My Covenant of peace shall not waver.

****

Volume II: 457-463. Text: Genesis 19: 17.

When Sodom and Amorah were to be destroyed, God sent two angels: One to destroy, one to save. It is always like that in life: Every destroying power is offset by a saving power, so that the ruins caused by the destroying angel might rise again into a splendor even greater than the former. Nature has many such instances, for example the decaying seed becomes a beautiful tree. The same holds true in religion. The God-spirit of history both tears down and builds up. Those who smile at the two angels and mock them as Lot's relatives did, are eventually buried in the ruins. The same is true of those who mourn about what time has wrought. But there is no lack of men who see a light in the darkness, and eventually they will be successful. The angels gave Lot four exhortations: 1. Save yourself; 2. Look not behind you; 3. Do not stand still in this plain; and 4. Flee to the mountains. All our strivings for religious Reform rest on these same exhortations. Religious Reform must come from deep in the heart; it must not stop halfway, and it must keep in sight Israel's goal.

1. Save yourself. Our endeavors for a religious revision must be based on true religious convictions. The angel said to Lot: "For the sake of your life leave this

place." Judaism faces an analogous situation: It must save itself by tearing itself away from what is dead. God's word and Law cannot be modeled according to the fancy or the idols of the day. Even those parts of the divine Law which are of a temporary nature demand obedience, as long as they are living and indispensable means to life, providing they represent the true spirit of the divine Law. Only when their power has been diminished and their purpose has been fulfilled may we disregard them. Then it becomes our duty to get rid of them. When such laws, as at the present time, have obviously become an actual obstruction to the stream of religious life, we must listen to the cry חמלט על נפשך.

2. "Look not behind you." Go forward, master your desires for the things to which you have become used, make the necessary temporal sacrifices wherever there is a renovation. Lot did not hesitate to do so! We like a place best when we must leave it, because our memories are in it. But the angels, (duty and fate), took Lot and led him away by force under the protection of God's mercy, בחמלת ד' עליו. Bewailing his fate he went on to a new life, but he carried within him the seeds for greater good that would some day bring in a harvest. Somewhat similarly many Jews today say: Our children can go with you, but we are too old to be one of you, we have lived too long under the old system to

change now! Habit leads us to look back, but the divine spirit, which leads man on the road of culture, in religion and elsewhere, leads us to look forward, to keep in mind the high task of remodeling Judaism. The Rabbis tell us that Lot hesitated, because he wished to take his possessions with him. A voice called out to him: Look not behind you! Thus we also must sacrifice, we must not hesitate to give the shekel, since it is to be a כפר לנפש, a ransom for our soul. This holding back is fitting only for those who break with the old because they are indifferent to religion, or those who make the break out of purely negative desires: But he who looks forward out of conviction will not hold back.

3. Don't remain in the plain -- that is, the circle of destruction: Don't stop halfway! Whatever you recognize as good, pursue it wholeheartedly. Many have begun this work of religious reshaping, but soon become tired and quit when halfway to the goal. Others begin enthusiastically but quit when the matter becomes a reality. Still others form their religion according to their likes and dislikes; in some cases that is ultra-Reform, in others ultra-Conservatism. Here we may apply the saying of our text ואל תעמד בכל הככר . Take one road, and keep to it! But even if we only begin the work, others will continue לא עליך המלאכה לגמור ולא אתה בן חורין להבטל ממנה .

4. Flee to the mountains: ההרה המלט -- go to that mountain, which according to the prophet's word will some day be higher than all other mountains, which will be the gathering place for all nations who strive for the God of Israel. The Midrash tells us that the angel advised Lot to flee to Abraham, who had pitched his tent on this hill, and was thus saved by God. This call is also for us, who are members of the priest and Covenant people, protected by God against the fire of transitoriness. אוד מצל שאם. We are a brand plucked from the fire. On the messianic peak of a blessed humanity the eyes of Abraham and Moses rested; our gaze also must be directed there! There we shall find a place of refuge while heavenly fires will consume the abominations of Sodom and Amorah when heathenism will be destroyed. Then the people of all nations shall flee to this place, with Lot's words on their lips: מצער היא ותחי נפשי הלא -- it is small, but my soul shall live therein!

****

Volume II: 491-497. Text: Genesis 25: 23.

TEXT: "Two Nations are within your womb, and two people shall be separated from your bowels, one nation stronger than the other, and the older shall serve the younger."

Rebecca felt a strong battle within her womb

before her sons were born. It is thus everywhere in physical and in spiritual nature where a hidden life attempts to come to the light. Another mother כנסת ישראל also experienced pangs of birth. But we, even as Rebecca, know our "Keeper," and are not afraid. Two forces battle within us, one for the old outdated way of life, the other for the new, and one must overpower the other. Our motto is: The older shall serve the younger! We have three tasks: To heal the breaks and damages in 1. The Synagogue; 2. The school; and 3. In life.

1. In the Synagogue. Public services are beyond a doubt always the center of religious life, but rather than the essence of religiosity, they are the main front of religion; by them we can gauge the spirit of the community. Public worship appears in the Bible as the first sign of the battle for הקב"ה: The portable Tent and the House of Prayer for all people on top of the mountain signified the two extreme points of the priestly efficacy of our people. Thus we must first determine for what we must look in the reshaping of our public cult. Are organ or choral music the essential mark of distinction in our Temple? They influence our spirit of worship, but they are of no value if they are merely to cover up an inner degeneration. We don't want to embellish corpses, but rather want to rescue what is

buried alive in the old cult, we want a service that deserves such a name, that will succor our soul when it is in need of comfort. We want a religion that will mend the rips and tears in our fate, our desires and our actions; a religion that will bring peace between man and man, and man and God. We must remove the rabbinic concept that prayer only replaces the קרבן, and is merely a link in the שלשלת הקבלה we must bring it to its fullest living expression. The older (sacrificial) cult must be replaced by the younger cult. Therefore we must cease to pray exclusively in Hebrew, a language no longer understood by most people. Hebrew can at best reawaken some vague memories. We must exclude such prayers as those which curse heretics, we must cease our cries of wrath against enemies no longer even in existence, comical sighs against no longer extant persecutions; expressions of longing for the resurrection of the Jewish homeland and sacrificial offerings. All these things are detrimental to modern worship. We must not only cut out old prayers, we must substitute wholesome replacements. In place of curses, even as Abraham, we must have prayers for those who have gone astray; instead of the prayers for a national home, we must give thanks to God that He has scattered us to act as a light to the nations, to prepare them for the great Day of Judgment, when a band of love and belief will tie together

all mankind, and the younger Israel will conquer the older heathenism.

2. In the school. ורב יעבד צעיר: This must be taught to people in their youth already. Of what good are schools which spread doctrines contrary to Biblical teachings which proclaim that man is sinful from birth on; schools which teach bigotry; which empty Israel of all ethical considerations, and fill youth with foolish ideals about the eternal separation of our people from all other nations. Such teachings are of course foolish, but their effects are serious, for when the children thus indoctrinated reach maturity, they will laugh at these ideas and will sell their Israelitic birthright for a dish of pottage. Blind parents do not care much, they are only interested to see their child become an איש יודע ציד, an individual that will know how to chase after earthly materials. Religion for them is merely a mantle to cover what is indecent and rotten. However any individual who professes the teachings of Sinai seriously, and deems them to be holy, will admit that we need a different type of school. We need schools that will attempt to give religious insight to our children, which will teach our children that Judaism is not only a matter of memorization or even imagination, but that Judaism is of the spirit, of the mind, and of life -- even as the revelation of Sinai, even as the teaching of Moses

which is close to us. We must build solid educational institutions in order to give our efforts a strong foundation. Only then can we tie the upcoming generation to Judaism.

3. In life. By these means only can we regain life for the Law. Or don't we need that? Is our sick, torn, ennervated life, with its battle between actuality and conviction, in harmony with a teaching whose highest goal is peace and atonement and the consequent happiness? Since we have become used to finding the essence of Judaism in empty formulae, against which the spirit of the times rebels, we honor religious custom and tradition only as long as "it does not interfere." If we become hungry, or get the thirst for gold we sell our birthright. Only the historic thread, running through all ages, can lead us forth from this labyrinth; it is the boundary line between the eternal and the temporal, it alone keeps us. We must arise as never before; we must not make foolish attempts to hinder progress, but must rather work for this glorious development. We must remove meaningless covers from the old to ease the pangs of birth of the new. We don't want to break with the past, but the older must come to serve the younger. The old bars have fallen forever, and louder than ever before God's call rings out ורב יעבד צעיר.

****

Volume II: 614-622. Text:Genesis 37: 1-18.

Jacob, after many wanderings, has returned to his home. This closes the period of the patriarchs, and Joseph comes into the limelight. Here the period begins where Egypt is the stage. The name Israel stands between two time periods, a glorious past, an even more promising future. We also stand between two worlds -- one dead, one blossoming. There are five steps in the life of Joseph identical with the steps in our present religious revolution.

1. The first period is that of early youth, when Joseph was with his brothers, and did מעשה נערות. He did not commit these from an evil heart, but out of an excitable disposition. The same holds true of Reform. At first, with a childish disposition, not in a holy, serious sense, we sought to uncover the weak spots of the Old Judaism. Deep in his heart Joseph was close to his half-brothers. Similarly, like him, there is a certain amount of satisfaction in nestling up to a confession which is only half-brother. In Europe a Jew accepted in a Christian milieu did his best to be forgotten by other Jews. The insult "you can't be recognized as one of the tribe of Israel" was received as the highest compliment. This self-abasement had its root in the degeneration of Judaism, in the conviction that it was destined only for dark corners, and was not to be recognized openly and

universally.

2. This childish spirit could not last long. The Reform ideal soon overcame the level of pure negation, this indifference to everything religiously Jewish, which let the inheritance of the fathers go to waste. The second step began when Joseph was called a בן זקנים, according to the Targum a בר חכימ. His nobler side broke through the childishness. In our age, the unnatural condition of frivolity was shed, and efforts were made to better religious circumstances. We began to perceive that the old stem was still full of life, and was only burdened by many dead branches. Many efforts were made to help this condition. At first we attempted only to eradicate the results of this condition, or at least to cover them up. Thus the cult and practical life were a strange mixture, especially in public services, which are a mirror of the life of the community. Thus in the same Temple there was organ music, but the prayers were tired; on the one hand people thanked God for their blessings, on the other they mourned that Israel was being slaughtered daily. Similar conditions existed in practical life. Everybody chose commands and prohibitions according to his own likes and dislikes, creating a תהו ובהו.

3. The third step for Joseph came when the greatness of his ability to rule was manifested to him in a dream, when he saw the sheaves of others bowing to

his sheaf. The Rabbis declared: אתם כונסי פירות רקובים ואני כונס פירות קיימים -- your fruits are rotten, mine are eternal, despite all changes. Before Joseph was happy to be only an equal to his brothers, now he attained the conviction that God was giving him a great future, before which even his brothers must bow eventually. The same is true of Reform: With the conviction of its eventual victory, it arose to do battle. Today it no longer sits at the feet of talmudic ceremonial law, it no longer looks for a codex to justify its opinion. It says to Talmudism: For millenia you have gathered fruit to the height of a tower so that Judaism might not starve, but there was no light or air, and your fruits have become rotten! My fruit (sheaf) is the soul, the essence, truth and ethics, held down until now by formalism, but now קמה ורגם נגבה, it shall arise! This fruit is eternal, it is always fresh and good, ממני פריך נמצא -- here Israel finds its strength, its greatness, and eventually all the world will partake of it, as the Psalmist said: He who goes there and cries, and carries his seeds to be sown, he will come with glee and gather his fruits. Even as Israel, so the religious form is only a vessel for the flame of Sinai. We are its bearer for all humanity. The time will come, as the prophets said, that the sun will not serve you as the light of the day, nor the moon to shine by night -- God will be your Eternal

Light! This idea of an unshackled Judaism is still a golden dream, so that one may cry out to us, as they cried out to Joseph: You are dreamers of empty ideals without a foundation in reality! True, the Reform ideal has not been realized as yet, the blind masses still run after their idols. But be patient! Our efforts are not in vain! We must follow God's command: "Go home and see to the welfare of your brothers and the sheep."

4. To this cry Joseph answered: הנני . That was the first step to the realization of his dream. Of course he had to weather the hatred of his brothers, but in the end he was the victor and forgave them. Never fear: God executes His decisions; whoever is true to himself in his efforts for a great goal is never disappointed in the end. Even if step by step, we shall conquer the opposition's territory, we only desire war to bring peace, peace with ourselves and peace with our God. We don't want our children to be burdened with the rotten fruit which their parents only carry out of habit! We want to teach them what is right; we want schools, which will raise glowing admirers and not haters of Judaism; we want a Moses and an Isaiah, not ridiculous fables; we want to praise the House of God for all people, not the punishing rod. That is the way to find the brothers: To follow the rules only in part may be a shortcut, but it

will not lead to the goal. One becomes then, as Joseph, a תעה בדרך -- a strayed wanderer. Attempt a compromise between the old and the new by discounting Talmudism, and yet adhering to the letter of the Biblical Law: It will only lead to failure. The man of whom Joseph asked directions said to him: נסעו מזה -- You will not find them there. No, we will not find our Judaism there, for the letter of the Bible went out of existence with the burning of the Second Temple. The Biblical spirit lives forever, by it you will find the brothers! They want to דתן, that is "Twin-wells," namely תורה שבכתב and תורה שבעל פה. For the Oral Law is merely an adaption of the Written Law according to the changes of the times. Before both fountains lie many stones of torpidity. Both the Bible and history give forth the spirit of God. Remove the obstructing stones from before the wells, make of them לוחות, and you will have the sign of the Covenant between God and the brothers.

5. Then, as Joseph, we shall reach the fifth step, the level at which true Judaism will rule and forgive. As Joseph called out to his brothers: "God sent me here to provide food for you!" so Judaism will go through the darkness of Egypt to provide spiritual food. They, who are now the enemies of Judaism, and call us dreamers, they will come and say: Give us bread, the manna of heaven. For in our camp there is hunger, our sheaves have only

rotten fruit, yours stands with God's word .....

****

Volume II: 647-656. Text: Genesis 15: 1-12.

It is common knowledge that material of value is never acquired but with some pain, that great achievements are usually preceded by big conflicts as a preparation. It is thus also with spiritual goods. Imagine how difficult the task of spiritual pioneers always has been! At the head of these chosen ones stands Abraham. The legend is that he was threatened by Nimrod at birth; the first three years of his life were spent in a cave where he acquired knowledge of God; later he was thrown into a fiery furnace by Nimrod, and was saved by God. Our text permits us to look into the very soul of this fighter for God; it serves as a basis for our contemplations of the painful experiences connected with the strivings for light, justice and truth, as well as the consolations which these render.

Such efforts awaken mighty enemies, and such enmity is all the more difficult for those who wish to bring love and blessing to others. It may even awaken doubts whether in the long run evil will not triumph, since it often gains the upperhand, at least temporarily. The opening words of our text are reassuring to Abraham: "Fear not, I am your shield, your reward will be very great." These words were spoken immediately after Abraham, in

behalf of justice, had defeated the four kings, and had rescued Lot and the inhabitants of Sodom. He was on the side of the oppressed and held it as a קדוש השם to free them, no matter of what tribe or belief they were. But hardly had he returned, but he feared the wrath of the mighty defeated. And who, under similar circumstances, would not? And if one fights old prejudices, -- who can describe the wrath then engendered? People prefer to be bereaved of their God rather than of their idols!! Such is the course of the world which the great blind masses wish to gain for themselves.

Such blindness leads to another painful experience for the representative of light and truth -- the experience of loneliness. According to our text, Abraham, who was without friend or heir, felt this deeply and bitterly. Even God's assurance that his reward would be great made him ask sadly: "What will you give me, God, I who am childless and alone? All will die with me, a stranger will inherit from me! He can get the material goods, but he cannot continue my spiritual ideals!" Many who were pioneers of God have felt thus. No wonder they ask as Moses did: Of what good are the tablets of the Covenant if those for whom they are destined dance around the golden calf?

Add to this the restless life of a man following such ideals. Abraham said: ואנכי הולך ערירי -- I must

wander alone. Men filled by the spirit of God feel a need to wander. Thus Abraham wandered from Kasdim to Charan, then to Canaan, to Egypt, and again to Canaan. With some, as for example Moses, such wandering is caused by persecution, so that over and over again they must abandon what they have built, and wander once more.

These are hard trials. But our Rabbis said: God has a healing ready for every wound which his Father-hand has smitten. In this effort for light, for truth and justice there is a healing power far stronger than all painful feelings, it is the trust in divine help, the hope for a divine victory, the hope to live in a victorious future. All that is contained in our text.

"Lament not -- not Eliezer, but your own son will inherit from you." Faith in God was reawakened in Abraham: He knew that God would not fail him. This hope and zeal is present in all men who truly have God's fire burning within them. At times they may hesitate for a moment, but then their trust returns. Truth always carries triumph within itself.

Abraham wished for continuance of his teachings, and he was promised a descendancy as numerous as the stars in the heavens. His was a bold hope -- he was alone in his belief, only Malkizedek in Salem was remotely a man of the same ideals. Yet his hopes never wavered. Should we then fear for our Judaism? We must not count .

heads, we must rather test the power of our truth! The living fly is stronger than the dead lion! The Midrash tells us that the cow, the goat, and the ram of our text represented Chaldea, Persia, Syria and Rome, i.e. the heathen nations. Abraham saw these dead, but the dove, Israel, lived -- a sign that heathenism despite its strength must perish, but Israel, despite its weakness, shall live. It is thus always: Not might or power, but the spirit of God prevails. Even if the picture is very dark, the spirit will triumph over all that is dead and rotten. Always remember that there is a future, we are working for our children, we do our tasks for them, for enlightened Judaism. But, even as Abraham, we must not only live <u>for</u> the future, but also <u>in</u> the future.

Abraham asked: How shall I know that I shall inherit this land?" That which was to be inherited by his descendants, not one of whom existed yet, he regarded as his own already. The pictures of the future which he saw before him enhanced his own existence. Let us follow his example. Without losing the present, let us live for the future and in the future. There we can see victory, with millions around its banners, at its feet the פגרים of dead ceremonies, above it the dove, the everliving spirit of God's teaching.

****

Volume II: 740-747. Text: <u>Exodus</u> 15: 22-27.

This text advances the idea that Israel's

history, especially in the dispersion, always has had the theme: God leads us from Marah (bitterness) to Elim (greatness and glory). What happens to Israel in our text happens in life in general -- Israel is always between light and shadow, between happiness and sorrow. Wherever we find a fresh well of happiness, it is always preceded by some measure of sorrow, danger, longing or pain. The fate of all men to some extent is: "By the sweat of your brow shall you eat your bread." We appreciate our possessions according to the difficulties of their acquisition. Nowhere do we find a better illustration of the situation "Marah to Elim" than in Jewish history: God will lead His chosen ones 1. To glorious recognition through pressure and disgrace; 2. By religious 'ossification' to a full religious revival; and 3. By fierce battles of development to the most wonderful peace.

1. To glorious recognition through pressure and disgrace. We need not mention our sufferings, our fears, we need only think of the pressure by our worst enemies, of our nameless endurance, which the divine purpose utilized to make the world happier and more enlightened. No matter how great the ridicule which was heaped on us, the tribe as a unit could not be denied its high mission. Neither can anyone deny the marvel of our unity despite our scattering -- a fact that speaks of divine interference. But hatred knows how to change blessings into curse, and so it happened that because of

our position among the nations we were held up as an abomination of sin. Israel was sent by God, they said, not as an example of what to do or to be, but rather as an example of what not to do or be. To them we appeared not as a redeemer, but as the archenemy of a redeemer. The idea of a whole people functioning as priests or redeemers was so alien to universal thought that one of this people had to be raised to divinity before they would recognize him as their redeemer. Under such ideologies the measure of Israel's suffering kept on increasing; in God's name the "sinner" had to be chastised! But truth will win, and eventually even the greatest hatred must die. The legend of the cursed eternal Jew is slowly dying, the most learned spokesmen of the church today call Israel the elected priest people of the Covenant, from whom others have learned -- Shem, beneath whose tents Japhet found shelter. The deeper this recognition, the deeper must be the knowledge of the debt to be paid, and the more surely the time must come, when the nations shall speak in the words of the prophet: The man of pain, God's servant, he carried our sickness, he suffered our tortures -- we thought he was being punished, chastised and tortured by God; he was hurt by our sins, oppressed by our transgressions! "The woman suspected of adultery drank "Sota" water -- to be מרים and מאררים if she was guilty ואם לא נטמאה האשה וטהרה היא ונקתה

ונזרעה זרע..Israel, married to God, was to pass the same test, together with those who accuse her of breaking faith with God. In the dispersion we drank much of the מי המרים. We did not wither, we gained in power and in strength, and eventually the promise will be fulfilled אם תשים אשם נפשו יראה זרע יאריך ימים וחפץ ד' בידו יצלח. We passed the test brilliantly, and went from Marah to Elim.

2. By religious 'ossification' to a full religious revival. Even while surrounding ourselves more and more with meaningless customs, unconsciously we were constantly heating the fire with which to smelt our own shackles. As a seed is covered with frost, the latter eventually disappears, and the plant comes up, the roots growing deeper and deeper. Thus the divine seed of the sacred and holy will grow in the womb of Israel. The more our horizons of religious activities were dammed, the deeper the tide of the religious spirit was swept into us, to break forth eventually. Our treasures are not new, our fathers already forged them in darkness. For them externals were alive; the accusation of externalism is true today only for those who disbelieve the validity of customs and yet ape them. The religiosity of the Ancients, however, can be an example to us -- for in it, though slumbering, was the soul of enlightened Judaism. Even though they practiced their religion in love, it lost

its clarity temporarily, its ethics degenerated, the equality of the children of God was denied, and the mission of Israel was not recognized, until וירהו ד' עץ, God planted His staff (The Midrash calls it an עץ חיים -- the symbol of enlightenment) in sweetening waters, that it also might become sweet again. Love in the days of old lacked the light of prophetic insight, whose shimmer we see today. This light can be cold or warm: If this light is kindled in love, then it is warm; otherwise it is only a cold beam: We rekindled it with great zeal, and thus the shackles led to an unshackling, Marah led to Elim!

3. God will lead us through fierce battles of development to the most wonderful peace. The twelve wells of Elim were symbols of the twelve tribes, from whom come the fresh waters of the divine Law. ספר החינוך asks: Why were there twelve wells at Elim, and later twelve stones at the Jordan? It answers: Formerly the Torah was tied to Israel and so became like immovable stones. That is the issue of our battle: The Torah must again become like the free flowing waters. The Torah chronologically is 2000 years beyond Palestine, but now it must be lifted in spirit, in customs and mores beyond this barrier. Stones or waters -- that is the question, and therefore we are faced with this battle. At the beginning of our movement there may have been some extremes, and the people cried מה נשתה:

These give us hard rocks, and those give us bitter waters that tear away everything connected with our past! These times, ב'ה, are behind us ויורהו ד' עץ וישלך אל המים. Judaism is now like a fresh tree, its roots deep in our history, and our waters are sweet. We do not want to cut down the stem of Judaism, we want to give it light by freeing it of all encumbrances that it might freely grow and develop. We can't tire in this! These rifts in our house are temporarily very hard on us, but they will bring the peace of God eventually. From Marah to Elim, where the waters of Israel will water the seventy Palm trees, that is the seventy nations of the earth, with blessings, where יזל מים מדליו וזרעו במים רבים -- Jacob's buckets will give water, and his seed will sprout next to rich streams.

****

Volume III: 815-822. Text: Exodus 25: 17-21.

This is the third sermon in the series on the cherubim. We mention the cherubim again to point out what constitutes the basis of family life. Each cherub has the face of a child -- one is a boy, one is a girl. Both faces are turned towards the ark, the wings are lifted upwards, meeting at the top to protect the ark. Here we find the following teachings: 1. The religious education of children cannot be begun early enough; 2. Both sexes must have it; 3. It is the foundation stone of

all family life.

1. Early education. Each child should learn to look towards God's Law, every young soul must point its wings upwards. ראשית חכמה יראת ד', and also במה יזכה נער את ארחו לשמור כרבדיך. You as parents are priests for a Sanctuary, you must give everything it requires. Parents live and grow with their children; they base everything on the future of their offspring. Even in old age, when experiences no longer happen to parents, their own worn wings lift anew with those of their children. Everything is for them, they work and build, even if the stones of their buildings are cemented by their own blood. But never forget אם ד' לא יבנה הבית שוא עמלו בוניו בו -- without an ethical foundation the work of building children's lives is in vain. Without religion they begin their careers with broken wings; God alone gives satiety to the soul in the drought. He gives strength to the tired, power to the powerless; ויעפו נערים ויגעו ובחורים כשל יכשו -- those torn from God remain children eternally; the tired, youths who stumble; וקוי ד' יחליפו כח יעלו אבר כנשרים. But they who trust in God renew their strength, they lift their wings like eagles ירוצו ולא ויגעו ילכו ולא ייעפו -- they run without tiring, they walk without fatigue. Parents -- you must give your cherubim wings that grow from God's Law, closing over them to protect them from the heat of

the day. Make your choice betimes, when the cherubs are still of זהב טהור, when they are still pure and innocent. As children they are still beautiful, promising to be big and strong -- as dwarfs they will be ugly, misshapen. Watch that they do not become dwarfs!!

2. Boys as well as girls. The cherubs of the ark were one boy and one girl. Abarbanel says education in youth for both sexes is symbolized by these cherubs. We cannot fight enough against the prejudice of the Old Judaism to educate only the males. The treasures of the feminine spirit have been taken from us for a long time by this system. The fact that women in the old Israel were exemplary mothers and wives was in spite of these laws. The Talmud states: כל המלמד את בתו תורה כאלו לומדה תפלות. Talmudic Judaism teaches: נשים ועבדים וקטנים פטורים מק"ש. Further: Women cannot make worship a public affair -- מאה נשי כחד גברי דמיין. Don't marvel at this attitude of the Orient, marvel rather that despite this attitude life returned to the women in Israel what theory and law had taken from them! This system was of course detrimental to our religious life. Until this very day we still have the blessing: שלא עשני אשה in our liturgy. It is our task to return women to their rightful place. The Bible says: זכר ונקבה בראם ויקרא את שמם אדם ביום הבראם. Both man and woman were called by a common name; our text makes both cherubs share in the wings that meet over the ark,

both מקשה תעשה אתם. They are twins ופניהם איש אל אחיו, facing each other.

3. One of the most significant aspects of our text is its bearing on the unity of marriage. The wings of the male and the female cherub are turned upward to indicate their growth into young manhood and womanhood that they might mate and live together עזר כנגדו, for mutual protection. Whatever their lot ופניהם איש אל אחיו, they are to be one person והיו לבשר אחד. But this can only take place when אל הכפרת יהיו פני הכרבים, they turn to face God, when they turn to God in their youth already סככים בכנפיהם על הכפרת, when their home is a shelter both to them and to their Sanctuary. Here the words of the Psalmist are of importance: "If God build not the house -- they labor in vain that build it." Where belief in God is lacking, there duties are neglected and there is no peace. But if God is in your home, then your children, like the cherubs שתולים בבית ד' בחצרות אלהינו יפריחו, they will bloom עוד ינובון בשיבה, until old age overtake you. Yes, they will even spread out their wings over that ארון which is the grave.

****

The Golden Calf.

Volume III: 841-848. Text: Exodus 32: 1-21.

Our text shows us Moses at the peak of his high mission in a struggle that we also must fight in his spirit. According to our story the image of the golden calf wasn't

fashioned to be worshipped, but to take the place of the absent Moses. To prevent worse, Aaron acceded to the wishes of the people and built an altar for God before the image. But even then he committed a transgression. Hardly was it finished, when the people called -- "This is your God, Israel, Who brought you up out of the land of Egypt." The idol originally was put by the people above themselves, but below God. Similarly with religious forms. Originally they were a means to worship God, a mirror in which to reflect themselves. In this manner religious forms were molded in the pure gold of education. But this system was perverted, the mirror became a distortion, the lever a brake. What was to awaken us to the Divine became divinely authoritative to the people. Fervently they clung to this system, even after it was dead, and retained its forms and ceremonials. Moses ground up the idol, put the dust in water, and then forced the people to drink it. We must do the same. We must grind up the dead and drink from the eternal stream that flows from Sinai. We must do this with, 1. Glowing enthusiasm and 2. Firm determination.

1. With glowing enthusiasm: The gentle Moses was never so enraged as in the instance of the golden calf. He did not speak, he only acted; in his rage he broke the Tablets, ground up the idol and only then spoke to Aaron: "What did this people do to you that you brought

this great sin upon them?" We also need such fervor to break our religious shackles. To be a blessing both inwardly and outwardly we also need such fire. Others may wish just to exist without progress, but we want to build on the old ruins, to lay foundation for coming generations, to unstop the channels that run down from Sinai, that others also may drink from the divine well.

2. With strong determination. Aaron was uncertain, Moses was firm. Aaron was carried away by his desire to appease; instead of acting firmly, he waited for Moses; he took gold to make an image in order to appease the people, forgetting that people are far more willing to sacrifice for their idol than for their God. This shows us that you should never appeal to superstition against superstition. When his plan failed, he tried to have a festival for the Lord on the next day, when he thought Moses would return. Thus he became a sinner, together with the people. His soul, a mild sun ray, was able to show the right way, but was not strong enough to interfere with the wild elements, to stop sin once it had started. He could work for repenting spirits, but he could not, like a prophet, bend proud necks. He was a man of peace, not of battle. Such peaceful natures are good in normal times, but not in times of stress. In times of danger we need leaders who will cry out מי לד' אלי !! We live in such days! On the one side we have indifference and the worship of mammon, with its constant dance around the

golden calf -- on the other side a thoughtless religiosity with self-deception. For many years now we have needed a change, but it was always tomorrow, tomorrow -- חג לד' מחר . The leaders of our people always kept on saying: You can't take their images away suddenly, tomorrow we shall begin to do it gradually. So the people did it themselves, and in such a fashion that our whole religion was thoroughly reformed. However they did not dedicate their image to God, as in our text, they merely pushed it aside in life; what was formerly unripe, now became overripe -- and rotten. There was ambiguity, the practices condemned in German where extolled in Hebrew, as for example the sacrificial cult and the restoration of the House of David. Under that system וישב העם לאכל ושתו , the people learned to enjoy the physical goods in life, and then וייקמו לצחק, they mocked the holy and sacred. They called this a "golden means." What had actually happened was that they had broken the egg too suddenly, the young chick was too immature to come forth unaided. We want to brood out the egg with religious warmth and fervor. We want to burn and grind up this idol until ויטחן עד אשר דק until it becomes thin, ויזר על פני המים , we want to pour its dust into the waters of Sinai, וישק את בני ישראל -- that Israel may drink thereof. When Moses descended from the mountain, he met Joshua. The latter thought he heard shouts of war in the camp, but Moses answered

קול ענות אנכי שמע. Rashi explains this as meaning: I hear a voice of blasphemy, I wish to God it was war! But it is peace -- a godless peace! We say war against such peace -- we say היום לעשותם ולא מחר לעשותם, today and not tomorrow let us prepare a festival for the Lord: מי לד' אלי!

****

Volume III: 909-917. Text: Leviticus 1: 1-7.

The most important of sacrifices is the burnt offering. Of all other sacrifices the priests were permitted to eat but not from this. Its name is עלה -- one that ascends to heaven. The עלה makes man appear at his best, as king of the earth, for it was used whenever there was the urge for prayer, in the morning, at night, and for all important occasions. The crown of human achievement is the ability to recognize God, to worship Him. Unfortunately, how rarely is prayer what it is supposed to be, what it pretends to be! How few people bring an acceptable עלה before God! Unfortunately the people in many congregations are not really thankful until the "travails" of the service are finished. Is it not clear that this type of service is rather a חלול than a קדוש השם? What then are the true signs of worship? 1. It comes from the depth of the heart; 2. It rises high to heaven; 3. In order to rise to heaven it avoids all overburdening; and 4. It acts in a purifying manner on our inner and external life.

1. It must come from the depth of the heart. Our text states: תמים יקריבנו , without blemish it must be offered. The prophet Malachai speaks of crippled animals that were offered, of sacrifices that came from robbed loot -- do you bring such before God as a sacrifice? As with the sacrifices, so with prayers: They must be perfect and without blemish; prayer must come from a true desire to worship, as the prophet Isaiah stated, who hated lip services if the heart was not with them. Thus also the Rabbis: אל תעש תפלתך קבע אלא רחמים ותחנונים לפני המקום -- let prayer be a pouring out of the heart, not only an obligation bound to certain predetermined hours -- תפלה בלא כונה כגוף בלא נשמה. Nevertheless we have such dicta as מצוות א'צ כונה. The Midrash says that the שמע and the תפלה may be said in any language (נאמרין בכל לשון) -- nevertheless the blind letter worship brought about the acceptance of the dictum that not the feelings, but the Hebrew sounds were important! In the Talmud Yerushalmi a story is told of a few men who prayed and simultaneously counted the stones of the wall before which they stood! One even boasts that his head, without him knowing it, automatically bends at the מודים !! Their lips were praying -- but what of their hearts? That they called an עלה ! They put an idol in the Temple and that they called honoring God!!

2. True worship must rise to heaven: That was

already one of the requisites of the עלה . Scripture states: ואש המזבח תוקד בו -- the fire of the sacrifice must flame upwards. The Book of the עקדה comments on this passage כי דברי התפלה צריכין חמום , and והמתפלל והמזבח עצמו שהוא , and also בכונה גמורה אש מפיו תאכל הלב מתלהב ועולה -- with other words there must be enthusiasm, there must be a flame שלהבת יה ; there can't be any מחשבות חוץ in prayer. This does not mean that we must exclude our daily affaires from prayer; to the contrary, man must appear as he is when worshipping. But the dignity of prayer demands that we never forget before Whom we stand, and for a certain time all our thoughts ought to be occupied with nothing but our prayers.

3. I say: Prayer must be offered "for a certain time" so that there is no overburdening of the prayers. Here we may apply the words of Scripture: "Not too much and not too little." According to our text the offering was to be given in parts, not as a whole ונתח אתה לנתחיה . This procedure was followed so that the altar flames could climb upwards easier and faster. Many of our מחזורים , of which people often are so proud, are real extinguishers for true prayerful fervor: They are so big. As Ecclesiastes taught: כי האלהים בשמים ואתה על הארץ על כן יהיו דבריך מעטים. If you count stones while praying you have little to lose, but he who truly prays needs no huge tomes. The dove, a very small animal, was acceptable as an עלה ;

similarly a little prayerbook will do as well as a big one. We have no need for huge volumes that are carried on the shoulders with difficulty, but which are so large, that they can never enter the heart.

4. Finally true worship is purifying for the inner and the outer man. Our text says of the burnt offering: ונרצה לו לכפר עליו "may it be acceptable for atonement." The Rabbis declared: העלה מכפרת על הרהורי הלב, that the offering applies only to unclean thoughts, which have not yet been materialized. In truth, however, the עלה can atone for anything. Yet prayer must be pure, we must be careful that it is not an אש זרה. There are those who pray for wrong things, to them the prophets say: "Away with the noise of your song, I care not to hear the sounds of your Psalter." Some people consciously steal, swear falsely, and stray after other gods -- then they go to the Synagogue to make atonement. המערת פרצים היה הבית הזה. True reverence sends forth what the heart can't think and the tongue can't speak. מלאכי אלהים עלים וירדים, they are angels going to God, to return as a crown on the head of the prayerful one. Such prayer is the Seraph of whom Isaiah speaks (Chap. 6) "When this coal touches your tongue ..... your sin is atoned."

May this Seraph also touch us, so that the words which form the heading of our soon to be completed prayer-book will find full application עלת תמיד העשיה בהר סיני לריח ניחח אשה לד'.

****

Salt as a Sign of the Covenant.

Volume III: 938-944. Text: Leviticus 2: 13.

Meal offerings must be salted. Even God's "food" must contain salt, salt is even called the מלח ברית אלהיך, which means that salt must portray something symbolically. It was not a question of taste, for the burnt offerings contained salt, and these offerings were not eaten by anyone. The Arabs to this day eat salt when making a pact of friendship or when taking an oath.

1. Salt is a symbol of steadfastness, it protects food against rotting and dissolution, it keeps parts together against separation and preserves them from destroying elements. It is in direct contrast to honey and leavened dough which Scriptures in a previous passage excluded from the altar because both lead to souring, and in ancient time sour foods were equal to something rotten, unclean, and therefore equal to death. Even though all sacrifices differed, all had the final goal to renew and to secure the Covenant with God. Thus salt could not be lacking, to point out that the Covenant was imperishable and indestructible, both from the side of Israel and God. In this sense another passage speaks of the ברית מלח עולם . Thus the adherents of the old Judaism always had salt on the table, which was an altar in a sense. This ceremony is of no significance for us any longer, but the thought behind it is still important to us:

We must never depart from our Jewish calling. The signs of the Covenant may change with the times, but the Covenant must remain; our basic truths and obligations may never change. We must fight against all changes in these respects, no matter what happens. We must seal the salt Covenant with our very lives; sour dough and honey, which may at first tickle the palate, but will later change into gall, we must avoid. All the more we must never stand back before the much smaller religious sacrifices demanded of us under the blessings of freedom in this country; we must never let the salt be lacking in the קרבן. Shame on those who spend more in one evening at the gaming table than they do the whole year for Synagogue or the religious school, and lull their consciences to sleep with a lament about "the bad times." Fools! for exactly these bad times should teach them that the קרן קימה does not lie in gold and silver -- riches can disappear with a single wind, but only salt protects against decay.

2. Salt does more: If decay has set in, its acid powers eat the rottenness away. The same holds true in the relation of Israel and God. Israel was satiated with Egyptian idol worship when God chose it for His nation; even after Sinai the people could not resist worshipping the golden calf. Nevertheless God remained true to them. The power to restore the sick, to cut away

what is dead, manifested itself then and later over and over again in the course of our history. In our long wanderings salt often has been our צדה לדרך. The salt could not prevent occasional internal or external rottenness, but there were always men who were reminded of the divine call: Don't keep the salt of the Covenant from your meal offering! They then proceeded to cleanse the precious manna. Thus the prophets preached against meaningless ceremonials: They were the salt in Israel. After the Second Temple the teachers of the Law who declared impotent many institutions of old that would have endangered the heritage of the fathers, were the salt. This was done by re-interpretation of the Biblical word. Similarly there were men in the middle ages who strewed grains of salt into the masses. These kernels, although not fully effective, often ate in deeply. We also must strew grains of salt: Not that we can hope to succeed in our efforts in one day, but only complete blindness can doubt that our enlightened efforts are the salt that is entering the pores of our surroundings. Where there formerly was only inertia, there is now industriousness and life. Therefore, away with the honey we are being offered, we must continue to bring the salt of the Covenant before God.

3. Salt, while not fit for food, has the quality to make other items fit for consumption by being added.

It protects from dissolution by dissolving itself. Thus salt presents a picture of self-sacrifice for the welfare of others. Our sacrifices and the travails of our pilgrimage have only the goal to fulfill our mission as priests, to restore the pure belief in God and a pure humanity in all the earth. The task given us by God is to act as the salt strewed about among humanity: Bitter alone, but quickening as a means to heal the sicknesses of all the world. In this sense our text has a higher meaning -- the salt of our Covenant induces us to be honorable; to be ethical to everyone on the outside, to be religious on the inside, to present a picture of light of the Mosaic Law, that everyone may say: הוא לכם זרע -- this is seed of God: Here nothing is empty, there is sincerity and meaning, the spirit of religion, which seeks to heal the rifts in the hearts of all men. Not for our own benefit, but as a spice for mankind Israel was called. At the time of our choosing all the world, originaly pure from God's hand, was corrupted by heathenism.* God took Israel as the new vessel, He threw in the spice, so that the earth might be full of healing waters, and all the children of God will enter into a ברית מלח עולם with their God.

****

Volume III: 997-1005. Text: Leviticus 14: 33-45.

Reform is rapidly becoming a very popular concept.

*As stated in the Haftarah to this passage II Kings 2: 19-22.

Congregations which formerly scoffed are now coming, somewhat shamefully, to our camp. There are chorals in Temples, which formerly termed them חקת גוים, there are organs, they even speak of the spirit of Judaism. The cry now is: כנגע נראה לי בבית -- there seems to be some damage in the house that we must try to repair. We can be happy about this attitude, we must not despair if it goes slowly, if it does not come suddenly. But we must be careful that others do not take our colors and sail under a false flag. Anyone who comes to us we must ask: הלנו אם לצרינו -- are you with us or with our enemies? Let us then look today for the Shibboleth, the sign of pseudo-Reform, in contradistinction to true Reform. Our text gives us that Shibboleth. True Reform must 1. Come from inner desire; 2. It must be understood expertly; 3. It must wish to heal the religious damages from the ground on up.

1. From inner desire. According to our text, if there was damage in a house, the owner had to examine it ובא אשר לו הבית -- thus it was written in the תורת כהנים -- and: ולא ישלח ביד שליח the owner himself had to come, not a representative of the owner. This regulation was ordained so that the owner would recognize his home as a Sanctuary. The owner was to show his zeal for keeping his Sanctuary clean, he was to show his desire to remove the unclean. If he sent another, he did not mani-

fest such an interest. It is thus with the rebuilding of our house of Judaism, which is in need of repair. Religious repair is only of value when motivated by an inner desire, if the conviction is present that the old Judaism is no longer tenable, that the stream of culture and the circumstances of life have made breaches in our house that are in need of repair, that there be not a צרעת ממארת -- an all-destroying pestilence. Where there is no such desire, no real understanding of the damage, where people cry to the כהן -- "the frame work of our house is still very strong, enough even to resist the lion-voice of the חזן for centuries longer, but the world is turning modern, the old times are over, so perhaps we also had better renovate" -- where that cry is heard, there religious changes can do but little. God is not there, and even the called teacher, the architect of the new building, will finally be regarded as the real trouble of the house.

2. True Reform must be paired with expert knowledge. The priest in our text was the expert for cleanliness or uncleanliness. There was much to do in examining a tainted house, an expert had to sort the clean from the unclean, so that the good stones would not be cast aside with the bad ones. The priest had to see to it that it was not a wall of merely piled-up bricks, it had to be a סלע משמת ימי בראשית to keep the uncleanness

out -- so as not to ignore one of the main provisions of the Law: ונתתי נגע צרעת בבית ארץ אחזתכם , that is to say the stones were unclean only if the damage had been done by nature, not if man caused it. The same holds true in religion: We must be familiar with God's word to see what is good and what is bad, so that the good will not be removed from the סלע משמח ימי בראשית , the wall of Judaism erected by God already in Adam's days for all times. Even the most glowing desire for true Reform will stumble like a drunk, crying: Let us build a tower up to heaven -- until all air castles will fall and lead to a Babylonian confusion, leading to nothing.

3. True Reform must lead to a thorough healing of religious damages. In our text the bad stones were removed from the wall; a mere dabbling over would not heal the damages; the old must be removed, the new substituted. A glowing varnish with rottenness underneath is of no use, and only heightens the immorality, especially in the field of religion. A Rabbi said once on Yom Kippur: You beat your breast; you are like those who in case of fire sound an alarm, but neglect to bring the fire-fighting apparatus, while the צרעת ממארת burns on within you! It is thus with these pseudo-Reformers who boast of their beautiful Temples, but carry all their filth and rottenness in their religion, and while the wounds fester -- they play an organ to heal them. We need first and most prayers

understood by the people, which will awaken reverence in their hearts. As long as prayer consists of contents not commensurate to our needs, they are a slander of God. We need a change in our practical religious life which rests on talmudic grounds, whose precepts are mostly on paper, but are not real. Reform now has attempted this for a quarter of a century. At first the movement was small, now it is much more grown. Its romantic days are gone, we are now in the midst of the struggle. We must realize that the old בית המקדש was destroyed because Jewish nationalism had lost its significance, and its customs had actually become harmful. Instead of merely covering the damage, we must remove it, and build a house for all nations.

****

Volume III: 1031-1041. Text: Exodus 28: 15-30.

The purpose of the אורים ותמים is easily discerned. By the time of the Second Temple they were lost already. The Rabbis thought the Tetragrammaton was on the חזן; by it the stones gleamed, giving the answers to the priests' queries. The name refers to the unique ability of the stones to light up, the questions are the אורים, and the answer to the questions are the תמים . The main idea of the text is: Aaron was to wear the structure on his heart whenever he appeared before God, signifying that the priest was to have Israel's interests

at heart. This is of significance, because all of Israel are priests today. Thus part of our calling is to have Jewish interest at heart. We can then deduce from our text: Each of us must take to heart 1. Israel's divine guidance; 2. Israel's high mission; and 3. Israel's religious circumstances.

1. Israel's divine guidance -- that is our history, it is the משפט, God's decision, which Aaron carried on his heart. The אורים were only consulted by the people's leaders in conjunction with the national interest. These decisions were then known as the משפט ד' . Whatever the אורים may have been externally, it was their purpose to be the bearers of eternal and true thoughts. The divine revelation at Sinai was אורים , and תמים was the continuance of this divine revelation in history. The structure was a precursor of prophecy which sought to find God's ways from the signs of the times. This system, however, disappeared completely with the Second Temple. During prophetic times there was no room for the means that only the priests had used, and which was useless after the priesthood had become corrupt. In this manner also the dead letter of the Law had to give way to the Law's spirit. Many people still try to have the days of ancient glory live when they are dead, instead of waking the spirit and nourishing it. Occasionally we saw men with such ideals, with such spirit. R. Yochanan ben

Zakkai, Rav, Samuel, Ibn Ezra, Maimonides, Leo de Modena -- but they were few, and eventually had to give way to the ארבע טורים as our religious codex. True, these works have contributed much, but today they are merely petrified tomes, heavy on our shoulders, not bright precious stones. But these ד' טורים are carried by many of our people neither on the shoulders nor in the heart, for the people have no convictions. What can we do? We must reawaken the אורים ותמים!! We must reawaken the divine revelation and discard the letter of the Law. What was good long ago is no longer good in many instances. What is still alive must be watched like the apple of the eye; what is dead we must remove because it is a חשן משפט without the אורים ותמים.

2. We also must have our mission at heart, for this also is a divine משפט. The אורים were used mostly for military affairs, to consult ד' צבאות. We are to be the אור גוים, and when תשפכנה אבני קדש בראש כל חוצות, we were dispersed in all the world, we were to be the אורים of the world, so that eventually, as the prophets said, all nations will come to the mountain of the Lord, and the אורים will become תמים, completed by smelting all nations into one family of God. That is our task; neither slavery nor freedom may keep us from it. All people shall recognize us as the priests of God, we shall not teach by missionarism, but

by precept and example, by קידוש השם. No matter what job we fill, we shall always give witness to רק עם חכם ונבון הגוי הגדול הזה -- and we may say כי מי גוי גדול אשר לא אלהים קרובים אליו and כי ד' אלהינו בכל קראו אליו ומי גוי קדוש אשר לו חקים ומשפטים צדיקים בכל התורה הזאת.

3. If this is our highest task, then there is no doubt that nothing can be more dear to us than our Jewishness and our Judaism. When Moses gave us such teachings, could he have had in mind those Jews that have many feast and fast days, who have hundreds of ceremonies and say prayers yards long, but steal at night, and rob others of what they have earned by their hard work? Are not the like of those our shame? Isaiah would call out to them: "Why these festivals and New Moons ..... my soul hates them ..... your hands are full of blood!" Are these Israelites who seek the messianic age? This much for Jewishness; the same holds true in regard to Judaism. Could Moses have had in mind men who insult God by speaking empty words, who cry for a return to Jerusalem when they do not want to return? We must be more careful of flesh and blood than of flesh and milk! That is not the example we wish to set others -- rather must we be ethical and moral beings, who shy back of any חלול השם, who fight all that is dead and rotten, to make the אורים וחמים shine out to the glory of God. We may never say מה לי לצרה הזאת. We must keep to

the words of Moses: תמיך ואוריך לאיש חסידך -- your Urim Vetumim belong only to the pious. He who truly has God's interest at heart can, if necessary, say: האמר לאביו ולאמו לא ראיתו -- ואת אחיו לא הכיר -- ואת בנו לא ידע . From them shall the Messiah be born, dressed with אורים ותמים -- with the way of החיים והשלום.

****

Volume IV; 18-25. Text: Numbers 13-14: 9.

TEXT: The story of the spies; their corrupt testimony, the report of Joshua and Caleb.

Not only when Canaan was to be conquered did the Israelites have to "spy out" the land -- also after the destruction of the Second Temple we had to "spy out" the earth, to be able to fulfill our messianic mission, to found an ecclesiastic empire. The nations had to be investigated, their religious and ethical standards had to be proved. Everywhere we had to fight giant powers, which we have not overcome to this very day. Of what have we need, opposite these mighty powers, to fulfill our high calling? Our text gives us the answer.

1. We can't forget the spiritual power that unfolded itself in our past. The spies saw three tribes: Achiman, Sheshai, and Thalmai. In their report they did not give the place names of these tribes. This fitted their scheme, for in Hebron the patriarchs were buried. A reminder of the patriarchs would have stirred memories

in the people sufficient to quench all their fears. There is a legend that Caleb kissed the soil where the patriarchs were buried, and received courage in that way. Thus, for us also, there is no bigger inducement to mighty deeds than the memories of the chosen of our people, the עמודי עולם. We would be blind to all our history to think אפס כי עז העם הישב בארץ, that the three tribes of giants -- the heathen, Christian, and Mohammedan nations -- with whom we must have a battle of the spirit, are too mighty for us. But were we not a minority, as now, when we were in Egypt, when we fought the Maccabean wars -- the latter to rededicate a Temple more beautiful than ever before? We resisted Rome after our Temple and our state had been destroyed; the more we were persecuted, the stronger we became spiritually. The future of an ideal would be bad if its merit were to be counted by the number of its adherents.

2. We may notice that our strength is rising, theirs diminishing. Our text states that Hebron was built seven years before Egypt's Zaon. This is the Hebron built by Arba, the father of Anak -- called Kiryath Arba before Zaon, the capital of the Pharaos. In Hebron there were then only a few Anakim left, and their power had so far degenerated that the city was no longer called after its founder Arba, but was called Hebron instead. Joshua easily drove the Anakites from there later on, and there-

after they remained in only three places in Canaan. The fact that Abraham's descendants had grown so numerous, while the descendants of the three "giants" had degenerated so far, should have given the spies courage. But the spies were fooled by superficial impressions, they measured only by material (sensual) standards. A few giants impressed them more than the spirit of God. Only Joshua and Caleb did not fear them, they realized סר צלם מעליהם and אתנו ד'. Thus we also must apply a higher gauge to the course of events, and never fail in our hopes for victory. True, the gentile confessions still seem overwhelming, but on looking deeper one must admit that there is a ray of light breaking through, traversing the earth, which brings the promises of the prophets always closer. We can miss the tendency to a fraternization of all men in the spirit of God. It cannot be denied that already millions of Christian confessions deny the deity of the man from Nazareth; that the so-called "only-saving" church is rotten at its roots, that the dark dogmas of inherited sin and eternal damnation are rejected already today by many non-Jews. No longer are heretics burned; the stealing of a Jewish child recently was condemned by almost all nations.* Even heathen China recently had to open its doors that the sun of culture might shine in. Even if ruins today still appear gigantic, they are still ruins, disintegrating constantly,

*A reference to the Mortara affair, discussed below.

while the power of God is increasing all the time. Only fools can believe that a dying giant has a greater future than a growing child!

3. In fulfillment of our task we may not neglect והתחזקתם ולקחתם מפרי הארץ, to take of the fruits of the land, that is, of the culture of the lands in which we sojourn. We cannot admit foreign particles into our religion, but we also cannot neglect to partake of what has been given us by God: Inspired human minds. That alone can prevent us from become stale. Judaism must not appear as a strange twig grafted on a tree, it is rooted in and must grow from the heart. Therefore all useful things must be retained by us, the unethical must be cut out. We shall have to sacrifice the theory that we are strangers -- but this is only a theory, for practically we are not strangers. This belief is based on a pride of position by birth, and that is as bad as the pride that Christianity holds. It is in contrast to the Mosaic teaching of the equality of all men created in the image of God. The thought must disappear ארץ אוכלת יושביה היא -- Israel will be destroyed if it feels at home anywhere but in Palestine. Our home is not where the first buds of God's teaching appeared on our vine, but it is נחל אשכול -- wherever our grapes ripen. The church watered our wine originally, thinking it too strong for the heathens in its pure form. But the water

is disappearing מים רבים לא יכלו לכבות את האהבה --
they cannot extinguish our fire .....

****

Volume IV: 41-48. Text: Numbers 15: 37-41.

TEXT: The command to make fringes in the corners of garments.

The ציצית are to remind us of the divine Commandments. As regards the blue thread, R. Meir teaches:

מפני שהתכלת דומה לים וים דומה לרקיע ורקיע לכסא הכבוד.

Both the ancient Jews and heathens put much value on the language of colors -- with the heathens this was nature worship, in our teachings it pointed to the truths of God. To the Indians (Hindus), the color blue was divine because of the sea, and because water is a basic element. To the Jews the color blue was like heaven, symbolical of the ethereal, heavenly and divine. The law of fringes then points to certain religious concepts and truths, especially as a protection against sin. The fringes teach us three things: 1. Man, as a son of God, has a spirit; 2. Man's body is a Sanctuary; 3. Israel, as a people, is called to be a nation of priests.

1. וראיתם אותו, so the command states, look at the blue thread, and remember the divine Commands, and don't follow your heart or your eyes. These are the drive to the unclean within man. They represent the evil drives within us, the tinder; and the sensuous without, the flame. To keep this flame and this tinder apart,

the סרסורין, agents of sin, the heavenly blue thread is to remind us of the Divine in our nature. As everywhere, so here also Mosaism sees the best protection against sin in the raising of man's self-respect, unlike other religions which foster self despisement. The other threads of the fringes can be of any color, for they represent the many colorations and shadings of human nature -- but the blue is there to remind us of the Divine.

2. The fringes represent the human body as a Sanctuary, and the limbs are the כלי הקודש. According to another Mosaic passage all utensils of the Sanctuary were to be covered with a blue cloth during the wanderings in the desert. Only the altar was covered with purple, signifying that it made atonement for the blood, that is the נפש, the soul. Thus the blue thread in man's clothing reminded him that our body was a מקדש ד', a lamp for the heavenly light that God kindled within us. Even the animal part of us is called to serve God, to be ennobled by the breath of the spiritual. Therefore we must be careful not to follow the punishable desires of the heart, to desecrate the limbs dedicated to God! We have human drives -- these are servants of the spirit; we must be careful that they don't become idols! Not the sensuous eye or the desirous heart -- but the mind must rule! The bad can be mastered for the good. Thus the blue thread is

a reminder of the holiness of the entire body .....

3. All Israel is a priestpeople: Aaron's whole garment was blue. Here the תכלת identifies its wearer with the divine Law. Our text states: "I ..... God .....Who led you forth from Egypt." This means, "I, God, have chosen you!" Therefore your garment is a priestly garment with fringes. The word ציצית also means "blossom," a sign that our sprouts (disciples) will some day open up and fill the world with a heavenly light at the time when the thread will encompass the whole earth. What can inspire us more than to be God's chosen ones -- or shame us more than to desecrate this trust? As priests of God we must do good to others, we must be a pure people. We must remove the dead from our midst: Those ceremonies whose memory is still dear to us even as the memory of a beloved deceased -- but the spirit of these ceremonies, which is immortal, we must retain. That is the lesson of the ציצית. These ceremonies are not artificial, in ancient days they were truly religious. For us they have lost their value as symbols. The blue thread is now gone; according to the Talmud the ציצית were to be white; the blue thread, symbolizing the coloration of life, is now gone. Ibn Ezra stated that the ציצית were to be worn outside of our cbthes. This is more important outside the time of prayer than during prayer time, for the fringes are reminders against sin, which we

are not as likely to commit during prayertime than outside of it. As for those who represent tradition: Instead of keeping the ציצית in plain sight all day long as a reminder against sin, as they are supposed to be, they hide them with an ארבע כנפות, a miniature Tallith. Thus they have only a ruin of a ceremonial. We honor the spirit of the ceremony, but not the garment itself, and thus we no longer use a Tallith. But all the more must we regard the exhortation of the Preacher: בכל עת יהיו בגדים לבנים ישמן על ראשך אל יחסר. This white garment is symbolical of an unstained life; that must be our Tallith, and the oil of the priestly spirit, that must be our Tephillin ornament!

****

Cities for the Levites and Refuge Cities.

Volume IV: 176-184. Text: Numbers 35: 1-7.

In Biblical times each tribe had its own district, each, that is, except the Levites, who were given forty-eight special cities. On the average that would be four cities in the territory of each tribe. The Levites, as the prophet stated, had a task: יורו משפטיך ליעקב ותורתך לישראל. Their tasks were the maintenance of the sacrificial cult, to be the medium that enflamed the God-spirit again and again, and to atone for those who felt themselves to be guilty. They had to keep God's Law pure, they had to regulate the nation's life according

to God's word, to clear up doubts, and to appease quarrels. They were to be priests; God was to be their only heritage, and the Sanctuary their only occupation. The question might be asked: Why did they have different cities? Why were they not scattered throughout the nation?

These cities each had a type of miniature Sanctuary; scattered throughout the land all Jews were constantly reminded of the Temple. The cities also were places of refuge for those who had committed an unpremeditated slaying. As the altar of the Temple was a place of refuge, so also were these cities.

1. These בתי כנסיות were also בתי מדרשות were schools for Israel's teachers and judges, where the divine wisdom was handed down from age to age. There was no luxury here, but also there was no want, and so the inhabitants could devote their time to study. These cities were centers where historical memories were renewed, collected and kept; here many of our oldest documents were written. The cities could assist one another -- which would have been impossible had they been scattered. Many people, as we know from the Bible, did leave these cities, and went to live elsewhere, but even then the individual Levite was spiritually always connected with his brothers and thus felt himself all the more a divine messenger.

2. These city-centers found their counterparts in various schools after the destruction of the Temple. The names of these cities make us marvel about the deep wisdom of the Mosaic legislation, "Command the Israelites," so our text states: ונתנו ללויים מנחלת אחזתם ערים לשבת. The Levites thus had no property, not even their cities. Yet they still were independent, for they had to bend before nobody. This law prohibiting the Levites from property ownership was a protection against the type of priestly rulership that has in non-Jewish circles so often become a scourge of nations. Nothing is more dangerous than real estate in the hands of the clergy -- woe the state that puts no limits to this! For then it often happens that the priestly caste in the name of God takes the fat of the land in payment for the dew of heaven, eventually becoming unethical and finally tyrannical, as history has so amply shown us. In Egypt, for example, priests owned one-third of all land, and besides that they had many other sources of income. The chief priests of various temples were next to the Pharaohs. In India also one-third of the land belonged to priests; some temples were actual cities, with as many as 40,000 priest inhabitants. Similar situations existed in Babylonia; we know about the Catholics, who utilized God's word: "You ..... are strangers before Me, for Mine is the whole earth," despite the teachings of Jesus

that his kingdom was not on this earth. The Levites had only God as their heritage; they had a set income, there was no poverty, but also there were no riches -- they were not the שלוחי דרחמנא, but rather representatives of the people. It was their task to keep the people's spiritual treasures, to circulate them.

3. Who can miss in their position and task the example for our later task, to be missionaries to the people of the earth? The thought has been voiced that the malice of nations and fate have forced us into the role which the Levites formerly occupied among us. We have been scattered, our only property is God -- our ghettoes in many respects have been our ערי לויים. We, the new Israel, have the holy conviction that our dispersion is not a punishment, but a necessity connected with many sacrifices. The Levites, according to Scriptures, instead of the first born, were to be priests, they were to guard the visible and the invisible treasures of our people. The last blessing of the great prophet therefore praises Levi as the most noble tribe in Israel. But Jacob, long before Moses, blessed Levi: "Simon and Levi are brothers" (that is, in ideals and character), "works of violence are their kinship ..... caused by their anger ..... אחלקם ביעקב ואפיצם בישראל: "I shall divide them in Jacob and scatter them in Israel." Here the scattering of Israel is understood as a punishment. Jacob saw a fact

-- but he had no idea that this fierceness of spirit would once be employed in behalf of the Sanctuary, and would become the property of all Israel, to bring salvation to all the world. No wonder that our own people put the same false commentary to the facts, making the suffering and sacrificing priest an outcast sinner! They also, as Jacob, knew not of the tremendous changes that were to take place in history, which would contradict their theories of גלות -- that in the future Israel would be the tribe of Levites among the nations!

****

Israel's Declaration of War.

Volume IV: 273-280. Text: Deuteronomy 6: 4.

The שמע is our declaration of war. It is an unprecedented manifesto in that: 1. A small group made it against the whole world; 2. It started a war of several thousand years; 3. It changed each lost battle into a glorious triumpth; 4. It purposes to found an indivisible world, which will be both a republic and a monarchy.

1. A small group made it against the whole world. History glorifies all instances in which a small group triumphed over a large one, reckoning it as the victory of the spirit over raw physical power. A battle such as ours, however, has never taken place. The best proof for this is that armies have been of no avail against

us, that faith in God alone has been our strength. The world has had thousands of idols and temples, until Israel came and called out into the chaos: " ד' אלהינו ד' אחד -- Your services are a desecration of the true God."

2. This manifesto started a war of several thousand years. Even had we lost, we would have been stamped as heroes. This war is very old -- but we are not even thinking of peace yet! History has many records of a small group holding out against a larger one -- but it has no other record like ours! Nothing could change us -- not in the desert, by the rivers of Babylon, or the dispersion! We have not lost any of our strength, it is still in our pulse beat, it is still often a bloody witness between God and Israel. Russia, Austria, Italy, Wallachia -- in those countries millions of Jews are still being slain; only recently blood accusations arose against us once more. Many of our people like to listen to the שמע in the synagogue, their only worry is whether the Chazan's interpretation is beautiful or not! They think that at worst it can cost them a couple of Sabbath hours -- as long as their stores are open during this time it does not matter to them. But where priestly hangmen ply their trade, there the שמע still has meaning, there it still is our battlecry!

3. Each lost battle is a glorious triumph. In the sense of being routed by superior numbers we have usually lost our battles, but wherever our enemies triumph

most loudly, there our protest ד' אלהינו ד' אחד rose most loudly to God above. The spirit of religion cannot be killed: No matter how bad the defeat, it emerges always more glorious than ever before. Twice we received blows that might have been fatal to another people. The first time it was from Babylon. Away from home, would the people not forget God, mingle with and assimilate into their conquerors? Was the danger not all the stronger, since according to all contemporary prophets heathenism had kept on cropping up in Palestine, and the sacred Law still had not taken deep roots? But those fears proved to be without foundation; especially away from home the faithless learned to appreciate their treasure. They returned seventy years later as a people of God, to rebuild the Sanctuary. With Ezra Judaism really began to live. Then came the second great blow -- Rome conquered Judah, and distributed the small group to the ends of the earth. Nations persecuted us, but could not destroy us; whatever we lost in temporal powers and treasures we gained in spirit.

4. Lastly we aim to build simultaneously a world republic and a world monarchy. Israel wants to free the nations from the shackles of men and error. ד' אחד is a protest against the splintering of mankind, for all men were created in the image of God. We don't want to do away with nationalities, we merely want to

regard all nations as the branches of one tree. In the ideal world there will be no slaves and masters, no royal decrees to force men's minds into defined channels. Of course there are certain difficulties to be overcome. Who is to make decisions -- the majority? Majorities rarely have wisdom -- that is the trouble with the republican type of government. A republic can exist only if it is a monarchy at the same time -- a theocracy of One God, where one confessional and ethical law reigns in the hearts of all men, where reason condemns blind belief. We shall never rest until we accomplish this goal, until the word of the prophet be fulfilled:

ביום ההוא יהיה ד' אחד ושמו אחד.

****

Volume V: 15-22. Text: Genesis 5:1.

TEXT: זה ספר תולדות אדם.

Nachmanides said our text should have been זה תולדות אדם for the word ספר can refer only to the Bible. The text should be explained כי כל התורה כלה ספר תולדות אדם. This opinion is shared by the Midrash, which has several explanations for this verse. Let us consider three of these explanations, all based on the idea that the Bible wishes to embrace the whole world with its precious treasures.

1. R. Akiba taught: The main principle of the Torah is ואהבת לרעך כמוך זה כלל גדול שבתורה. Ben Azzai

taught זה ספר תולדות אדם זה כלל גדול שבתורה , because the untouchable sanctity of man rests on the teaching בדמות אלהים עשה אותו . Accordingly Scripture constantly calls to us: You are a son of God. Ben Azzai is right. True, Akiba's sentiment is one of the Torah's greatest principles; but, besides to our neighbors, we also have obligations to God and to ourself. We really need a further motivation to understand the exalted meaning of Akiba's words. My enemies, for example, I cannot love, as Christianity boasts -- on paper; that is. That is not contained in ואהבת לרעך כמוך . But then again we must abstain from using unfair weapons, we may only go so far as to make enmity towards us harmless. We even must help our enemy's ox or ass if it is in distress. All these matters rest on the fact that even our enemy is a child of God. Many believe our "friend" or "neighbor" is only someone of our own people. The Catholic church, e.g., says an oath to a heretic need not be kept. The Shulchan Aruch states: He who transgresses a law out of spite, e.g., shatness, may be killed. Such laws could come into existence only because the letter of the Law was master, but its spirit was misunderstood. Were we to accept the spirit of this Law, then anyone who breaks the law of loving his neighbor, in that he makes it dependent on religion, is to be called a פושע ישראל . Also, all our obligations to God and self,

are based on our God-likeness. Only as such are we free to chose between good and evil. Only when we recognize that will we no longer fear God as a slave fears his master, but love Him as a child loves his father. In that sense the best explanation of our verse is found in Ben Azzai's exposition.

2. Another Midrash states: ראוי היה אדם הראשון שנתן תורה על ידו. Adam really should have had the Torah. The Midrash quotes God as having said: יצירי כפי הוא ואיני נותן לו. But by his sin Adam proved himself unqualified, and so God commanded זה ספר תולדות אדם: This book is to be for Adam's descendants. Not for the descendants of Abraham, but for those of Adam -- for all men! Here we find the very crux of Reform Judaism. True, Scripture says תורה צוה לנו משה מורשה קהלת יעקב, but only insofar as we first chose the Torah. By our mediation it is to become ספר תולדות אדם, the Book for all men. If the claim of our Orthodox co-religionists were true that the ceremonial part of Bible, intended for Israel only, had the same significance as its ethical and credal parts, so that even in the messianic age the largest part of the Torah was still destined only for the descendants of Abraham -- then we could answer: But what about this verse? Would it not then have to be called תולדות יעקב ? But a teaching headed by the words בדמות אלהים עשה אותו, that can never mean that one people

is closer to God than another! One tribe can be the bearer of the treasure -- but not to the exclusion of another!

3. The third Midrash refers to Psalms 139:16. גלמי ראו עיניך, mine unformed substance have your eyes seen, ועל ספרך כלם יכתבו, to be made in days to come, but not one of them is at hand as yet. This book of fate, mentioned here, God showed to Adam, who saw in it all future generations. Going a step further, we see the Bible as the blueprint for all human history. The Bible thus is not only a religious text, but our (mankind's) history text as well. We have many historical books -- but one story of the Bible surpasses all of them, e.g., the story of Adam: He is happy and innocent, then sin comes, and the story ends with: Dust you are, and unto dust shall you return. Is not that the history of the whole world, of all mankind? Does not every one first live in innocence, then ripen ... יוסיף דעת יוסיף מכאוב? .....The Story of Cain and Abel is the story of false religiosity -- and there are many more stories like these. Yes, זה ספר תולדות אדם embraces all mankind. No other book in all of history has influenced the story of man as much as the Bible has.

****

The Jacob Ladder.

Volume V: 141-149. Text: Genesis 28: 10-22.

The Bible gives no explanation about the meaning

of the ladder, but we can find it in the divine revelation to Jacob: God will give Jacob's descendants the land on which the ladder is resting; they will spread out in all directions, and all the peoples of the earth shall be blessed through them. The ladder points to the basic principles by which eventually all generations are to be blessed. These proclaim: 1. One creation; 2. One man; 3. One humanity -- all as the necessary sequence of the teaching of the one God.

1. One creation: This refers to the אחדות המציאות already mentioned in the Moreh. Heathenism denies this, it thinks of nature as a constant battle between darkness and light, and thus its gods are divided into categories of good and evil. Abraham first saw creation as a ladder on which active forces climbed up and down, but always as God's angels, guarded by the One at the top of the ladder. How did Abraham get to know God? The Midrash tells us that he first prayed to the sun; he saw it descend in the evening. Then the moon and the stars came and disappeared. He then understood that these were מלאכי אלהים עלים וירדים, and that the Deity must be invisible. This picture of the ladder is the true antithesis to the Babylonian tower, whose top also was to reach to heaven. But in our picture that which is divided finds its catalytic agent in God, Who unites them; here reason is the top rung of the ladder, but still far below God. Here lies the refugee from his

father's home -- is that the picture of a God? Hardly, but it is the picture of the king of created beings! For even in his shackles -- what activity! In his mind there are dream pictures עלים וירדים בו, which lift themselves to God, and stray far into the future. He, the wanderer, dreams that his spiritual seed will some day master all minds. In Babylon, however, man wanted to climb and put himself next to God. The Babylonians were an arrogant people, deeming themselves deities. God did not send lightning to destroy them, for such deities must of necessity destroy themselves. They quarreled, their languages became mixed, and each of them, ashamed, heard the divine call: Your own passion will destroy you. Look up, and you will see what you could have acquired!

2. One man. Our Ancients already called man עולם קטן, a microcosmos: In a miniature way every man has all the phenomena of a world within him. Man thus is, as the universe, a ladder, his foot is in the dust, his eternal spirit in the heavens. Heathenism was divided against itself here also. Man's earthly sojourn is for the heathens a state of refuge, the only possible salvation is release from earthly bonds. Even religions that believe in only one God, but leave room for heathen concepts, believe in the innateness and the origin of evil in man. Were they to be asked: Whence this uncleanness?

What is the sin of the innocent babe? They would answer: אבותינו חטאו ואינם , the children must pay for the sins of the parents. Not so is God's teaching: There everybody comes forth pure from God's hand, endowed with each יצר. Our earthly powers may be the mother of evil, but they are not evil itself! No! Earth can be an Eden for us -- if we are driven forth, it is by our own sins, for while our feet are in the dust, our heads are in heaven -- we can make of the situation whatever we want! If we do wrong, then we do not climb the ladder to heaven like the angels: We may climb mountains of gold, with much trouble -- but once at the top, there is no God, only a gravestone!

3. One humanity. This is also brought out by our text of the ladder. In the beginning mankind was in the dust, clinging to the material, but slowly it is rising to heaven and is purifying itself. Here also heathenism finds only discord. How can one, who has contempt for his own unclean being, have regard for others? Heathenism has love in its mouth, but never enacts it. History proves that much blood has been shed in the name of love. The only true teaching is: God created man in His image. No matter how we are split up, into tribes, races, and nations, we still are all the children of one Father. Israelites are the מלאכי אלהים , as such we עלים לארץ ישראל , and then we וירדים להוצה

לארץ , down all the rungs of the ladder, to unite all men into one congregation. It is merely a reminder of heathenism to think that Israel will always occupy a separate position, even in the messianic age. As others blame the sins of their forebears, so our Orthodox co-religionists claim that we are in exile because אבותינו חטאו ואינם -- but no -- we are not exiled children, but מלאכי אלהים with a mission. This must penetrate to all our people -- salvation is not on Zion alone, but wherever we erect a stone and annoint it with the oil of reverence. No longer do we need bloody animal sacrifices, but only the ethical deed .....

****

Volume V: 202-211. Text: Genesis 26: 18-22.

TEXT: The three wells dug by Isaac.

Our Ancients already tried to find a meaning for the full description of the three wells dug by Isaac. For us these wells picture three levels of development: 1. The patriarchs; 2. From Moses to the end of the Biblical era; 3. The collective history of the Jewish people from its inception to this day.

1. The patriarchs. עשק , the name of the first well, means "division," as there must be of necessity wherever new wells of the spirit are dug. שטנה means resistance, necessary wherever something new is to be founded, and something traditional and inherited is to be defended against enemies. רחובות means expansion,

continuing to build. The Patriarchs are examples for the following generations; they were the first to open the well of religion for the heathen world, thirsty for true religion. Yet these three, despite their unity of purpose, were different in their strivings. Abraham, the first well digger in the heathen desert, is the cornerstone on which the future was to be built. His well was עשק, fight, division, a strong stand against heathen cults. He was the אב המון גוים . Isaac is a picture of faithfulness to that which he inherited from his father. He was a passive force, willing to be sacrificed. His father dug the spiritual well, he built a dam to protect it. It was he who kept the well open and the waters flowing. Tradition calls him the עלה תמימה-- his father was the high priest, he the sacrifice without blemish. His passivity ran through his whole life. His wife was obtained for him without choice. Abraham received a divine revelation to prefer Isaac above the first born Ishmael, Isaac had no such revelation, he even preferred the rough uncouth Esau to the gentle Jacob, who strove for higher things. He was a tool, for only by divine guidance, not by his own free will, did he give Jacob the first blessing. But, recognizing divine providence, he said to Esau regarding Jacob: גם ברוך יהיה . His was a friendly nature, he did not fight. Therefore he was the only one among the patriarchs

whose name was not changed -- which, among the ancient Hebrews, was always of great significance, pointing to a spiritual revolution. He was followed by Jacob, who was fighting already even within the womb. Jacob also received his greatest spiritual treasure from Abraham, but he was the man of רחובות, the man of expansion. He had to fight for the right of the firstborn, all his life was troubled. He was a refugee to Charan; under the open sky God revealed the future greatness of his descendants to him. Upon awaking, he dedicated a stone as בית אלהים. He had to fight for his wife, he was forced to leave her homeland by stealth. Almost returned to his own home, so the legend tells us, an angel attempted to stop him, but he won out over the angel and was named Israel.

The different methods utilized by the patriarchs in fighting for their believes are similar to the way in which Israel varied in its actions throughout history. Since the inception of our people as the God-people on the stage of the world, there are three periods; each personified by one of the patriarchs: A. The period of the foundation laying, B. The preserving period, C. The period of development and expansion.

2. The time of Moses to the closing of the talmudic period saw many events: Despite the many centuries involved, it seems like a short period for the tremendous spiritual activity that took place during that

time. All that is big and magnificent in Judaism was born during that period. The cornerstone of our very life, of our essence and activity, was the Sinaitic revelation. There we were called to our task. As Abraham defied Nimrod in אור כשדים so Moses defied Pharoah in Egypt. But Moses' teaching was not a mere reformation of what the patriarchs had taught -- they only knew God as שד׳, the highest Power in heaven and on earth -- Moses knew Him as ד׳, the sole power of heaven and earth, whose greatness is merely reflected by the universe. Moses first recognized Him as the Judge, and yet also as the Father of all men, who even requires לפנים משורת הדין, self sacrificing love. Moses formed a nation to receive and guard the God-given Law. As Abraham on his travels to Canaan dwelt many years in Charan, because he found it difficult to leave his old home with all its customs and habits, thus Israel, while in the desert, over and over again expressed its longing for Egypt. Finally Palestine was conquered and the Temple was built. This cistern of religion was temporarily stopped -- וישתמום פלשתים -- it was closed up by the Babylonians, but like the well of old, it was redug. Then the Second Temple was built and destroyed. But the old cistern was out of commission, many stones and much dust had accumulated within it, rendering it useless. The wise Teachers of the time adapted Scripture to contemporary life, and so the talmudic age began. The stream of water

had become too mighty for the old cistern, it had overflowed its source, tearing along the now useless cult institutions. This stream went far beyond the boundaries of Palestine among the nations. Talmudism's spirit of course was far removed from a messianic calling -- it actually fills us with the idea of separatism. But this period also was necessary; for the homeless it provided a substitute for their home. But even in this talmudic spirit there were the germs of the messianic age. The Talmud says מצוות בטילות לעתיד לבא -- in the messianic age the Mosaic ceremonial Law will be abolished. It also says that our suffering is to atone for the sins of the nations, האומות מתכפרון ביסוריהין של ישראל. It further teaches that the Third Temple will be built by God Himself out of fire -- i.e. the holy flame of the divine spirit will consume all the world, and make of it a pure altar. True, these ideas could not take root immediately, but their germ was already present, to bloom at the proper time.

3. All Jewish history. With the closing of the talmudic period, the cornerstone for the future building had been laid. Now came the period of sacrifice, which has lasted to the present day. It is the picture of Isaac ready to be sacrificed -- the difference being that in this instance the sacrifice actually does take place. There is no progress there, merely passive suffering. It

is the period of ice and snow, protecting the seed until spring, until we can say כי עתה הרחיב ד' לנו ופרינו בארץ. This new period, so like Jacob's period, is the present time. Even as Jacob quarreled with his older brother, so we must find the older Judaism. We must gain the blessing of our Father, then build. But as soon as we had begun that, a cry arose in the Orthodox camp, even as Esau had once cried: את בכרתי לקח. They cry it even today, many of them with ham in their mouth, looking for their משיח. Nevertheless we shall win, for our motto is רחובות -- not destruction, but expansion. We shall fight until our enemies will feel their defeat and acknowledge us as victors saying שירת עם אלהים ועם אנשים והוכל.

****

Volume V: 333-341. Text: Exodus 4: 14-27.

TEXT: Moses is to meet Aaron; the circumcision of Moses' son. Moses had two encounters on his way from Median to Egypt, the angel of death and the angel of peace -- Aaron, אוהב שלום ורודף שלום. The first could not approach him, for Moses still had a great task before him. The second welcomed him with a kiss. The third figure in the picture is a woman, who attempts to buy off the angel of death by the circumcision of her child. These figures give us a few worthwhile lessons: 1. Spiritual heroes, as other men, must struggle with fate, but each hurdled difficulty gives them new strength and confidence;

2. Only God's Covenant unifies humanity with eternal love and unshakable faithfulness; and 3. Truth is greater than peace.

1. The picture of the returning hero struggling with an angel is a familiar one; we know it from the story of Jacob, who thereafter is called Israel, a glorious fighter against man and against Elohim, the powers of fate. Perhaps Jacob also was merely ill even as Moses, an illness that left him with a lame thigh. At any rate, both Jacob and Moses had to fight an unforeseen calamity. Thus all heroes of God must fight -- not only human enemies, but also lies and darkness, as well as fate. Examine men who are the pride of nations -- rarely do we find them as favorites of fate. Usually they have passed through severe trials; after their death they received stone memorials, during their lifetime they had no bread. After their death their birthdays are national holidays, during their existence they fondered in exile; from their graves arise worlds of lights, during their existence the ruling orders had condemned them to death! Yet they never faltered. These trials were only means to steel their strength. God's flame changed their shackles to wings, their tears of pain became the purest oil to nourish their flames. In this lay the blessings that lifted the patriarchs to new heights of faith. Moses was in a somewhat similar situa-

tion; up to this point of our narrative he hesitated about his divine calling. True, he began his trek to Egypt, but strangely enough -- as already the Midrash and Ibn Ezra note -- he went with his wife and children, as if he were going to settle in Egypt, not lead out a people. He became ill; in this he saw a divine punishment, and thus promised to send back his wife and children (ancient Bible exegetes connect the וישלח את אשתו with v. 14 ויחר אף ד' במשה). Zipporah, who could hardly have known of his gigantic plans, misinterpreted his command that she go back, she thought her husband had become estranged from her. She circumcised her child, and said חתן דמים אתה לי -- now that I have even given the blood of my child for you, you are wed to me anew. What is important however, is that Moses did send his wife back.* Now that all doubt had left Moses, the angel of death, which according to the legend had wound itself around his body as a snake, became his divine rod, even as earlier his other rod had turned into a snake.

2. Let us now look at the meeting of the brothers. In the case of Jacob and Esau, Scripture states וירץ עשו לקראתו ויפל על צוארו ויחבקהו וישקהו ויבכו. But despite this warm meeting, they almost immediately fell

---

*Cp. v. 36, Ibn Ezra, to Exodus 18: 2 and Rashi, Ibid., who quotes from the Mechilta: Aaron was astonished that Moses had brought his family, whereupon the latter sent them back.

apart again -- and how could it be otherwise? Jacob still strove for the higher things in life, Esau was still the materialist. The blood of brothers in such a case may motivate noble sentiments momentarily, but then the prime motives of each must come to the fore again -- and so each went his own way. But in the case of Moses and Aaron it was different. Well can we apply the words of the Midrash here חסד ואמת נפגשו צדק ושלום נשקו. Aaron, in high regard among his brethren in Egypt, who had prepared the people,* willingly takes the lesser charge, to be the interpreter for his brother. Involuntarily we cry out הנה מה טוב ומה נעים שבת אחים גם יחד. Here there is not the blood-tie of the חתן דמים, but the higher אש שלמעלה of holy enthusiasm, that unites for lasting love, and immediately purged all impure feelings as soon as they arose. And thus they were united in their respective callings to the very end of their days.

3. We know that Moses stood higher than Aaron from the great teaching: צדק ואמת stand higher than שלום וחסד. True, the latter stands very high: It represents the most beautiful lot of mankind in the messianic age. But combined with the former it represents a peace that is rooted in truth, a love rooted in justice. Aaron was well equipped to take the place of Moses as a leader, as he proved with the incident of the golden calf.

*Tanchuma: אמר משה עד של עמדתי ח' אהרון אחי מתנבא לחם שמנים שנק Cp. Ibn Ezra to אהרון אחיך הלוי and Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel II: 47.

Moses was a giant prophet, shaking the heathen world with his spirit. In his anger he even smashed the tablets, he ground the golden idol, and commanded the people to drink its dust with their water. That shows little mildness, but the Law he gave was full of love and kindness, rooted in truth, as shown in his attitude to the stranger, the slave, and even to animals. In Aaron the desire for peace was so highly developed, that even his moral convictions were affected by them, witness the incident of the אגל. He attained fame only in the reflection of his greater brother, as the interpreter of his words. He prepared the people in Egypt for the coming of their redeemer, but he himself was not capable of filling that role. This proves that under the present religious struggles we cannot accept the glittering peace but must take truth as our motto. The question is: Shall we permit the present religious petrification to continue, or shall we break it. Sores as ours are never healed by little plasters, they need painful operations. People love to put the romance and the swindel of beauty in the place of truth, but those are at best flowers for the grave which truth alone can open. The kiss of Esau for Jacob -- that was a rotten peace! True peace lies in the meeting of love and truth, when justice and peace kiss one another. That is the peace with which God may bless us ...

****

Volume V: 365-373. Text: Exodus 6: 6-8.

What was Israel's crime that it had to suffer under Egypt's bondage? The first link of this iron chain had been forged by the sale of Joseph to Egypt, but why did the children have to suffer for the sins of the fathers? The question was discussed frequently by our ancestors, but always on the premise that man's sufferings never came without cause. But this is contradictory to Biblical teaching. Temporal evils, according to this teaching, are not always punishments for transgressions, they are often only trials to glorify single individuals or entire nations, to steel them for their calling. That is the solution to the riddle. Every moral battle is in a sense a temporal evil, every practice of virtue requires some self-mastery and sacrifices. Such battles are necessary for human destiny, but there are also battles of fate which we must fight without having been their cause. These strengthen our powers and help to fulfill our high mission. Thus Scripture, in regard to the forty year desert sojourn states למען ענתך ולמען נסתך להיטבך באחריתך. God wanted to humble us, to do well by us in the end. We can apply this also to the period of Egyptian slavery. That period merely constituted the pangs of birth. The slavery in Egypt was the cornerstone of the institutions of healing which God wanted to create through Israel. It is our aim to prove this hereby:

1. The slavery of Egypt was an indispensable means towards the preservance of the Jewish nationality. Our special nationhood unquestionably was the central pillar of the giant building of prophecy. Even if its teachings of one God and of one humanity were from the very beginning aimed towards the goal of the unification of all nations under the sovereignty of the One and Only, nevertheless these treasures had to be gathered in one place, in one nation in the midst of heathendom, to permit its plans of world conquest to function. Israel was this nation, and in the beginning could not be separated too much from the misconceptions of the surrounding world. The conscience of its spiritual position had to be absorbed into its very being, had to dominate its life. The farther its effect was to reach eventually, the closer it had to withdraw within itself at first. And how could such preparation have better taken place than through the communal life in Egypt? Egypt was the greatest nation of the day, which, with its rich civilization and attractive exuberance, would have necessarily absorbed the Hebrew colony. In the beginning the separated dwelling places of Goshen might have provided sufficient protection. Scripture testifies clearly how strong the remembrances of Joseph's deathbed prophecy were, for it tells us that the new Pharoah, who had not known Joseph, was afraid that the Israelites might unite with an enemy that would come from the East ועלה מן הארץ -- and would

go up from the land, i.e. out of Egypt and towards Canaan, proving how strong the desire was for the Promised Land. But soon Israel spread from Goshen throughout the land, forgetting tradition, for such is the nature of an immigrant people in a land whose inhabitants are more numerous and stand on a higher plane of culture, to assimilate amongst them and be integrated with them under such conditions. What then preserved their unity? Why is it that after a sojourn of four hundred years they still had their Hebraic names, had a separate, if heathen, cult? Our Ancients taught: Israel was redeemed from Egypt because it did not change its language and its name; that is to say they preserved their separate nationality. The only means for that was the people's enslavement. The iron chain became a tie of love, whereby God's hand held His people together.

2. In another respect also Egyptian slavery was a step in the preparation of Israel's calling: Slavery was most suitable to make the people susceptible to its teachings after it had been liberated. Man, created בדמות אלהים is born free to rule as king over creation, be he of any race whatever -- עבדי הם ולא עבדים לעבדים. Mosaism tolerated slavery only as an evil which had to be dissolved, unless the whole structure of society was to fall. Such teachings would best be accepted by a people that had been reared in slavery, which had endured tyranny, and to which God Himself had called out ואשבר מטות עלכם ואולך אתכם קממיות. It was God's work

which the Pharoahs called rebellion, God's hand overthrew their so-called "historical rights," in the name of which men were treated as animals, and sucklings were torn from their mothers' breasts. Sinai taught: Away with crowns, the right to which is born with men, which are inherited as a pestilence from generation to generation. There are no born nobles, as little as there are born slaves. It is a desecration of God's name to have millions of beings, created in His image, ruled by one their equal, and he often mentally limited and ethically unnerved! ד' מלך God must rule! A republic, under His dominion, ruled by His holy Law -- that is the natural form of government. And where could such an order have been applied better than in a tribe that had felt the capricious rule of a human kingdom in its full strength, which had experienced such tyranny, and had seen the most sacred privileges of man downtrodden? God taught us mildness at Sinai, to give bread to the hungry, to clothe the naked. The prophet taught us to be humble, to walk with God. When the slave leaves his master, give him of the best! אם אמאס משפט עבדי ואמתי -- ומה אעשה כי יקום אל וכי יפקד מה אשיבנו הלא בבטן עשני עשהו ? ויכוננו ברחם אחד.

All these teachings even today are not being obeyed by millions -- then how could they have been accepted millenia ago, unless it was by a people that had experienced pain? To such alone could God call ואתם ידעתם את נפש הגר -- Only

a people that knew what bitterness meant could appear as the herald of the most noble humaneness amongst the barbarity of that age, to attain by its teachings and its life the titles of רחמנים and גומלי חסדים. That is why Israel had to live in Egypt under tyranny. The nation that is destined to carry the highest wisdom, the strictest justice and the deepest love had to experience lies, hatred and injustice before it could begin its historical mission.

3. Only such an education could give us the training necessary for our calling. What is good for a man is good for a people: טוב לגבר כי ישא על בנעוריו. Israel's task lasted for millenia. We are the wanderers, in many lands of the old world treated worse than the negroes are treated here אל תראני שאני שחרחרת ששזפתני השמש בני אמי נחרו בי. The years could not break us -- such strength is shown only by a people that has had preparation for the ordeal. "The sons of my mother were angry with me" שמני נטרה את הכרמים כרמי שלי לא נטרתי. Our training then was not a curse, but a blessing bestowed upon us through God's wisdom. Only from the cry of the desert, where God found us and whence He took us, can the jubilation of Eden spring forth in the future.

****

From Marah to Elim.

Volume VII: 36-44. Text: Exodus 15: 22-27.

December 28, 1862.

Marah means bitterness, Elim means power and

strength. This section of the Torah portrays a great truth: That man is called through Marah, bitter struggle, to reach Elim, the highest unfolding of his strength. Even as God's wars have no other goal than to bring a true peace, so many, after God's example, must wage war against the powers of fate and men and experience many hardships to gain in strength and to obtain victory. This we shall attempt to prove by the way of 1. Each single man; 2.. All mankind; and 3. Israel.

1. Each single man. Usually many pains are experienced before the weak child becomes a strong man. Man, the king of all creatures, is born for weaker than all other beings. The child constantly searches -- it breaks a doll, not out of a desire to destroy, but to gain knowledge. Childhood days are commonly called golden days, because they are free of guilt and worries. But we cannot deny that those days are richer in tears than in laughter. The tree that is man grows up from an עמק הבכא. Then comes adolescence, with confidence and pride, until manhood arrives. No matter how high the floods, they cannot tear the young tree loose -- וירהנו שם על המים. Then how much struggle until self-sufficiency is reached, until a livelihood is found! Man goes across oceans to find it, and then the golden fruit is his, and he looks back from Elim to Marah. Man must struggle desperately to obtain his highest goods:

Moral good! Often there are voices of sirens that attempt to lull his conscience, thunder-claps of fate deafen him to the point where he would deny his God, that he might wallow in common passions, carrying his high prerogatives like נזם זהב באף חזיר. But it is in man's power to conquer his fate, to go from Marah to Elim. Then comes the last struggle on earth. The struggle against death -- and again man goes from Marah to Elim, to God. How foolish those who know only the ego, not recognizing that the body is an image of all creation, that this it is the משכן ד'.

2. All mankind. Adam lived in Eden, safe from harm, surrounded by nature's plenty. Then God's voice, i.e. an inner drive of nature, commanded him not to eat of a certain fruit. But his free will drove him to break the prohibition and to partake of the fruit. He was free for the first time to distinguish between good and evil, he became cognizant of his Godlikeness, and his rulership. Of course, this deed cost him Eden, his childhood. But nevertheless he went from Marah to Elim; in the place of what he lost he gained the conscience of his royal dignity, instead of innocence he was able to gain virtue. The same is true in all world history. Whenever we wish to gain higher levels of cognition it must be by the way of Marah. Let us take some examples. How much the reformation of the church has cost us in sixteen centuries! Bloody civil wars,

beautiful countries became cemeteries, nations fought each other for centuries like wild beasts. All this came to an end, but the blessings it brought will never cease, the blessings of free endeavor and freedom of conscience. What boundless confusion reigned with the beginning of the French Revolution! It went so far that for a moment war was even declared on the heavenly Monarch. But these wild muddy waters ran off, and what remained were the blessings of civil liberty and the idea of freedom of worship. Monarchy received its deathblow then, it remains weak to this day, shaken by constitutions and the dogma of the God-spirit that calls man to rule himself under the laws of God and the equality of all citizens משפט אחד יהיה לכם כגר כאזרח. In our own country at the present time there is Marah. Who would not shed tears over the many victims already taken by this Civil War, over the rift in this once mighty people, the dangers that threaten this asylum of freedom, both from within and from without? But we may be sure that this great republic shall come forth from this battle gloriously and victoriously -- only much purer. We may be certain that it is on the road from Marah to Elim. History does not lie, it always goes forward, never backward; it is impossible that a slave state can arise here. Slavery will be destroyed, the goal of this fight is הלא אב אחד לכלנו הלא אל אחד בראנו מדוע נבגד איש באחיו. All monarchs cannot prevent our victory יושב בשמים ישחק --

for God scoffs at such an idea, and calls out לא בחיל ולא בכח כי אם ברוחי .

3. Israel. Here the way from Marah to Elim is best illustrated. Under Egyptian bondage we grew from a family of seventy to a nation of a few hundred thousand. When the pressure of the shackles was at its very highest, God carried us from Marah to Elim וירחנו שם על המים . The twelve tribes were equal to the שתים עשרה עינות מים of the divine revelation, the seventy people who emigrated to Egypt were שבעים תמרים with many tasty fruits. We were permitted independence only a few centuries, then we were exiled to Babylonia. What pain this caused! But this pain gave birth to the glow of love which Israel bears its God and His teachings. In this exile the prophets were truly uplifted. The people left their homeland poor, but they returned immensely enriched. The nation went from Marah to Elim, and the seventy years of exile became seventy palm trees, rich in shade and fruit. Then came the Syrian Antiochus and he was offset by the heroic Maccabees. Then came the biggest catastrophe, the destruction of the Second Temple. Who can measure the fear and the pain of our people? There was not one place in the world the eternal pilgrim did not visit. Israel's history contains more wisdom, more character, and more philosophy in one single page than all novels and all atheistic writings! It teaches man to sing of great ideas while mounting a funeral pyre, it teaches how

dungeons can be palaces in a world where people thought they had to strew the path to the grave of a Rabbi raised to divinity with big piles of Jewish corpses. And yet our people could cry: Today we are slaves, but next year freemen! Still we call to God ויעשו כלם אגודה אחת . But from Marah we shall go to Elim. Our painful scattering is to bring blessing to the nations, which, according to ancient tradition, numbered seventy. The twelve fountains of ancient Israel shall water these seventy palms, til the earth be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. We are still far from this goal, but we have triumphed already in many instances, and are constantly advancing. Let us never forget that God always leads from Marah to Elim!

****

The Divine Thronecarriage.

Volume VII: 96-102. Text: Ezekiel 1: 5-26.

The מרכבה, of which our forebears would not speak openly, is nothing but a symbol of our immeasurable and wonderful universe. The heavens are the trone of God, the earth is His footstool. The Midrash explains that the lion, the steer, and the eagle are kings of their genuses, man is king over all creatures. These four חיות are the bearers of the divine throne, representatives of the magnificence of God in Creation. Their spirit is in the accompanying wheels, i.e. movement is life, inactivity is

death. The animals and their wheels always go forward, never backward. Everything in the world moves forward to a goal. This goal is determined and foreseen by the team's exalted Driver. The wheels have eyes. The movement is not blind, led by chance -- no, there is an עין ראה, an all-seeing eye, there is a Providence which guides the steps of all creatures, a wise, all-embracing spirit, which leads the spirit in the wheels. Each of the four beings has wings that point upward, i.e. all beings, rational or irrational, have a selfconscious or dark longing for their invisible Creator, holding out their wings to Him like arms. This praise of God is what the prophet calls קול כנפיהם. Let us restrict ourselves this time to the noise made by these wings, which the prophet describes as כקול מים רבים כקול שדי קול המלה כקול מחנה. Bachya, in his Torah Commentary* explains that the prophet wanted to bring out the four properties of the noise. This noise is intricate, ריבוי הקולות; the comparison to mighty waters shows that the noise is never interrupted, התמדת הקול. The comparison with the voice of the Almighty's voice shows the equality of all the voices, and the comparison with the noise of a camp shows the harmony of the various tones, קבוץ תנועות הקולות. On this basis let us now examine the voices that proclaim God's majesty and His will in the universe, the same voices

*To Leviticus 1: 1.

that spoke to Moses and to Israel at Sinai. Even as these voices are many, so there are many hosts that praise the Creator, His power, His love, His kindness and His justice. They sound in 1. The visible worlds of bodies; 2. The invisible worlds of the human mind; 3. The course of history.

1. The visible worlds of bodies. How manifold they are! Who can count them? Even the little which we can view with our senses -- how high it is above our comprehension! Even the wisest of the wise must say אחכמה והיא רחקה ממני. It is too high for me! It is thus up to the lightgiving Seraphim, the stars, in their endless courses, among them some whose light we can see only when they have traversed a path of millenia, or even to the throne of the divine Majesty itself! Man has done great things in comprehending the movement of the heavenly bodies, in calculating the course of certain stars, and in discovering new planets occasionally. This can only lead us to the glorification of the unexplorable Omniscience, to the maxim of the famous philosopher of old who said: The peak of knowledge is to know how little we know. A man of open eyes and sound mind can only exclaim ברכו* ד' מלאכיו גבורי כח עשי דברו לשמוע בקול דברו and הללוהו שמי השמים.

2. The invisible worlds of the human mind. Who can measure that which we call reason, emotions or con-

---

*Psalms 103: 20.

science? Who can tell the moment when nature breaks the veil of unconsciousness so that the child can first say "I"? Who can fathom the depth of the heart? It is a harp of many strings, touched sometimes by angels of love, at other times by furies of passion. And then man's conscience. All our acts, premeditated or spontaneous, are engraved there, to react on the heart, their birthplace, to make it an Eden or a hell. Who can fathom this mirror in which we see ourselves, no matter how tightly we shut our eyes? Let the sinner attempt to flee its images, not to listen to its voice -- it is in vain! It looks at us with love or with anger, its image is the reason within us, it alone is the חי, ever living, standing as the highest angel next to the throne of God.

3. The course of history. Look at the long line of growing and dying nations, the world of man, progressing always to higher levels of cognition, of ethics and freedom. It proclaims eternal justice, when God's hand is stretched out to destroy a collossus; eternal love, carrying the smallest from the dust of the earth to the highest heaven; eternal wisdom destroying malice and bringing it to the grave, and this grave changes to a fount of truth and ethics. Yes, the wheels of the universe have eyes -- God's spirit lives within them, guiding them. And the חיות, driven by these wheels,

always go forward, never back. Even those that go in a constant circle have a purpose as servants of God. The pride of these חיות is the human face -- whether it is white, red or black -- it is the highest bearer of the divine throne. These חיות have wings, and through the noise of these wings God speaks to man, even as the חיות sing to Him: קדוש קדוש קדוש ד' צבאות מלא כל הארץ כבודו.

****

The Divine Thronecarriage.

Volume VII: 123-130. Text: Ezekiel 1: 5-26.

Let us once more consider the voices of the wings. We shall prove today that they sound on without interruption. כקול מים רבים. As the seas sound on and on, so do these voices, never being silent, always singing שירה to God on high. השמים מספרים כבוד אל ומעשה ידיו מגיד הרקיע יום ליום יביע אמר; there is eternal motion, eternal praise. Sun, moon and stars move eternally, sending forth their rays, proclaiming: The God of love has sent me! Occasionally clouds cover their rays, the wings seem to sink down, the heavenly bodies seem to pause in their courses as if the spirit has fled them. But this stand-still is only an appearance. The clouds are torn, and their rays break forth once more. In passing one another, the one Seraph may hide another momentarily -- but then the hidden one appears once more כגבור ישיש לרוץ ארח. If two trains or ships meet there

often is a catastrophe, even the greatest care of men cannot prevent that. But the heavenly trains, immeasurably greater, going with speed millions of times as great, never touch each other! And as in the heavens so on earth מלא כל הארץ כבודו. As the birds so the trees look on high כל עצי השדה ימחאו כף, they cry out: From one small seed God in His wisdom has raised us ההרים והגבעות יפצחו לפניכם רנה, God has raised us from the depth of the earth. Endless is the tone-ladder on which living beings praise God from the lowest worm to the proud lion and royal man. And can we describe the restless motion in the mind of men, the thousands of thoughts and emotions that course through heart and mind מכסות את גויתהנה, to provide the body with its necessities? But plants and men, they all must pass away. Then the atheist cries: איה אלהיכם -- but, you blind ones, they never cease! The waters whirl under the ice, the seed grows in the earth, seemingly in its grave. The outer shell may disintegrate and disappear, but never so the spirit. The seed lives most when apparently it is dying. The Targum Jonathan declares to our text: The animals with their wheels stand still in the moment when God's voice speaks in its full majesty. Thus it is with all visible structures. Here we can apply the words of the Preacher: דור הולך ודור בא והארץ לעולם עמדת. Not an atom is lost in creation, from seeming death comes new life. God commands, and covers are shed, for a moment it seems like all activity has ceased -- but then the

spirit emerges, clad anew. And this higher spirit in man -- not the low spirit of the animal nature, but the rational spirit, it comes forth. Some might say: True, this spirit lives, in that it is carried over to other creatures, e.g. parents give life to their children. Can parents pass thinking rationality to their children? As a rule, is there not a great difference in this respect between parents and children? Only memory and phantasy, which belong in the realm of the lower animal spirit of man decrease as we grow older, but not reason, conscience, and the desire to explore things. And what place is there for the higher spirit, once the earthly form ceases to exist, but to go on to a much higher sphere than this earthly life? Should the king be uprooted while the slave goes on? No, the king, once his slave is gone, goes to the King of Kings! Here we can apply the words of our text ובהנשא החיות מעל הארץ ינשאו האופנים. The spirit, born from God, and bearer of the divine throne, when its wheels stop, and its wings seem broken, is listening to the voice of God, which cries שובי אלי, return to your Father and Judge, harvest of the seed you have sown! Then it rises with its wheels beyond the earth, to sink down at the foot of the divine throne. What happens there even the greatest prophets do not know עין לא ראתה אלהים זולתך. Leave it to dreamers or lying prophets to fill hells with skulls and fiery coals, paradise with trees and fruits of gold, and

a לויתן. But remember, there is an eternal life, an eternal conscience, and an eternal Judge. Only in this sense is there a גן עדן or a גהינם, remember עין ראה ואזן שמעה וכל מעשיך בספר נכתבים -- אין שכחה לפני כסא כבודו.

And does the noise of the wings ever cease in the course of history? No one can miss God's guidance in his own life, events prove that ד' חקרתני וחדע ותשת עלי כפרה. That is in our own life, but even louder can we hear the call of divine foresight in the history of nations. Here we see our ethically-holy God, אל קנא צדק ומשפט מכון כסאו אש לפניו תלך ותלהט סביב צריו תאירו ברקיו תבל. And what is the basic law of world history? The most proud and mightiest colossus falls if it has no ethical foundation, but the most tender seed will grow and become a world ruler, even if millions seek to wipe it out. Think of Rome and Jerusalem, and תולעת יעקב, the small worm of Judah that was victorious over the giant snake. Small as a worm, pursued by herds of lions, we have maintained ourselves, to build the structure of truth everywhere. Here also it seems on occasion as though truth has ceased because of the noise of lies, and many ask איה אלהיכם. But when history seems to have gone backwards, in reality it is making a fresh start for the salvation of mankind. Every apparent triumph of evil is only another nail in its coffin. The brothers of Joseph thought they were rid of him when they sold him -- but

they only started his career. That is the beauty of the centuries, that lies always dig their own graves. The wings do not rest, they make so much noise that המו גוים מטו ממלכות, the nations quake בקולו תמוג ארץ, the earth shakes because of the noise, and the wheels overpower hostile armies, raising humanity on high with the cry ד' ימלך לעלם ועד .

****

The Divine Thronecarriage.

Volume VII: 154-158. Text: Ezekiel: 1.

We spoke last of the uninterrupted continuance of the voices of the wings; let us now discuss 1. Their equality in strength; 2. Their internal harmony.

1. Their equality in strength. According to our text the noise of the wings was כקול שדי, which means, according to Kimchi, like the noise of thunder: Wherever God's voice is heard, it is heard with equal strength by anyone who does not shut his ears willfully. Loudest and most directly God speaks to man, for he is the real Sanctuary of God. There the word of the Psalmist finds its best application: ובהיכלו כלו אמר כבוד and also לבי ובשר ירננו, אל חי . Our Ancients term man an עולם קטן, a microcosm. Man is the ruler over all the living, as we can clearly see from the picture of Ezekiel, where everyone of the Chayoth has a human hand under its wings. Man's conscience has an אריאל, a lion of God; man's

heart with its memories and hopes has the wings of an eagle. Man's body, a mirror of the universe, is called a צלם אלהים; his royal forehead is a heavenly firmament, beneath which stars of thoughts twinkle. His eyes encompass unmeasured space, his tongue can be a poisonous dagger or an aeolian harp; his hand ennables him to change wildernesses into Edens. It lies under the wings of the חיות as a sign of its calling to awaken the latent powers of creation, to be a שותף במעשה בראשית. But also outside of man there are voices which proclaim God's glory בקול שדי. All irrational creatures are ruled by immutable rational laws, which are a mirror of divine wisdom. Man's first God idea came from the heights and the depths, as the heathens even held sun, moon and stars to be divine. "Raise your eyes on high," so the prophet calls out וראו מי ברא אלה. "Listen to the staggering voice," so cries the wise man in Job. The marvelous grouping of tribes, the color-blending of the races, the integration of the peculiar qualities and capabilities of the various nations, their progress in the fields of arts and sciences, from the work of תובל קין to our trains and machines, the first imitations of the sounds of nature to language -- are not all these proof of the divine Guide, that sound from one end of the earth to the other? They are proof that God's spirit is in the wheels on which the generations roll on, that God,

the Father of humanity, rules, that the חיות are called to spread their wings ever higher!

2. Their internal harmony. The voices of the wings, which seem so countless, are harmonized כקול מחנה. As all the parts of an army listen only to the voice of one commander, so also the heavenly hosts. Their voices are in different tones, they move in opposite directions, but are all messengers of the same Master, executing His high will, משפט ד' אמת צדקו יחדיו. The confusion is only a seeming one, even as the seeming standstill of nature. God עושה שלום במרומיו, there is harmony and peace. The earth shakes at God's voice, and yet we can hear it קול דממה דקה. It is the same voice heard in the first cry of the newly born child, the last whisper of the dying, the song of praise of the morning star. Even Satan, according to Biblical teaching, stands worshipping before the throne of God. He, as the man that wrestled with Jacob, wants to be conquered by his opponent, to adorn him with the victory crown of sanctity. The voice of God sounds in the prayer of the oppressed of our people and in the שירה of Moses, when Israel had been victorious. The evil deeds of a Nero and the great acts of a Washington -- they are all links in the chain of salvation by which God leads mankind to its high goal.

A D D E N D U M.

Sermon Texts

arranged in

Biblical Order.

ADDENDUM.

Index of Texts for Sermons.

Text	Type	Page.
Genesis.		
4 : 3-8	Sabbath	444
5 : 1	Sabbath	512
8 : 1-12	Sabbath	449
15: 1-12	Sabbath	468
19: 17	Sabbath	455
25: 23	Sabbath	458
26: 18-22	Sabbath	519
28: 10-22	Sabbath	515
37: 1-18	Sabbath	463
Exodus.		
3 : 11-14	Installation, Baltimore	257
4 : 14-27	Sabbath	524
6 : 6-8	Sabbath	529
12: 1-14	Pesach	341
15: 22-27	Sabbath	471
15: 22-27	Sabbath	533
17: 8-16	Sabbath Zachor	373
25: 17-21	Sabbath	476
25: 17-23	Yom Kippur	309
28: 15-30	Sabbath	494
32: 1-21	Sabbath	479
Leviticus.		
1 : 1-7	Sabbath	483
2 : 13	Sabbath	487
14: 33-45	Sabbath	490
16: 1-34	Yom Kippur	287
Numbers.		
4 : 1-33	Sabbath	434
8 : 1-4	Sabbath after Chanukkah	439
12: 4-9	Sabbath	412
13- 14:9	Sabbath	498
15: 37-41	Sabbath	502
16: 2-4	Sabbath	417
19: 13	Sabbath	422
21: 17-19	Sabbath	428
29: 35	Shemini Azereth	321
31: 19-25	Sefirath HaOmer	355
35: 1-7	Sabbath	505

ADDENDUM (cont.).

Text	Type	Page.
Deuteronomy.		
5 : 19	Shevuoth	361
6 : 4	Sabbath	509
14: 1	Yom Kippur	297
32: 7-17 and Ezek. 32: 7-17	Special Day of Atonement	377
I Samuel.		
2 : 1-10	Rosh Hashonoh	276
Isaiah.		
5 : 1-3	Sabbath	402
5 : 1-7	Installation, Philadelphia	265
9 : 5	Pesach	337
9 : 5	Tishoh BeAv	368
12: 3-5	Simchath Torah	326
Ezekiel.		
1 : 5-26	Sabbath	538
1 : 5-26	Sabbath	542
1	Sabbath	546
28: 12-18 and Deut. 32: 7-17	Special Day of Atonement	377
Haggai.		
2 : 9	July 4, 186?	391
Zecheriah.		
4 : 1-3	Yom Kippur	303
3 - 5	Chanukkah	331
Psalms.		
90: 12	Sefirath HaOmer	349
118:5-25	July 4, 1861	383
Aboth.		
V : 9	Kol Nidre Evening	283
Non-textual	Funeral	400

163286

VOLUME III.

P A R T IV.

The World Arena.

PART IV.

Section A.

The Slavery Question.

The Slavery Question.

Whatever can be said about Dr. Einhorn, whether he is labeled as a great scholar or a venomous, bitter man, no one can deny that once he had set himself a principle nothing could alter his belief. Throughout his life he fought a battle for the freedom and the equality of all men; on many occasions he emphasized in his sermons and in his writings that all men had been created by God בדמות אלהים and therefore were equals. Thus, once he entered the fray on the slavery question, he was willing to sacrifice everything for the sake of his cause. For some reason or other, indescernible to us, Einhorn did not take part in the raging conflict regarding slavery that marked the pre-Civil War political era, i.e. we have no records of his participation in the political struggle. But once the storm broke he immediately aligned himself with the abolitionists, his clarion call for freedom in the name of religion ringing loudly and clearly in the ears of all who would hear. The result was that he was attacked vehemently in the New York Evening Post, and was forced to leave Baltimore. A graphic account of his more or less dramatic flight appeared later in the Sinai, the essentials of which are appended to this section.

Einhorn had very definite believes in regard to a clergyman's political alliances. Obviously as a man

every minister enjoyed all the prerogatives and privileges of a citizen, but once he ascended the pulpit he became the spokesman for religion and thus lost all individuality. However when political opinion became a religious, a moral or an ethical issue, then it was the clergyman's solemn duty to acquaint his congregants with the views of his faith on this political question. Einhorn felt very certain of himself on this point, and published his views in the Sinai in an article entitled Politics in the Pulpit. The essence of this article is appended hereby.

This view he applied to the question of slavery. Strangely enough he did not take the initiative, but waited until another Rabbi had raised the issue. This was done by Dr. Raphael* in an address on January 4, 1861, the day proclaimed as a Day of Atonement and Prayer by the President of the United States. Einhorn proceeded to attack this speech point by point. He demonstrated that characteristically the sermons given by most Southern ministers were apologetic in nature. He cited Chaplain Stockton of the United States Congress, who prayed before that assembly: "What do they, the Southern states, want? Slavery in the States? Let them have it, not because we approve of it, but because it is there through the providential allotment of the divine Being .....". Others, such as the Rev. Dr. Cummins of Baltimore (the capital of a slave state), excused slavery as a heritage. "It is clear," so Einhorn wrote, "ethical feelings are the

*Sic. This is Dr. Morris Jacob Raphall.

masters, but the masters must bow down before the force of circumstances. It is not a question of taking the slaves from the South by force, or whether we have a right to do this -- for every ethical man would regard this as a crime. Neither is a slaveholder necessarily an immoral being, there are most honorable men amongst the slaveholders, who were raised under the aegis of this institution, and quiet their consciences by humane treatment of their slaves. The question is: Is slavery in itself an evil from the ethical viewpoint or not?"[1]. Einhorn then attacked Raphael's arguments on theological grounds; a casuistic procedure which is of absolutely no importance. However his closing words are most enlightening, in that they give us the motivation for his attack: "I am not a politician and have nothing to do with politics, but to proclaim the institution of slavery as a by God consecrated arrangement in the name of Judaism ..... that is a חלול השם ..... Only Jews who appreciate the dollar more than their God and their religion can ask this ....."[2].

The account of Einhorn's departure from Baltimore,[3]. the greater part of which was written in the first person, is in reality an apology. No blame can be attached to him for his flight, for if the account is accurate (and we have no reason to doubt this), then he really was in danger. But the fact that he left his pulpit permanently under the

described conditions sounds highly suspicious. First of all the telegram which he received offering him another pulpit "several hours after writing his letter of resignation", came just a little too conveniently. In the second place the official letter received from his congregation did request him to return, and only asked him to refrain from the controversial topics of the day. This, however, was in the nature of a request by the board of his congregation, certainly not in the nature of a demand. Had he followed the pattern of his character he would have protested such a request, perhaps even have threatened resignation. Instead, without a word of protest, he simply resigned. These two factors then, the so convenient telegram and the not following of his usual way, are most suspicious. But then again that is only an opinion, as most historical analysis is; it is a conjecture based on the facts, but since we base our opinion on "a doubtful fact" and a psychological interpretation of character and personality, it constitutes a matter that can never be proved factually.

P A R T IV.

Section B.

Swiss Intolerance.

Swiss Intolerance.

Einhorn is best known to students of American history for his willingness to leave a good post for the sake of his principles, even though, as we have just stated, that fact is highly doubtful. Be that as it may be, he proved his mettle as a fighter on numerous other occasions also. But then his voice is only one of many, and he is not singled out, for his organ (the Sinai) was not loud enough to be heard universally. Let us examine some of these situations.

As a lover of freedom and as a chauvenistic American and Jew he was highly incensed at the intolerance shown by Switzerland to Americans of the Jewish Faith. This term "Americans of the Jewish Faith" is judiciously chosen, for while it may bring about controversial opinions today, in the political scene we are about to discuss from Einhorn's viewpoint it dealt primarily with the status of citizenship. From the Swiss viewpoint, of course, it dealt primarily with affiliates of Judaism who happened to be American citizens.

The Sinai published a letter[4] by a Mr. S. MühlhÄuser dated Basel, June 17, 1858. This gentleman claimed that he and another American Jewish businessman were denied the right to settle in Berne because of their religion. The Swiss government claimed that this was "because of the multiplication of the Jewish population in

Switzerland." The truth was that the general population of Berne at the time amounted to 30,000 people, and the Jewish population amounted to -- 20 families!![5].

The matter had been brought to the attention of President Buchanan, but he had not taken any action on behalf of the Jewish Americans involved. Mr. Fay, the U. S. Ambassador to Switzerland, was married to a Swiss patrician, and in the opinion of Einhorn's correspondent was therefore strongly biased, as shown in the ambassador's letters, which were forwarded to the New York Staatszeitung for publication. These letters are unfortunately not available to us, but the letter printed in the Sinai refers to the ambassador's statements: "..... that we (i.e. the Jews) could not demand that to which we have no right."[6]. The writer protested against the commercial treaty with Switzerland which had been rejected by Dr. Webster and Henry Clay, but was later ratified through the efforts of Mr. Fay. The letter closes with protests and a request for advice.

After publishing the letter Einhorn added his own reactions. In it he proved that while he could espouse a cause fiercely he could also be diplomatic. For the moment, he stated, nothing further could be done. Four congregations sent delegations to Washington, but each appeared as the representative of all of American Jewry! Einhorn had warned against such a procedure, but his advice had been

termed as "partisan passion," and had as such been rejected. Politely these delegations were defeated by the government, but the Jewish press played it up as a wonderful thing and a victory. "The intelligentsia and the rich people" of Baltimore had a dinner to celebrate the matter, which the "poor and dumb radical-Reformers" were permitted to watch from a distance. However when the matter of expenses for the delegation was mentioned, the "rich people and the intelligentsia" were disgusted that matters of money should be mentioned for such a "holy mission" .....

It was Einhorn's opinion to leave the matter alone now, but when the treaty was to be renewed, a vehement protest should be raised by American Jewry. As for the advisability of taking legal action: Einhorn declined comment, since he claimed to know very little about law.

P A R T IV.

Section C.

The Board of Delegates of American Israelites.

The Board of Delegates of American Israelites.

On January 8, 1860, a meeting was held in Baltimore to collect funds for Jewish refugees from Morocco, who had fled to Gibraltar. Einhorn was one of the communal leaders called upon to speak. He was wholeheartedly in favor of the project, but made some remarks regarding the sponsorship of the rally. An organization calling itself the Board of Delegates of American Israelites, patterned after the Board of Deputies of British Jews, had come into existence almost overnight. Were this organization established merely for the purpose of collecting funds for charitable enterprises, Einhorn would have supported it wholeheartedly, but he was opposed to an official body of representatives of American Jewry which in his opinion would endanger religious freedom, and might, as in the case of Catholicism, be suspected of political motives. Its only raison d'etre would be the fostering of religious or political aims (for all of American Jewry), which Einhorn opposed. This so-called Board sent out a letter to the various Jewish congregations in November 1859, requesting a meeting of delegates for organizational purposes, but rather than awaiting replies, a few delegates from New York and a few other cities met hurriedly to form the organization. They did not even think it necessary to notify the various congregations of their new masters![7].

Brief speeches by Drs. Hochheimer and Illowy

followed, and then Einhorn once more took the floor to explain his attitude further. Again he emphasized that he would have no objections were the Board only an agency for the collection of charitable funds, but he very definitely suspected it of political motives.

Einhorn then, in his article reporting that meeting, rose to the very height of his sharp sarcastic humor. Bitterly he attacked the "old lion" from Philadelphia (Leeser), and then criticized the grammatical German text of the Protocolle of the Board. The German grammatical errors do not lend themselves to an English translation, but one instance of Einhorn's bitter attacks on Leeser we might try to render. Referring to the grammatical relationship of two words in the Protocolle, "since" and "therefore," Einhorn stated: "These two words may be related to each other in this text as they might fit in the following sentence: 'Since Mr. Leeser is a great עם הארץ, therefore the post of Jewish pope in America may be allotted to him.'"8.

Among other things the Board proposed to organize American Judaism to establish centers of learning to train Jewish clerics, and to set up a Jewish court of arbitration, so that litigation between Jewish individuals or corporations might be settled without appeal to civil courts. These aims Einhorn denounced. Those men, who head this Board, and cannot even compose their aims in a proper grammatical form, should be put in charge of the

training of Rabbis? Why, any German school boy can write a better composition than they can! And they should be judges? Probably according to the חשן משפט (sarcastically:) which Mr. Leeser knows so extraordinarily well! Of course the diamonds in the "breastplate of decision" would look very nice on Mr. Leeser's chest!

The "board of arbitration" was to consist of three rabbis. Well then, since this triumvirate is to come to life as soon as possible, Mr. Leeser had better get married, for a כהן גדול was forbidden bachelorhood! But why three popes? One pope and one "popess" would be sufficient, for the courts of three popes and their retinues would be too expensive a proposition!

The article continues in the manner, making a laughing stock of Rev. Leeser. An even more facetious article follows,[9] with suggestions such as "a Jew who desecrates the Sabbath is to be imprisoned until the arrival of the Messiah," or "Ritual slaughterers must be qualified to remove beards with scissors, so as to avoid the use of a razor.....," and "the Messiah is not to be recognized until he has proved his Portuguese ancestry to the Board. Then a great dinner shall be given in his honor, at which Leviathan will be consumed, but Jews of German origin may only have its tail. The German Jews must also wait on table at that dinner ....". There is a great deal more of this type of humor, but let this suffice for the present.

In a more serious mood Einhorn later published his protests and objections.[10] That article is given as an appendix to this section. In addition the Sinai published the Protocolle of the Board in full,[11] but due to the length of that document and its irrelevancy to this dissertation that is omitted here.

P A R T IV.

Section D.

The Chaplaincy Question.

The Chaplaincy Question.

Another public matter in which the Board took it upon itself to act as the spokesman for American Jewry was the matter of Jewish chaplains to the troops in the field during the Civil War.

In the rubric of news dispatches for November 1861, an article appeared, based on the Sunday Dispatch, October 10, 1861, blaming Mr. Cameron, Secretary of War, for the exclusion of Jews from the chaplaincy. The following month Einhorn withdrew this accusation, after it had been pointed out to him that Jews were forbidden that office by an act of Congress, and not through the personal interference of the named official.[12]. The letter from Simon Cameron, addressed to A. Fischel, who had applied for the position as Jewish chaplain, is published in this article, but we suspect that this is a translation (to the German) from the original document. Cameron based his decision, as he points out in his letter, on the ninth section of the Congressional Act of July 22, 1861, which provided for chaplains who were duly ordained in a Christian denomination. The seventh section of the Congressional Act of August 3, 1861, contained a similar clause.

This appeared even worse to Einhorn, for no longer was it the decree of a single individual, but an official decree from the government which denied the Jews a civil

right. The Illinois Staatszeitung[13]. hoped that this action would be rescinded by Congress. Einhorn believed that the Jewish population could not afford to remain silent in this affaire. "Central cooperation" would take too much time, and referring to the Board of American Israelites (without mentioning the name), he warned that "certain persons should not have the presumption to act in an unauthorized manner as the representatives of all American Jewry."[14]. Such an attempt would call for counter declarations, which could only be harmful to the common cause. The procedure suggested was that the Jews should not plead this cause in their own behalf only, but in the general interest of the inviolability of constitutional rights. Large gatherings, delegations, and blatant newspaper articles should be avoided, so as to preclude any talk that the Jews wanted to create disturbances in times of national disaster. This statement, incidentally, while not greatly supported elsewhere in the Sinai, points out to us indirectly that there must have been a fair amount of antisemitism prevalent in the United States at that time which Einhorn did not wish to stir up. He requested only that the problem be solved in a dignified manner, and that full confidence be shown in the powers of the administration. He did not make any concrete suggestions as to procedure.

A communication from New York, dated December 13, 1861, was received by Einhorn,[15]. quoting a report (from the

New York Times) that the Board of American Delegates had decided to appoint a Dr. Fischel as chaplain to Jewish troops, and to petition Congress in regard to the exclusion of Jews from the chaplaincy. The Times reporter pictured the Board as "composed of the representatives of the principal congregations of the United States." According to the statement by Einhorn, which follows this dispatch, most of the congregations that recognized the Board were Southern congregations. His sarcastic suggestion was that the Board's chaplain therefore be placed in Richmond.

The history of the matter according to Einhorn is as follows: The Board of Temple Emanuel of New York appointed a committee to investigate the circumstances in regard to obtaining a Jewish chaplain. This committee was empowered to take any action it saw fit to take. The chairman of this committee, B. Cohn, went to see Mr. B. Hart, president of the Board of Delegates, in a private capacity. He suggested that a volunteer committee of prominent New York Jews be formed, some of them to be taken from the membership of the Board of Delegates, and Mr. Hart was to be the chairman of this committee. The name of the Board of Delegates, however, was not to be mentioned. Hart's reply was that he would have to put such a proposal before his organization, but he did not doubt that the proposal would be rejected. Thereupon the trustees of Emanuel decided to petition Congress without outside aid. Incidentally Mr. Hart informed Mr. Cohn that the Board

did not possess the funds to employ Mr. Fischel, but depended on contributions from various congregations.

Einhorn interpreted these facts to signify that the Board was not inclined to cooperate with various organizations, but was only interested in enlarging its own sphere of influence. The chaplaincy is only a minor issue, he opined, a steppingstone the Board wishes to use in further acquiring power. Several important congregations already had petitioned Congress, the Board was only a "fifth wheel." Einhorn also admitted that it was not so much a matter of an actual admittance of Jews to the chaplaincy, as it was the principle of the matter, for a sick or dying Jew religiously is not in need of ecclesiastic aid.

Einhorn had written to this point when he received a copy of the Board's petition to Congress, submitted in the name of Jews "..... numbering not less than two hundred thousand."[17]. Einhorn became quite incensed at such impertinence, and expressed his opinion in not to be misunderstood language. In a later article[18]. a protest was issued against the audacity of the Board, which was published in the Daily National Intelligencer of Washington on February 6, 1862. This protest stated that while the undersigned were in favor of the admission of Jews to the chaplaincy, they did not recognize the authority of the Board. The protest was signed by Drs. Lilienthal, Wise, Adler, Hochheimer, Felsenthal, and Einhorn. Thus Einhorn's hopes for avoiding blatant publicity were shattered.

P A R T IV.

Section E.

The Mortara Affaire.

The Mortara Affaire.

The so-called Mortara affaire became a cause celebre in the middle of the nineteenth century. According the Jewish Encyclopedia,[19] Edgar Mortara, a child of Jewish parents in Bologna, Italy, was forcibly removed by papal guards from his home on June 23, 1858, at 10:00 P.M. Einhorn, in the rubric of news dispatches,[20] gives the date as July 20, 1858, at 8:00 P.M. The particulars of the two accounts differ in various minor details, but it is difficult to say which is more accurate. The Jewish Encyclopedia account was written by Dr. Gotthard Deutsch, a competent historian; Einhorn's account was contemporary. We do not know how accurate his correspondent was, so that the date and other minor details must remain open for further perusal. Edgar Mortara, a six year old child, had been dangerously ill several years before: Dr. Deutsch claims four years before the incident, Einhorn's correspondent states two years before. The Catholic servant girl of the family, very fond of the child, baptized the youngster secretly, believing that she could thereby save the child's life. When she confessed this to a priest a few years later, soldiers were dispatched to claim the child over the protest of the parents, that it might be raised as a Catholic. Einhorn states that five soldiers fetched the boy, led by a monk

of the Inquisition; Deutsch claims that a Swiss officer led the guards.

Under the date of August 23, 1858, a letter was circulated in Sardinia, dated in Turin, protesting the affaire, and demanding letters to the Pope to save the child. In the news dispatches of November, 1858,[21]. Einhorn reported that the central consistory of French Israelites addressed a letter to Napoleon III, a Catholic emperor, to seek his help. Bitterly he then noted that the Austrian Rabbis who were so vehement in the case of the circumcision of a Jewish child a few years before, did not even protest in this case. A London paper[22]. advised English Jews to stop all loans to the Pope. A later dispatch[23]. quoted various other European newspapers without adding anything new to the facts. It is interesting to note, however, that Einhorn in this article, written in December 1858, repeatedly mentioned the child as being eight years old, whereas a few months before he had spoken of a six year old child. Since the age of eight is mentioned several times there is no question of a slip of the pen here. This would lead us to believe that Einhorn's dating of the entire affaire must be approached cautiously, and would incline us to put more credence in Dr. Deutsch's facts.

According to another dispatch[24]. Sir Moses Montefiore, as President of the London Committee of

Deputies of the British Jews, appealed to American Jewry to unite in protest with English and Dutch Jewry against the kidnapping of Edgar Mortara. Einhorn editorialized sharply[25]. that the necessity of an outside appeal is certain proof how little faith United States Jewry has in its government, which was so indifferent towards its citizens in the matter of Swiss intolerance. Those who possessed some insight wanted to avoid a second defeat at the hands of the government. The Har Sinai congregation attempted to unite the various factions in a protest, but was not successful in its attempt. Individual protests were registered, and eventually the general press criticized the Church for its conduct. Even high Roman dignitaries protested. Heartless politics were finally forgotten for a moment. No one expected threatening intervention by the United States Government, only a word of disapproval. But even there there was only disappointment. General Cass (Secretary of State) wrote to Mr. (B.) Hart, president of Mikveh Israel in Philadelphia, rejecting the latter's plea almost without a motive for doing so. In addition he referred to the abduction as "alleged." This, to Einhorn, was almost an insult. Objective analysis, however, cannot view General Cass' rejection in that light. The wheels of government grind slowly; as long as dispatches appeared in the press only and had not been reported through the regular channels,

a United States Cabinet member could not jeopardize the country's position. Nevertheless a carefully composed statement might have been released, and therefore Einhorn was not entirely in the wrong.

The committee in Philadelphia was not sufficiently rebuffed to give up its plan to write to the President directly. Still Einhorn objected to the approach of the committee, which expected the President to interfere with canonical law, indirectly asking him to have secret baptism stopped. A rejection to such a request would at least carry the appearance of justification. He felt that the issue must be approached on moral grounds, requesting only a protest against the intrusion on "sacred family rights."

In the meantime Hart, whom Einhorn criticized, wrote again to General Cass; he was rejected again, but at least the second letter contained a motive. Neither of these letters is available to us, but Einhorn's analysis of them is not unreasonable. Cass' letter implied that even in this country many things happen which cannot be examined too closely judiciously -- how then can we preach morality to the Pope? Cass also made it clear that Buchanan would not make the same mistake as Van Buren, who in 1840 instructed the American consul in Cairo to interfere on behalf of the Jews in Damascus. Einhorn saw nothing but a second defeat for the American Jewish community in the

entire affaire.

In another article[26]. Einhorn brought the last report of the Mortara case. Rather than to leave well enough alone, a Philadelphia committee went to Washington and returned without accomplishing anything. The New York congregations wrote to the President; they received a reply which referred to General Cass' letters and in addition contained the following:[27]. "..... have been of the conviction, that the government has neither the right nor the duty to subject the conduct of foreign independent powers to moral censure, and to express a reprimand when they undertake actions against their own citizens or subjects which may appear despotic or unjust to us. Such procedure would separate us from all nations ..... It is sufficient to defend the rights of our citizens in accordance with ratified treaties or international stipulations, when and where these may be attacked by a foreign government. Were Mamola (?) Mortara a citizen of the United States, then the matter would appear in a completely different light."

Einhorn's reaction was: "The old B------[28]. is sly as a fox." The word "subjects" is just a gentle hint (in Einhorn's opinion, which is correct in our estimation), that the Jews in America are not exactly citizens, and should therefore be a little less demanding. And then, "after having worked up a bit of a sweat in us,"

he (Buchanan) wants to appear as our protector in foreign countries!

Einhorn then reports a somewhat puzzling incident. On January 9, (1859), on the anniversary of the founding of the Jewish Orphan Home in New Orleans, the speakers made fun at the expense of the Mortara parents! A large part of the audience applauded them; Einhorn hoped that the Rev. Gutheim took steps to stop such behavior. He can explain the matter only by stating that the gentlemen must have looked too deeply into the wineglass .....

The local committee (Baltimore) also sent a petition to the President. Einhorn is somewhat confusing here: In the same sentence he disapproved of the procedure, and yet stated that he himself wrote the petition. The text is then reproduced in the original German (an English translation of which was sent out), but it contains no essential new material.

Einhorn reported in addition that Mr. Harris of Baltimore on January 10, (1859), introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives on behalf of the Mortara family, urging the President to interfere. The Democrats fought this resolution, but Mr. Harris declared he would present it again. The Senate of the State of New York at Albany was supposed to be presented with a similar resolution. The article closes with the reproduction of the reply sent by the prince-regent of Prussia to the Jewish community

of Berlin, a copy of which was forwarded to Einhorn by Dr. Holdheim. Einhorn contrasted this sympathetic letter with the attitude of the President of the United States, who "in his fright of the Jesuits does not even dare say a word of heartfelt sympathy for the bereaved (parents)." 30.

P A R T IV.

Section F.

Anti-Semitism.

Anti-Semitism.

It was not very often that Dr. Einhorn bothered with anti-semitism, but two instances are worth noticing. Anti-semitism as it was known in Europe, with bloody persecutions, pogroms and violence did not exist in this country. The nation was very young, there was ample room and opportunity for all who were willing to work, and the young American tradition was of civic liberties and religious freedom. Here and there unavoidably an individual would appear who had been wronged by a single Jew, and wished to spend his venom against all the members of our faith. Then there were those who came as seekers of opportunity, not as refugees from oppression, and they would bring Old World standards to the new shores. Worst of all, however, was the type of anti-semitism that was engrained in children by bigoted churchmen, so that often Christianity was almost synonimous to hatred of the Jews. The occasional efforts of a frustrated individual presented but little danger, but the organized efforts of religious groups had to be counteracted sharply.

Einhorn took cognizance of these efforts of organized anti-semitism in an article entitled Catholic and Protestant Pietistic Christianity Against the Jews.[31] The European-Christian state is described as a Hercules-Samson; culture and humanitarianism are its Delilah, which

shears away the tresses of the middle ages. "The church," so Einhorn,[32] "has a good stomach; without much ado it has swallowed the property and the blood of millions of heretics, and in the process became fat, obese -- and a little dizzy." Just what was the European picture at this time? Catholic France had broken the relationship of church and state at the time of the French Revolution; Austria, hoping to choke off political fanaticism, permitted ecclesiastic fanaticism, but had thereby provoked unrest among the lower strata of the priesthood, which led to dangerous demonstrations, but these demonstrations even then represented only a weak reflex of the general dissatisfaction. As for Protestant countries, Rothschild entered Parliament about this time; the Prussian constitution guaranteed Jews equal rights despite the efforts of Stahl and Wagner.

In general, in other words, progress seemed to be everywhere. The reaction of the church, in Einhorn's analysis, manifested itself in such affaires as the Mortara case, and in several similar, less spectacular incidents which happened throughout Europe. And yet Einhorn finds Protestant pietism more abominable than Catholic pietism. The latter follows a definite system and swallows its prey without crocodile tears; Protestantism, on the other hand, boasts of its anti-Catholic reason. Even though the love of fellowmen is the official law

of Protestantism, only too frequently do its preachers lapse into tirades of hatred. Thus, for example, the Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthum[33] brings the story of a Pastor Mallet of Bremen, the baptized son of Jewish parents, who delivered a bitter tirade against "that curseladen people." Dr. Frankfurther of Bremen answered this in a sermon on Yom Kippur, which sermon was printed and enjoyed tremendous popularity amongst Jews as well as Christians.

This article by Einhorn up to this point is full of contradictions. He begins by citing the progress made in Europe, and then raves against instances of "pietism," ignoring that he cites only very isolated instances. In the case of the Catholic church there is reason, but as Einhorn himself states it is a matter of the church encroaching upon the rights of individuals, which evil was slowly but surely dying in the process of divorce of church and state. In the case of Protestantism, however, Einhorn can cite nothing similar, yes, he actually cites cases to the contrary! The fact that an unimportant little pastor, probably nothing more than a sensation seeker, preached an anti-semitic sermon is of no consequence whatever. In our opinion it would actually have been best to ignore such a thing, unless it became too obnoxious by repetition.

By this we do not mean that the problem of anti-

semitism did not exist in Europe, for it certainly did. We are merely trying to point out that to condemn the entire Protestant movement for the acts of some irresponsible members is most unjust, and a very unfair approach. The fact that the Prussian government did guarantee Jews equal rights is alone sufficient evidence that there were plenty of "good" as well as "bad" Protestants.

Closer to home is the attack made on the Jewish population in a German language newspaper in Philadelphia, the Deutsche Kirchenfreund, in the September issue of 1857.[34] That article described the Jews as homeless wanderers who have long lost their right to Canaan, the land of their fathers. Rather than to go into this diatribe of typical anti-semitic ignoramuses, let it suffice to state that Einhorn answered their charges one by one and then entered into a diatribe of his own .....

The second article which dealt with anti-semitic utterances was entitled The New York Independent Against the Jews.[35] Einhorn's article answering the paper is appended hereby in abbreviated form and needs no further analysis.

PART IV.

Section G.

The Struggle for Reform.

The Struggle for Reform.

Einhorn carried on the struggle for the advance of Reform Judaism both at home and abroad. The latter was done by sending the Sinai to colleagues and friends in Europe, as we can see from occasional responses by European rabbis. In addition he did not hesitate to give an opinion in a legal question which might arise abroad.

Such an opinion, although unsolicited, he gave in the following instance, reported under the title The Struggle of Religious Parties in English Jewry.[36] A member of the congregation of Cardiff, England, married a convert to Judaism. She bore him a child which died, and was buried in the Jewish cemetery. A second child, a son, was to be circumcised, when there was a sudden request for the woman's טבילה. The document was sent to Dr. Adler in London, who requested that the woman come to London to be reconverted by him personally. Rather than do this, and since the congregation refused the services of its Mohel, the family procured its own Mohel at considerable expense. The congregation was deeply impressed, and challenged Dr. Adler for giving his reasons in not recognizing the woman as a Jewess.

Obviously the entire matter revolves around Orthodox technicalities which are of little interest to us. Various details, however, are of interest, for they

indicate some movement towards liberalization on the part of English congregations. The very fact that the Cardiff congregation dared to challenge Dr. Adler shows that centralized authority was waning. For more details on this case see the appendix to this section.

At home also Einhorn fought for Reform. Thus for example he was wholeheartedly in favor of the introduction of family pews into the Temple. The Sinai carries an anonymous letter on this subject.[37].

A most interesting fact is noted under the title The Sabbath Must be Recaptured.[38]. Einhorn reports success in his struggle for a revitalization of our religion. Forty members of his congregation actually closed their businesses on the Sabbath as a result of his Yom Kippur sermon of 1859.[39]. The essence of that article is appended to this section.

This is one of the instances in which Einhorn could show real results in his fight for Reform Judaism, or perhaps we should say Judaism in general here, for this harks back toward a more conservative religious policy. In addition it points out another fact: Einhorn was not only interested in doing away with ceremonialism; wherever he thought he found something worth preserving he fought for it with all his might. Yet this is a paradoxical situation, for one of the trends of early classical Reform was to make practical life and religion more congruent.

Observance of the Sabbath, however, is practically impossible for most men in a Christian milieu, yes, in many types of endeavor it might actually constitute occupational suicide. For that reason we believe that while these forty businessmen may have closed their stores one, or perhaps even two Sabbaths, we gravely doubt that this trend continued for any marked period of time.

While we are speaking of congregational activities, we might also mention a very interesting article entitled The Penetration of English Elements into the German Reform Congregations.[40] This article, to be found in the appendix to this section, claims that up to this date (1859) the English language has been a brakeshoe to the progress of Reform. German theology and German research gave birth to Reform, and at least for the present the German language must be the tongue of Reform.

Every statement made by Einhorn is unquestionably true, especially that only German trained qualified leaders were available at that time, and their English was not sufficient to permit them to teach in the language of the land. Nevertheless the tenor of the article is such that we harbor a slight suspicion (which we certainly cannot prove) that perhaps Einhorn's English was such that he could not teach and preach in English, and that the article was therefore somewhat selfishly motivated.

In addition the article smacks of a teutonic nostalgia which is in contrast to Einhorn's usual con-

demnation of European ways. After all, it does seem a little strange to say that the introduction of German would hinder progress! It would rather appear to us, as we have stated once before, that the introduction of a new element such as English would make for additional progress, drawing the younger elements of the populations, rather than bring about a regression.

PART IV.

Section H.

Friends and Enemies.

Friends and Enemies.

In his relations with other rabbis Einhorn made both enemies and friends. It has often been said that one can know a man by either his enemies or his associates. This certainly is true in the case of Einhorn. It is characteristic of him that none of his enemies could lay claim to real scholarship, that they were mostly ambitious men who bluffed the public, and tried to advance themselves by legitimate or illegitimate claims. Noteworthy in this respect, as related in the Sinai, are four men: I. M. Wise, Rev. Leeser, Dr. Szold and Dr. Illowy. In the latter case, however, it must be said that after the initial disagreement the relationship between Dr. Einhorn and Dr. Illowy became at least cordial. The disagreement consisted of a literary feud, which, however, was soon forgotten. The details can be found in the appendix to this section under the title The Self Defense of the Rev. Dr. Illowy.[41].

The second one of his colleagues whom he attacked sharply was Dr. Benjamin Szold. Under the title The Fate of the Oheb Shalom Congregation in Baltimore[42]. Einhorn reviewed Szold's inaugural sermon, דברי שלום, [43]. in the most sarcastic and cutting manner of which he was capable. Then he exposed Szold's מזכרת נשמות, a booklet ostensibly written for the Yizkor service. Einhorn's exposé consisted

of two columns, the one carrying the text of Szold's work, the other the text of the prayerbook by Drs. Mannheimer and Maier. Szold's work is so obviously a plagiarization from the latter that it is incomprehensible that anyone would dare to publish such a work under his own name.

In another work, briefly entitled Reproof (Abfertigung),[44]. Einhorn attacked Szold once again. It is not necessary to repeat Einhorn's defense against the foul (we cannot use another word) accusations of Szold. Einhorn never was more sarcastic (and justified in his sarcasm) than on this occasion. In answer to Szold's accusations he reprinted a few testimonials given him in the past. It is unnecessary to say any more about this article which is only evidence of how low a "rabbi" could sink .....

But not Einhorn alone was touched by this attack. The board of Temple Emanuel of New York immediately formed a committee to denounce Szold's writings in the Israelite, which paper had published the man's slanderous attacks in a spcial addition to the usual paper on February 10, 1860 (#32). The Sinai carried the protest of Temple Emanuel's committee in an article entitled Rev. Dr. Einhorn in Baltimore and His Enemies.[45]. I. M. Wise, one of Einhorn's arch enemies since the latter had been instrumental in destroying the Cleveland Conference, made a statement in the Israelite,[46]. to the effect that the article by Szold

had been in his desk for several weeks and was published during his absence from Cincinnati. Nevertheless not a word of a retraction or an apology appeared in the Israelite. The resolution of Temple Emanuel, denouncing Szold, was signed by Dr. Adler and a few Temple officials. In addition a personal request was sent to Dr. Einhorn to publish this material in the Sinai.

A few words will suffice to state the enmity between Dr. Einhorn on the one hand, and Dr. Wise and Rev. Leeser on the other. Wise's name is mentioned in the Sinai only in passing, with the exception of the incident of the Cleveland Conference which we have already discussed in full. Leeser's name also was mentioned only here and there; in our opinion Einhorn was not interested in provoking quarrels. In regard to Leeser, however, there is one notable exception, and that is related in an article entitled Defense Against Leeser's Attack on Congregation Kneseth Israel.[47] Since that article is appended to this section, and is quite self-explanatory, there is no need to discuss it further.

One other incident is reported in the Sinai which is provocative in nature, but cannot be called downright enmity. It appeared in an article entitled The Strange Speech of a Neo-Orthodox Jewish Preacher Regarding the Relationship of Judaism and Christianity.[48] Dr. Jellinek, Rabbi in Vienna, was a candidate for the "Landestag."

Before a mixed audience of Christians and Jews, among other things he made the statement "they (the Jews) are happy when the teachings of Christianity are spread far across the oceans, when Christianity unfurls its banner, that (banner) of love." Einhorn criticized him for this, pointing out that Jewry has suffered a great deal from Christianity for the past 2000 years, and accused Jellinek point blank of hunting for votes. However, nothing further ever came of this accusation.

Einhorn had his friends as well as his enemies. We have already mentioned Dr. Adler of New York; we might also mention Drs. Deutsch of Philadelphia and Cohn of Albany to whom he refers on occasion. Works of Dr. Ritter of Germany appeared in the Sinai, and more frequently the name of Dr. Holdheim of Berlin was mentioned. When the latter died Einhorn eulogized him in a lengthy necrologue.[49] One of his dearest friends in America was Dr. Bernard Felsenthal of Chicago, whose works occasionally would appear in the Sinai, and with whom Einhorn carried on an extensive correspondence, some of which will be excerpted in a later section.

We conclude this section of our essay by stressing a rule which Einhorn lived faithfully all his life: Wherever he went he insisted on freedom of the pulpit. In an article entitled Watch Your Freedom of Teaching[50] he

relates the case of a rabbi who was not careful in this respect and had to suffer the consequences. The details of this case may be found in the appendix to this section.

APPENDIX I.

Dr. Einhorn's Departure from Baltimore.

Sinai, Volume VI : 135-142.

Dr. Einhorn's Departure from Baltimore.

Vol. VI: 135-142.

Dr. Einhorn does not wish to bother people with his private troubles, but he feels that he owes an explanation to the public for his sudden departure from Baltimore. A part of his congregation was touched by the fever of the slave question. Various persons in Baltimore attacked him most viciously, so that the worst was to be feared. The New York Evening Post published part of a sermon preached by Dr. Einhorn and published in the Sinai shortly after Raphael's speech. This sermon had sharply accentuated the equal birth of all men, without reference to politics. The purpose of the New York paper was to encourage various Jews in Baltimore to a public declaration "that they did not belong to the congregation of this abolitionist preacher." This paper was hardly read in Baltimore; its only purpose was to focus public attention on Dr. Einhorn's anti-slavery opinions, and to sick a mob on him. Besides that he committed the crime to cleanse Judaism of the shameful blemish cast on it by Raphael's speech -- so that someone remarked about him: "Only a blackguard would write like that." Dr. Einhorn considered it his duty to preach against slavery since Mosaism speaks firmly of the freedom of man, and all the more so since some members of his congregation spoke of their "Southern Rights." To friends he had expressed his opinion that if

Maryland would leave the Union he would deem it necessary to leave his post. Events stood thus when the revolution began in Baltimore on April 19, and mobs destroyed some presses and attacked "black-republican" citizens. Dr. Einhorn decided to leave Baltimore for a few days to take his family to Philadelphia, then to return and to await events -- if possible he wanted to find an escort for his family, and remain himself. Then two members of his congregation came to him and requested him urgently to leave immediately, since he had been identified with a "black-republican" paper whose presses had been destroyed that day, and he was in personal danger. His reply that he could not leave in such a manner was overruled by the assurance that his congregation desired him to leave immediately, and to await their call to return. Later on a soldier warned him. On the night of April 21 several armed young men remained at his home to protect him. Then on the 22nd he left Baltimore. Privately he heard later that law and order had been restored in the city, but he wished to have official assurance that the congregation was ready again to receive pure preaching without fear. He wanted to return for Shevuoth despite the fact that he did not receive such a letter, in order not to leave the congregation without a sermon for the holy days. However, רבות מחשבות בלב איש ועצת ד' היא תקום -- he became ill, and could not leave. Then, on ערב שבעות,

he received an official letter from his congregation. Law and order had been restored, so the letter informed him, but no definite assurances could be given. A congregational meeting on May 12 had requested his return, but had asked him henceforth to avoid the controversial issues of the day from the pulpit. Dr. Einhorn resigned immediately from a pulpit where he had a lifetime job. He was hurt to leave without a word of farewell, but circumstances forced him to do so. He left with the assurance that the seeds he had sown would sprout some day. A few hours after sending his resignation he received a telegram requesting him to take another job.

A "paper for children" reported later that the "heretic" who had protested against the Board of Delegates had been driven out by "the citizens of Baltimore." "A sinner may tremble at קול עלה נדף, the voice of a trembling leaf," so he writes, "but never before a driveling little paper or an ignorant little Chazan".51.

As for his own position in Baltimore, he asks that the greater part of Baltimore's Jewry or his congregation be the judges of that.

APPENDIX J.

Politics in the Pulpit.

Sinai, Volume VI : 170-173.

Politics in the Pulpit.

Vol. VI: 170-173.

All congregations in this country are hearing the present political events discussed from a religious viewpoint. It is almost impossible to avoid this. The fourth of January brought us theological discussions about secession and slavery that can fill a whole library. The Southern Bible is different from that of the North. It actually happened in the same town that in one Sanctuary the words of Jeremiah 1: 14 were cited: "Out of the North the evil shall break forth upon all the inhabitants of the Land," while another church used the text of Ezekiel 21: 2: "Son of man, set thy face toward the South ..... and prophesy against the forest of the field in the South: Hear the word of the Lord, Behold I will kindle a fire in thee ....". It is a fact that every congregation expects a discussion of the events of the day, be it with or without trepidation. Everyone feels that religion must speak a word where all of humanity and society are concerned. A Sanctuary that ignores such a question leaves an empty space in the hearts of people where there should be an uplifting. Nevertheless we hear occasionally the categorical assertion: The pulpit should have nothing to do with politics. Men of a peace, which is only a peace according to outward appearances, even say that a Sanctuary as a House of Peace is desecrated by sermons which do not

remain aloof from politics. We dare say that such statements are based on lies, which have unfortunately embraced all religious life. We admit that certain political areas are extraneous to the field of religion. But only an individual who does not understand the essence of religion, or is willing to make it a slave to his passions, can state the same about the question at hand. We do not feel called upon to discuss the stand of Christianity in this matter, but Judaism can never be indifferent whether men are being enslaved, or when the glorious institutions of our homeland, which have already brought immeasurable blessings to humanity, are being destroyed by honor-seeking or perjurious rebels. Is not the slave question a religious one? A religion that has regulations for the easing of a burdened animal cannot be indifferent to an enslaved human being. It is understandable how a worship of the letter of the Law, misunderstanding the spirit of the Mosaic Law, can permit slavery, but one cannot accredit it with complete apathy to an institution which enslaves millions of rational beings. All year long humanitarianism, kindness, and mercy are praised as the essence of Judaism. Those are easily made declarations ..... but no word is to be spoken if human beings are bought and sold like animals, when parents and children are torn apart forever!

It is also obvious that a conscientious Jewish clergyman must encourage his co-religionists to willing

sacrifices and patriotism, to the exertion of all powers for the defense of our constitution. We will not call Washington a Messiah, for in the messianic kingdom there cannot be slaves or perjurious knaves. However, it cannot be denied that his great work is the most noble moment of development in recent world history. Our star spangled banner has brought our people many blessings, and has also become the banner of salvation for the enslaved of all nations. Light and darkness, Ormuzd and Ahriman, George Washington and Jefferson Davis are embattled. Mocking all civilization the rebellious South wishes to deny the principle that all men are born equal -- it is asserting that slavedom and right-by-might are state-building powers which are the basis of civilization. Were this to succeed, who would have to fear more than Israel, the arch-slave of slaves? The religion of Israel, so vehement in its speech of salvation in peaceful times, cannot countenance such crimes, it must speak a word of encouragement to those who wish to fight these evils. The prophets did not distinguish politics from religion. Jeremiah encouraged the people to seek the welfare of Babylon, Samuel preached a political sermon against monarchy, Isaiah did not hesitate to preach against Jewish slaveholders. It is indeed high time to confiscate the Bible that interferes in politics until everything is settled. Then we can speak freely, speak our mind regarding the apologetes of slavery, and exhort our co-religionists to defend the Union with their blood.

APPENDIX K.

Counter Declaration (Re: Board of Delegates).

Sinai, Volume V : 47-54.

Counter Declaration (Re: Board of Delegates).
Volume V: 47-54.

In November 1859 the delegates of a few congregations from New York elected a Board of Delegates of American Israelites. Earlier that same month the originators of this institution had sent letters to various congregations in which assurance had been given that there would be no interference with the internal affairs of Synagogues. The plan, however, had not been sufficiently explained in that letter. Such rash action (as the election) by so few congregations becomes noticeable in itself immediately. But the veil of mystery was quickly lifted -- in its recent protocols the Board actually proposes the building of a hierarchy, which would even interfere with civil rights. Its proposals included a court of arbitrations to solve litigation, and a committee of three rabbis to lead American Jewry.

Several congregations protested at least indirectly against the building of an organization that would represent all of American Jewry, which, by its original denial of having a religious character, became suspected of political separatism. Now that there is no longer any doubt regarding this organization we wish to register our protest:

I. Any type of spiritual mastery is opposed to Judaism, which a. gives equal priestliness to all its

adherents; b. recognizes no other authority than the divine word in Bible and history; c. prefers the bastard who has a knowledge of the Law to a high priestly idiot; d. not only permits free research in the divine word to every member of the priestnation, but actually commands the same. Only in its primitive stages did this people require a separate priesthood as keepers and handlers of the Law, but next to these there appeared very soon a free-acting spiritual power in the form of the prophets, which fought against hierarchical barriers and thus against spiritual petrification. Already at the end of the Second Temple the Law was taken from the hands of priestly influences by the institution of the Sopherim. Only the Great Synhedrion in Jerusalem could proclaim generally binding decisions and uphold the unity of religious practices. After its dissolution many schools differed greatly on many most important points in life. Even this Synhedrion originally was only a court that handled federal laws, in which domain religious prescriptions were included. The fall of the Jewish State rocked this institution to its very foundation, and it was preserved partially only because the people had need of a central religious authority. This was especially necessitated because traditional materials lacked order, e.g. there were no fixed dates for holidays since there was no fixed calendar. As soon as the Mishnah had been codified, and

the calendar had been fixed permanently, most powers of the Synhedrion disappeared to give way to full freedom at least on the principles at hand. Traditional Judaism of course judges the course of history in another manner, but its representatives cannot speak of a religious authority with legislative powers at all outside of the messianic age, for according to the Talmud such authority is passed on exclusively by S'michah, the chain of which has been broken. The Board is thus in internal conflict if it sticks to rabbinism to such a degree as to permit no change whatever in the liturgy on the one hand, and on the other wishes to install a rabbinical council, which, as the expounders of the Law, is to rule American Judaism. According to the Talmud all of Israel could not do such a thing legally, or transfer the Sh'chinah to anyone, even were he of the stature of R. Akibah.

II. Such a constituted authority, instead of promoting unity in religious life, would cause only deeper rifts, and turn additional thousands to religious indifference. It is undesirable that the great majority of American Jews has disengaged itself factually, if not principally, from tradition. The differences in religious directions are expressed almost exclusively in the field of the public cult -- in life they can be discerned only rarely. Were such an authority constituted, it would primarily have to battle the general breaking of laws, e.g. the ignoring of the Sabbath laws and the dietary

laws. How would they attempt this? If by teaching -- then why have chief shepherds give commands to lesser shepherds, to command to the flock? Why lower the latter two to marionettes? No! Such an authority would not function with the electric spark of enthusiasm, but with the lightning of excommunication! The results then are easily imagined. We have a precedent: In February 1942 the Board of Deputies of British Jews excommunicated the West London Synagogue because of a few meaningless reforms. That congregation in turn threatened to bring the case to court or even before the Parliament; the act caused such indignation that the congregations of Liverpool and Manchester returned the proclamation, and the congregations of Portsmouth burned it with festivities.53. This act would have led to a dissolution of the Board, had it not been for the fact that it was an organization needed to act as the official representative to the state.

III. Added to this is the fact that this Board is not satisfied to attempt to supress the priest struggles of principles in Judaism, it also wishes to supress every free impulse -- even works of charity are to be regulated and decreed from the top. It is difficult to comprehend how they could ever even think of putting such a guardianship over free men. It is even more difficult to believe that it was their purpose to establish an inquisition in the field of charity -- such plans are more worthy of the

disciples of Loyola than the sonsof Abraham.

IV. Even more surprising is their intention to establish a Jewish court -- not only for religious matters, but also for civil matters. That would mean a Jewish state within the state. In Europe's Christian states, the underprivileged Jews, without difference in religious shadings, greeted the elimination of Jewish courts with great happiness, because by that act at least a part of their civil separation was removed. And here, in this free country, they even think of instituting such civil courts! Would not that mean a suspicion against the love that we all have for our country? Would not that mean to lend assistance to the lies of our enemies, that separation and isolation are inherent to the Jewish people?

The Occident,[54.] published by the vice president and spokesman of the Board, has another view. It says that America, because of its free institutions, is called to raise the Jews to eventual independence, thus preparing them for the promised return to Palestine; for that day, when Jewish Law will again be our authority in all religious and civil respects. From this viewpoint it is at least understandable how we will be prepared for the great Synhedrion of Jerusalem by a rabbinical committee here. Those Jews who think of their sojourn in the United States merely as a stopover to Palestine can easily be counted -- aside the fact, that this claim is in strong contrast with the messianic view, according to which the

sufferings of exile with their atoning qualities are to prepare us for the messianic kingdom. Whatever this all may be -- we take it as a sacred obligation to proclaim with hundreds of thousands of other Jews, that we do not seek the restitution of the Jewish state with its connected institutions, but we merely look for the unification of all of God's children to the recognition of the One and Only. With all our love for Palestine as the cradle of our people and our divine Law, we do not seek the goal of our universal mission there, but rather in all the lands where we have been called as the bearers of God's word. We see in this country a lever towards the messianic age, but only insofar as there are not royal or ecclesiastical decrees here to oppress the struggles of the mind, no faith is lifted above another, and truth can run its course unhindered by external influences. We hope that Israel shall have a great future in this country to glorify the name of God before all nations ..... In a place, where Judaism is permitted to breathe deeply and freely, but cannot endure fresh air, there it were better to bury it than to incarcerate it.

APPENDIX L.

The New York Independent Against the Jews.

Sinai, Volume VI : 143-148.

The New York Independent Against the Jews.
Vol. VI: 143-148.

This paper recently published an abusive article against the Jews which attempted to spread the poisonous seed of the Eisenmenger type of literature on American soil; only German scholarship is lacking, for the article is written with a comical naivete. It was obviously written by a baptized Jew. It is truly fortunate that the American people are used to the lying quality of the press, and that for many years the German-Jewish elements in this country have awakened respect in their business dealings and their religious stand. First this convert pictures the German Jews in a very flattering manner: They are described as uncouth and without knowledge as a result of the poor conditions pertaining in the Jewish schools of Germany. At thirteen, he states, children leave school there, after they have learned nothing but to read and to write, and have become members of their church by means of an oath which they do not understand. Had this fellow only the slightest knowledge of the conditions in those schools for the past twenty to thirty years, he would know that many a pupil in the middle grades there could measure up to many of the teachers of the public schools here, and that many of the present generation of German Jews in this country are far ahead in education of their co-religionists here. This fellow ob-

viously mistakes the ברכות over the Torah at Bar Mitzvah as an oath -- incomprehensible to him. But supposing such an oath, not understood, was administered -- would the member concerned then be any worse off than a Christian who takes a comprehensible oath to an un-understandable and irrational formula of belief of his church? Among one thousand converted Jews -- is there one who has become a Christian heart and soul, and is not merely a low chafferer in his religion? This fellow further accuses the Jews of selling their women by means of a Shadchan, who gets a flat percentage for his efforts. A man of rationality might consider the significance of the wedding ring, or he might even refer to the Bible -- which of course would not suit the pious Christian Independent. He might then find that in this custom of "selling" their women, the Jews do not pay money, but receive money for taking the women.[55] And besides that, are our marriages as a rule poorer in morals or happiness than those fashioned out of passion? Compare the Jewish home with the Christian home! If we come out behind in this comparison, then we are ready to canonize all baptized Jews, as well as the Independent and the famous Christian preacher who recently in an unctuous manner offered his church pews for sale to those who wished to buy. No, we may not have overcome the oriental manner in regard to the legal position of the wife, but its incomparable ethical powers are revealed in the principle: כל יהודי שאין לו

כל יהודי שאין לו אשה שרוי בלא אשה אינו אדם and also שמחה בלא ברכה בלא טובה.[56]

Judaism counts it as a religious duty that its high priest be a married man, whereas Christianity, which boasts that it views marriage from a higher level, produced celibacy according to the heathen example, and according to many opinions regards marriage as a necessary evil. This correspondent further declared that German Jews were liberal to the poor occasionally -- but then only out of the desire to shine, while the true spirit of charity was lacking. The boundless ignorance of this convert reveals itself more and more as one can see. We know no love for the oppressed? The Jewish heart cannot even see an animal suffer, the ass of an enemy must be relieved of its burden -- even to a משומד we give alms! French and English Jewry only recently gathered money for the oppressed Syrian Christians, who had accused the Jews of heinous crimes! And who is filled by sacrificial love? He accuses Jews of "swearing, drinking, and gambling." And whence the Christian souls which swear and tumble drunkenly on our public streets? One might believe these Christians were drunk only on Mr. Beecher's sermons, that the thousands of Christian families thrown into need annually only play in gambling houses leased by Jews! The only oath the Jews know is: I'll be a משומד if .....". If, however, some Jews do break the laws

regarding the Sabbath, come to services only rarely, or neglect the putting on of Teffilin, then they still are no worse than those Christians who deny Jesus and decide only in their dying hour to accept religion.

In closing we might remark: The impartiality of the Christian Independent, which supposedly has a famous Christian preacher as its editor-in-chief, rejected a rebuttal to these lies, but finally printed an explanation that was by far not satisfactory. This statement read: "At the repeated solicitation of a correspondent, we recently gave place in our column to some statements concerning the character and social conditions of the Jews in this country, which, although the writer himself was a Jew, are abundantly proved to have been altogether erroneous, unjust and injurious. While we need hardly mention that our correspondents express their own views, and not ours, we hasten to say that our Jewish contributor was entirely wrong in his statements concerning the great body of citizens of his own faith and kindred not only in this city, but in the country at large. We make this explanation with as much pleasure as we ever felt in correcting any error that ever crept into these columns."

APPENDIX M.

The Struggle of Religious Parties in English Jewry.

Sinai, Volume VII : 147-154.
VII : 177-183.

The Struggle of Religious Parties in English Jewry.
Vol. VII: 147-154.

Copies of correspondence were received from Dr. Guttheil of Manchester, England, which had been carried on with Dr. Adler of London. The question is whether a rabbi has the right to deny the validity of certain religious documents of a congregation because this congregation had dared to remove itself from his jurisdiction, and to give certain minor reforms to its cult. The denied documents in question concern a child born in legal wedlock, but branded as a ממזר. Thus, since family life is interfered with by a hierarchial action, we must not underrate the dangers involved.

This affaire also has a brighter side, despite the insults heaped on a family and a congregation, namely that the Reform movement in England will gain in scope because of these matters. England has only two "Reform" Synagogues at the present time. The Marguerite Street Synagogue of London and the Manchester Congregation of British Jews. Their Reform is limited to an organ, choral music, and the doing away with the second days of holy days. But at least it is a beginning.

Correspondence:

Case history: Mr. G. Abel of Cardiff wished to have his betrothed converted to Judaism. This happened; the couple were married כדת משה וישראל, and a כתובה was

written.

Mr. Abel then joined the congregation at Cardiff. A child was born, it died, and was buried by the congregation. A second child was born, and Mr. Abel requested the services of a Mohel. This was denied him until the wife's כתובה could be examined. This document was sent to Dr. Adler in London, who then found the כתובה lacking and required that the lady come to London where he (Adler) would convert her. The child could then be circumcised either in London or in Cardiff. Thereupon the Cardiff congregation denied its Mohel the authority to circumcise the child, and Mr. Abel was put to considerable expense to procure another Mohel. This was done at the express wish of the mother. The congregation was very much impressed by this, and requested reasons from Adler for his actions.

Adler replied that he had wanted to see the שטר גיורת, but had only received the כתובה. This led Adler to believe that the Cardiff congregation had recognized the lady as a גיורת, but he did not consider this sufficient since Cardiff did not have an authorized בית דין.

The congregation of Cardiff then proceeded to send Adler a. a full account of all that had taken place; b. a theological opinion by their rabbi, Dr. Guttheil. There is the repetition of the request that no more

privileges be withheld from Mrs. Abel, that she be recognized as a proselyte, legally accepted into the congregation of Israel, בקהל ישראל.

Vol. VII: 177-183.

Dr. Guttheil's תשובה to Adler follows, but the latter does not wish to recognize it.

APPENDIX N.

The Sabbath Must be Recaptured.

Sinai, Volume IV : 289-291.

The Sabbath Must be Recaptured.

Vol. IV: 289-291.

As a result of the recent sermon on Yom Kippur about forty members of the Har Sinai Congregation have decided to close their businesses on Shabbos. Those who claim that Reform cannot inspire its people will henceforth have to admit that this is not true. Talmudic Judaism conceives of the prohibition against work on the Sabbath mainly as the type of work that produces, and for certain people, who have businesses not of a productive character, loopholes are left, although the Talmud does not approve of these.[57] In contrast to this Reform Judaism, in harmony with Exodus 16: 26, and Isaiah 58: 13, prohibits all business, be it of a productive character or otherwise.[58] There is no intention here to indulge in a polemic. However it is certain, and must be admitted by everyone, that this is a vital question for Judaism. If, to repeat, American Jewry continues to trade away the Sabbaths and play off Sundays, within a decade nothing will be left of Judaism. The Orthodox have made some attempts in this direction of preserving the Sabbath, but their attempts have lacked vitality. After all, what good are preachers before empty pews; schools, where children are merely convinced of the split between religion and life? What good are Kosher hospitals if we close our eyes to the deepest wounds of Judaism?

My colleagues, Drs. Illowy and Hochheimer, are uniting with me in this struggle.

APPENDIX O.

The Penetration of English Elements into the German Reform Congregations.

Sinai, Volume IV : 161-169.

The Penetration of English Elements into the German Reform Congregations.

Vol. IV: 161-169.

It takes little familiarity with the condition of American Jewish religious life to recognize that the English element under the present circumstances is a brakeshoe for Reform strivings. German research and science are the hearth of the Jewish Reform idea, German Jewry has the mission to bring life and recognition to thought on American soil. We see our English speaking coreligionists discarding old tradition, but they lack the exclusively empowering idea for such action, the product of a trend of thought completely foreign to them, against which English puritanism even takes a hostile position. Mostly unacquainted with the literature since Mendelsohn's days they have hardly an inkling of the existence of an inner religious-historical development, or even of the universal character of Judaism, and thus cannot understand how war can be declared against stability in a legal manner. Eventually it will be necessary (and desirable) to have this religious revolution in the English language, both spoken and written, but for the present this is to be regarded as an impossibility. 1. The Reform idea is still too young to be stripped and to be robbed of its original covering, the German language; 2. Jewish teachers are not available who know both German theo-

logical science and also English well enough. At the present time it can be put as an axiom that a German congregation with a trend towards English has an equally strong trend towards a standstill. A good example of this is Temple Emanuel in New York. Rich human material is available, the congregation is rich materially and also has a first-class German theologian and an excellent president. Thus we could have expected it to reach the full heights of our present day religious development, but this expectation was not fulfilled, because the English, i.e. really the Portuguese-aristocratic element, has gained the upper-hand. Most of the congregational membership thinks and speaks the German language, but this is hidden to keep the appearance of "being strange" from the natives. And yet they pray in Hebrew! There Jewish nationalism is really exhibited!! The children need English in the Temple, but don't they, and their parents also, need the non-Hebrew prayers as well? It is indeed bad that no need is felt here for a change.

Recently the Temple Board of Directors asked Dr. Adler to give a report on the wearing of hats in the Synagogue. He stated that theoretically there was no objection to bared heads, but from the practical view it was best to have bared heads only during the sermon. The Board of Directors was willing to accept the rabbi's suggestion to have bared heads for the entire services,

but the congregation could not raise the required two-third majority to pass the measure. When both the rabbi and the Board recommend a measure, it should not fail to pass under healthy circumstances. The correct procedure would have been to do away first with the all-Hebrew prayerbook, and thus have declared war on orientalism!

At this point follows Dr. Adler's discourse regarding the wearing of hats during Services.

After Adler's scholarly discourse the congregation still voted contrary to his wishes, deciding that there must be a difference between the liturgical part and the practical part of the cult. A regulation was passed that hats must be removed during the sermon, but worn for the Services. This action marks the sermon as a דבר הול .

According to the Midrash, the Messiah will נראה ונכסה וחוזר ונראה -- with Adler's congregation it is the other way around. First the people are to hide themselves under a hat, then they are to come out during the sermon, and finally they are to hide again.

Einhorn concludes this article by stating that many of his friends will be angry that he mixed into an affaire which was none of his business -- but truth for him is more than personal relationship.

APPENDIX P.

The Self Defense of the Rev. Dr. Illowy.

Sinai, Volume II : 772-775.

The Self Defense of the Rev. Dr. Illowy.

Vol. II: 772-775.

The rubric of news dispatches of November 1857 related that Dr. Illowy of Syracuse sacrificed two chickens at the dedication of a cemetery there. In Einhorn's opinion this was done to fool the angel of death, and since the latter is synonymous to Satan, Einhorn deduced that certain people even know how to cheat the devil.

Illowy then claimed the right to defend himself, which was granted him with the proviso that Einhorn might analyze his defense.

This defense was written in the form of a letter to "A. H." in Chicago. Illowy himself did not perform the ceremony of which he was accused. Rather a Mr. Kunreuther of Chicago asked him regarding the availability of a ceremony at the dedication of a cemetery, since the שלחן ערוך made no mention of such a ceremony. This matter was attacked facetiously in the Deborah, #44. Illowy referred his questioner to the שלה זהר and the אליה רבה, which adivses the slaughter of a chicken which is later given to the poor. He then continued by asking why such a ceremony is more silly than many other ceremonies which were being observed by modern Judaism. The criterion of a ceremony, according to him, is whether it brings about desirable results. The wearing of תפילין, he opined, is at first sight much more strange

than the slaughtering of a hen for the benefit of the poor! Yet one who knows the spirit of ceremonies cannot laugh at either one of these. He then continued by giving a long homiletical discourse on a man's feelings upon visiting a cemetery. He concluded the argument by stating that this ceremony is recommended by the זהר, and that it reminds us of the sin offering, the עגלה הערופה, which in ancient times was sacrificed at the grave of an Israelite slain by an unknown assailant.

Then follows his real self defense. He merely informed his questioner as to the practice, but did not recommend the ceremony, since "he knows the verdict of the vulgus only too well."

So far Illowy. Einhorn then states that Illowy's reasoning as to the עגלה ערופה is perfectly correct -- but is copied from Holdheim's collected sermons, Vol. I, pp. 140-141. Illowy protected a cabbalistic practice, but he did not by any means base it on the same premises as it is found in the Bible. He then quotes extensively on this subject from his own book, Das Prinzip des Mosaismus, pp. 198-199.

He continues by condemning Illowy for the glorifications of cabbalistic nonsense which pictures anyone buried in a cemetery as a morally corrupt individual. Supposing the חשוב שבקהל is to be buried -- how can one portray him as morally defunct? This ceremony would change

any eulogy into an insult! And if the dead person were morally defunct, how would the slaughter of a chicken awaken us to our own responsibilities?

Finally Einhorn reveals the true character of the ceremony, which really rests on heathen principles. The Cabbalists regarded the offered calf very much like an Azazel, which was sacrificed to appease Samael (cp. מאירת עינים and עיר מלקש). That function is to be fulfilled by a chicken in this case. The Cabbalists watered down a heathen concept; the cow was to appease the מדת הדין.59.

This kind of nonsense, Einhorn concludes, merely destroys Judaism. And as long as chickens are mentioned, he wants to refer also to the כפרות. Despite his mystical leanings, the רמב"ן already referred to it as מפני דרכי האמורי, and as such forbade it, as did the בית יוסף. If the people are blind, that is too bad, but if its leaders advocate this kind of nonsense he feels enraged and disgusted. He has nothing personal against Illowy, but only wants to point out his error in the interest of religion.

APPENDIX Q.

Defense Against Leeser's Attack on Congregation Kneseth Israel.

Sinai, Volume VI : 175-180.

Defense Against Leeser's Attack on Congregation Kneseth Israel.

Vol. VI: 175-180.

In the June issue of the Occident, 1860, p. 139, Leeser attacked the Kneseth Israel Society of Philadelphia. He had not done this for years, but as soon as Dr. Einhorn became its Rabbi, he "pulled his somewhat rusty sword once again."

A board has been formed in Philadelphia for the purpose of examining Jewish ritual slaughterers. There is no authority for such a board -- it sounds somewhat like the same authority formed it which originated the Board of Delegates of American Israelites, now passed on. The boards of trustees of five local congregations decided to form this examining panel; Congregation Kneseth Israel was invited to participate but did not respond to the invitation. Leeser regrets that this "body" isolates itself in such a manner, and that its members regard themselves as a type of Protestants, who are denying their origin, are provoking a schism in Judaism and find it a "pleasure" to create a sensation. Whether this "society" disregarded the invitation on the grounds of Reform principles Einhorn does not know, but if this is the case, it still does not deserve to be scourged in such a manner as those who believe that all the flames of Sinai are concentrated in the kitchen hearth. Furthermore Mr. Leeser, who has no knowledge in

theological matters, is the last man who may dare to question a congregation that leaves him and his alone. What would Mr. Leeser do if a rift were to break out in his own congregation between the trepha-eaters and the Sabbath-desecrators on the one hand, and those loyal to the Law on the other hand? He would try to appease them! And a congregation with a rabbinical representative cannot follow its own view, without being asked before the simple Chazan-Tribunal of the Occident?

But supposing Congregation Kneseth Israel would care for Shechitah -- then it would be doubly and triply obliged to refuse this panel permission for such examinations! Mr. Leeser will find this incomprehensible at first, but he will be even more surprised to hear that this is based on that which makes the whole matter incomprehensible to him, namely his lack of knowledge of the Law. We do not wish to attack the individuals of this panel -- all of them to our knowledge are honorable Chazanim who also function as slaughterers -- that is, all with the exception of Rev. Leeser, who is only a Chazan and not a Shochet. Those men, however, do go beyond their jurisdiction, in that they usurp a right denied them by the Shulchan Aruch, Yoreh Deah I. There, in the glosses of R. Moses Isserles, it is stated אין אדם שוחט . אלא אם כן נטל קבלה בפני חכם Ture Sahab, ibid. 4, declares: ולא סגי ליטול קבלה מן המומחה בשחיטות לחוד רק מחכם בלאו הכי ג'כ כי הוא יודע לנסותו היטב ואותן הנוטלים קבלה מן השוחטים שאינם

חכמים בלאו הכי לא יפה הם עושים . This board is thus invalid, since none of its members can claim the title Chacham. Furthermore they have no right to examine a man who has already received Kabalah from a rabbi. In addition this board is prejudiced, and in an examination like this there is no room for partisanship. The fact that five congregations have recognized this illegal board, they must straighten out with their consciences; but if Mr. Leeser regrets the action of Kneseth Israel Congregation which stands in accord with the Shulchan Aruch, then he has only set up a memorial to his ignorance. Rabbi Akibah said: When I was still an עם הארץ, I wanted to tear apart anyone who had knowledge of the Law. Rev. Leeser will never pass this state of hatred -- but there's no danger of his tearing anything apart -- his teeth are dull and his bite is no נשיכה שועל. But we must do justice to his originality. Our group, headed by a rabbi, he calls a "Society," his own, headed by such a famous "Chazan," he calls a "congregation." Would he have gone a step further, and had called us a Gehinom Society, I would have become a Shochet out of despair, would have taken Kabalah from his "Board," and finally would have become a regular reader -- of the Occident!

APPENDIX R.

Watch Your Freedom of Teaching.

Sinai, Volume VI : 244-248.

Watch Your Freedom of Teaching.
Vol. VI: 244-248.

Judaism can never constitute a difference between clergy and laymen, and may never depart from the principle of the general priesthood of all its confessors. The discontinuance of S'micha has done away with all "clerical power," the Rabbi is only a teacher, distinguished solely by his knowledge of the Law. On the other hand, the congregation cannot figuratively shackle its rabbi, and thus force him to become tyrannical. Least of all may his freedom of teaching be touched. How can a teacher be respected if he must dance to the fife played by his pupils? We have had an example of just that very recently. Rabbi Stein of Frankfurt resigned from his congregation in May 1860 after holding this position for eighteen years. He explained his reasons in a brochure. He was employed as the "second rabbi" of the congregation, and the stipulations for his office were the following:

1. In preaching he had to restrict himself to religion and ethics. ("Moral").
2. He may not interfere in the management of congregational activities.
3. He may not interfere in the congregational school. The teaching of religion and confirmation are to be left to the teacher employed by the congregation.

4. All his communications with the authorities are under the control of the board.
5. He may not issue decrees or prohibitions in religious or ceremonial matters.
6. He may not publish anything without previous permission of the board.

Of course these rules are only for the "second rabbi" -- but even there they are unheard of. However, these regulations were not removed when the second rabbi left his post.

It happened that the rabbi wished to preach on the ninth of Ab, and this was denied by the board without giving any reason. All these regulations from a board which might consist of idiots!

The root of such evils lies in the lack of knowledge of Judaism. In times past the Jewish aristocracy consisted of the learned. Today there is an aristocracy of money instead of knowledge (except in America), so that in elections the matter of riches is considered. Under such circumstances the rift between rabbis and laymen becomes bigger, and consequently the fear of clerical usurption becomes stronger. The only way people know to check this danger is by shackling the rabbi completely. Let us watch our freedom of teaching!

NOTES

to

PART IV.

Notes.

1) Sinai, Vol. VI, p. 3.

2) Ibid., p. 22.

3) Cf. below, Dr. Einhorn's Departure from Baltimore; Sinai, Vol. VI, pp. 135-142.

4) Sinai, Vol. III, pp. 1023-1029.

5) Ibid., p. 1024.

6) Ibid., p. 1025.

7) Cf. below, Counter Declaration (Re: Board of Delegates); Sinai, Vol. V, pp. 47-54.

8) Sinai, Vol. V, p. 7, footnote.

9) Suggestions for the Board of American Israelites; Sinai, Vol. V, p. 23.

10) Sinai, Vol. V, pp. 47-54.

11) Sinai, Vol. V, pp. 106-116.

12) Sinai, Vol. VI, pp. 329-331.

13) No date is given.

14) Sinai, Vol. VI, p. 330.

15) Ibid., pp. 377-379.

16) No date is given.

17) Sinai, Vol. VI, p. 379.

18) Sinai, Vol. VII, pp. 2-3.

19) Article Mortara Case.

20) Sinai, Vol. III, pp. 1076-1078.

21) Sinai, Vol. III, p. 1111.

22) No name or date is mentioned.

23) Sinai, Vol. III, pp. 1140-1143.

24) Ibid., p. 1144.

25) Ibid., pp. 1147-1151.

26) Sinai, Vol. IV, pp. 2-7.

27) This is not the original text, which is unavailable to us, but a translation to English from the German translation of the original.

28) Buchanan, of course.

29) Sinai, Vol. IV, p. 3, bottom.

30) Ibid., p. 6.

31) Sinai, Vol. III, pp. 1115-1127.

32) Ibid., p. 1115.

33) No date is given.

34) There is some doubt regarding the year; since no copies of the magazine are available to us, we cannot check this. Einhorn gives the date as September issue "L.J.", which stands for "Letzten Jahres," or last year. He published his own article in December 1858, which would date the magazine in question 1857. It is inconceivable, however, that he would relate the incident one year and three months later, so that we suggest the date 1858. A slight emendation of what may be a printer's error might do this, namely the reading of "D.J." (Dieses Jahres = this year) instead of the above mentioned "L.J."

35) Sinai, Vol. VI, pp. 143-148.

36) Sinai, Vol. VII, pp. 147-154 and 177-183.

37) About Family Pews in the Synagogue; Sinai, Vol. VI, pp. 205-207.

38) Sinai, Vol. IV, pp. 289-291.

39) This sermon appears in a condensed version in the section of Holy day sermons in this thesis.

40) Sinai, Vol. IV, pp. 161-169.

41) Sinai, Vol. II, pp. 772-775; Vol. III, pp. 805-815.

42) Sinai, Vol. IV, pp. 321-339.

43) Preached Saturday, September 24, 1859.

44) Sinai, Vol. V, a special addition of 28 pages after p. 64.

45) Sinai, Vol. V, pp. 65-70.

46) #34, 1860.

47) Sinai, Vol. VI, pp. 175-180.

48) Sinai, Vol. VI, pp. 112-115.

49) Sinai, Vol. VI, pp. 289-297.

50) Sinai, Vol. VI, pp. 244-248.

51) The "paper for children" and the "ignorant little Chazan" can leave no doubt that Einhorn referred to Leeser's Occident.

52) Cf. Maimonides, Mamrim I: 1-4.

53) Jost, Neuere Geschichte der Israeliten, II: 73-74.

54) January 12, 1860.

55) This statement must be qualified: In recent times, of course, parents have given their daughters a dowry, but not so in Biblical times. Cp. Genesis 24: 53; 30: 18; 34: 12; Judges 14: 10; et. al.

56) Yebamoth 63a.

57) Cp. Bezah 37a.

58) Cf. Protocols of the Breslau Rabbinical Assembly.

59) Cp. רש"י to the passage in Deuteronomy 21: 1-9.

PART V.

The Scholar.

The Scholar.

After reading the preceding material, no one can possible doubt Einhorn's encyclopedic knowledge and his great scholarship. Appended herewith are two articles which constitute some additional research published in the Sinai. The fact that all the work in these articles has long been superseded is of no great significance, for no matter how great a man may be, he is always only a member of his own generation, and his contributions must be considered in relation to the work produced by his contemporaries.

APPENDIX S.

The Spiritual Life of Israel in the Old Egypt According to its Light and Dark Sides.

Sinai, Volume VII : 207-212.
VII : 235-240.
VII : 263-266.

The Spiritual Life of Israel in the Old Egypt According to Its Light and Dark Sides.

Vol. VII: 207-212.

One of the greatest riddles in Israel's history is its preservation under the tyranny of Egypt for a period of several hundred years. Egypt was highly cultured, and according to history a highly cultured country usually soon absorbs all strange colonies within it. Nevertheless, after four hundred years, Israel, though it had become similar to Egypt's population in many respects, still had its own cult and the Hebrew language. Its geneologies show almost exclusively Hebrew names, and Moses' words "The God of the Hebrews has sent me to you" show that even though the Israelites had become more or less heathen, they still had their own cult. When such a phenomenon occurs, it proves that the people involved has a mirror, even though somewhat darkened, which shows figures from the past for which the group still yearns. The descendants of the patriarchs can boast of a nobility which no king on earth possesses. Whence came this power that let them keep their cult, their language and their customs, without which, as the Midrash remarks, they would have perished? This power came from the tribe of Levi. Our Ancients often instinctively uttered historical truths, which historical research only reached by round-about ways. They claimed that the tribe of Levi, because of its higher mental faculties was recognized as the nobility

of Israel even by the oppressors, and was thus excused from manual labor. Aaron, so they claim, had prepared the people for Moses' return by fiery addresses. According to Ibn Ezra Aaron as a speaker was known in Egypt as הלוי. In this tribe the traditions of the patriarchs were undoubtedly best preserved, and thus they also did not participate in the incident of the golden calf. This tribe can be divided into three lines; Gershon, Kehath and Merari. Kehath, the family of Moses, was amongst them the greatest. We may conclude this from the names which Kehath gave his four sons, for names were of great significance in antiquity. These names, according to Exodus 6: 18, were: Amram, Izhar, Hebron and Uzziel. Amram means "Nation of the Most High;" Izhar means "Light;" Hebron is the name of the city where the patriarchs were buried; Uzziel means "My strength is God." Thus a fourfold exhortation went out to Israel from these names: 1. God has chosen you for His people; 2. Remember your calling to become a light unto the nations; 3. Remember the sleeping patriarchs; 4. Trust the divine spirit in your midst!

1. Amram -- People of God. A nation with such a name, and therefore a feeling of having been chosen, can never be overpowered by any force on earth; it can be bent, but never broken. Thus Israel in Egypt was like a tree, the trunk was bent, but the root full of vitality.

It adopted many heathen concepts, but never lost sight of the God of its fathers. The name Israel in itself was a constant pointer to the nation's Covenant with God, and a promise of victory against the powers of fate and man. How deeply the tradition of being a chosen people was rooted in the nation is proved by the fact that Moses had to proclaim the divine revelation of "my first born Israel" only to Pharoah, but not to the people. The concepts of God were very vague at that time, so that Moses had to ask: What is His name? With the prevalent general concepts of God it was easy to adopt heathen views. Yet this namelessness of God was a distinction from heathenism which had definite names for all its gods. The people felt that it was lacking a great salvation-bringing truth, but the name Amram was a surety for them that they would find this treasure eventually, if they only did not lose themselves. This alone was enough to arm the slaves against their tyrants.

2. The name Izhar, the promise of becoming a light to the nations, strengthened their feeling. This also was a tradition in Israel, that the people would become a blessing to all the families of the earth. It has been found notable that Abraham already had so lofty an ideal, which mankind still regards as a faraway goal, so long before the Babylonian exile. But is it not far

more notable that Abraham recognized the power of God as the Ruler of heaven and earth, in a time when altars were still flowing with human blood? Abraham was a Chaldean, and according to non-Jewish sources the father of astronomy. This corresponds with his original name Abram, which means "Father of the heavenly heights." When he reached the conclusion that the heavenly stars were not gods, but only messengers of an unfathomable Being, was not then the conclusion very close, that the rational stars on earth, men, also were messengers of the Great One? According to the legend mankind had been one unit, with one language, until selfishness scattered them, in that God was lacking! Is it then not natural that Abram recognized this and became Abraham, the father of the multitude of nations? As little as his descendants in Egypt knew God, they did know that God had made a Covenant with their ancestor, and that they were the heirs of this Covenant, that from their midst, Izhar, a light, would come forth for all mankind. Where such hopes were prevalent, based on a great past, slavery could no longer oppress them, they could be weakened, but not exterminated. There the call of the sons of Levi would find an echo: Today you are still in darkness, but the sun of redemption is rising, and you, the slaves, will someday call prisoners to freedom!

Vol. VII: 235-240.

3. The name Hebron proves that the Israelites always remembered their ancestors. Nothing strengthens a nation as much as a glorious past, and when its heroes shine for millenia, then the memory of them constantly causes new blossoms of hope to bud in sorrow-laden hearts. The best proof for this are the Jewish Middle Ages. Surrounded by robbers and murderers, Israel stood fast, as their martyrs cried out: "Remember those who slumber in Hebron." If Israel had this spirit millenia after the death of the patriarchs, can we then marvel that these memories stood as a column of fire between them and the Egyptians after only a few centuries had passed after the patriarchs' death?

4. Added to this was another phenomenon that added a double strength to the means of preservation, namely a discernible power (of God) in the fate of the oppressed. This is expressed by the name Uzziel, i.e. "God is my strength." Scripture tells us that the more the unfortunate Hebrews were tortured, the more they spread out and gained in numbers. They had to build fortifications against Egyptian enemies, but then the fear arose that they would unite with a possible enemy. So their work has increased in order to lower the oppressed to the status of animals and to restrict their growth. But even then they increased. The Egyptians

began to drown their first born, but all to no avail, for by the time of the Exodus Israel numbered 600,000 men fit for war. Such obvious guidance by God could not fail to give them hope, so that they could cry to their hangmen: Uzziel, God is my Strength, and He is mightier than your Baal Zephon!

Until now we have restricted ourselves to a discussion of the bright side of Israel's spiritual life in Egypt, but we may not ignore the dark side, how far our tribe removed itself from the pure belief in God which its fathers had. That Israel subjected itself to idol worship during that period is proved by the later incident of the golden calf. The most important Bible exegetes explain that the golden calf was not regarded as a divinity in itself, but was put up in the place of Moses who was absent, as an intermediary between God and man. This view is also found among the heathens, in that they believed such an image could attract divine powers and guide divine care to the worshippers; but according to the Mosaic Law this is idolatry. The question is: Which heathen idol was being extolled in the form of this calf? If the Egyptian worship of steers was imitated amongst the Israelites (which view is now generally rejected), then Moses would have had trouble with the sacrificial cult, and in his exhortations would not have mentioned the worship of the heavenly bodies explicitly.

Amos 5: 25-26 sheds more light on this problem: "Did ye bring unto Me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness for forty years, O house of Israel? So shall ye take up Siccuth your King and Chiun your image, the star of your god, which ye made to yourselves." Kimchi thinks Chiun is Saturn, who was worshipped by the Egyptians as Knepth. סכות מלככם has been translated as "the tents of your king," referring to Moloch, who has no name and is simply referred to as Moloch, king. This Moloch service was prevalent in Israel already at a very early time; it took several centuries to uproot it. According to Biur and Philippson, and contrary to Rashi, this passage is in reference to Israel in the desert, and not to the age of the prophets. According to this passage then, Israel served Saturn and Moloch in the desert as subordinate deities. These two deities are seemingly different, but in reality the same. Both are termed עחיק ירמין. Amos speaks of them as two types of cults, but this is explained by the fact that the same deity used different ideas for expression and required different sacrifices at various occasions, and also because Saturn rarely appeared as the fire god Moloch. Creuzer, in his Symbolik II: 414, mentions Moloch as appearing in Egypt as a calf's head, with a glittering stone in its forehead. Thus we may conclude that the incident of the golden calf has the same basic idea as that which is mentioned in Amos. Some think: The Jewish

Sabbath, which takes place on Saturnus day, owes its origin to the Saturn service, in that the Greeks and Romans recognized Saturn as the god of liberty, equality, and blissful life. These concepts appear in the Jewish Sabbatical and Jubilee year. Furthermore, Saturn stands at the border between the moving stars and the fixed stars, thus providing a contrast between the change of earthly creation and the motionless rest of the Creator (Bähr, Symb. II: 558). Supposing the Egyptians had the Sabbath and Moses had borrowed the form from them, then the Mosaic Sabbath would have a form so contrary to that of the heathens, that it would be insipid to put a heathen origin behind it. Moses did adopt many institutions from the heathens, e.g. circumcision, sacrifice, cherubim, etc., but he gave them a divine spirit, to slay the enemy with his own weapons. In the above mentioned sense Mosaism recognized no differences between heaven and earth. To the contrary, the earth is the central point of creation, because man, the image of God, dwells there. Furthermore the Mosaic God does not rest. He is eternal and immutable, but always interfering. His rest on the seventh day, i.e. after the six days of creation, means to point out only completion, the flawlessness of His work, and the unchangeability of the laws of nature. Furthermore even the external Sabbath form is not a borrowed on, as Bähr points out (Op. cit.,

loc. cit.),for in pre-Mosaic days neither the Egyptians nor any other nation had even a trace of a Sabbatical weekday, whether the week was counted by the seven planets or not. And in addition, the day of Saturn in Egypt was the first, and not the seventh day of the week. (Bähr, II: 558).

Vol. VII: 263-266.

The question arises: Why is Saturn day, the first day of the week for the Egyptians, the last for Israel? Such a change can only come about in connection with the Sabbath, first mentioned by Moses in connection with the gathering of the mannah. ששת ימים תלקטהו וביום השביעי שבת לא יהיה בו. Here the seventh day as such is already generally recognized before the institution of the Sabbath. A new count of weekdays, had it been instituted, would have had to be mentioned explicitly, even as the new system for counting months, according to which the spring month became the first. The day of Saturn thus counted as the last day for the Jews in Egypt, in contrast to the general custom. Regarded more closely this can be explained easily. The number seven was sacred with all ancient nations, because of the worship of the seven planetary gods. In Israel it is the number of the Covenant between God and man, the number of peace and

salvation, and thus also between man and man. (Bähr, I: 187-179). Thus Abraham put up seven lambs as a witness between himself and Abimelech. The number seven appears especially as a number of peace, of redemption, as is illustrated by the Jubilee year which frees from slavery, and also partially the Sh'mittah year, in which the Hebrew slave is freed. Jacob served Laban seven years, proving that in this respect also the number was important to the patriarchs. Such traditions could not die among the Israelites even in Egypt, because the Hebrew expression for an oath, שבועה, also points to the ethical meaning of the number seven. Remembering the conscientiousness of the Covenant between the patriarchs and the great unknown God, which was uninterruptedly preserved during the slavery in Egypt, and that this Covenant was the proof for the eventual redemption, we need only regard the qualities of Saturn in relation to human enslavement to make it appear most natural that the Israelitic slaves took the seventh day as a day of intercession between the still unrevealed God and those in need of redemption. Saturn, as we have already noted, was the god of freedom and equality, almost the god of the slaves. The heathens of Charan, where there was a notable slave market, regarded him almost as a Satan. (Chwolsohn II: 384). Creuzer, in his Symbolic IV: 764, speaks of Rome's Saturnalia, when master and slave were equal. The Greeks had a similar

festival, when the king proclaimed: "I am as one of those amongst you."

The worship of idols in Egypt and in the desert is repeatedly connected with the desecration of the Sabbath in Ezekiel 20. This fact also speaks for the Saturn worship in Egypt. This connection also explains how the second decalogue motivates the Sabbath with the Egyptian slavery.*

This interpretation also explains why no fire was to be kindled outside the Temple on the Sabbath. It is an activity which Scripture obviously does not put in the category of work. Older exegetes seek the artificial explanation that the kindling of fire could easily lead to work and is therefore forbidden. The true explanation is a relatively simple one. Israel had dedicated the seventh day in Egypt to Saturn, and in this cult there surely were sacrifices. To prevent such sacrifices which might even lead to Moloch worship, all kindling of fire on the Sabbath was forbidden, except under levitical supervision in the Temple. Proof for this theory lies in the time in which this prohibition first came out. It is not mentioned with the gathering of the manna, nor in the Decalogue, but only in a meeting which took place after the incident of the golden calf. It was proclaimed only then by Moses, because at this occasion the people had demonstrated their continuing loyalty to the worship of

*The name of Aaron's wife אלישבע "My God -- seven" seems to point to Saturn worship.

Saturn.

The crown has fallen from Saturn's head a long time ago; he is not worshipped by slaves, and not called an abolitionist Satan by slaveholders. The seventh day is still called Saturday, but this is only an empty formality. In its place is the Mosaic Sabbath, which proclaims the high ideas of freedom and the equality of all men in the name of God.

APPENDIX T.

The Close Connection between Nisan and Tishri.

Sinai, Volume VI : 77-84.

The Close Connection between Nisan and Tishri.

Vol. VI: 77-84.

Nisan and Tishri have always been the two most important months in Israel. In both new epochs of time begin, both contain foundation-laying events. Nisan is called the first month in the Bible (ראשון לחדשי השנה) -- Tishri is the seventh month, and yet for thousands of years the latter has been the beginning of the year. There are unmistakable signs that at one time Tishri was the first month. Examining this situation more closely, we find in the extant traditional materials four main factors which point to the common denominator in the two months, and also accentuate the qualities of each. The Talmud comments to the passage in Scripture, according to which the Tabernacle was erected in the desert on the first day of the first month (Nisan) of the second year after the Exodus (cf. Exodus 40: 17): אותו היום נטר עשר עטרות . According to Sabbath 87b it was the first day of creation, the first for the princes to bring their sacrifices for the dedication of the Tabernacle. There are then four factors that unite these months closely: 1. Creation was fulfilled; 2. The tabernacle was built; 3. A central point was created for services; 4. The tenth day was dedicated for the consecration of the Covenant.

1. On the first of Tishri we celebrate the

divine act of world creation; in reality the coming into existence of humanity, the crown of creation. Our Ancients taught: אדם נברא בר"ה. From that point our calendation commences. Since the Biblical days of creation point to six periods of development, irrational beings may have existed hundreds of thousands of years before man. Rosh Hashanah 11a declares: בניסן נברא העולם. This is the foundation of the various sagas, about which there are differences of opinion. But there is no contradiction involved here. This verse refers to the closing of the epoch of irrational creatures. It is a time of rejuvenation in nature, while the beginning of fall, with its harvests, was the propitious moment for the appearance of man, king of creation, who at his arrival found a set table awaiting him. Also, by the fact that nature was going to sleep, his feeling of superiority over nature was awakened. Nisan, however, has an even higher dignity, it gave man a higher fulfillment by the creation of Israel as a divine nation. Tishri is the birthday of man in general -- Nisan is the birthday of the Jewish nation with its high task of blessing all the families of the earth. By its shining example, the pure path before God, Israel is to be an example for all humanity. New Year falls during the seventh month, as the Sabbath on the seventh day, a זכרון למעשה בראשית -- a testimonial to the completion of the natural order by the coming into existence

of rational beings. Pesach, in the first month, points to the completion of the eventual moral order by the choosing of Israel as the God-people.

2. In both months a tent-of-God was built. In Nisan, as already indicated, the Tabernacle in the desert was built. On the first of Tishri we celebrate the creation of an even holier tent-of-God -- namely man, created in the image of God. כל הנגע במת בנפש האדם אשר ימות ולא יתחטא את משכן ד' טמא (Numbers 19: 13).* Man, in whom the spirit of God resides, is thus raised to the dignity of a Temple of God by this passage. This Temple is higher than the one of wood and stone. The main parts of the אוהל מועד, as our Ancients already tell us, are symbols or imitations of man. The body is the ark in which God's testimony is kept; man's reason is the light of self-consciousness and recognition of God; heart and spirit are the cherubim that spread their wings protectingly over the divine testimony. The true sacrifice is the warm blood, purified of its unclean drives by the flame of heaven, standing in the service of heaven (cp. Torath Haolah 1: 25). He who desecrates this Temple by an ethical putridity has committed a more desecrating act than he who entered the Temple on Mt. Zion in an unclean condition; he who hurts this Temple by an attack of malice, as Scripture explicitly points out, has commited an act of מעל בי' -- far worse than a pro-

*The context here does not warrant Einhorn's naming man a משכן ד'. This is a far-fetched homiletical exegesis of the Biblical text. Cf. Rashi to Loc. cit.

fanation of lifeless Sanctuaries. But he, to speak with Isaiah, who breaks the bread for the hungry has prepared a שולחן הפנים in a higher sense; he who clothes the naked has donated a פרכת. With pride we remember the משכן built in Nisan, and simultaneously, with thanks, we remember that God raised an even higher tent in freeing our people out of the hands of Pharoah. As the seventh month reminds us of the dignity of man and calls to us כי גרים אנחנו לפניך and כצל ימינו על הארץ, thus the first month is a reminder ואהבתם את הגר, for everyone who is oppressed feels himself a stranger among his fellowmen כי גרים הייתם בארץ מצרים.

3. Another similarity is the following: On the first of Nisan the custom to sacrifice individually on hills was done away with. This cult was not relegated to the central Sanctuary. The priesthood was also instituted at this time. The original idea that anyone could sacrifice (e.g. the Pesach lamb) is of course commensurate to the Mosaic principle that the whole nation consists of priests. But the God-nation needed a central point of light in the beginning, when heathendom was still strong in its midst. This central Sanctuary was to strengthen the loose links, to fasten them closer together. A special priestly tribe was designated to watch the purety of the Law, to keep away heathen customs! Did something similar happen with the creation of man in Tishri? Heaven with its stars, earth with its countless

beings, irrational nature, they all sang a Shirah to God, but with all the light from the heaven there was darkness, with the multitudinous choirs, there was loneliness. Then man, the image of God, was created, and the shackles were broken, loneliness had come to an end. In man creation found its focal point. The Midrash says: אדם הראשון היה בכורו של עולם והקריב קרבן ולבש בגדי כהונה גדולה. With him the עבודה and the כהונה began, his head first wore the crown in which the light of creation and the beauty of the world's Ruler were reflected.

4. Another similarity between the two months lies in the purposes of their respective tenth days. On the tenth day of Nisan the paschal lamb is to be purchased, ready to be sacrificed on the fourteenth day. The tenth day of Tishri is a day of atonement and purification, which prepares sanctification -- not by prayer and fasting, but by the struggle in life against dark powers. Only from such a peace with God comes the worthiness of man to receive God's temporal blessings on the fourteenth, the harvest festival, which will drive out worry and unite the family in thanks. The Pesach meal of the fourteenth day also unites the family for a meal of the Covenant, when Israel celebrates its birthday as a God-nation, hearing again the cry of Hosea: "I betroth Thee unto Me forever." How could Israel, enslaved mentally and

physically in Egypt, suddenly rise to such high dignity? The tenth day, the day of the purchase of the paschal lamb, was also a day of atonement and of preparation for the Covenant meal; which day tore down incarcerating walls, and from the links of shackling chains forged a bridal ring for Israel.

P A R T VI.

The Educator.

The Educator.

As an educator we know very little about Dr. Einhorn from the Sinai, with the exception of one article, appended hereby. But there he attacks another school, giving us only a negative slant on his own approach.

In addition he reviewed a few Sunday School texts, but since those are irrelevant to the present paper, they are omitted.

APPENDIX U.

The Jewish Sunday School in Baltimore.

Sinai, Volume II : 437-446.

The Jewish Sunday School in Baltimore.

Vol. II: 437-446.

An article in the last issue of Sinai* regarding the Jewish Sunday School in Baltimore was recently censured severely, which is proof that a word was spoken at the correct time. As long as that Sunday School went unchallenged, the public did not care about it; now that an interest has been taken, much has been gained. Most intelligent Jews, no matter whether they are Orthodox or Liberal, are on our side. Here are the grounds for our attack:

Is it not true that a teacher must be familiar at least a little with his subject, and that the material must penetrate and appeal to both reason and emotion?

Hufeland, a German physician, once said to a quack who prescribed medicines according to the former's book: "Some day you'll die of a printing error." The same holds true in a religious school where the teachers do not know their subject, and at best can read to their students out of a book. Such machine-like instruction can at best oppress youthful minds, it cannot succor them; it can only produce a lip-religion without a heart. If there is a mistake, the whole school could die an ethical death!

Is it not true that a religious school teacher ought to know at least a little of the Hebrew Bible?

---

*Cf. "Nachrichten-Baltimore"

Our Ancients fought as long as possible against the recording of the Oral Law, out of fear it would cause the Bible to lose its central place. With the present flood of religious books and catechisms we would almost have as many Bibles as we have Jewish authors! Every true Jew must help to prevent that, for if that happened the Bible would go out of fashion -- to make room for fashionable ladies.

These ladies know of Judaism and Hebrew as much as a blind man knows of colors -- does not that justify a condemnation of the school? Furthermore, as their texts prove, the school has a hyper-orthodox coloring: Yet the Mishnah of Kedushin 92a, and Yore Deah 245, 21 prohibit ladies to teach publicly out of moral respects. We don't care -- but if this school is supposed to be Orthodox -- then what? Of course we do object if women teach about such cardinal points as circumcision -- to do this a lady must be most heroic, and must blush deeply ..... .

Of course a hullabaloo will be raised about our impropriety. But who commits an impropriety, he who practices it, or he who condemns it?

Furthermore a religious book such as Leeser's is as impossible as can be expected of an author who is a stranger in this field according to his own confession. A complete picking out of mistakes would require a

separate work -- only a few follow here.*

As Leeser states in the preface to his book, half of his book he owes to the catechism of Dr. Kley (preacher of the new Hamburg Temple), departing only in points which seem heretical to him -- and as Leeser thinks, he appears occasionally as a "schismatic." It takes a great deal of "Meisterschaft" to be able in such a case to boast with Rabbi Meier in regard to his association with Acher: I have taken the kernel but have thrown away the shell. It is easy to see beforehand how an undertaking must have missed that attempted to shape an ultra Orthodox book of religion from a book saturated by Reform ideas.

Examples follow here from Leeser's text book, which can be of no particular interest to us. Einhorn then continues: Only in America would a man, who hardly knows the first principles of religion, dare to undertake the writing of a religious text book, and only unknowing and careless parents can permit their children to be taught according to such a book, which portrays the holiest moral laws as mere ceremonials, and thus indoctrinates youth with the most harmful principles -- even if this is done without the intention of the author.

We merely want to extend a warning to the parents of Baltimore: Don't send your children to such a school! At best it plays only a game with what is holy and can only kill your children for Judaism.

*We have omitted the listing of these errors, since we are concerned only with Dr. Einhorn's works and not with those of Rev. Leeser.

In the knowledge of having fulfilled a sacred obligation, we look with contempt on the chatter that we have by this warning insulted "ladies." One does not sell one's God for etiquette, and at the cost of one's religion one does not pay compliments. Isaiah did not hesitate to show the daughters of Zion their folly. We insulted no one. Ladies were not called to be prophets, and teachers cannot feel hurt if their office is challenged. No insult to the ladies was intended, we do not even accuse them of ignorance of our faith, or of aping Methodism. They may be angels -- but angels of death, spreading a net of Leeser's fantasies over our youth.

Three men recently returned the Sinai on account of this article. How ridiculous! If all of our subscribers did the same, we still would not change one word of the truth!

Jews of Baltimore! The fate of this school will prove whether you are on the same level of religious education as the Jewish populations of other cities, or whether you are far below them. If elements of native Jews -- amongst whom are many honorable people who have kept immigrants far from them and never cared to join an existing congregation -- finally would acknowledge the honorable position and the religious activities of their German religious cofreres, and would

wish to join in our religious life, we would welcome the phenomenon. If a few, proud of the noble blood in their veins, come down from the clouds like the בני אלהים to the daughters of man (Genesis 6: 2) to overpower our religious life and to imprint upon us a sniffling Puritanism, then religious duty requires us to stop them in the name of God and our holy religion, to remind them that German Jewry today is what Spanish Jewry was a few centuries ago, to remind them that what they use as Jewish literary work is only a crippled impression of the intellectual products of German Jewish scholars.

PART VII.

Panorama.

Panorama.

Before closing this dissertation, we must take a look at the religious world of Einhorn. Reform in a non-technical sense, i.e. in the sense of liberalization, had shaken all of Judaism. While most people were intellectually too far removed from sensing the changes, scholars of every Jewish denomination were deeply conscious of the changes that were taking place. Thus Conservatism and Neo-Orthodoxy appeared on the scene. At the moment we cannot concern ourselves with the details of this schism, for that is a topic which must be treated separately. It is interesting, however, to see Dr. Einhorn's reactions, which are appended hereby. The articles are clear and do not need further elaboration.

APPENDIX V.

The Desperate Battle of the Old Belief.

Sinai, Volume V : 257-262.

The Desperate Battle of the Old Belief.

Vol. V: 257-262.

The process of development in the religious field is ostensibly progressing. One cannot help to shed a tear for those who mourn in pious resignation on the graves and ruins of the old system as Jeremiah once did. But if such Jeremiads are changed into curses, one must be filled with abhorrence. How does the papacy fight its death struggle? Pius IX has a Jewish boy stolen over the protests of the whole civilized world, and even over the protests of high church dignitaries. Because the parents cry out, the Jews of the Vatican are mistreated and tortured. While the iron arm of the church was extended over the nations, her behavior was the result of folly that deserved to be cursed, but today it is nothing but cowardice, an act of murdering the helpless. Recently the church has issued excommunications against mighty men, but the names of the cursed were kept quiet, showing that the church in its last moments can do nothing but clench its fist instead of doing penance for past sins. And what of the catholic press in regard to such men as Garibaldi, to whom the Italian people are flocking? It raves ..... one is astounded about its virtuosity in vulgarity ..... the names it calls the people, such as robbers, bums, beer-bums: As if the Catholic clergy never is a little drunk -- by means of

noble wines, of course -- as if it were not better to be drunk on plebian beer than the blood of heretics, which is consumed by the church in streams. A Catholic paper of Cincinnati* reports that recently there was a festivity of anti-papal German Catholics in Mannheim. Among other clerics the rabbi was present. The paper remarked that where there was a demonstration against the holy Roman church, of course the "Mauschel" (Kike) had to be present. Why such raging, gentlemen? The spirit of world history has spoken his judgment against your case -- and that you cannot curse to death! Jesus died with the words "Eli, Eli, Lamah Azavtani" on his lips. Would it not be better if the papacy in its death were to imitate the Rabbi of Nazareth -- even though it never did during its lifetime?

Unfortunately Jewish Orthodoxy cannot be exonerated completely of similar gestures. We shall never cease to respect honest Orthodoxy, even to put it far higher than that half-bakedness which steals a few radical-reform phrases today, and tomorrow becomes fanatic against the cause of practical Reform; which sanctifies the Talmud tomorrow after deriding the Bible today. But Orthodoxy must never forget one thing: The present ethical consciousness has forever condemned certain traditional principles. There are certain axioms of ethics, before which any religious theory must bow down

---

*No source or date is given.

today, unless it wishes to be branded as unethical. Among these axioms is freedom of belief. The sensible part of Orthodoxy, e.g. the publisher of the Jeshurun, will admit that one cannot deal with Jewish heretics today as the Shulchan Aruch prescribes. Recently Rabbi Kohn of Lemberg was attacked by a fanatic -- even the Orthodox members of our faith were shocked about such events. Even more recently Dr. Chronik, Rabbi of the Liberal Amsterdam community, was attacked by a mob, so that a platoon of dragoons had to be called to protect him from the "pious." Chronic protested this action to the Orthodox rabbinical candidates, who obviously had encouraged the riot, telling them that even according to Orthodoxy it was forbidden to attack those who differed in opinion from tradition. We think Dr. Chronik wasted his breath in the protest -- let them curse all they want, as long as they do not become violent. However, we think it most deplorable that such events can happen in the enlightened year 1860, that Orthodoxy will not recognize the dangers of such behavior. Such fanaticism is arising only because the reform principle is coming to the fore increasingly. Orthodoxy cannot fit itself to the divine decisions and fights bitterly. Reform regrets this, for in Orthodoxy lay the seeds of Reform, and at its deathbed Reform wishes to honor it as one honors a dying mother.

APPENDIX W.

The Bitter Battle in the Camp of Neo-Orthodoxy.

Sinai, Volume VI : 67-77.

The Bitter Battle in the Camp of Neo-Orthodoxy.

Vol. VI: 67-77.

A new battle has broken out, this time within the camp of Neo-Orthodoxy. Neo-Orthodoxy is not a definite religious aim, but rather a definite opposition to Reform, even though it departs somewhat from the traditional religious view. It holds on to the old Judaism because of romantic notions, and is thus not so much opposed to Reform principles as to their practical application; or else it remains with Orthodoxy out of a sacred feeling of obligation and duty. It distinguishes itself from tradition in that it feels the necessity to spiritualize Biblical and rabbinical Law, and to find a symbol in every custom, no matter how insignificant it may be. Nevertheless, it is far from making the acceptance of the Law dependent on its spiritualization. At the head of this movement is Dr. Hirsch of Frankfurt. He has fought for this cause ever since his "Nordische Briefe"* appeared more than twenty-five years ago. He is fighting zealously for a lost cause, but he does not think it is lost, even promises it victory. He is opposed by Dr. Zecharias Frankel, the head of the Breslau Seminary. He, a man of great scholarship, has broken with tradition in principle long ago, but nevertheless is one of the most bitter opponents of

*Dr. Einhorn probably means Hirsch's Nineteen Letters of Ben Uziel.

Reform Judaism. He spoke his anathema over the Hamburg prayerbook because it did not pray for the restoration of Zion and other matters vital to him .... in brief, he took every opportunity to represent rabbinic Judaism. However, it is clear to anyone who can read between the lines that even for this spokesman the talmudic guise of Judaism does not appear as an outflowing of divine inspiration. Frankel never showed his break with the old Judaism more clearly than with the appearance of his recent book דרכי המשנה. The work itself is excellent, but it presupposes the human origin of tradition everywhere, not even excluding laws which the Talmud appraises as having come down from Moses by oral tradition (הלכה למשה מסיני). This must seem all the more dangerous to a man like Hirsch, because Frankel is the head of a seminary, and furthermore, because the author at no point attempts to bring proof for his contradictions of the traditional view, presenting his work as if it were self-understood. The subject under discussion deals not only with theory or dogma, but with matters of vital importance in religious practice. If there is no oral Law directly from God, then the prohibitions of Terephoth and many others, esteemed as divine institutions, are only human decrees. The denial of the divine origin of the oral Law necessarily involves also the mutability of the Mosaic Law, for many talmudic definitions are out-

growths of the Biblical word.

Hirsch's Jeschurun recently published a letter of Gottlieb Fischer of Stuhlweissenburg "to all friends of truth and our Jewish future," in which Frankel's break with talmudic Judaism is definitely proved and he is called a heretic and a denier of Torah ("Thoraleugner"). Hirsch wrote a sixteen page editorial to the essay, which latter has not yet been completely published.

For Frankel the orally handed-down Halachoth and rabbinic interpretations of the Talmud, traced back to Moses, are only products of the human mind. Tradition traces the above mentioned customs to a divine revelation, and heretical views such as Frankel's are equal to a denial of God (cf. Maimonides in his commentary to Mishnah Sanhedrin 88b and 90a).

Frankel did not answer these accusations, but his pupils published an article in the A. Z. d. J. in which they expressed their regret about the actions of the Jeschurun -- but they did not attempt to defend their teacher. The "Briefkasten" (letters-to-the-editor department) has a letter from a pupil of Frankel, assuring Dr. Hirsch of Frankel's personal piety. Hirsch's answer of course was that he was not interested in Frankel's personal life, but was concerned only about his official stand. Finally a certain Dr. Beer defended Frankel in an addition to the A. Z. d. J. #6, 1861 -- but in such a manner that all decent people will shy away from such things.

APPENDIX X.

Orthodoxy's Chances for the Restoration of the Old Sacrificial Cult.

Sinai, Volume VII : 329-331.

Orthodoxy's Chances for the Restoration of the Old Sacrificial Cult.

Vol. VII: 329-331.

An organization for resettlement in Palestine was recently founded. Most of its members are Orthodox, who view in the undertaking a chance to restore the old state. It is questionable that many will respond to this invitation; true Orthodoxy cannot view this undertaking favorably, to wit, the passage of Song of Songs quoted by Kethuboth 111a in this respect: "I adjure you, O daughters of Jerusalem, by the roes and the hinds of the field, that ye neither awaken nor stir up love, until it please."

PART VIII.

Correspondence.

Correspondence.

Out of the approximately thirty letters of Dr. Einhorn[1] written to Dr. Bernard Felsenthal during the years 1861-1862, which are available to us, only a few contain matters of interest. Most of them contain financial statements for Einhorn's prayerbook, sent to Dr. Felsenthal for collection. There are a few congratulatory notes on Felsenthal's engagement and on his assuming the duties of Rabbi at Temple Sinai in Chicago. We can see clearly that Einhorn's health was not good, he speaks of a nervous ailment which did not permit him the use of his right hand. Otherwise only three letters contain notes of interest. One dated Philadelphia, May 31, 1861, speaks of Dr. Deutsch:

> My faith in Dr. Deutsch also "stands on weak feet;" he appears to me to be a character who is not made of iron ... but whence would our Reform spirits take iron characters? Deutsch is a bit of a "Pfaffe" (deragatory term for a parson), but can pass among American Jewish "Pfaffen."

A second letter speaks of "Benjamin II," the Jewish traveler who approached Einhorn for help, and whom Einhorn recommended in the Sinai.[2] In a letter dated Philadelphia, September 23, 1861, Einhorn changed his mind about the gentleman involved, stating

> "..... his character does not appear as Kosher to me as before. I take him for a collecting Pollack .....Let him stick to [3]Wise whom he fits better."

1. These letters may be found in the American Jewish Archives, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.
2. Cf. above.
3. Undecipherable.

A third letter, dated May 25, 1862, is directed against I. M. Wise. Einhorn advises Felsenthal not to act against the religious school text by the "general humbug of Cincinnati," for that would only result in the "pouring out of a whole mud puddle of vulgarity." The letter continues:

> "Whoever touches this man soils himself. Those who look up to him as a mental giant are too stupid to be taught, and for all others such an instruction is superfluous. This man was not ashamed to send me free of charge his junk immediately after its publication, but to this date I have not been able to force myself to read it; matter of fact is, I don't know where to find it. From the Jeschurun[1] I saw recently that this Jewish pope was so impertinent as to request all rabbis of Europe to prosecute a man by warrant ("Steckbrieflich verfolgen") for deserting his wife in Chicago ..... You should read that irresponsible, confused, abhorrent nonsense, paired with worship of self! ..... For a moment I was tempted to take up my pen so that at least not all of the American Rabbinate would be made ridiculous in the eyes of Europe, but on second thought I found it more fitting to avoid a polemic against this man."

Thus for the letters -- they speak clearly and are in no further need of analysis.

---

1. No date is mentioned.

C O N C L U S I O N.

Conclusion.

An old German proverb has it that "all things have an end, except for sausages, which have two ends." And so we reach the end of the Sinai. The cessation of its publication was stated by Dr. Einhorn in his farewell message to his readers, which follows below:

A Farewell.

Vol. VII: 319-320.

Dr. Einhorn states that Sinai died in the fight against slavery.* This struggle cost the Sinai more than half of its subscribers. Many had also refused to pay their bills; more than $1,000 were outstanding, which Dr. Einhorn could not collect. He himself did not possess the funds to cover such a deficit, and besides that the weakness in his right hand required a lot of rest. Should anything require special attention, Dr. Einhorn planned to write pamphlets.

He stated he would leave it to others to decide whether or not a new Reform publication was necessary. That would be up to the richest among the Reform congregation.

---

*A reader writes: Sinai's fate lies in its motto: "I seek my brothers," for the Sinai, even as Joseph, was sold during the search.

Only little remains to be said. These preceding pages have clearly shown the personality of Dr. David Einhorn. A vehement, indomitable fighter for what he believed to be the truth, a violent opponent of ignorance, a sterling character to the few who called him friend, a great preacher, and an even greater scholar. What I. M. Wise did for American Reform Judaism in the way of organization, David Einhorn did for Reform Theology. The one could not have stood without the other, and so, in death, the two are at last united in the living monument which we of this generation call Reform Judaism.

Einhorn's task was by no means finished; for many years he continued to labor in the Lord's vineyard from the pulpit and with the pen, until at last he was called to join his fathers in the year 1879. But the analysis of his remaining works we must leave to a future occasion.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION - LIBRARY - CINCINNATI, OHIO

169295